

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. MOAKLEY. Fix up the rule, whatever.

In effect, Republicans voted to deny Mr. MONTGOMERY—

Mr. THOMAS. Regular order, Mr. Speaker.

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

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

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

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

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

Does the gentleman from California seek recognition?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 238]

AYES—242

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

NOES—190

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

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

NOT VOTING—2

Borski Cubin

□ 1423

The Clerk announced the following pair: On this vote:

Ms. Cubin for, with Mr. Borski against.

So the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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 AND RESCISSIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1995

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

□ 1425

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

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

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, 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. Chairman, 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. Chairman, today we bring to the House our regular and emergency supplemental appropriations and rescissions bills, H.R. 1158 and H.R. 1159. These bills, the product of 10 subcommittees, were ordered reported by the Committee on Appropriations on March 2. This was after 6 weeks of hearings beginning January 11 and culminating in the completion of subcommittee mark ups on February 24.

Mr. Chairman, the scope and size of these bills is unprecedented. Together these bills would rescind over \$17.4 billion. If you add in the \$3.2 billion that has already been rescinded in the emergency defense supplemental, the total rescissions reported by the Committee on Appropriations in the last 6 weeks are over \$20.3 billion during the brief existence of the 104th Congress. I do not believe you will find any comparable performance in past Congresses.

Mr. Chairman, the details of these bills are well known. We began marking up in subcommittee nearly 3 weeks ago. These were open mark ups and the news of what was in them spread quickly. Also the reports to accompany them have been available since we cir-

culated the bills for our full committee mark up on February 27. The reasons for the action we took are described in great detail in these reports. I commend them to all Members. Because of this I will not spend any time reviewing the bills at this point. Rather, I would like to talk about the overall situation that we dealt with on developing the bills.

After I became chairman in early January, I said that we needed to do a rescission bill. My reason was that we could not wait for our fiscal year 1996 bills to begin to downsize the Federal Government. If we began in fiscal year 1995, we would send the message sooner of our resolve to produce a leaner, not meaner, less intrusive government.

After we began to developing our rescission bill, major supplemental appropriations needs became known. Early in December we became aware of a significant unfunded problem in the Department of Defense of over \$3 billion. When the President's budget was submitted, we learned of \$7.5 billion more of supplemental needs, mostly for additional FEMA disaster relief. At this point we were not sure that any fiscal year 1995 effort to downsize Government would result in any savings beyond what we had to develop to offset the \$10 billion in supplementals.

The approach we used to address this problem was to keep the development of the supplementals and rescissions separate. We put our rescissions on one track and developed the supplementals on another. A target was never set for rescissions. We just wanted to make a strong effort, and place ourselves in the best position we could in developing our fiscal year 1996 bills in order to meet expected significantly lower allocations.

□ 1430

First we peeled off enough rescissions to offset the defense supplemental because it needed to move the quickest. Then we peeled off enough rescissions to offset the nonemergency supplemental needs, and finally we packaged the domestic emergency supplemental needs with all of the remaining rescissions we had identified. As it turns out, we had over a 3-to-1 ratio of rescissions to supplemental appropriations in this final package.

I worked closely with the subcommittee chairman in aggressively pursuing rescissions, but I did not do this with any fixed target in mind. I am pleased with the outcome and with their product, but we were not trying to achieve any goal except looking to the future and getting a start on what needs to be done to balance the budget.

As it turns out, we were able to offset all supplementals, something that has not been done before, and we reduced fiscal year 1996 outlays resulting from prior appropriations by a very helpful margin.

We have started the process of downsizing the Federal Government, and our fiscal year 1996 bills can more easily be meshed in with this plan.

Perhaps most importantly we have sent the message that we will reduce the deficit beginning in fiscal year 1995 whether or not we have a balanced budget amendment.

Here are the guiding principles we used to develop the rescission proposals: We defunded unauthorized programs; we consolidated programs where duplication was so obvious that a meaningful service could not be rendered; we cut back on programs that received large increases in the fiscal year 1995 bills. Where we found programs that just do not work, we stood up and said so. And in other programs we flushed the pipeline, especially in the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

These principles produced huge results; some say these results have gone too far, but when we get into the details Members will find out just how important our thorough review of downsizing government was.

Take the special supplemental food program for women infants and children for instance. We have been accused of taking food out of the mouths of needy children. All we did was reduce slightly the amount of carryover that was occurring in this program because it was being increased faster than the system could handle it. No beneficiaries will be impacted, no one will be removed from this program, and the program funding will continue to increase.

We recommended terminating the low-income home energy assistance program beyond fiscal year 1995. Now we are being accused of causing low-income people to freeze to death, but this is just one more example of a temporary program far outliving its time. Energy costs are far below the pre-1980 levels in real terms. If low-income people need an income supplement, then a reason other than energy cost needs to be used. We need to go elsewhere and find other ways to help those people, as we certainly can do with the myriad of programs that are available under the Federal Government.

We recommended in these bills rescinding funding for construction of six veterans' ambulatory care units. Funding for these projects was added above last year's budget request. They were developed as part of last year's universal health care proposal that subsequently died, and if these projects are needed, then they could be reformulated as part of a new health care proposal. Building facilities without the solution on how to pay for them and how they might fit into some other overall scheme just is not reasonable.

However, I understand there will be an amendment to address this issue, and the problem may be resolved for the veterans.

But we are also recommending terminating the Summer Youth Jobs Program. This program has turned into an income supplement program without