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. BEREUTER 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 If you add in the $3.2 billion that has already been rescinded in the emergency defense supplemental, the total rescissions reported by the Committee on Appropriations in the last 6 weeks are over $20.3 billion during the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 circulated 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

improving the employability of most of the participants or providing any long-term positive effect or skills training and we can do better than this. This program is not fulfilling any of its objectives.

Opponents of these bills say we are cutting spending in the wrong places. But this is a government with 163 job training programs, administered by 15 agencies costing $20 billion. Do these programs duplicate each other, do they work, can they be consolidated? Of course they can. But if this is the wrong place, the wrong time for cutting, then perhaps we should assume all 163 programs are doing just fine, thank you, and move on. I doubt that that is the case.

What is wrong with looking at education programs where 240 separate programs costing heaven knows how much and including 48 elementary and secondary education programs continue to flourish, notwithstanding the redundancy, the duplication and waste and inefficiency. Do they duplicate each other? Of course they do. Are they cost effective? No. Do they result in higher test scores? Obviously not from looking at the scores over the years. No one in or out of government can really say with certainty that we need any or certainly the vast majority of these programs.

Let us not forget the 93 early childhood programs, the 46 youth development programs, and the 14 nutrition programs. Actually I think that is closer to 30 nutrition programs. Is everybody satisfied that they are all functioning well and providing effective and efficient service to the neediest of Americans? Of course not.

In fact, I am convinced that we cannot find any single bureaucrat or advocate that says all of these programs are needed or meritorious. We can consolidate them. We can render service where service is needed. We can save the American taxpayer money, we can have fewer programs and less bureaucracy. We can work toward a balanced budget by trimming the Government down in this duplication and waste.

But if these are the wrong places to cut, what are the right places? If this is the wrong time to cut, then when is the right time? Do we fix the roof while the sun shines, or do we wait until the economy takes a turn down and find a new excuse to prime the pump with new jobs programs or youth development programs and more education programs?

Now that the balanced budget amendment has failed to pass the Senate, the thorny question still remains: Will Congress ever cut Federal spending? Even if we do not change the Constitution, it is still only one avenue open to us. It is the old-fashioned way. It is simply to sit down and get the job done, and take the first step, and that is what this bill is, taking the first step.

The Committee on Appropriations took the view that now is the time and that this rescission package is the way. The rescissions in these bills are less than 1 percent of the entire Federal budget. But it may be too much for some of our colleagues and for the President, all of whom are casting about for excuses as to why we should not even cut a single program.

They say we are not cutting spending, just paying for tax relief for the rich. But even if Congress fails to cut taxes, spending will exceed revenues by $200 billion this year and every year into the future, according to the Clinton administration plan.

If we approve this bill or approve the Clinton administration plan, another trillion dollars of debt will be layered on your children's shoulders in 5 years' time.

Mr. Chairman, here we are with a chance. We can downsize the Government, we can do it at a time of relative prosperity. We can reduce the deficit if we have the courage to get rid of bad programs, and we can do it in the old-fashioned way by just voting to cut spending now.

Let us not wait until next year or the year after, let us take the opponents at their word. If they are for getting our expenses in line with our inflow, then indeed we must pass these bills and I would urge the adoption of the bill.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 13 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, what I would like to do here is to set the stage and explain why we are here and why we are doing this today. We have heard the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] and a lot of our Republican friends talk to us about deficit reduction and give us lectures about the need for deficit reduction.

I think it is important to explain how this country got to this moment. This chart will I think demonstrate what has happened to this country since the end of World War II. At the end of World War II, because we needed to borrow money in order to pay for the war, we wound up with a national debt which was roughly 115 percent of our total annual national income. Under a series of Presidents, Republican and Democrat, and under Congresses which were mostly Democratic but sometimes Republican, we brought that down on a bipartisan basis through the years to the point where in 1980 our debt as a percentage of gross domestic product was about 23 or 24 percent.

Then what happened is that Ronald Reagan was elected to office. He presented us a budget which essentially doubled military spending and which provided huge tax cuts for rich people, and that package was rammed through this House. I know, I was here; I offered alternatives to it. I warned at the time that if that budget package passed, we would have an explosion of both the national debt and the Federal deficit.

Mr. Stockman, who was the budget director for President Reagan at the time, admitted that, in his words, ''the numbers did not add.'' In fact, his exact words were these: He said:

> In the budget that we sent down to the Congress we got the deficit down to $31 billion by hook or by crook, mostly the latter. We didn't think it all the way through. We didn't add up all the numbers. We should have designed those pieces to be more compatible. But the pieces were moving on independent tracks. That's what happened. But for about a month and a half we got away with that because of the novelty of it all.

Now that is Mr. Stockman talking, not me.

So the Reagan budgets were passed, and what happened? The Federal deficit which had never been larger than $74 billion exploded to nearly $300 billion over the next decade, and the national debt tripled and quadrupled. As a result, this line began going in the wrong direction; it began going up, so that today we are at a national indebtedness which is about twice the level as a percentage of the national income as it was in 1980.

So in the 1980s we had three different efforts to try to correct the problem because the Republican party was embarrassed by what they had produced. And we had three magic fixes: Gramm-Rudman I, Gramm-Rudman II and Gramm-Rudman III. None of them fixed the debt, none of them affected the deficit, although each of them promised within a time frame of 4 to 5 years to balance the budget.

The public finally got fed up with it, and 2 years ago they elected President Clinton. They expected he would do something about it. He produced a budget which called for $500 billion in deficit reduction. He got not a single Republican vote for that in the House or in the Senate.

Under that, our committee, after that budget was passed, our committee produced cuts in 500 separate programs in the first year of the last biennium and last year we produced cuts in 400 programs in the year during which I was chairman.

Now I will fully grant that our Republic friends did a much better job of getting their message across about what happened on the budget than we Democrats did. I will grant that. And as a result, we lost 53 seats because the public apparently did not like the fact that we had voted for the Clinton budget. They did not apparently like the fact that we had voted for the Clinton budget program which did bring that deficit down from the $323 billion that George Bush told us it was going to be on the day he walked out of the White House, down to around $180 billion today.

□ 1445

But I will grant we did not do a good job of explaining what we did. We paid a price for it. I think that demonstrates that our party is willing to pay whatever price is necessary to get

the deficit down. We have already paid that price.

I would remind you that not a single Republican voted in either the Senate or the House for that deficit-reduction package. I say that simply to try to make the point that what we are talking about here today is not a difference over spending levels. Every single amendment that I asked the Committee on Rules to make in order would have saved precisely the same amount of money that is being saved in this bill today. What we argue about is where you are making the savings and where you are not making the savings.

This is not an issue about the number of education programs or the number of job-training programs. I stipulated at the beginning of the markup that we supported the elimination of most of the programs in question.

But here is what we do not support: We do not support hitting kids before they are born by cutting back on the Healthy Start program as this bill does. We do not support clobbering kids by wiping out over a 3-year time frame public broadcasting, because that is the only decent television that most preschool kids get these days. We do not support, as you do in another bill, cutting $7 billion below current services in the school lunch program. We do not support that. We do not support going after job-hungry kids by eliminating the summer jobs program, 610,000 kids just told to go take a walk this summer. We do not support whacking tech prep and the school-to-work programs as this bill does, and we do not support wiping out the drug-free school program that you wipe out, and we do not support eliminating 100,000 scholarships for kids who need help to go on to college. Neither do we support shooting old people.

What this bill does is say to 2 million senior citizens who make less than $10,000 a year, ''Sorry, but even if you live in my district, 30 below zero weather, you are not going to get any help to pay your fuel bills anymore.'' That means those seniors are going to have to choose between prescription drugs and heating their homes. I think that is a lousy choice for any Member of Congress who makes $133 thousand a year to impose on somebody in that income bracket. I think morally that stinks.

I also think it is wrong to say that you are going to take 40 percent of the housing hits and target them to senior citizens. So that is what we object to. We object to where you are getting the cuts.

We also object to where you are not getting the cuts. We tried to get the Coleman amendment made in order that would have allowed us to cut $400 billion in highway demonstration pork, but the Committee on Rules under the Republican leadership said, ''No, you cannot cut there.'' I tried to offer an amendment which would delay for 5 years the development of the F–22 aircraft which we do not even need until the year 2014, but which is going to cost us $150 million a copy. We tried to delay that for 5 years so we could save $7 billion so you would not have to wipe out the school lunch program. The Committee on Rules said, ''No, we do not want you to have that fix-up.'' So they said we could not offer that amendment.

We also wanted to set up a new system for disaster relief so that every citizen who needs help can still get it, but gets it under a system of loan guarantees paid for by State governments, not Uncle Sam. That would have enabled us to restore a whole series of programs. We would have been able to restore Healthy Start, Chapter 1, safe, drug-free schools, education for the homeless, SSIG State scholarships, Public Broadcasting, summer jobs, Eisenhower teacher training, senior-citizen housing, older workers' programs, and veterans' benefits. But, again, the Committee on Rules said, ''No, you cannot save the money there. You have got to go after seniors. You have got to go after kids.'' We think that is the wrong thing to do.

Now, why are we here? We were told a few months ago we were cutting the $17 billion in order to free up money for the Republican tax package. Two days ago we saw what that tax package does. We see what that tax package says to corporations like AT&T, du Pont, Boeing, General Dynamics, PepsiCo, Texaco, Greyhound Corp., Panhandle Eastern Corp., W. R. Grace, Sundstrand Corp., Burlington Industries, Westinghouse, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera. These are the folks who years ago paid no corporate tax, because we did not have an alternative minimum tax in the tax code.

Now, the Republicans are ripping out the provision in the tax code which says they have got to pay taxes. We are going to go back to the years when we have these giant corporations paying no taxes.

The second thing the Republican tax package does is say they are going to give three-quarters of the capital gains tax breaks to people who make more than $100,000 year. So we argued in committee you should not do that, you should not be shooting seniors, you should not be shooting kids in order to provide these kinds of tax bennies.

When we offered the Murtha amendment to prevent these cuts from being used to finance this kind of a rip-off, every single Republican in the committee voted against our amendment. But now they have not been able to take the heat. Why? Because the public understands you should not be gouging seniors and kids in order to provide these kinds of tax rip-offs, and because I frankly think that a lot of thoughtful Republicans on your side of the aisle recognize that is not the right thing to do. And so now we are told that they are suddenly going to accept the Murtha amendment and accept the Brewster amendment and provide us with the fig leaf by which they can now say, ''Well, we are not going to cut taxes by making these reductions after all.''

I would simply say what this really means is that there is a great deal of confusion apparently on the Republican side of the aisle about what they are going to do with their taxes. We were told first they were going to pay for whatever tax cuts they provide. Now we are being told, ''well, we are not going to do it after all.'' We are going to be told tomorrow in the Committee on the Budget that they are willing to make generic cuts buy simply lowering the caps without describing which programs are going to actually be cut.

But what this demonstrates is that whenever you have a specific program which the Republicans are talking about cutting, then it is going to be very difficult for them to get the votes in their own Caucus to produce the votes for those cuts in order to finance the kind of outrageous tax breaks which they are talking about in the Committee on Ways and Means bill.

So I would urge Members today to vote for both the Murtha amendment and vote for the Brewster amendment. But do not kid yourself, do not kid yourself. In the end, they are still going to provide those wild tax breaks for corporations and high-income people. That tax package is just as misguided as shooting seniors and shooting kids' programs in order to free up a few dollars so they can pretend that they are going to make a significant impact on the deficit.

I urge a vote against this bill and to vote for those two amendments.

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

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS], the distinguished chairman of the Housing and Veterans' Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations.

(Mr. LEWIS of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate my colleague yielding and rise at this moment to express my strong support for the work of the committee.

All of us recognize that the country faces a most serious economic problem with ever escalating, year in and year out deficits, and a total deficit pushing well beyond $4 trillion. The price will be paid not by us but largely by a few of our children, indeed mostly our grandchildren.

My section of the bill involves approximately one-half of the rescissions that are involved here, and the subcommittee responsibility covers a whole array of Federal programs ranging from veterans to housing to EPA to NASA, a total of 22 different agencies.

Beyond that, within this bill is a very important element, a supplemental appropriation that affects 40 different States that have been impacted by disaster in recent years. A

very significant part of that will affect my own State, for as you all know, California in recent years has had every disaster known to man. Californians have not asked to be put in this position, but ironically, as we work together today, all of you know that much of my State one more time is almost totally under water. One of the great things about this process is that it reminds us one more time that in times of crisis Americans come together as a unified public and help each other.

There is little doubt that all of us know that this will not be the last natural disaster. There will be another. We just do not know when it will occur or what part of the country it will hit.

I want you all to know that at that point in time this Californian stands ready to help you as you have helped us in the past.

Above and beyond that, we will be discussing a whole array of rescissions within my subcommittee. And in a lot of that discussion we will talk about HUD where there are some $7.2 billion worth of rescissions. This chart indicates the problem we have in discretionary spending and housing. Over the last 4 years, discretionary outlays have increased a full 50 percent, moving from $20.5 to $31 billion. Anybody who has any sense, who is willing to look, knows that those programs need fundamental review, and our effort here is to establish a new playing field whereby we will better serve the people who need Federal housing assistance.

Under our proposals, not one family currently receiving services will have those services terminated, and many more, in my judgment, will receive better service over time in a much more efficient process. That is what triggers and motivates these spending cuts.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR], the distinguished Democratic whip.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague for yielding and I commend him for his statement earlier.

Mr. Chairman, the Republicans talk a lot about renewing American civilization, but you cannot renew American civilization by taking Big Bird from 5-year-olds, summer jobs from 15-year-olds, scholarships from 20-year-olds, in order to pay for a tax cut for the very wealthiest and most comfortable in our society. That is exactly what this bill does.

Mr. Chairman, yesterday the Committee on Ways and Means reported out the Republican tax plan out of committee. The bill cuts taxes by over $700 billion.

But the deep and the very dark secret of the Republican tax plan is this, the vast majority of the benefits go to those earning over $100,000 a year or more. Under the Republican tax plan, if you earn $100,000 a year, you get a tax cut of about $4 a day, but if you earn less than $100,000 a year, you get a tax cut of about 7 cents a day. If you are a Fortune 500 company under the Republican plan, not only will you get a tax break, you might not have to pay any taxes at all.

Look at how they intend to pay for it. They want to cut over $200 billion from veterans' benefits. They want to cut heating assistance for our elderly. They are cutting programs in nutrition for our infants. They are cutting jobs for kids and drug-free schools. That is what this bill does that is before us today.

So, Mr. Chairman, this is not what the American people voted for last November. If this is what the first $17 billion in cuts looks like, I can only wonder, I can only imagine what the next $700 billion is going to look like.

Mr. Chairman, let us not target children to pay for tax cuts for the most comfortable and the wealthiest in our society.

We all want to reduce the size of governments, but let us start by cutting over $200 billion in corporate welfare. What about all the irrigation subsidies and the mining subsidies and star wars? None of that is mentioned in here. They are just going after kids, going after the elderly. They are going after those in our society who are least able to defend themselves.

Mr. Chairman, Republicans keep talking about wanting to have a debate over issues. Well, we would love to debate these ideas, but under the rule in which we are operating now in the discussion of this bill, we have been shut out. Under this rule, we have time to debate probably just a dozen amendments; 82 amendments printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD have been shut out. Is this what the Republicans mean by an open rule, by gagging 82 amendments, using an elaborate set of criteria not found in any House rule?

We cannot even offer amendments suggesting new cuts if we had them. Under this rule the only cuts we can offer are deeper cuts to the Republican cuts that have already been offered.

So, Mr. Chairman, this rule is closed. It is outrageous. It is offensive. It is contradictory to everything said last year when our colleagues on this side of the aisle complained to us about having open rules, especially on deficit reduction proposals like this one.

□ 1500

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to say ''no'' to targeting children and the elderly, say ''no'' to tax cuts for the wealthy, say ''no'' to this bill.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government of the Committee on Appropriations, the great gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LIGHTFOOT].

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise to engage in a colloquy with the gentleman from New Mexico, chairman of the House agriculture appropriations subcommittee.

I would like to discuss the U.S. Department of Agriculture's National Swine Research Center to be located at Iowa State University. This project was included in the rescission legislation.

This center has been developed as a direct result of a partnership among the U.S. pork industry, the Agriculture Research Service and the U.S. Congress. The center has always had, and continues to enjoy the complete support of the Iowa congressional delegation and funding from the Iowa legislature.

The subcommittee has raised legitimate concerns about the center's mission in an era of declining Federal budgets. But I can assure the gentleman from New Mexico and this House, the center meets the tough criteria for future Federal spending.

Since the rescission bill was marked up, the Agricultural Research Service has testified before the agriculture appropriations subcommittee that the type of research to be conducted at this center is unique to problems associated with large hog operations, especially with environmental concerns.

My question to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN] is: Can we work with the subcommittee to find a way to fund this necessary research?

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LIGHTFOOT. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. SKEEN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I respond by saying, the subcommittee looks forward to working with the gentleman and other members of the Iowa delegation to find funds to start this research. It is my understanding the research enjoys widespread pork industry support and is important to ensure the continued world leadership of the U.S. pork industry into the next century.

As the gentleman from Iowa stated, the Agriculture Research Service has stated the unique nature of the research. It is essential that we address the problems facing the U.S. hog industry. I look forward to working with the gentleman.

Mr. LIGHTFOOT. I thank the gentleman from New Mexico and look forward to working with him to resolve this difficult situation.

Mr. SKEEN. This was an honest pork situation.

Mr. LIGHTFOOT. This is an honest pork situation. We are talking about real pork, the kind on four legs that you eat.

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

Mr. FAZIO of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, as we begin this first debate on the guts of the contract on America, the Republican economic plan, we ought to reflect on what has happened to working families' incomes

in this country. It ought to be the baseline upon which we base our basic judgments about what to cut in spending and where we ought to be making adjustments in our taxes.

If you look at 1950 to 1978, Americans essentially at all income levels grew together. The poorest actually grew the most. The wealthiest, well, they had a 100-percent increase in real family income growth, were consistent with all the other classes in American society.

But in the last 20 years, since 1979 through 1993, we had a marked change in our society. The wealthiest gained most of the economic growth, 18 percent increase in the top 10 percent. Those at the bottom, in fact, 60 percent of all American working families, saw real declines in their standard of living. They have been the ones who have paid the price. Republicans offer little relief to that vast segment of our workforce that has seen real incomes decline in this recent past.

Despite the explosive growth of overall household incomes in the same period, most benefits were concentrated among upper-income families.

Now, if we want to go about restoring opportunity and providing the foundation for income growth for most Americans, we have got to take a different approach.

But that is not what we are doing here today. Without a doubt, this is an important bill for many of us, including those from California whose districts are under water and who have unpaid bills from the North Ridge earthquake. Yet I think without much exception, hopefully none, we will be opposing this disaster assistance bill because, unfortunately, the Republicans have chosen to put that funding at risk by unilaterally offsetting those funds with cuts that do California more harm than good.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD], the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Legislative Branch Appropriations.

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

Mr. PACKARD. Today, as a member of the Appropriations Committee, I am proud to offer our first down payment to balance the budget by 2002. Republicans made a promise to the American people; now, we are putting out money where our mouth is. As chairman of the Legislative Branch Subcommittee, I am pleased to contribute to this effort.

As the subcommittee responsible for funding Congress, I believe that our legislative branch must undergo the same kind of scrutiny as every other branch of Government. In fact, we should set the example.

I made a commitment to not just downsize for downsizing's sake. I want to restructure, I want to make Congress work better at less cost.

As part of that effort, we defunded the Joint Committee on Printing which oversees the Government Printing Office. This will remove duplication and redundancy. The House and the Senate's current committee apparatus can take over the Joint Committee's functions and eliminate the excessive overhead in the process.

On a voice vote, my subcommittee unanimously approved the reductions we made. I am pleased to offer these cuts as part of the rescission bill now before us.

Furthermore, I wish to commend the gentleman from Louisiana, Chairman LIVINGSTON, for his tenacious hard work and his dedication to deficit reduction. This is a transitional time in America. The voters asked for a smaller government that spends less, taxes less, and regulates less.

We must make some difficult choices to accomplish our goal. However, the voters elected us to make those tough choices. We must and we will. The American people, their kids and grandkids are counting on us.

I am proud of what we are doing today.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER].

Mr. HEFNER. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, the Republicans have a Contract With America. They are proud of it. They had a 50-day celebration. They made a big to-do about it. They should be proud of what they are doing with the Contract. It is in the contract that you are going to have a cut that is going to give a tax cut to the most wealthy, affluent Americans in this country. And do it at the expense of the people who are the most vulnerable people in our society: children, senior citizens, and veterans.

Make no mistake about it, that is going to happen. This money goes into a pot. You can accept the amendments or whatever you want to do, but this money is counted as cuts that you have made today and you are going to use it for a tax cut.

I have a very limited amount of time here today, but I would like to give you a couple of instances of what separates us, the Democrats, from the Republicans. There was a group of consultants and people who work regularly for the Republicans, having a meeting just around the table with some of the people at Harper's.

Here are some of the things that were said when they talked about social security. They said, they talked about cutting social security.

Mr. Frank Luntz, the Speaker's adviser, said, ''Philosophically, you are right, but politically we can't do anything for at least 2 years until we get the public's confidence.'' They also said, Mr. David Frum said, ''The big programs like welfare, Medicaid and Medicare, will take a little time to get rid of. But there is a lot of little ones that we can get rid of right away.''

And Mr. Reed, who is a consultant for the Christian Coalition, says, ''The Legal Services Corporation, which provides legal aid for the poorest in our country, would be a great one to start with.''

Be proud of your contract, but be honest about it. We are going to have a tax cut for the wealthiest people in this country, and we are going to put at risk the most vulnerable people in our society: the little old lady huddling up in Connecticut because she does not have the money to pay her heating bill, and the children who are going to be suffering from the lunch program. It is going to happen.

You can do all the rhetoric you want, but that is what separates us.

I urge a vote—and I have never voted against a disaster in my life, or an extension in my life—but this is one where I am going to make an exception.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY], the honorable whip for the majority party.

Mr. DELAY. I thank the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Louisiana, for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] for the work he has done on this bill.

I would just like to take this time to address two provisions in H.R. 1159 that act as moratoriums on Federal trip reduction requirements and mandated emissions testing programs. The bottomline is simple: The scant environmental benefits to be gained from these flawed programs fall way short of the costs involved in implementing them.

I would like to thank Chairman LEWIS for working with me on these very important provisions and commend him for producing one of the toughest subcommittee marks in this rescission bill.

By preventing EPA from enforcing these requirements through the end of the fiscal year, we are giving the authorizing committee time to reopen the Clean Air Act. Changes must be made to reflect the expensive failures all of our constituents have encountered in dealing with these programs. Likewise, we must give States the option to choose the methods that work best for them to address their pollution problems.

EPA has backed off the trip reduction requirement. They acknowledge its ineffectiveness and say they will not enforce it. But businesses must still submit ''employee commute option'' plans to their States, forcing employers to divert resources to comply.

The bottomline is that the law is still on the books and just because EPA says it will not enforce it now, there is nothing to stop them from reversing their position in the future.

This situation is causing significant uncertainty in the business community.

The moratorium in this legislation would provide that certainty until the Congress has an opportunity to reevaluate the authorizing language.

As far as the federally mandated emissions programs go, a virtual rebellion has occurred in those States required to implement them. Of the 28 States forced to comply, 22 programs have been delayed or suspended or the State has refused to comply altogether.

For example: in Maine the program was suspended after only 2 months due to the high number of false failures and reports of vehicle damage; in a demonstration in Denver, in January, cars were actually deliberately rigged to fail the IM 240 emissions test but instead passed with flying colors; according to a 1992 GAO report, the EPA itself found that in one case, over 25 percent of the vehicles tested using IM 240 failed initially, but then passed a second test, even though no repairs were made; according to one State coordinator of the so-called Green Party, ''This law is unfair to poor and working people who cannot afford to pay $450 to have their cars fixed.'' Another member said, ''The program won't accomplish what it is supposed to—clean up the air.''

The fact is, that despite the EPA Administrator's pledge to grant States flexibility on their emissions testing programs, EPA cannot be trusted to handle these issues administratively. This moratorium provides a desperately needed short term fix until a long-term retooling of the requirement can be developed.

This bill doesn't repeal the laws that have broken down on the heads of the American public. And it doesn't fix those laws either. All it does is prevent the fact that these laws are broke from causing further unnecessary pain.

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I would also like to thank the gentleman for this discourse which he has begun on this very important question.

As the gentleman knows, there are many, many States under the gun of the EPA on the auto emissions issue, and we want them to pause. They said they are going to pause, as the gentleman indicated. But how do we know they are not going to unpause and begin the process all over again, when we are still not sure of the standards that are going to be applied, how they are going to be tested, what mechanisms the States are going to be given option to utilize?

It is important that we help the EPA help themselves.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to he time remaining on each side?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] has 9½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] has 9 minutes remaining.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Cleveland, OH [Mr. STOKES].

Mr. STOKES. I thank the distinguished ranking minority member, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 1158, the bill making emergency supplemental appropriations and making rescissions for the fiscal year 1995. This bill would drastically cut funding for programs that are vital to the most vulnerable and needy in our society. As I stated in my remarks opposing the rule to this bill, numerous attempts by my Democratic colleagues failed to override the cold and callous reductions contained in this measure.

Everyone voting on this bill today should understand what these actions mean to millions of Americans. It has been said that none of the cuts in this bill would hurt people—that the cuts occur prospectively. This is not the case. No matter how some may want to justify these reductions, this rescissions bill is a prescription for disaster. It is an assault on the very basic and essential programs that impact the daily well-being of Americans; education, health, housing, and jobs. That is why I am opposed to the bill before us today.

Even if you support the argument that our Nation needs to be more vigilant in its efforts to reduce the Federal deficit, there is no grounds for the inequity in the rescissions in this bill. The figures derived were not from any set target or economic formula. These amounts were arbitrarily picked by the Committee Chairmen. In the end, the pain and burden of this bill is placed squarely upon the shoulders of the poor, the elderly, and the children of this country. These are the people who are really jeopardized by this legislation.

Let's talk about these cuts and the nearly one-half million elderly and almost 1½ million children living in public housing who will be harmed by the almost $3 billion slashed from public housing programs at HUD.

These elderly are predominantly single and disabled women, living by themselves. They are the same constituents who have approached each and every one of us about the need to provide special housing facilities for the elderly apart from special housing for the disabled and mentally ill. After years of negotiation to ensure that the housing needs of all special populations are met fairly by HUD, this bill in one fell swoop eliminates the 5,000 new section 8 vouchers and certificates which would be used for this purpose.

This cut, which completely eliminates the 69,000 new rental assistance vouchers, would also mean that 12,000 certificates reserved for homeless women with children—the fastest growing segment of homeless persons in America—would be rescinded. Additionally, the 3,000 certificates set aside for homeless persons with AIDS would be zeroed out.

Ironically, this bill cuts section 8 vouchers and certificates which are used by FEMA to provide assistance to families displaced by the Northridge earthquake in California, the same disaster for which we are providing assistance for in this supplemental. How do you provide disaster relief for them in one hand and take it away from them in the other?

People living with HIV/AIDS are further harmed by the reductions in this bill that eliminate funds for the housing for persons with HIV/AIDS [HOPWA] program. This cold-hearted action virtually takes away the only chance that people infected with HIV/AIDS and their families have for housing at their most dire time of need. Slashing the funds for this program will force people with HIV/AIDS—a growing number of whom are women with children both infected or affected by HIV—into the streets. This destroys any chance they may have had of leading a normal life while undergoing treatment or any chance of dying with dignity.

Mr. Chairman, if this is not enough, what chance do our children have when their brains and development are impaired as a result of ingesting lead-based paint with this bill which reduces the lead based paint abatement program at HUD?

One of the few possible sources of funding that may have been available to ease the loss of Federal funding for assisted housing halfway through the year, the community development block grant, is also targeted for a cut. Every State and local jurisdiction across this Nation benefits from this important program. In States like Georgia—recovering from devastating summer floods—FEMA has utilized CDBG monies in conjunction with its efforts to restore disaster communities. This bill eliminates $350 million from CDBG.

This list goes on and on with what I consider to be short-sighted and mean spirited rescissions. It is important that we defeat this bill which hurts our most needy citizens.

Lastly, this is what this bill does:

Funding for Healthy Start is cut $10 million. This program provides resources and assistance to urban and rural communities with high infant mortality rates; 2,200 pregnant women will not receive primary care; 33,000 prenatal visits will be eliminated; 3,000 pediatric appointments will be eliminated; 5,800 clients will not receive child care; 3,267 clients will not receive skill and job training.

Funding for low-income home energy assistance is terminated. Millions of children and elderly will be forced to choose between heating and food.

Funding for summer youth jobs has been completely eliminated, and funding for youth employment training has been cut by more than 50 percent. Approximately 1.2 million young people will no longer have summer jobs, and 318,000 will not receive employment training. This action leaves over 1 million young people on the streets in our inner cities and rural areas with missed opportunities, lack of hope, and nothing constructive to do.

The bill destroys the school to work, the tech-prep program and the youth fair chance program. Funds have been completely eliminated for these programs.

Funding for veterans' medical assistance has been cut $206 million. Funding for homeless veterans' employment training has been terminated.

Funding has been terminated for the Safe and Drug Free Schools Program. Ninety-four percent of our Nation's schools will lose critical resources for student safety and drug abuse prevention.

Funding for higher education is cut more than $237 million, and includes a $111 million cut in financial aid. These cuts will place the pursuit of a college education outside the reach of thousands of students; $7.3 billion has been cut from HUD housing programs.

These are but a cross section of the cuts in ''people'' programs. The action taken by the Republican majority is not only unconscionable but also very mean-spirited.

This bill is a prescription for disaster. It hurts the elderly, our children, our veterans, and low income people. I urge my colleagues to defeat this bill.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BALLENGER].

□ 1515

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to engage in a brief colloquy regarding State OSHA programs with Chairman PORTER.

The committee bill includes a $16 million reduction in OSHA spending for fiscal year 1995. As I understand it, this rescission represents the entire increase over the fiscal year 1994 appropriation. The agency will have an operating budget of $296,428,000 for fiscal year 1995.

I would like to clarify one point. In fiscal year 1994, State program enforcement received $68.630 million and State program enforcement received $70.615 million in fiscal year 1995, an increase of $1.985 million. It is my understanding that State programs will not be reduced by any more than the original increase of $1.985 million.

Mr. Chairman, I ask the gentleman, is this your understanding?

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BALLENGER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from North Carolina for his question. It is also my understanding that the State plan programs will not receive a disproportionate share of the cuts and will receive the same level of funding appropriated for fiscal year 1994.

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Illinois for clarifying the point.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. COLEMAN].

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

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. Chairman, I gave all of my colleagues on that side of the aisle an opportunity to make some more cuts, and they did not take it. I say to my colleagues, you remember the amendment I took to the Rules Committee as the ranking Democrat on the Subcommittee on Transportation? I provided you an opportunity to go after some highway demo projects. But they would have been in your district, just like they would have been in Democratic districts, and you opted out of that one.

So, Mr. Chairman, I do not want to hear any more speeches about tough choices and courage on this bill when they go after the elderly and the veterans in my district and the kids in my district. I do not call those tough choices. I call that kind of a chicken way out because, as I said, you had a chance to cut highway demo projects, by the way, up to $2 million, if you wanted to, from ISTEA and House Appropriations Committee highway demo project, but, no.

I want to tell the American people, and I want to tell all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, you took the easy way out. We don't want to harm any of our colleagues' projects because, after all, we don't really think that's pork when it comes to our projects; do we?

So the statements of the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] and the statements of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] notwithstanding, it is not our side that wants business as usual. I say to my colleagues, I gave you the opportunity, yet you would not allow in this closed rule for me to present this amendment, and I didn't take the money and put it anywhere else. I was just going to allow you to cut another $400 million in my amendment. Or up to $2 billion if you had offered one and made a more serious rescission package. I would have preferred you not to take school lunches. I would have preferred you not to hurt my veterans. I would have preferred you not to hurt the elderly. But I didn't even require that you not do that. I gave you a chance, and you didn't take it.

So, Mr. Chairman, I think it is high time we all stopped praising ourselves over on that side of the aisle in the Republican Party and patting yourselves on the back. It is time that they fessed up and admitted they did not do what they could have done.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARR].

Mr. BARR. Mr. Chairman, I rise to engage the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS], who chairs the subcommittee dealing with HUD, in a colloquy if he is willing.

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

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I would be very pleased to do so.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Chairman, many communities throughout the State of Georgia, including those within my own district, have raised a concern regarding the proposed reduction of $349 million in community development block grants. I am informed that the cut amounts to as much as an 8 percent reduction from what has already been publicly announced and communicated to them.

Mr. LEWIS of California. The gentlemen is correct. Many local communities have been notified of their fiscal year 1995 allocations and have initiated community meetings to plan for the release of CDBG monies for the wide variety of eligible purposes.

Mr. BARR. So can we expect the committee to help us make a determination of how to assure these communities that they will receive what they were previously promised?

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARR] for his efforts.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON].

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I think this is a very important bill. It has 20 pages of cuts, approximately $20 billion. But one of the things that really bothers me is that at a time we are making very strong cuts to get this budget under control, we are sending up to $52 billion down to Mexico. The President circumvented the Congress of the United States and did that by himself with the Secretary of the Treasury from the exchange stabilization fund.

Fifty-two billion dollars.

Mr. Chairman, we are cutting $20 billion out of this, and at the same time we are cutting Americans, and we should do that to get the budget balanced, we are sending $52 billion to Mexico. This is at a time when their peso is dropping like a rock and our dollar is dropping right with it because, in part, of our sending that $52 billion down there.

The American people do not want us sending their taxpayers' dollars down to Mexico, and we cannot even get a vote on it in this House of Representatives. One of the things that I think is extremely important, if we are asking Americans to take a hit in order to get this budget balanced, we should do the same thing in foreign policy, and we should tell the people in leadership here, and in the other body, and at the White House, ''We want an up or down vote on the Mexican bailout.''

Mr. OBEY. How much time does each side have remaining, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. Five and a half minutes on each side.

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

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, in a famous court case a Supreme Court Justice said of obscenity, ''I know it when I see it.''

Mr. Chairman, we see it here today in the form of the Republican rescission bill on the floor. The bill abandons all sense of decency by cutting programs for children and seniors in order to cut taxes for the wealthiest Americans. Mr. Chairman, because the Republican disaster bill cuts investment in children, like nutrition, education and summer jobs, it will create other problems which will increase the budget deficit while it increases the human deficit.

Furthermore, Mr. Chairman, it is indecent to cut assistance to homeless vets and to cut other veterans' medical benefits while giving tax benefits to the wealthiest Americans and corporations. It is indecent to cut home heating oil for senior citizens. It is indecent to ask California's children to pay $2

billion—$2 billion in assistance for the aid that California will receive for the earthquake disaster.

Mr. Chairman, much has been said about saddling our children with increased deficits—budget and human. We must defeat this bill today.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANZULLO].

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the committee recommendation to restrict funding in the bill for the imposition and enforcement of requirements that the States implement trip reduction measures to reduce automobile emissions.

Under the 1990 Clean Air Act amendments, Mr. Chairman, businesses that employ over 100 people in severe ozone nonattainment areas have developed a plan for forced carpooling. This employee commute option is supposed to encourage alternative means of transportation. However this plan is costly and, in some cases, impractical and unnecessary, which is why I applaud the restricting of the funding.

Mr. Chairman, in my home State of Illinois the estimated cost of businesses to comply with the employee trip reduction mandate is as high as $210 million a year, and data from southern California shows it simply does not work. One rural county in my district is included in the Chicago severe nonattainment zone and has no mass transit system, and people would be left with no reasonable option other than to instigate forced carpooling to comply with the mandate. This is unacceptable, and I applaud the Governor for standing against it.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN].

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 1158.

Mr. Chairman, as a new Member of the House I voted for a balanced budget amendment knowing full well that such a measure would require tough choices. While some contend that we do not need such an amendment, personally I feel our Nation's future depends on it. Our national debt is staggering, our annual deficit continues to grow, and our actions today on H.R. 1158 mark the first real step to protect future generations. We are here for our children and grandchildren, pure and simple. If we act today, we give them the greater measure of security. Most important, this first tough vote may give them a chance to have the opportunities we now enjoy, a great education, the prospect of a good job and a quality of life unparalleled in the world.

My hometown paper urges that the majority party start to act in the new Congress, actually to cut spending. It urges Congress to start making the tough spending decisions now. While I don't always listen to my hometown paper, they are right: Don't talk cut, cut sensibly, and my constituents agree.

Our vote today will lead to a balanced budget. Let's be clear; this package is a $17.2 billion reduction out of a total of a $1.5 trillion budget. It is a 1.1-percent reduction.

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

Specifically, this bill reduces the HUD budget by $7.2 billion dollars. It has become obvious that many HUD programs are not working. The GAO and the inspector general's report reflect those facts. We need to get the money to people who Congress intended to help. The money does no good sitting in Washington.

Then there is the issue of scare tactics now that we are at decision time. They are the same tactics used when we made the same tough choices in my State. Again, we were told the sky would fall in. It did not happen. What did happen was smaller, smarter government. And we reduced taxes. We can and we will make the same tough choices in Washington. We can and will balance the budget while ensuring that the needy in our country are cared for.

Let us focus on some facts. Just one example: There have been many false accusations about the impact of cuts proposed in the Department of Housing. Despite a reduction of $7.2 billion, not one of the 4.8 million households currently subsidized by HUD will lose housing assistance. In fact, if all these cuts are approved, HUD's spending will still increase $3 billion over last year's level.

In the end its the Washington bureaucrats that are running scared. And scared they should be. No longer will we fund programs that don't work; no longer will we allow Federal bureaucrats to sit on taxpayers' money. We will set priorities, we will limit the size of Government, and we will do what we said we would—reduce the deficit, balance the budget, and restore the future to our children. I urge the passage of this bill.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY].

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

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 1158, the omnibus rescissions and disaster supplemental appropriations bill.

I strongly disagree with the priorities laid out by this bill. This bill cuts the muscle but leaves the fat. We owe the American people deficit reduction that builds on the major reductions we have made in the last 2 years.

There are cuts we should make. We can and should cut the strategic petroleum reserve, abolish numerous Federal commissions, eliminate the Aerospace Marketing Division within the Department of Commerce, modify the Triad force structure and delay the F–22 aircraft. These are just a few of the cuts I have advocated and will continue to push.

But the bill does not touch these programs, and the rule does not allow us to offer amendments to make those cuts instead of the cuts in this bill, fighting drugs and crime in the schools, helping students attend college, providing nutrition to infants and pregnant women, supporting education and public broadcasting, offering summer job opportunities. These are not the cuts we should be making.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge my colleagues to oppose this bill.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. FORBES].

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Chairman, fairy tales could come true, it could happen to you.

We are going to be listening to a lot of nonsense on the floor, poppycock, bogus, misleading false information. This is the kind of rhetoric that is coming out of the other side. It is manufactured dialogue with no basis in fact or reality, and I think we ought not to lose sight of that, Mr. Chairman.

The fact of the matter is that we are doing the necessary business of the Nation as asked of us on November 8 of 1994. We are making the tough decisions, and we are not hurting children, we are not hurting veterans, and we are not hurting senior citizens, and it is unconscionable of the other side to raise that kind of false rhetoric.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Chairman, I say to my colleague: Tell the little old lady who I met in Stevens Point who was living in the house that her husband had built for her as a wedding present and who had boarded up every room in the house and was living only in the living room, the bathroom, and the kitchen, even sleeping on the dilapidated couch, who needed the home heating assistance program in order to stay in that house—tell her you're not going to hurt her by this action. I don't know how many people you've met like that, but you ought to meet more of them. You would know better than to say you're not hurting them.

□ 1530

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of this package of spending cuts. This is a balanced package that will both pay for emergency disaster relief and start us on our glidepath to a balanced Federal budget. As a member of the Appropriations Committee, I have been intimately involved in the development of this bill, and I must say I have been surprised by the overheated rhetoric from the other side about the rescissions. Let us be clear what we're talking about. This package represents just 1 percent of the Federal budget—1 percent.

But we cannot, as we have in years past, simply pass a supplemental appropriation and expect to just ''find'' this money somewhere in the budget. As we were all told when we were young, money does not grow on trees, and I think it is time for the Federal Government to admit that fact.

We all have heard a lot of rhetoric about children. Folks, it's time we face up to the fact that the most important step we can take for our children is to balance the budget and stop leaving them an inheritance of debt. Let us stop living beyond our means and claiming we are doing it for the kids.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill in a bipartisan fashion.

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

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this bill, and I am proud to be a Democrat today.

Mr. Chairman, I would love to run against any Member of this Chamber who votes to eliminate the summer jobs for our teenage sons and daughters. I would be proud to run against any Member who votes to eliminate the winter heating program that helps people like Sadie in my district, a women who is 73 years old, worked all her life at a laundry, raised a family, and now survives by picking up odd jobs at age 72.

I would love to run against any Member who votes to eliminate this program today for the hundreds of thousand of seniors across our country who depend on this program, and then to take those savings and save them up for a tax cut for the wealthiest people in our society, rather than raising the money by closing tax loopholes that let billions of dollars go out the back door by letting our pharmaceutical companies manufacture abroad, or not close the transfer pricing loophole that lets foreign companies do business in this country and not pay their bills.

Mr. Chairman, I would love to run against anybody that votes to eliminate summer jobs and this winter heating program.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOLLOHAN].

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking minority member.

Ladies and gentlemen, I really do not know what the majority speakers who have argued that this does not represent real cuts for real people mean. Because it does take away from real people's programs.

In my remarks on the rule, I commented that the bill sets up a face off between the emergency supplemental needs of States experiencing disasters and domestic critical discretionary programs. It ravages discretionary spending and sets up an unfortunate model for funding into the future whenever we have disasters.

We are cutting programs which benefit the most volunerable in this country under this legislation. We should be, Mr. Chairman, looking at these programs more carefully. We should be sympathetic to California disasters. But if we do not want to fund California disasters as emergencies, we should find some other formula. Maybe we should start an insurance program for disasters. But to us this as an excuse for making cuts in discretionary spending, in child nutrition, in youth summer programs, in homeless assistance grants, in community development, to cut housing $7.3 billion, is absolutely unconscionable.

Now, what we are funding for the disasters is $5.3 billion. What are we going to do with the other $12 billion not associated with the California disasters? Is it associated with a tax cut? I suspect it is, and I suspect that this bill includes rescissions to pay for high income tax cuts by devastating domestic discretionary programs.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

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

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, we are going into the amendment process, a rather lengthy process, on this very important bill which cuts a net of $11 billion in spending, the largest rescission bill in the history of the country. It is a very important first step towards balancing the budget.

Now, we have heard arguments that the deficits were caused by the Reagan years, but everybody should know that Congress approves the budget, Congress is the one that spends the money and raises the taxes. And throughout the Reagan years, Ronald Reagan reduced taxes on the American people, yet revenues went up and Congress spent more.

The reason we have the deficit is because Congress appropriated more money than revenue received. Democrats controlled the House of Representatives for the last 40 years; the Congress was responsible for the deficit.

They never saw a program they did not like. They never saw a program they did not want to take taxpayers' money and use it to tell them how it should be best spent. Then when we finally try to get the spending under control, we hear all of the bleeding hearts tell us how we are cutting women and infants and children and all this other stuff. A cut to them is an increase to any normal human being.

The WIC program, Women, Infants and Children Program, we are told we are cutting. It is going up from $3.4 to $4.2 billion in the next 5 years. We are said to be cutting the school lunch program. It is going up from $4.5 to $5.6 billion in the next 5 years. Those are not cuts, those are increases.

We are trying to make this government more efficient. We are trying to bring common sense to the budget, and we can hear this bleeding heart stuff, this compassion game from now until eternity, but it will not bring fiscal sanity to this country, and it risks the possibility of total and unequivocal economic collapse and a lower standard of living for every man, woman and child in this country in the future.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose H.R. 1158. Two-thirds of the $17.1 billion in rescissions contained in H.R. 1158 are taken from programs for children and the poor. While this fact demonstrates the majority party's indifference to programs that impact children, low-income families, and the elderly poor, the majority party's indifference is compounded by the fact that these rescissions were intended to offset part of the majority party's proposed package of tax cuts that total $189 billion. When it was brought to light that these cuts in programs for children and the poor were going to pay for tax cuts for the rich, the majority party was forced to change their strategy and dedicate the funds to deficit reduction.

I submit that this bill will only increase our nation's deficit. It will increase our deficit in education, nutrition, housing, employment and other services that our communities desperately need to raise the future generations that will lead this nation. It decimates the precious few dollars we spend on investments in our most important asset—our human capital—and yet does not touch the tax credits, subsidies, and direct benefits that corporations are feeding upon from the Federal government.

H.R. 1158 cuts appropriations for low-income programs by 15% while cutting appropriations for other programs by just 1%. Of H.R. 1158's many rescissions, the following are some of the more egregious: All $1.7 billion appropriated for the Summer Youth Employment Program for the summers of 1995 and 1996 and thereby denies summer jobs to 600,000 low-income youth in each year; $7.2 billion in appropriations for housing programs, including $5.7 billion for assisted housing; $1.7 billion in education appropriations, including all $482 million in FY 1995 appropriations for the Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program, $186 million from the Goals 2000 Program which includes state and local grants to assist education reform, $232 billion in vocational and adult education programs, and $63 million for Student Financial Aid under the State Student Incentive Grant Program; and $206 million in veterans programs, including $50 million for veterans medical care.

For the State of Hawaii, the rescissions package translates into cuts totalling $73.5 million, including the following: $12.6 million for Section 8 Housing vouchers and certificates, $7.4 million in Housing modernization, and $1.45 million Housing subsidies; $4.4 million for the Summer Jobs Program for the summers of 1995 and 1996; $2.2 million for the Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program, $541 thousand for the Goals 2000 Program for grants for education reform, $413 thousand for the Tech Prep Program which addresses the need for a more technologically proficient work force, $303 thousand for the Education for Homeless Children and Youth Program, $297 thousand for the Eisenhower professional development program which provides

state grants to assist in the professional development of teachers in all the core academic subjects, and $260 thousand for the State Student Incentive Grant program which may cause students to lose their scholarships.

Of significant importance to my state is the elimination of two programs dedicated to the well-being of the Native Hawaiian people. The full remaining amount of Fiscal Year 1995 funds for the Native Hawaii Education Act and the Native Hawaiian Health Care Act are rescinded in this bill. The removal of these funds and proposed termination of both programs constitutes an abrogation of Federal responsibility to the native people of Hawaii.

Native Hawaiians are Native Americans. They occupied the land which now constitutes the State of Hawaii for centuries prior to the islands' annexation to the United States. The overthrow of the Hawaiian's sovereign government in 1893 was achieved only through the illegal actions of U.S. Government representatives.

For over 70 years, with bi-partisan support, the Congress has acknowledged and reaffirmed the Federal Government's legal and moral responsibility to the Native Hawaiian people by providing assistance for the improvement of their social and economic welfare.

The Native Hawaiian Education and the Native Hawaiian Health Care Act are among several programs designed to uphold the United States' trust responsibility to the indigenous people of Hawaii. The termination of these programs will have serious and detrimental consequences for the most vulnerable Native Hawaiians—the elderly and the children—and violate the integrity of the United States Government.

Yet in one fell swoop, without hearings or serious consideration by the committee's with jurisdiction over Native American affairs, without thought of the consequences, this rescissions package drives a wedge into 70 years of history during which the Congress deliberately, purposefully established programs for the Native Hawaiian people.

It is just another example of how these rescissions further shred the social ''safety net'' of this country which has proved to be the sustaining element of our society through recessions, inflation, times of economic prosperity, through war and through peace. These rescissions prove beyond doubt that the collective voice of those Americans most impacted by these rescissions is but a faint echo, if even that, at any caucus held by the majority party.

I strenuously oppose H.R. 1158 because in its attempt to complete the implementation of the majority party's Contract with America, it utterly decimates the more important Social Contract.

Mr. TORRES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this cold and heartless attack on our children, our veterans and our working poor. Two days ago, I had lunch with some of my youngest constituents at their elementary school in Pico Rivera, California. I wanted to see for myself the importance of federal assistance programs and to learn what these programs mean to the children and their teachers.

What I learned was heart-rending. It was heart-rending because for many of these children, programs like Head Start, WIC, Summer Jobs, and Drug Free Schools are the safety-net that keeps them from falling into the abyss of drug abuse, gang violence and often death. It is a social safety-net that is being stretched to the breaking point. This rescission bill, with over a billion dollars in cuts to local school districts, could rip a huge hole in this small but essential net. It is appalling to think that there are people in Congress who would deny this small but essential benefit. But that is exactly what the Republican majority has decided to do.

ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

The proposed reductions will also undercut important investments in emerging energy efficiency and renewable energy technologies conducted by the Department of Energy. I have to question the wisdom and motivation behind cutting these conservation programs, when virtually no funds were taken from the budgets for nuclear fission, nuclear fusion, oil and coal programs. It almost seems as though any program designed to aid the environment was targeted for life-threatening surgery.

There are other cuts that I find baffling and which lead me to question the priorities of the Republican leadership. For instance, the rescission of $1.3 billion in Safe Drinking Water loans that are needed to help States, localities and water suppliers protect the public from waterborne diseases like deadly Cryptosporidium. I would also mention the $145 million cut in the Energy Department's budget for cleaning up nuclear waste in dozens of states around the country. These cuts, which are now only figures on paper, could soon spell serious long-term public health and safety problems.

VETERANS

Mr. Chairman, I am extremely disappointed to see part of the rescission package come at the expense of the already beleaguered Veterans Affairs Medical facilities.

I spoke briefly in committee on this topic. But my resolve has not diminished. Today I am compelled to stand up for a group of people, 3.5 million under-represented citizens, from Puerto Rico and the many veterans that live on the island.

Last year $34 million was provided to build an outpatient facility at the VA Medical Center in San Juan, P.R., $4 million was approved to complete the design and initial stages of the facility in FY 1994. With the funding slated for FY 1995, construction was expected to begin shortly.

Veterans Administration Secretary Jesse Brown considers this VA outpatient addition a top priority. He visited the hospital in October of 1994. during that visit he told the head of the hospital that he was ''angered, surprised and sickened,'' by what he saw.

The outpatient facility addresses a 15-year old problem of severe overcrowding at the existing San Juan Medical Center. The current situation leaves doctors to conduct medical examinations in the hallways and nursing stations.

In Puerto Rico, demand for VA medical services is almost four times greater than the national average. Outpatient care has proven to be both effective and cost efficient. The San Juan VA Medical Center cannot shift resources from inpatient to outpatient care without the new facility. Construction on this project should not be delayed.

Today's action is just a step toward fulfilling the so-called ''contract,'' But, this action is a breach of the contract we have with our Nation's veterans. Our Nation's veterans deserve better.

The Republican leadership has declared a new war on poverty, but in fact they have declared war on the poor and the middle class. They claim to be cutting spending in order to pay for a natural disaster program. But these cuts are themselves a disaster in the making, because they are cutting vital social programs while programs wealthy corporations go untouched.

We are all for deficit reduction. In fact, Democrats voted to reduce the deficit by over $400 billion last Congress, without a single Republican vote. As long as the Republican leadership insists on providing breaks for the well-to-do, it is my responsibility to defend the average Americans who stand to lose the most.

Today's action is a step toward fulfilling the so-called ''contract.'' But, this action is a breach of the contract we have with the American people. The contract we have with the American people includes all Americans, not just the wealthy but all of our citizens, whether they are young or elderly, black or white, rich or poor. The American public simply deserves better than we are offering here today.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 1158. This legislation constitutes a mean-spirited and ill-advised attack on the well-being of our children and the health of our environment. While cutting deep into programs which benefit the less fortunate in our society, H.R. 1158 leaves the fat cats and corporate welfare beneficiaries unscathed.

Because my time is limited, I will focus my remarks on a few of the objectionable provisions in this bill.

At a time when we hear much rhetoric about family values from the Republican majority, this bill rescinds $25 million from the special nutrition program for women, infants and children, one of the most cost effective and beneficial Federal programs. We should be spending more money on the WIC Program, not taking away desperately needed assistance to mothers and their children.

At a time when the Republican majority is preparing to end Federal welfare programs under the guise of encouraging work, it rescinds $2.3 billion from Labor Department job training programs which help young people to obtain meaningful work.

At a time when the Republican majority talks about creating an opportunity society, this bill rescinds $1.6 billion in education program funding, shutting the door on our children.

At a time when the Republican majority doesn't mention the word environment in their contract because they know that the public overwhelmingly supports laws which protect our environment, this bill contains a blank check to ravage our national forests under the banner of salvage sales. In their rush to judgment, the majority didn't even bother going through the proper committees and include this authorizing language only through a waiver of the House rules.

At a time when the Republican majority takes great pride in defending property rights, this bill snubs private property owners who are willing sellers of their land by decimating the Department of the Interior's land acquisition budget.

At a time when the Republican majority complains that the Park Service is underfunded and uses that as an excuse to oppose new park acquisitions, this bill rescinds $22.8 million from the park construction budget.

At a time when the Republican majority wants to increase the role of State and local governments, this bill eliminates the urban park and recreation fund's entire budget of $7.4 million.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is riddled with misguided cuts and missed opportunities to cut subsidies for corporate welfare. I have introduced H.R. 721, the Public Resources Deficit Reduction Act of 1995, which would recover more than $3 billion a year lost through unjustified subsidies for timber, mining, grazing and water. While H.R. 1158 guts environmentally beneficial programs it completely ignores these environmentally destructive subsidies and the rule precludes any consideration of the provisions of my legislation.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, H.R. 1158 is flawed because it contains special interest provisions which are utterly irrelevant to deficit reduction. As just one example, the committee report accompanying H.R. 1158 includes language which is intended to bypass the Resources Committee and repeal section 3601(C)(1) of the 1992 Central Valley Project Improvement Act. That section required a study to address fish, wildlife and habitat concerns in the San Joaquin River and is objected to by certain heavily subsidized irrigation interests. While it is obvious that report language can not repeal a statute and this report language is not enforceable and non-binding on the Bureau of Reclamation, it does reflect the extent of the feeding frenzy that the subsidized special interests engaged in with cooperation from the Republican majority on this legislation.

Mr. REED. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to object to yet another attack by the Republicans on America's most vulnerable citizens. This time, the target is low income and elderly Americans who rely on public housing assistance. Last week, House Republicans reported a rescission package totaling $17.3 billion dollars. Forty percent of the cuts came from one Department; the Department of Housing and Urban Development. These Housing rescissions cut across virtually all of the Department's housing programs, from public housing projects to elderly housing, and from tenant-based rental assistance to homeownership initiatives for working families. Rhode Island stands to lost $73.5 million dollars.

In Rhode Island alone, we are expected to lose over $9 million dollars in modernization funds and operating subsidies for housing authorities throughout the State. This will severely hurt city and town officials because these reductions come in the middle of the fiscal year. Without warning, they will be left with less money to run and maintain public housing buildings where mostly elderly, low income and disabled people live. Without proper funding, many households will be displaced throughout Rhode Island and the Nation.

In addition, Republicans have cut $2.7 Billion in the Incremental Rental Assistance Program. This means 69,000 rental certificates and vouchers will be denied to low-income citizens who need some assistance in paying their rent. Rhode Island's funding for Section 8 Rental Assistance has been cut by $22 million dollars. This is a loss of 209 units, which means that those households with so-called Federal preferences will spend more time on Rhode Island's waiting list. Those without Federal preferences could wait forever. How can we expect to reduce government assistance to low income people when we gut programs that are designed to move these individuals from dependence to independence?

Mr. Chairman, when so much talk around here is about reforming our welfare system and ''empowering'' our citizens, it disappoints me greatly that Republicans have decided to rescind funding for programs that are designed to encourage self-sufficiency. One such program is the Tenant-Based Rental Assistance Program, an approach that was hailed by former Republican HUD Secretaries Jack Kemp and Carla Hills as the primarily Federal program for helping low income families achieve decent housing. This program maximizes individual choice and requires minimal government interference in the private market, yet the Republicans believe it is not worthy of proper funding.

It is important to point out that the rescissions to HUD will also have a major impact upon our children. Among the funding on the Republican chopping block is the lead hazard reduction fund. This funding is necessary to reduce the high level of lead based paint still found in many homes throughout America. In fact, my district has been faced with the increased health and educational problems found in children who have been exposed to lead. About one-third of children under six in the Elmwood area of Providence have blood lead levels high enough to require medical care. In 1994, 25 kids were hospitalized in Rhode Island for lead-related heath problems. Without this funding, these homes will go unprotected and result in higher cases of children being exposed to lead.

In addition to hurting our children and the elderly, the Republican rescission bill eliminates $297 million dollars to help fight this Nation's homelessness problem including the deletion of 3,000 housing certificates for persons with AIDS who are homeless. This action by the House Appropriations Committee will only increase the current rate of homelessness.

Republicans have argued that this rescission package will be used to reduce government spending. At the same time, they propose a tax cut that benefits families making over $100,000, a capital gains tax break that will cost $183 billion over the next 10 years, and a so called ''neutral cost recovery'' tax break for capital intensive companies. So while the American people are hearing from Republicans about how they are reducing spending, the reality is they are reducing spending on the poor, the elderly and our children to help finance tax breaks for the wealthiest Americans.

The people I mentioned tonight—the elderly, the children, the disabled, the homeless, the poor, anybody who benefits from HUD—will all be worse off it this rescission bill passes. Make no mistake about it, if this bill passes Congress, the only public housing for many people will be on the streets of America.

Mr. Chairman, I urge Members to call their local housing officials and ask them if this bill will make it easier or harder for them to run their programs. If they tell you that these cuts will make it easier, then I recommend you to support this bill. If, like the officials I have spoken with, tell you this will severely hamper their programs, I ask you to join me in opposing this bill.

Mr. BORSKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 1158, the Omnibus Rescissions and Supplemental Appropriations Act. This is the most mean-spirited bill that I have ever seen come before the House for consideration. This bill would literally take food from the mouths of children and send millions of senior citizens into poverty. And for what? Not to balance the budget. These cuts would go to pay for emergency appropriations and to finance massive tax cuts for high-income Americans.

This legislation cuts previously approved funding to pay for $5.4 billion in disaster relief for California, even though under the 1990 Budget Enforcement Act such funds are regarded as emergency requirements, which do not have to be offset by cuts in other programs. But, this bill goes even further, making cuts totaling $17.1 billion in order to begin financing tax breaks, 80 percent of which will go to those making over $100,000. The large majority of these spending cuts are aimed at children and low-income elderly. The majority party in this House is taking money away from the weakest in our society and using it to help the most powerful. Clearly, this is Robin Hood in reverse.

This package slashes funding from clearly successful programs that assist young and unborn children. $25 million will be cut from WIC, the Women, Infants and Children nutrition program. $10 million will be cut out of Healthy Start, a prenatal nutrition and care program. All of the funds for Safe and Drug-Free Schools will be eliminated.

An even larger share of the cuts in this package would be targeted at low-income senior citizens. In the last 30 years, the proportion of elderly living below the poverty line has been cut substantially because of a variety of programs. This package would strike at the heart of these same programs, forcing many seniors to fall below the poverty line.

More than a million senior citizens now live in federally assisted housing. This bill would cut $7 billion from housing assistance, resulting in future shortages of decent housing and a reduction in upkeep and security in units already occupied.

In addition, this package would eliminate funds that provide assistance to elderly households to pay their winter heating bills. Eliminating LIHEAP will force millions of senior citizens to choose between heat and medicine.

This package also attacks the older worker program which provides job opportunities to low-income Americans over the age of 55. These jobs give older Americans the chance to earn an income while providing services to local communities such as weatherization, park and play-ground maintenance, and working with underprivileged children. $14.4 million will be cut out of this program.

Veterans are also targeted by this legislation. Over $200 million will be cut from veterans' medical facilities and equipment. These cuts will come at a time when more and more veterans are reaching the age where they will need more medical service.

Mr. Chairman, it is becoming infinitely more clear every day that the majority in this House intends to protect their friends and special interests and do nothing to help middle-income Americans. Unfortunately, this bill is only the

beginning. I urge my colleagues to vote against it.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, the House Republican Leadership has set in motion a process that endangers earthquake and flood assistance to California. The Republican Leadership decided on February 7, 1995, to require other States and other programs to be cut to pay for the earthquake and flood assistance needed in California. Spending cuts have never been required in other emergencies, emergency spending is specifically excluded from needing offsets in the Budget Act, and this action sets in motion a confrontation that California does not need and may not win.

But the tragedy is that this bill is not about emergency aid. This bill is really a ''Trojan Horse'' in which the Republican Leadership has stuffed cuts of nearly $12 billion beyond those needed for the emergencies. These cuts were intended for use as an offset for part of the Republican tax cut, a bill that hasn't even been written yet and won't be debated until next month. Then, facing opposition to this approach, the Republican Leadership decided to take those excess cuts and put them toward deficit reduction.

To pay for this, the Republican Leadership has cut housing programs, veterans programs, EPA water and sewer grants, and NASA programs to pay for this earthquake and flood assistance. They have pitted homeless people in Chicago, against disabled veterans in Texas, against towns in Kansas trying to pay for clean water upgrades, against the people of Northridge. This just isn't fair. Even worse, it isn't needed.

Florida Hurricanes, Missouri Floods, and every other emergency in the past have not required offsets. The Republican Leadership has broken new ground by requiring these program cuts. They have, in effect, broken a contract with the residents of California. If the Republicans want to require ''pay as you go'' provisions to apply to emergencies, change the Budget Act or propose legislation for self-insuring funds, like many Democrats have done, such as Representative MINETA.

In essence, the Republican Leadership has engaged in a game of ''chicken'' with the White House and the Democrats in Congress and have dragged the people of Northridge along for the ride. We may not be able to pass this legislation because of the political fights that the Republicans have started. We may see delay or even cuts to the assistance package. And, at the end of the day, the President may have to veto this bill, due to the unthinking cuts the Republicans have made. And the tragedy is that none of this needed to happen in the first place.

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Chairman, I rise this evening in strong opposition to the mean-spirited and remarkably calloused rescissions bill which we are in the process of considering in this body. I do so with a heavy heart and a strong sense of foreboding about the effects of many of the random cuts in worthwhile programs within this bill. There are several which I felt particularly strongly about, and therefore I had authored and filed amendments to restore three particular rescissions. However, due to the restrictive rule which was authorized for consideration of H.R. 1158, I am regrettably unable to offer these amendments. This is another in an incessant progression of restrictions placed upon me and other Members of this Congress who, while striving to represent their constituents, have been prevented from doing so by the majority.

Three especially onerous rescissions, in my opinion, are those regarding public housing, the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program [LIHEAP], and the summer jobs program. In districts like Illinois' First Congressional District whose residents have largely not yet benefited from the improvements in the Nation's economy, the succession of economic blows which these rescissions will land squarely on the backs of those who can least afford such brutality is utterly unconscionable and perhaps even somewhat bewildering.

The bill strikes more than two billion dollars for public housing operating subsidies, modernization and development. Mr. Chairman, nearly one fifth of my constituents live in public housing. Among the developments in my district are some of the more notorious in the Nation, including the Robert Taylor Homes and many others. Working in close conjunction with HUD Secretary Henry Cisneros and with the support of the first President in more than a decade that understands and cares about what happens to the Federal Government's tenants, we have been laboring mightily to improve the plight of public housing residents. I am shocked, appalled and dismayed at the sweeping and damaging nature of the public housing-related rescissions which are under consideration today in this body. For Chicago alone, the public housing operating subsidy reduction would be more than $68 million, the modernization reduction would be more than $25 million, and millions more would be taken out of funding for development and major reconstruction of obsolete public housing units. These cuts add genuine injury to the insults which public housing residents have endured for time immemorial.

Speaking of insults, what justifications can this body's appropriators offer to defend their complete elimination of the summer youth employment program? Can they really believe that prison construction and lip service to false, Jack Kemp-style ''empowerment'' can be the only substitute for creating genuine economic opportunity, real reduction of reliance on welfare, and consequent real reductions in crime? Chicago's youth will pay a drastic price for these reductions: of the $35 million which Illinois received last year, more than one third went for jobs programs in the city of Chicago. There is an identifiable human component to these cuts: some 65,000 Chicago youth have been helped by this program in the past 5 years, but over 10,000 additional youths, most of whom will have no alternative employment prospects of any kind, will be left on the street in the future as a result of the elimination of this program.

Moreover, as my colleagues from northern States know, the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program plays an essential role in keeping many low-income families warm throughout the winter months. I should point out that a large percentage of these families are either elderly or have young children, which are the two segments of society that are the most vulnerable to the elements found in colder climates. And Mr. Chairman, it is important to add that not only do States in the north rely on this program, southern States also utilize LIHEAP to assist families to pay cooling bills in those areas that are subject to extreme summertime temperatures. Again, these families from the south that utilize LIHEAP funding are mostly elderly or live with young children.

The State of Illinois alone receives 6 percent of total available LIHEAP funding. This means that over 238,000 families received an average of $258 in the last program year. If this rescission package passes this body with the cuts in LIHEAP funding intact, all of these Illinois families will have to look elsewhere for help in paying their heating bills. In my district, if you consider that ⅓ of these families are on AFDC, and one third are elderly Americans on Social Security, and ¾ of the total number of families receiving LIHEAP are headed by single mothers, you are left with a painful and unanswerable question: how will these families come up with money to pay their heating bills? Many will be forced to make decisions on what other basic necessity must be foregone in order to pay heating costs. Elderly recipients will be forced to choose which prescription they will leave unfilled; mothers will have to choose which child will go hungry; and families will be sent into homeless shelters because they cannot pay their monthly obligations.

As was the case with the public housing and summer jobs funding, I had hoped to offer an amendment to restore funding for LIHEAP and remove the program from the rescissions hit list. My friends who support eliminating LIHEAP just do not get it—millions of families around this Nation rely desperately on LIHEAP support. This program is not a boondoggle, but rather is a matter of life and death for many, pure and simple.

Mr. Chairman, the actions that the majority in House are sanctioning today are a direct, blatant attack on the poor and disadvantaged in this country. There are a host of other programs which will also be decimated, including Community Development Block Grants—some $7.6 million of which was earmarked for Chicago—and all funding for the groundbreaking Community Development Financial Institutions Fund on which I and others worked hard in the 103d Congress. I can only hope, once the hugely detrimental effects of these and other proposed cuts come home to the American people, that my colleagues in the majority will be justifiably and permanently restored to the minority party status which they are so richly earning.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I am in strong opposition to the Republican Rescissions Package before the House today. In my view, this bill is part of a larger GOP agenda to advantage the wealthiest of Americans at the expense of low-income children and the elderly poor.

Mr. Chairman, the Congress is currently operating under the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990 which sets out the criteria for Congress to respond to ''dire emergencies'' with supplemental appropriations. President Clinton was correct in declaring the situation in California—and elsewhere—a dire emergency and requesting $6.7 billion in disaster-related supplemental appropriations. Under the Budget Enforcement Act, this spending does not have to be offset by spending cuts in other programs.

If the Republican Leadership disagrees with the Budget Enforcement Act, then they should propose to amend it to create a special emergency fund within the budget to be used to respond to natural disasters. In future years, this would eliminate the need to make dire emergency supplemental appropriations that are

not included in the annual budget agreement. However, the Republican majority has made no such long-term proposal. Instead, they are attempting to use the California disaster as an excuse to cut popular programs that primarily assist disadvantaged children and the elderly poor.

The bill before us provides $5.4 billion in disaster relief but $17.1 billion in program cuts. The bill should not be considered in isolation from the larger Republican agenda. Next week, the House is expected to consider the Republican welfare reform legislation which would cut up to $70 billion from programs to assist low-income individuals and families. Following that bill, the Budget Committee is expected to report legislation that would lower the caps for discretionary programs by an additional $100 billion over the next 5 years, thus further cutting important programs for low-income families. These cuts are necessary to offset the $189 billion in tax cuts—primarily for upper-income Americans and corporations—expected to be passed as part of the Republican contract later this month.

The bill before the House today would:

Terminate summer employment programs for 600,000 disadvantaged youth;

Cut over $100 million from education programs for disadvantaged children;

Terminate the program that helps more than 6 million poor families pay their home heating bills;

Cut housing assistance for 630,000 poor families with children;

Cut housing assistance for 530,000 elderly Americans;

Terminate the program that provides housing for people with AIDS;

Cut 30 percent of the funds for public broadcasting; and

Cut over $200 million from VA medical programs.

Other cuts in this bill, such as the Healthy Start Program to reduce infant mortality and the nutritional program for women, infants, and children designed to decrease high-cost childhood medical problems, are only going to add to the Federal deficit in the long run. Eliminating housing assistance for more than 50,000 people with AIDS is not going to save money. Without housing, these people will become even sicker and end up in more costly hospital-based care. By cutting $186 million from this program, the Federal budget deficit will be increased through higher entitlement spending.

If this bill was about deficit reduction, then it would be part of an orderly process responding to a revised 5- or 7-year budget agreement. But it is not. If this bill was about responding to President Clinton's request to provide dire emergency funding for the California disasters, then it would be addressed in an orderly process as provided for under the Budget Enforcement Act. But it is not.

This bill is the beginning of a radical effort on the part of the Republican majority to provide tax cuts for the wealthiest of Americans and tax breaks for corporations at the expense of safety-net programs for Americans who have the greatest need for assistance. This bill is part of a larger agenda which does not reflect the majority views of the American people. I urge my colleagues to oppose the Republican rescissions package.

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, my Republican colleagues like to say they have a Contract With America. Well they sure as heck could have fooled me. With this bill the GOP is severely violating a contract that this body made with the American people just last year to ensure that the interests of our most vulnerable citizens—our low-income children, seniors, and veterans—are protected.

At a townhall meeting I held in my congressional district in Chicago last week, my constituents decried the efforts of the Speaker and his band of merrymen to steal from the poor and give to the rich. They expressed outrage at the insolent attitude of the majority party that caters to the monied interests in Washington while leaving them, literally, out in the cold. They challenged the leadership in this Chamber to propose solutions to the problems that continue to ail us rather than simply oppose all Federal programs that are currently in existence. In short, Mr. Chairman, my constituents demanded that this Congress produce results, not some fancy, 100-day public relations campaign.

Oh, if only the Speaker could have been there. Maybe then the legislation before us would reflect real needs instead of misguided priorities.

This rescissions package runs directly counter to the idea that we in this body must help people to help themselves—something in which the Speaker purports to believe. In fact, it runs directly counter to any type of commonsense approach to public policymaking. With the tremendously severe cuts in this legislation, the Republicans have basically pulled the rug out from under millions of Americans and said, ''We simply don't care.''

However, my constituents and I do care about how thousands of residents in the Chicago metropolitan area will be terribly devastated by this legislation. The list seems endless.

The Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program [LIHEAP], which helps 2 million elderly folks meet the high costs of their winter heating bills, is completely wiped out by H.R. 1158. As a result, over 82,000 Chicago households that were served in fiscal year 1995 will be cut off, not to mention those who have been on waiting lists. In a city such as mine, where on an average winter day the temperature hovers around 10 degrees, with the wind chill in the negative double digits, you tell me this is a sound policy decision. Tell the family of 60-year-old Earline Hooker, who froze to death in January in Chicago because she wasn't able to get LIHEAP assistance, that this program is fat in our budget. Get real.

This bill also rips hope and opportunity away from 600,000 of our disadvantaged youngsters through the dismantling of the summer jobs program that provides basic skills, income, and work experience. Across the Chicago metropolitan area this summer, 11,000 kids who had looked forward to being entrusted with responsibility will now be faced with hanging on the street corner with nothing to do but get into trouble. So much for promoting positive alternatives for our youth and investing in the future, Mr. Chairman.

The GOP continues its assault on low-income babies and their moms with a $10 million cut in Healthy Start—a proven program to provide expectant mothers with prenatal care, a $25 million cut from the Women, Infants, and Children nutrition program—knocking up to 100,000 mothers and newborns into limbo, and a $90 million cut in the lead-based paint abatement program—designed to deal with the health and related problems that befall children whose brains and development are damaged from lead-based paint. This is absolutely criminal.

Another, one of the most disturbing portions of this bill is its complete lack of regard for the plight of public housing residents in this Nation and the neighborhoods in which they live and work. Although the Department of Housing and Urban Development has already begun a serious effort to restructure and make Federal housing and community 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.

For instance, HUD has estimated that my city of Chicago will lose $180 million in this fiscal year alone as a result of the rescissions before us, eliminating more than 3,400 low-income housing units. Another $90 million will be lost in assistance for public housing modernization and operating subsidies, seriously disrupting already weakened maintenance and security for residents. In addition, $21 million in funds to help the homeless and individuals with AIDS find suitable shelter is out the window. Tell me how in the world this helps achieve what one former President of the other party termed ''A kinder, gentler nation.''

Ironically, even the Community Development Block Grant program that was started under President Nixon, is favored by a number of Republican governors, mayors, and county administrators, and is the ultimate example of Washington giving back program control to localities—something I though the majority supported—is nixed under this legislation. Because of this, the Village of Oak Park in my district will lose $200,000 that they had previously budgeted for making public facilities accessible to the disabled, providing loans to low and moderate income households for home improvement, promoting fair housing and racial diversity efforts, and preventing child abuse and neglect. Chicago will lose $7.7 million that would have gone to many similar efforts. Where is the logic?

Also outrageous, Mr. Chairman, is my GOP colleagues' attempts to insert language in the bill before us that would subvert the President's recently issued Executive Order prohibiting Federal contracts with companies that hire permanent replacement for striking employees. Despite the fact that there is extensive precedent for Presidential action regulating employment rights of Federal contractors, the Republicans have used this bill to play more political games instead of doing their jobs and governing,

Finally, it is a mockery of the democratic processes of this body that the Rules Committee agreed to a rule that allows only amendments in which any reduction in the bill's rescissions must be offset by increasing rescissions in the same section of the bill. Such a rule effectively protects the GOP's special interests while ensuring that widely supported and much needed programs for average Americans are targeted.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote no on the Republican rescissions package, thereby upholding the budgetary contract with the American people which we made last year.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this bill. It is a down-payment on tax breaks for the wealthiest Americans that is made on the backs of low-income and elderly American across the country. Like so many other bills brought to the floor this session, I believe this bill will have consequences which its proponents have not fully explored.

This bill targets programs designed to help low-income people meet some of their most basic needs. One of the most egregious cuts would eliminate funding for the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program [LIHEAP]. This valuable program helps 5.4 million American households meet their heating and cooling needs. Seventy percent of LIHEAP recipients have incomes less than $8,000 per year. The average benefit is merely $194, only a small portion of the cost of heating a home in many parts of this country. In my state of Connecticut, 73,000 households received important assistance in 1993 alone. During the winter of 1993 and 1994, one of the coldest and most brutal in recent memory, LIHEAP ensured that millions of Americans, especially elderly Americans, could afford to heat their homes. Without this assistance, poor families will be forced to choose between paying their heating bill and feeding their children. No one should have to make this choice.

The committee argues in its report that LIHEAP was intended to be a temporary program and that low-income people spend less of their income on heating costs today than when the program was established. What the Committee fails to note is that on average low-income families spend 18.4 percent of their income on heating costs while other families spend only 6.7 percent. While a gallon of oil might be cheaper today than it was during the last energy crisis, disadvantaged Americans are spending nearly 20 percent of their total income on energy costs. This figure is truly astonishing. This is a massive burden that would grow to unmanageable proportions if this program is terminated.

LIHEAP is not a welfare program. Instead, it assists working families and our senior citizens meet their most basic needs. With an average benefit of less than $200 per year, it only pays a portion of heating bills and helps people make it through tough times. It is truly a safety net that helps millions of families to avoid the Faustian choice between paying for oil or paying for medicine and food. We should defeat this bill so that nearly 5.5 million American households will not be faced with this choice next year.

I am also concerned about how cuts in this bill could undermine efforts to fight crime. We spent much of the month of February debating bills which my Repulicians colleagues said would be tough on criminals once and for all. I believe that this bill will actually undermine our efforts to fight crime.

For example, it cuts about $2 billion for youth summer job programs under the Job Training Partnership Act. This eliminates all funding for certain initiatives in 1995 and 1996. These funds provide summer employment for tens of thousands of young people each year. We have seen over and over again that when young people have educational or job opportunities or recreation options their involvement in criminal activities goes down substantially. Without the jobs these funds support, many of our young people will have a lot of idle time on their hands. Moreover, after my Republican colleagues eliminated prevention funding provided under the crime bill, these kids won't be able to go to a summer league. As a result, kids could turn to gangs for something to do and criminal activity is likely to follow. This is one of the consequences of these cuts that the committee report does not address.

In addition, the bill eliminates all funding for the safe and drug-free schools program. Just last week former First Lady Nancy Reagan testified eloquently before a House committee about the need to redouble our efforts in the fight against drugs. Mrs. Reagan did the country a great service with her ''Just Say No!'' campaign. There is solid evidence that drug and alcohol education programs in our schools work to reduce abuse and convince young people to avoid drugs and alcohol. Moreover, these programs are very cost-effective because they reach people before they get involved with the criminal justice system or develop health problems.

Instead of following Mrs. Reagan's advice, my Republican colleagues propose to terminate Federal support for these proven programs. They argue that States should fund these efforts and that federal support can come from other pots of money which are designed primarily to provide treatment to drug addicts. Currently, we have failed to commit sufficient resources to treatment and we can ill-afford to divert scarce funding. With the positive results of in-school programs, we should continue to provide a dedicated source of funding.

I also strongly object to eliminating funding for the National Undersea Research Program [NURP]. NURP is vitally important to the mission of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration [NOAA]. It is the only program in the nation which specializes in undersea research in our oceans and in the Great Lakes. Moreover, research conducted by NURP scientists is relevant to Americans nationwide. Scientists are currently involved in research on marine ecosystem health, rebuilding fisheries, environmental technology development and global warming.

By the year 2000, fifty percent of the population will live near the coasts. Marine-related economic activity is responsible for approximately one-third of our gross national product. Coastal areas are some of the richest biological resources in the world and are vital to our multi-billion dollar fishing industry, which employs many more people ''on-shore'' than on boats in the Atlantic or Pacific. Moreover, every American has a stake in accurately assessing the extent of global climate change.

The NURP Centers specialize in using manned and unmanned deep-sea submersibles in their research. The use of mini submarines and robotic devices allows us to explore parts of our oceans and Great Lakes which are impossible to reach with surface technology. Using these methods, we are gaining insight into the dynamics of our marine environment which will enable us to address long-standing problems. It takes years of experience to operate these devices safely and effectively. If NURP is eliminated, we will lose this expertise and much of this technology.

NURP is not just a coastal program. Research conducted by NURP-supported scientists has important economic and environmental implications for every American. I firmly believe that it provides returns that dwarf the small appropriation it receives each year.

Further, under this legislation, many worthwhile housing programs will suffer severely. Specifically, $404 million will be slashed from operating assistance for low-income housing projects. $1.1 billion will be cut from the modernization of existing public housing projects. According to the Department of Housing and Urban Development, reductions in these projects will affect 630,000 families with children and 530,000 seniors, nationwide. In addition, the latter cut will seriously affect capital improvement projects at many public housing authorities, in my district and across the country. Many of these facilities were built nearly 40 years ago and are beginning to fall into disrepair.

This bill would slash and burn education funding, impacting every school district. In addition to cuts in vital programs like Title I Compensatory Education for the Disadvantaged, Federal Direct Student Loans, and Student Financial Aid for higher education, a number of other cuts will have profound repercussions in my district. In particular, Impact Aid is critical to the delivery of quality educational services in towns with naval installations which are exempt from the tax base. In addition, the Javits Gifted and Talented Program, the Law School Clinical Experience Program, Eisenhower Professional Development Grants, Consumer Homemaking and Home Economics, the Tech-Prep program, literacy programs, and school-to-work transition programs provide important educational opportunities for Connecticut's students and teachers.

This bill is short-sighted in its ''save a little now, pay a lot later'' reasoning. By cutting $25 million from the Women, Infants and Children special nutrition program [WIC], the bill virtually guarantees that we will be paying more down the road for medical care for low birth-weight and learning-disabled children.

WIC is not the only vital health and human services program to be harmed by this bill. Rural Health Outreach funding provides important prevention and health education services for rural populations. Housing Opportunities for People with AIDS [HOPWA] also provides critical support for those who suffer from this devastating illness. The Community Services Block Grant [CSBG] program is so important to my district that I have received more mail on CSBG than on any other issue so far this year, unanimously in favor of maintaining funding.

Constituent letters in support of CSBG are rivaled only by those in support of public television, public radio, and the national endowments for arts and the humanities. It has often been said that no society ever flourished without supporting the arts which reflect its conflicts and its culture. The National Endowment for the Arts, in particular, has been a political punching bag for too long. These cuts are ill-considered and unwise.

Mr. Chairman, I am concerned about an amendment accepted in Committee which would require the Forest Service and the Department of Interior to make 3 billion board feet of timber available in each of the next two years. I understand the economic situation in the Pacific northwest and the plight of timber dependent communities. I face a similar situation in my district which is overly dependent on the declining defense industry. Moreover, I

also appreciate the need to get into certain areas and remove burnt and blown down timber to combat fire dangers and insect problems. No one wants a repeat of the devastating fires of 1994.

At the same time, I believe this amendment sets some dangerous precedents. The definition of salvage timber sale is very broad and could allow companies to harvest trees that would not normally qualify for a salvage sale. The bill specifically authorizes below-cost timber sales. It is truly ironic to include this language, which will ensure that the American people continue to lose money on timber sales, in a bill which is designed to slash federal spending. Moreover, the amendment makes the blanket pronouncement that these sales will be deemed to be in compliance with our most important environmental laws, including the National Environmental Policy Act and the Federal Land Policy and Management Act. This short circuits environmental review and could lead to unintended damage to streams, fisheries and wildlife habitat. Finally, I am very concerned that this amendment would substantially restrict the ability of our courts to review the legality of timber sales. Courts could not impose injunctions while challenges are being heard and they could only bar a sale if the agency acted in a capricious and arbitrary manner. This language unfairly ties the hands of the courts.

This measure should not be part of an appropriations bill. It has not been reviewed by the relevant authorizing Committees and has implications for future timber sales that must be carefully weighed.

Mr. Chairman, this is a bad bill that slashes programs designed to assist the most needy Americans. I also believe that it will cost us more money down the road in terms of lost productivity, increased crime and educational problems. I urge my colleagues to reject this bill.

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to the $26.5 million rescission from the National Institute of Standards and Technology's Manufacturing Extension Partnership (MEP). As cochair of the Congressional Manufacturing Task Force, I have had the opportunity to hear and see first hand the success of the Manufacturing Technology Centers. When Congressman Bob Franks and I formed this Task Force we did so because we saw a need to develop new ways in which government could stimulate continued manufacturing productivity as well as reform policies that undermine the vitality of the industrial sector. The MEP helps do just this.

This rescission would undermine this emerging nationwide network of extension centers—co-funded by state and local governments—that provide small and mid-sized manufacturers with technical assistance as they upgrade their operations to boost competitiveness and retain or create new jobs. This program has showed a rate of return of 7 to 1 for the federal government's investment, with concrete benefits in increased sales, cost savings and jobs for small manufacturers. It is a valuable program.

Relative to our foreign competitors, the United States has few established mechanisms to move technologies innovations into plants and to ensure their adaptation into production processes. The MEP program is one of them. This rescission will drastically reduce the effectiveness of the program. While the United States is still the world's leader in research and development, other countries like Japan and Germany are not that far behind us. Other nations have incorporated traditional business assistance services such as marketing, training and managerial support activities into their technology transfer delivery system to great advantage. Meanwhile in the U.S., some sources say it takes up to 55 years from the time a new manufacturing technology comes out of the laboratory until it reaches 90 percent of the U.S. companies that could use it.

Programs like the Manufacturing Extension Partnership are helping America stay competitive in the changing global markets. Let's not destroy that by passing this rescission.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to address the American people and give some insight into the fiscal priorities of the new Congressional leadership. This rescissions bill seeks to slash nearly one of every six dollars set aside for the disadvantaged in our country in fiscal year 1995. That represents a dramatic $17 billion, or 15.7% reduction in funding for federal domestic programs. In contrast, only 1.2% of the funding for the rest of the discretionary budget, including defense, is targeted for reductions. Today the new Congressional leadership sends a clear message: when it comes to making sacrifices in the federal budget, it's children, women, and senior citizens first.

The Republicans terminate the summer youth program starting in 1995, and reduce $1.7 billion in funding for education programs including School-to-Work activities. Such ill-advised policy will produce modest reductions in expenditures in the short-term, but yield substantial long-term losses in the productivity and earning power of today's youth. I question the wisdom of striking directly at the programs which enable motivated young people to improve their own lives.

Additionally, these rescissions terminate a program which teaches children about substance abuse and violence prevention, the Safe and Drug-Free Schools program. While this rescission will do little to cut the deficit, it does effectively cut through Republican rhetoric. The leadership cannot convincingly claim to be tough on drugs and crime while simultaneously taking away an effective tool in combatting children's drug use.

Low-income families, including over one million senior citizens who currently live in federally assisted housing, will bear 40% of the cuts outlined in this package. If these $7.3 billion in housing rescissions are enacted, safe, decent housing for recipient families will be jeopardized, and the infrastructure of this multi-billion dollar public investment will be badly damaged.

The new Republican leadership recommends the termination of the Low Income Home Energy Assistance program (LIHEAP). Last year, this program helped approximately 6.1 million low-income households pay their heating bills, and half of those homes sheltered elderly or disabled individuals. LIHEAP recipients have an average annual income of only $8,257 and spend approximately 18.4% of that on energy expenses. They will not easily recover from this loss. These families already face significant hardships, and many will be forced to choose between groceries and heat.

Finally, the Republican plan targets mass transit. In urban areas like Minneapolis, this is the only program that provides affordable transportation to low-income families. A $17.5 million reduction in funding for public buses and bus facilities will severely impact many areas in this country where buses are the only mass transit option available. The efficient and effective bus transportation system in my Congressional District has been a key element in the development of the Twin Cities. This cut will depress both urban and rural development while simultaneously reducing the limited transportation options of low-income Americans.

I urge my colleagues to vote no on H.R. 1158, and reject a callous attempt to place the burden of reducing the deficit directly on the backs of children, women, and the elderly.

Mr. BATEMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to discuss an issue that is of great concern to me and the District I represent—Impact Aid. I have dealt with Impact Aid for the last twelve plus years that I have been in Congress. However, I have discovered in recent weeks that the issue is not as familiar to many of my colleagues. So I would like to take this opportunity to clarify to everyone what we are dealing with when we discuss federal Impact Aid.

The Impact Aid program is designed to compensate localities for the tax revenue lost due to the presence of federal facilities. More than 2,000 school districts in fifty states nationwide count on the program as a reimbursement for the revenue loss by traditional funding sources, like property, sales and income taxes. This rescission bill deals with Section 8002 impact aid funding which provides payments for school districts heavily impacted by the federal acquisition of property, specifically for areas in which the federal government owns property representing 10 percent or more of the value of all real property in the jurisdiction. These funds are especially important to one area in my District where the federal government owns 40 percent of the land and I have heard from a number of my colleagues who represent areas where the government owns 75 percent or more of the land. This land is not subject to local real property taxes, a major source of funding for school systems. Please bear in mind that the tax revenue lost on this land is in addition to the losses incurred from those federal personnel who do not pay certain state or local taxes. This lost revenue would have gone to finance education in that area, including that for the children of federal employees. Even without the revenue, the school districts must provide education to the federal employees' children. Therefore, Impact Aid is not a handout. It is not an entitlement. Rather, it represents the federal government's obligation to provide access to education for the children of federal employees.

I believe it is essential that we ensure all children have access to an education. But this issue goes much further than that. In my capacity as Chairman of the National Security Subcommittee on Readiness, I am charged with ensuring that our armed forces are prepared to meet any military challenge we may face. The most basic assurance that we can provide is that of adequate personnel to defend the interests of our nation. Impact Aid directly affects military personnel who have agreed to serve their country but not at the expense of their children's education. In fact, cuts in Impact Aid will impact all children in a school district that experiences a resulting

budget shortfall. If programs are cut, schools cannot single out the federally connected children to bear the brunt of such cuts. We must meet the needs of our children and those who serve their country—we must continue to provide compensation to federally impacted localities.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this bill. This is not a rescissions bill, it's a resentment bill. It's a bill that shows how much certain Members of this House resent the needs of the poor, the young, and the elderly to get a helping hand from government.

There are fair ways to reduce government spending to pay for disaster relief and then there are mean-spirited and malicious ways of reducing spending. This so-called rescissions bill is chock full of mean-spirited cuts to people who need assistance.

And what are two-thirds of the rescissions in this bill going towards? Certainly not much help for those who are going to be hurt by these cuts. Far too much of these cuts are going towards people who need no helping hand from the government. These cuts are going predominantly to the top 10 percent of the wealthiest in the country, not quite the group that's in need of a helping hand from the government.

And what programs and people are getting rolled over by this steamroller trying to get tax cuts to the wealthiest: Food programs for women, infants, and children; low-income energy assistance for the elderly; employment programs to teach young people job skills; financial aid for students; health care programs for veterans; programs to keep schools safe from drugs and crime; healthy start funds to lower rates of infant mortality; and housing programs for the poor.

I guess the message being sent from those favoring this bill is that those people I have just named will have to fend for themselves. I don't think too much of the tax credit money going to the wealthy from these cuts is going to make life better for the groups I've just named. Looks like the Contract With America is limited to a select few.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Chairman, I oppose this supplemental appropriations bill for two reasons.

First, as a Californian, I'm disappointed that it fails to provide adequate funding in response to recent disasters in my state. While the administration requested $6.7 billion in emergency money to help California rebuild after the Northridge earthquake, House Republicans have provided just $5.4 billion—or $1.3 billion less than what's needed to do the job right.

Second, I cannot support legislation which responds to natural disasters in California by creating manmade disasters for families all across the United States.

This legislation eliminates over $17 billion in funding that heats our homes, nourishes our infants, enriches our culture, educates our children, heals our veterans, and houses our poor.

Mr. Chairman, California may have had the earthquake, but it's the most vulnerable in our society who will feel the aftershocks if this legislation passes. I urge my colleagues to defeat the supplemental appropriations bill.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of H.R. 1158, modified pursuant to House Resolution 115, is considered as an original bill for the purpose of amendment and is considered as having been read.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as modified, is as follows:

H.R. 1158

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 and making rescissions for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1995, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS

CHAPTER I

DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND 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.), $5,360,000,000, 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.

CHAPTER II

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION AND RELATED AGENCIES

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

COAST GUARD

OPERATING EXPENSES

For an additional amount for ''Operating expenses'', to cover the incremental costs arising from the consequences of Operations Able Manner, Able Vigil, Restore Democracy, and Support Democracy, $28,197,000, to remain available until September 30, 1995: *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.

TITLE II

RESCISSIONS

CHAPTER I

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

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, $3,000,000 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, $12,678,000 are rescinded.

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, $20,994,000 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, $115,500,000 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, $3,000,000 for the cost of 5 percent 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, $25,000,000 are rescinded.

CHAPTER II

DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

WORKING CAPITAL FUND

(RESCISSION)

Of the unobligated balances in the Working Capital Fund, $1,500,000 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.

OFFICE OF JUSTICE PROGRAMS

DRUG COURTS

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in title VIII of Public Law 103–317, $27,750,000 are rescinded.

OUNCE OF PREVENTION COUNCIL

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

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''.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF STANDARDS AND TECHNOLOGY

INDUSTRIAL TECHNOLOGY SERVICES

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103–317 for the Manufacturing Extension Partnership and the Quality Program, $27,100,000 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, $37,000,000 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, $3,300,000 are rescinded.

NATIONAL TECHNICAL INFORMATION SERVICE

NTIS REVOLVING FUND

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103–317, $4,000,000 are rescinded.

NATIONAL TELECOMMUNICATIONS AND INFORMATION ADMINISTRATION

INFORMATION INFRASTRUCTURE GRANTS

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103–317, $30,000,000 are rescinded.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Laws 103–75 and 102–368, $37,584,000 are rescinded.

In addition, of the funds made available under this heading in Public Laws 99–500 and 99–591, $7,500,000 for the Fort Worth Stockyards Project are rescinded.

THE JUDICIARY

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, $1,100,000 are rescinded.

RELATED AGENCIES

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103–317, $15,000,000 are rescinded: *Provided*, That no funds in that Public Law shall be available to implement section 24 of the Small Business Act, as amended.

LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION

PAYMENT TO THE LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103–317 and prior appropriations Acts, $5,849,000 are rescinded, of which $33,000 are from funds made available for law school clinics; $31,000 are from funds made available for supplemental field programs; $75,000 are from funds made available for regional training centers; $1,189,000 are from funds made available for national support; $1,021,000 are from funds made available for State support; $685,000 are from funds made available for client initiatives; $44,000 are from funds made available for the Clearinghouse; $4,000 are from funds made available for computer assisted legal research regional centers; and $1,572,000 are from funds made available for Corporation management and administration.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

RELATED AGENCY

BOARD FOR INTERNATIONAL BROADCASTING

ISRAEL RELAY STATION

(RESCISSION)

From unobligated balances available under this heading, $2,000,000 are rescinded.

CHAPTER III

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

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, $40,000,000 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, $116,500,000 are rescinded.

ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION AND WASTE MANAGEMENT

(RESCISSION)

Of the amounts made available under this heading in Public Law 103–316 and prior years' Energy and Water Development Acts, $28,000,000 are rescinded.

DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103–316, $20,000,000 are rescinded.

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

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, $25,000,000 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, $45,500,000 are rescinded.

POPULATION, DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103–306, $9,000,000 are rescinded.

MILITARY ASSISTANCE

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

PEACEKEEPING OPERATIONS

(RESCISSION)

Of the unobligated or unexpended balances of funds available under this heading from funds provided in Public Law 103–306, $4,500,000 are rescinded.

EXPORT ASSISTANCE

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF THE UNITED STATES

SUBSIDY APPROPRIATION

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103–87 and Public Law 103–306, $5,000,000 are rescinded.

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT AGENCY

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103–306, $4,500,000 are rescinded.

CHAPTER V

DEPARTMENT OF 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, $4,500,000 are rescinded.

PAYMENTS IN LIEU OF TAXES

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds available under this heading in Public Law 103–332, $5,000,000 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, $1,997,000 are rescinded.

UNITED STATES FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds available under this heading in Public Law 103–332, $2,000,000 are rescinded.

CONSTRUCTION

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds available under this heading or the heading Construction and Anadromous Fish in Public Law 103–332, 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, $14,390,000 are rescinded.

LAND ACQUISITION

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds available under this heading in Public Law 103–332, Public Law 103–138, Public Law 102–381, and Public Law 101–512, $7,345,000 are rescinded.

NATIONAL BIOLOGICAL SURVEY

RESEARCH, INVENTORIES, AND SURVEYS

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds available under this heading in Public Law 103–332, $16,680,000 are rescinded.

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

CONSTRUCTION

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds available under this heading in Public Law 103–332, $22,831,000 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, Public Law 103–138, Public Law 102–381, Public Law 102–154, Public Law 101–512, Public Law 101–121, Public Law 100–446, Public Law 100–202, Public Law 99–190, Public Law 98–473, and Public Law 98–146, $16,509,000 are rescinded.

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

OPERATION OF INDIAN PROGRAMS

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds available under this heading in Public Law 103–332, $4,046,000 are rescinded.

CONSTRUCTION

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds available under this heading in Public Law 103–332, $10,309,000 are rescinded.

TERRITORIAL AND INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

ADMINISTRATION OF TERRITORIES

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds available under this heading in Public Law 103–332, $2,438,000 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.

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, $12,500,000 are rescinded.

INTERNATIONAL FORESTRY

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds available under this heading in Public Law 103–332, $1,000,000 are rescinded.

NATIONAL FOREST SYSTEM

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds available under this heading in Public Law 103–332, $3,327,000 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, $4,919,000 are rescinded.

LAND ACQUISITION

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds available under this heading in Public Law 103–332, Public Law 103–138 and Public Law 102–381, $3,974,000 are rescinded.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

FOSSIL ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds available under this heading in Public Law 103–332, $18,650,000 are rescinded.

NAVAL PETROLEUM AND OIL SHALE RESERVES

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds available under this heading in Public Law 103–332, $21,000,000 are rescinded.

ENERGY CONSERVATION

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds available under this heading in Public Law 103–332, $46,228,000 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, $31,012,000 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 funds available under this heading in Public Law 103–332, $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, $2,300,000 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.

CHAPTER VI

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, 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, $1,603,094,000 are rescinded, including $10,000,000 for necessary expenses of construction, rehabilitation, and acquisition of new Job Corps centers, $12,500,000 for the School-to-Work Opportunities Act, $6,408,000 for section 401 of the Job Training Partnership Act, $8,571,000 for section 402 of such Act, $3,861,000 for service delivery areas under section 101(a)(4)(A)(iii) of such Act, $33,000,000 for carrying out title II, part A of such Act, $310,000,000 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.

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103–112, $682,282,000 are rescinded.

COMMUNITY SERVICE EMPLOYMENT FOR OLDER AMERICANS

(RESCISSION)

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, $12,000,000 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 $3,253,097,000.

EMPLOYMENT STANDARDS ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103–333, $2,487,000 are rescinded.

OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103–333, $16,072,000 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, $82,775,000 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, $8,883,000 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, $20,000,000 are rescinded.

BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

(RESCISSION)

Of the available balances under this heading, $50,000,000 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 $2,168,935,000, 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

LOW INCOME HOME ENERGY ASSISTANCE

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available in the third paragraph under this heading in Public Law 103–333, $1,319,204,000 are rescinded.

COMMUNITY SERVICES BLOCK GRANT

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103–333, $26,988,000 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, $25,900,000 are rescinded for carrying out the Community Schools Youth Services and Supervision Grant Program Act of 1994.

PAYMENTS TO STATES FOR FOSTER CARE AND ADOPTION ASSISTANCE

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103–333 for payments to States under section 474(a)(3) of the Social Security Act, an amount is hereby rescinded such that the total made available to any State under such section in fiscal year 1995 does not exceed 110 percent of the total paid to such State thereunder in fiscal year 1994 which, notwithstanding any other provision of law, is the maximum amount to which any such State shall be entitled for payments under such section 474(a)(3) for fiscal year 1995.

ADMINISTRATION ON AGING

AGING SERVICES PROGRAMS

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103–333, $899,000 are rescinded.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

EDUCATION REFORM

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103–333, $186,030,000 are rescinded, including $142,000,000 from funds made available for State and local education systemic improvement, $21,530,000 from funds made available for Federal activities, and $10,000,000 from funds made available for parental assistance under the Goals 2000: Educate America Act; and $12,500,000 are rescinded from funds made available under the School to Work Opportunities Act, including $9,375,000 for National programs and $3,125,000 for State grants and local partnerships.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103–333, $113,270,000 are rescinded as follows: $105,000,000 from the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, title I, part A, and $8,270,000 from part E, section 1501.

IMPACT AID

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103–333, $16,293,000 for section 8002 are rescinded.

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103–333, $757,132,000 are rescinded as follows: from the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, title II–B, $60,000,000, title IV, $481,962,000, title V–C, $28,000,000, title IX–B, $12,000,000, title X–D, –E, and –G, and section 10602, $21,384,000, and title XII, $100,000,000; from the Higher Education Act, section 596, $13,875,000; from the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act, title VII–B, $28,811,000; 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.

SPECIAL INSTITUTIONS FOR PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES

NATIONAL TECHNICAL INSTITUTE FOR THE DEAF

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103–333, $799,000 are rescinded.

GALLAUDET UNIVERSITY

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103–333, $1,298,000 are rescinded.

VOCATIONAL AND ADULT EDUCATION

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103–333, $232,413,000 are rescinded as follows: from the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act, title III–A, –B, and –E, $151,888,000 and from title IV–A, –B, and –C, $34,535,000; from the Adult Education Act, section 384(c), part B–7, and section 371, $31,392,000; from the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act, $9,498,000; and from the National Literacy Act, $5,100,000.

STUDENT FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103–333, $83,375,000 are rescinded from funding for the Higher Education Act, title IV, part A–4 and part H–1.

HIGHER EDUCATION

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103–333, $102,246,000 are rescinded as follows: from amounts available for Public Law 99–498, $1,000,000; the Higher Education Act, title IV–A, chapter 5, $496,000, title IV–A–2, chapter 1, $11,200,000, title IV–A–2, chapter 2, $3,108,000, title IV–A–6, $9,823,000, title V–C, subparts 1 and 3, $16,175,000, title IX–B, $10,100,000, title IX–C, $7,500,000, title IX–E, $3,500,000, title IX–G, $14,920,000, title X–D, $4,000,000, and title XI–A, $13,000,000; Public Law 102–325, $1,000,000; and the Excellence in Mathematics, Science, and Engineering Education Act of 1990, $6,424,000: *Provided*, That in carrying out title IX–B, remaining appropriations shall not be available for awards for doctoral study.

HOWARD UNIVERSITY

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103–333, $4,300,000 are rescinded, including $2,500,000 for construction.

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, $322,000 appropriated for administrative expenses are rescinded.

EDUCATION RESEARCH, STATISTICS, AND IMPROVEMENT

(RESCISSION)

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103–333, $55,250,000 are rescinded as follows: from the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, title III–A, $30,000,000, title III–B, $10,000,000, title III–C, $2,700,000, title III–D, $2,250,000; title X–B, $4,600,000, and title XIII–B, $2,700,000; from the Goals 2000: Educate America Act, title VI, $3,000,000.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, during fiscal year 1995, $56,750,000 shall

be available under this heading for the Fund for the Improvement of Education: *Provided,* That none of the funds under this heading during fiscal year 1995 shall be obligated for title III–B of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (Star Schools Program).

LIBRARIES

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103–333, $34,742,000 are rescinded as follows: for the Library Services and Construction Act, part II, $15,300,000, and part VI, $8,026,000; for the Higher Education Act, part II, sections 222 and 223, $11,416,000.

RELATED AGENCIES

CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103–112, $47,000,000 are rescinded. Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103–333, $94,000,000 are rescinded.

RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

DUAL BENEFITS PAYMENTS ACCOUNT

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103–333, $5,000,000 are rescinded.

GENERAL PROVISION

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 ''$298,000,000''; and

(2) by striking ''$2,500,000,000'' and inserting ''$2,453,000,000''.

CHAPTER VII

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

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)

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103–283, $418,000 are rescinded: *Provided,* That, upon enactment of this Act, any balance of the funds made available that remains after this rescission shall be transferred in equal amounts to the Committee on House Oversight of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate for the purpose of carrying out the functions of the Joint Committee on Printing.

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.

ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

CAPITOL BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

CAPITOL BUILDINGS

(RESCISSIONS)

Of the funds made available until expended for energy efficient lighting retrofitting under this heading in Public Law 102–392, $500,000 are rescinded.

Of the funds made available until expended for energy efficient lighting retrofitting under this heading in Public Law 103–69, $2,000,000 are rescinded.

GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

(RESCISSIONS)

CONGRESSIONAL PRINTING AND BINDING

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103–283, $3,000,000 are rescinded.

OFFICE OF SUPERINTENDENT OF DOCUMENTS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103–283, $600,000 are rescinded.

BOTANIC GARDEN

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available until expended by transfer under this heading in Public Law 103–283, $4,000,000 are rescinded.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

(RESCISSIONS)

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

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

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, $8,867,000 are rescinded.

CHAPTER VIII

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION AND RELATED AGENCIES

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

TRANSPORTATION PLANNING, RESEARCH, AND DEVELOPMENT

(RESCISSION)

Of the amounts provided under this heading in Public Law 103–331, $1,293,000 are rescinded.

WORKING CAPITAL FUND

The obligation authority under this heading in Public Law 103–331 is hereby reduced by $8,000,000.

COAST GUARD

OPERATING EXPENSES

(RESCISSION)

Of the amounts provided under this heading in Public Law 103–331, $6,440,000 are rescinded.

ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION, AND IMPROVEMENTS

(RESCISSION)

Of the available balances under this heading, $42,569,000 are rescinded.

ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE AND RESTORATION

(RESCISSION)

Of the amounts provided under this heading in Public Law 103–331, $3,500,000 are rescinded.

FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION

FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT

(AIRPORT AND AIRWAY TRUST FUND)

(RESCISSION)

Of the available balances under this heading, $69,825,000 are rescinded.

RESEARCH, ENGINEERING, AND DEVELOPMENT

(AIRPORT AND AIRWAY TRUST FUND)

(RESCISSION)

Of the available balances under this heading, $7,500,000 are rescinded.

FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION

LIMITATION ON GENERAL OPERATING EXPENSES

The obligation limitation under this heading in Public Law 103–331 is hereby reduced by $42,500,000.

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAYS

(LIMITATION ON OBLIGATIONS)

(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

The obligation limitation under this heading in Public Law 103–331 is hereby reduced by $70,140,000: *Provided,* That $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: *Provided further,* That no reduction shall be made in any amount distributed to any State under section 310(a) of Public Law 103–331.

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAYS

EMERGENCY RELIEF PROGRAM

(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

(RESCISSION)

Of the amounts provided under this heading in Public Law 103–211, $351,000,000 are rescinded.

FEDERAL RAILROAD ADMINISTRATION

NORTHEAST CORRIDOR IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

(RESCISSION)

Of the amounts provided under this heading in Public Law 103–331, $7,768,000 are rescinded.

FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION

TRANSIT PLANNING AND RESEARCH

(RESCISSION)

Of the available balances under this heading, $8,800,000 are rescinded.

DISCRETIONARY GRANTS

(LIMITATION ON OBLIGATIONS)

(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

The obligation limitation under this heading in Public Law 103–331 is hereby reduced by $17,650,000: *Provided,* That such reduction shall be made from obligational authority available to the Secretary for the replacement, rehabilitation, and purchase of buses and related equipment and the construction of bus-related facilities.

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 102–388 as amended by Public Law 103–122, $67,227,500, to be distributed as follows:

(a) $29,022,500, for the replacement, rehabilitation, and purchase of buses and related equipment and the construction of bus-related facilities: *Provided,* That in distributing the foregoing reduction, obligational authority remaining unobligated for each project identified in the joint explanatory statements of the committees on conference accompanying such Act shall be reduced by fifty per centum; and

(b) $38,205,000, for new fixed guideway systems, to be distributed as follows:

$9,120,000, for the San Francisco BART Extension/Tasman Corridor Project;

$12,655,000, for the Boston, Massachusetts to Portland, Maine Commuter Rail Project;

$875,000, for the Orlando OSCAR LRT Project;

$980,000, for the Salt Lake City South LRT Project;

$745,000, for the Cleveland Dual Hub Corridor Project;

$1,500,000, for the Milwaukee East-West Corridor Project;

$845,000, for the San Diego Mid-Coast Extension Project;

$2,235,000, for the Hawthorne-Warwick Commuter Rail Project;

$7,595,000, for the Seattle-Tacoma Commuter Rail Project;

$1,490,000, for the Lakewood, Freehold, and Matawan or Jamesburg Commuter Rail Project; and

$165,000, for the Miami Downtown Peoplemover Project.

Public Law 102–143, $43,296,500, to be distributed as follows:

(a) $6,781,500, for the replacement, rehabilitation, and purchase of buses and related equipment and the construction of bus-related facilities: *Provided,* That in distributing the foregoing reduction, obligational authority remaining unobligated for each project for which the obligation limitation in Public Law 102–143 was applied shall be reduced by fifty per centum; and

(b) $36,515,000, for new fixed guideway systems, to be distributed as follows:

$1,000,000, for the Cleveland Dual Hub Corridor Project;

$465,000, for the Kansas City-South LRT Project;

$950,000, for the San Diego Mid-Coast Extension Project;

$5,000,000, for the Los Angeles-San Diego (LOSSAN) Commuter Rail Project;

$17,100,000, for the Hawthorne-Warwick Commuter Rail Project;

$500,000, for the New York-Staten Island-Midtown Ferry Project;

$4,000,000, for the San Jose-Gilroy Commuter Rail Project;

$1,620,000, for the Seattle-Tacoma Commuter Rail Project;

$880,000, for the Vallejo Ferry Project; and

$5,000,000, for the Detroit LRT Project.

Public Law 101–516, $2,230,000, for new fixed guideway systems, to be distributed as follows:

$2,230,000, for the Cleveland Dual Hub Corridor Project.

Public Law 101–164, $1,247,000, for the replacement, rehabilitation, and purchase of buses and related equipment and the construction of bus-related facilities: *Provided,* That in distributing the foregoing reduction, obligational authority remaining unobligated for each project identified in the joint explanatory statements of the committees of conference accompanying such Act shall be reduced by fifty per centum.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

(INCLUDING RESCISSIONS)

SEC. 801. Of the funds provided in Public Law 103–331 for the Department of Transportation working capital fund (WCF), $8,000,000 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 $85,000,000.

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, $20,000,000 are permanently canceled.

CHAPTER IX

TREASURY, POSTAL SERVICE, AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

DEPARTMENTAL OFFICES

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103–329, $100,000 are rescinded.

FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT TRAINING CENTER

ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS, AND RELATED EXPENSES

(RESCISSION)

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

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 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

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103–123, $1,500,000 are rescinded.

INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE

INFORMATION SYSTEMS

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103–329, $1,490,000 are rescinded.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

THE 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

(RESCISSION)

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 FUND

(LIMITATIONS ON AVAILABILITY OF REVENUE)

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading for ''New Construction'' in Public Law 103–329 for Bullhead City, Arizona, a grant to the Federal Aviation Administration for a runway protection zone, $2,200,000 are rescinded; for Hilo, Hawaii, Consolidation, $12,000,000 are rescinded: *Provided,* That of the funds made available under this heading for ''New Construction'' in Public Law 103–123 for Sierra Vista, Arizona, U.S. Magistrates Office, $1,000,000 are rescinded; for Wheeling, West Virginia, Federal Building and U.S. Courthouse, $35,861,000 are rescinded: *Provided further,* That of the funds made available under this heading for ''New Construction'' in Public Law 102–393 for Nogales, Arizona, U.S. Border Patrol Station, $2,000,000 are rescinded; for Atlanta, Georgia, Centers for Disease Control, site acquisition and improvements, $25,890,000 are rescinded; for Atlanta Georgia, Centers for Disease Control, $14,110,000 are rescinded; for Newark, New Jersey, Parking Facility, $9,000,000 are rescinded; for Seattle, Washington, U.S. Courthouse, $11,548,000 are rescinded: *Provided further,* That of the funds made available under this heading for ''New Construction'' in Public Law 102–141 for Charlotte Amalie, Saint Thomas, United States Virgin Islands, U.S. Courthouse Annex, $2,184,000 are rescinded: *Provided further,* That of the funds made available under this heading for ''New Construction'' in Public Law 102–27 for Washington, District of Columbia, General Services Administration Headquarters, $13,000,000 are rescinded: *Provided further,* That of the funds made available under this heading for ''Repairs and Alterations'' in Public Law 103–329 for Walla Walla, Washington, Corps of Engineers Building, $2,800,000 are rescinded: *Provided further,* That of the funds made available under this heading for ''Repairs and Alterations'' in Public Law 103–123 for District of Columbia, Central and West Heating Plants, $5,000,000 are rescinded.

OPERATING EXPENSES

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103–329, $2,065,000 are rescinded.

FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103–329, $2,792,000 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.

CHAPTER X

DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

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 this amount is to be taken from the $771,000,000 earmarked for the equipment and land and structures object classifications, which amount does not become available for obligation until August 1, 1995.

DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION

CONSTRUCTION, MAJOR PROJECTS

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103–327, $156,110,000 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, $5,733,400,000 are rescinded: *Provided,* That of the total rescinded under this heading, $690,100,000 shall be from the amounts earmarked for the development or acquisition cost of public housing; $1,157,000,000 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; $2,694,000,000 shall be from amounts earmarked for rental assistance under the section 8 existing certificate program (42 U.S.C. 1437f) and the housing voucher program under section 8(o) of the United States Housing Act of 1937, which shall include $100,000,000 from the amounts made available for new programs within the rental assistance earmark in Public Law 103–327; $15,000,000 shall be from amounts provided for the Family Unification program; $465,100,000 shall be from amounts earmarked for the preservation of low-income housing programs; $90,000,000 shall be from amounts earmarked for the lead-based paint hazard reduction program; $186,000,000 shall be from amounts earmarked for housing opportunities for persons with AIDS; $70,000,000 shall be from the amounts earmarked for special purpose grants in Public Law 102–389 and prior years; $39,000,000 shall be from amounts recaptured during fiscal year 1995 or prior years; $34,200,000 shall be from amounts provided for lease adjustments; and $287,000,000 of amounts recaptured during fiscal year 1995 from the reconstruction of obsolete public housing projects.

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.

PAYMENTS FOR OPERATION OF LOW-INCOME HOUSING PROJECTS

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103–327, $404,000,000 are rescinded.

SEVERELY DISTRESSED PUBLIC 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, $523,000,000 are rescinded.

DRUG ELIMINATION GRANTS FOR LOW-INCOME 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, $32,000,000 are rescinded.

YOUTHBUILD PROGRAM

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103–327, $38,000,000 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 charges, 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, $19,000,000 are rescinded.

HOMELESS ASSISTANCE

HOMELESS ASSISTANCE GRANTS

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.

COMMUNITY PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT GRANTS

(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, $349,200,000 are rescinded.

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.

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, $210,000,000 are rescinded: *Provided*, That this amount is to be taken from the $386,212,000 which is earmarked to be available for obligation for the period September 1, 1995 through August 31, 1996.

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, $4,806,805 are rescinded.

BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103–327 and prior years, $25,000,000 are rescinded.

WATER INFRASTRUCTURE/STATE REVOLVING FUNDS

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103–327 for wastewater infrastructure financing, $3,200,000 are rescinded, and of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103–327 and prior years for drinking water state revolving funds, $1,300,000,000 are rescinded.

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

SCIENCE, AERONAUTICS AND TECHNOLOGY

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103–327, $38,000,000 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.

MISSION SUPPORT

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103–327, for administrative aircraft, $1,000,000 are rescinded.

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 III GENERAL PROVISION

DENIAL OF USE OF FUNDS FOR INDIVIDUALS NOT LAWFULLY WITHIN THE UNITED STATES

SEC. 30. (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 risks or hazzards; 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.

TITLE IV

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS

CHAPTER I

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

FOOD SAFETY AND INSPECTION SERVICE

For an additional amount for salaries and expenses of the Food Safety and Inspection Service, $9,048,000.

AGRICULTURAL STABILIZATION AND CONSERVATION SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for salaries and expenses of the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, $10,000,000.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION FUND

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

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. 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.

CHAPTER II

DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES

RELATED AGENCY

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.

CHAPTER III

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, as authorized under subsection (a) under the heading ''Debt Relief for Jordan'', in title VI of Public Law 103–306, $50,000,000.

CHAPTER IV

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.

BOTANIC GARDEN

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

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.

CHAPTER V

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION AND RELATED AGENCIES

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

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,''.

CHAPTER VI

TREASURY, POSTAL SERVICE, AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

DEPARTMENTAL OFFICES

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

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;''.

FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT TRAINING CENTER

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

In the paragraph under this heading in Public Law 103–329, delete ''first-aid and emergency'' and insert ''short-term'' before ''medical services''.

INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE

INFORMATION SYSTEMS

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

In the paragraph under this heading in Public Law 103–329, delete ''$650,000,000'' and insert ''$640,000,000''.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS—INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE

In the paragraph under this heading in Public Law 103–329, in section 3, after ''$119,000,000'', insert ''annually''.

UNITED STATES MINT

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

In the paragraph under this heading in Public Law 103–329, insert ''not to exceed'' after ''of which''.

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.

TITLE V

RESCISSIONS

CHAPTER I

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

PUBLIC LAW 480 PROGRAM ACCOUNTS

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103–330, $20,000,000 for commodities supplied in connection with dispositions abroad, pursuant to title III 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 RELATED AGENCIES

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, $19,500,000 are rescinded.

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, $2,000,000 are rescinded.

ACQUISITION AND MAINTENANCE OF BUILDINGS ABROAD

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103–317 and prior appropriations Acts, $20,000,000 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, $3,000,000 are rescinded, of which $2,000,000 are from funds made available for activities related to the implementation of the Chemical Weapons Convention.

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 funds made available under this heading, $6,000,000 are rescinded.

CHAPTER III

FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS

BILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

DEBT RESTRUCTURING UNDER THE ENTERPRISE FOR THE AMERICAS INITIATIVE

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102–391, $2,400,000 are rescinded.

ECONOMIC SUPPORT FUND

(RESCISSIONS)

Of the unobligated balances of funds available under this heading from funds provided in Public Law 103–306, $7,500,000 are rescinded.

Of the unobligated balances of funds available under this heading from funds provided in Public Law 103–87, $20,000,000 are rescinded.

Of the unobligated balances of funds currently available under this heading, including earmarked funds, from funds provided in Public Law 102–391 and prior appropriations Acts, $15,475,000 are rescinded.

OPERATING EXPENSES OF THE AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103–306, $5,000,000 are rescinded.

ASSISTANCE FOR THE NEW INDEPENDENT STATES OF THE FORMER SOVIET UNION

(RESCISSIONS)

Of the unobligated balances of funds available under this heading from funds provided in Public Law 103–306, $17,500,000 are rescinded.

Of the unobligated or unexpended balances of funds available under this heading from funds provided in Public Law 103–87 and Public Law 102–391, $30,200,000 are rescinded.

CHAPTER IV

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103–283, $187,000 are rescinded.

TITLE VI
GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 301. None of the funds made available in any appropriations Act for fiscal year 1995 may be used to issue, implement, administer, or enforce any executive order, or other rule or order, that prohibits Federal contracts with companies that hire permanent replacements for striking employees.

SEC. 302. Hereafter, the requirement pursuant to section 18(b)(3) of the United States Housing Act of 1937, for the provision of an additional dwelling unit for each public housing dwelling unit to be demolished or disposed of under an application submitted by a public housing agency under section 18(a) of such Act, shall not apply to any such application approved by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development in fiscal year 1995 or in any prior fiscal year: *Provided*, That no such application submitted by a public housing agency to implement a final order of a court issued, or a settlement approved by a court, before the effective date of this public law, shall be affected by this paragraph.

SEC. 303. 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.

SEC. 304. 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 an inspection and maintenance program for vehicular emissions.

SEC. 305. The Congress finds that the 1990 amendments to the Clean Air Act (Public Law 101–549) superseded prior requirements of the Clean Air Act regarding the demonstration of attainment of national ambient air quality standards and eliminated the obligation of the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to promulgate a Federal implementation plan under section 110(e) of the Clean Air Act for the South Coast, Ventura, or Sacramento areas of California. Upon the enactment of this Act, any Federal implementation plan that has been promulgated by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency under the Clean Air Act for the South Coast, Ventura, or Sacramento areas of California pursuant to a court order or settlement shall be rescinded and shall have no further force and effect.

SEC. 306. EMERGENCY TWO-YEAR SALVAGE TIMBER SALE PROGRAM.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section:

(1) The term ''emergency period'' means the two-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this section.

(2) The term ''Federal lands'' means—

(A) lands within the National Forest System, as defined in section 11(a) of the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974 (16 U.S.C. 1609(a)); and

(B) public lands, as defined in section 103(e) of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1702(e)).

(3) The term ''land management plan'' means—

(A) a land and resource management plan (or, if no final plan is currently in effect, a draft land and resource management plan) prepared by the Forest Service pursuant to section 6 of the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974 (16 U.S.C. 1604) for a unit or units of the Federal lands described in paragraph (2)(A); or

(B) a land use plan prepared by the Bureau of Land Management pursuant to section 202 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1712), or other multiple-use plan in effect, for a unit of the Federal lands described in paragraph (2)(B).

(4) 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.

(5) The term 'Secretary concerned' means—

(A) with respect to Federal lands described in paragraph (2)(A), the Secretary of Agriculture; and

(B) with respect to Federal lands described in paragraph (2)(B), the Secretary of the Interior.

(b) TWO-YEAR EMERGENCY PROGRAM OF SALVAGE TIMBER SALES FOR FEDERAL LANDS.—

(1) SALVAGE TIMBER SALES REQUIRED.—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 to satisfy the volume requirements of paragraph (2).

(2) SALVAGE TIMBER SALE VOLUMES.—The salvage timber sales sold under this subsection during the emergency period shall contain the following total timber volumes (programmed or otherwise):

(A) For Federal lands described in subsection (a)(2)(A)—

(i) not less than 3,000,000,000 board feet during the first year of the emergency period; and

(ii) not less than 3,000,000,000 board feet during the second year of the emergency period.

(B) For Federal lands described in subsection (a)(2)(B)—

(i) not less than 115,000,000 board feet during the first year of the emergency period; and

(ii) not less than 115,000,000 board feet during the second year of the emergency period.

(3) 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.

(c) EXPEDITED PROCEDURES FOR EMERGENCY SALVAGE TIMBER SALES.—

(1) SALE DOCUMENTATION.—For each salvage timber sale conducted under subsection (b) to meet the minimum salvage timber sale volumes specified in paragraph (2) of such subsection, the Secretary concerned shall prepare a document that combines an environmental assessment under section 102(2) and implementing regulations of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4332(2)(E)) 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. The environmental assessment and biological evaluation must consider the environmental effects of the salvage timber sale and consider the effect, if any, on threatened or endangered species. 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 before the date of the enactment of this section, 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.

(2) TIME PERIODS FOR, AND REPORTING OF, SALES.—

(A) FIRST YEAR.—For salvage timber sales conducted pursuant to subsection (b) during the first year of the emergency period, the Secretary concerned shall—

(1) offer sales which contain fifty percent of the total timber volume required pursuant to subsection (b)(2)(A)(i) or (b)(2)(B)(i), as the case may be, within the first 3 months of the year; and

(2) offer sales which contain the remaining volume required pursuant to subsection (b)(2)(A)(i) or (b)(2)(B)(i), as the case may be, evenly distributed throughout the remainder of the year.

(B) SECOND YEAR.—For salvage timber sales conducted pursuant to subsection (b) during the second year of the emergency period, the Secretary concerned shall—

(1) offer sales which contain fifty percent of the total timber volume required pursuant to subsection (b)(2)(A)(ii) or (b)(2)(B)(ii), as the case may be, within 15 months of the date of enactment of this Act, and

(2) offer sales which contain the remaining volume required pursuant to subsection (b)(2)(A)(ii) or (b)(2)(B)(ii), as the case may be, within the remainder of the year.

(i) Each Secretary shall report to the Committee on Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the United States Senate 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act and on the final day of each 90-day period thereafter throughout the emergency period on the number of sales and volumes contained therein offered during such 90 day period and expected to be offered during the next 90 day period.

(ii) SPECIAL RULES FOR SECOND YEAR SALES.—The Secretary concerned may begin salvage sales intended for the second year of the emergency period before the start of the second year if the Secretary concerned determines that the preparation, advertisement, offering, awarding, and operation of such sales will not interfere with salvage timber sales required during the first year of the emergency period.

(3) 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 satisfy the applicable volume requirement in subsection (b)(2) within the applicable schedule specified in paragraph (2).

(4) SALE PREPARATION.—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) to meet the applicable schedule specified in paragraph (2). The provisions of section 3(d)(1) of the Federal Workforce Restructuring Act of 1994 (Public Law 103–226) shall not apply to any former employee of the Department of the Secretary concerned who received a voluntary separation incentive payment authorized by such Act or accepts employment pursuant to this paragraph.

(5) 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.

(6) 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) shall be deemed to satisfy the requirements

of all applicable Federal laws (and regulations implementing such laws) including but not limited to:

(A) The Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974 (16 U.S.C. 1600 et seq.).

(B) The Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.).

(C) The National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4332).

(D) The Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.).

(7) EFFECT OF SALVAGE SALES.—The Secretary of Agriculture shall not substitute salvage timber sales conducted under subsection (b) for planned non-salvage timber sales.

(8) EFFECT ON JUDICIAL DECISIONS.—The Secretary concerned may conduct salvage timber sales under the authority of this section during the emergency period and the first year after the end of the emergency period notwithstanding any decision, restraining order, or injunction issued by a United States court issued before the date of the enactment of this section.

(d) 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.

(e) ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW.—Salvage timber sales conducted under subsection (b), 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) 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.

(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), 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 or preliminary injunction 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). 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 trial on the merits 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 (c)(6)).

(5) TIME FOR DECISION.—Civil actions filed under this subsection shall be assigned for hearing at the earliest possible date and shall take precedence over all other matters pending on the docket of the court at that time except for criminal cases. 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) AWARD AND RELEASE OF PREVIOUSLY OFFERED AND UNAWARDED TIMBER SALE CONTRACTS.—

(1) AWARD AND RELEASE REQUIRED.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, within 30 days after the date of the enactment of this section, 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 and volumes, 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).

(2) EFFECT ON LAND MANAGEMENT PLANS.—Compliance with paragraph (1) shall not require or permit any change in any land management plan in existence on the date of the enactment of this Act.

The CHAIRMAN. The bill will be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule for a period not to exceed 10 hours.

No amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text shall be in order unless printed as an amendment to H.R. 1158 or H.R. 1159 in the portion of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD designated for that purpose in clause 6 of rule XXIII before March 14, 1995. Those amendments will be considered as having been read.

It shall not be in order to consider an amendment proposing to increase the net level of budget authority in the bill.

It shall not be in order to consider an amendment proposing to redistribute budget authority within the net level of budget authority in the bill except within a chapter of the bill or, in the case of a title of the bill not organized by chapters, within such title. Any such amendment or any amendment thereto shall not be subject to a demand for a division of the question.

Debate on each amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute and any amendments thereto shall be limited to 30 minutes.

Are there any amendments to the bill?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LIVINGSTON

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer amendment No. 68, the Roybal-Allard amendment, an amendment that the committee will support.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LIVINGSTON: Page 50, strike line 16 through 21.

Page 54, line 18, strike ''$38,000,000'' and insert ''$75,000,000''.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] will be recognized for 15 minutes in support of the amendment, and a Member opposed will be recognized for 15 minutes.

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

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I am delighted to yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD].

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 1158, in its current form, includes a number of harmful rescissions that specifically target the most vulnerable segments of our Nation's population. These proposed rescissions disproportionately affect seniors and the disabled, among others, but barely touch the billions of dollars annually allocated for corporate subsidies.

My amendment attempts to bring balance to the rescission package by restoring $37 million in funding for fiscal year 1995 to implement one of the most important supportive services programs administered by HUD: The Congregate Housing Services Program.

The Congregate Housing Services Program has successfully prevented or delayed the institutionalization of thousands of frail seniors and persons with disabilities by providing vital, nonmedical services. These services include meals, transportation, and personalized assistance to bathe and dress, get in and out of bed, and to access wheelchairs. The program also funds the retrofitting of individual dwelling units and the renovation of facilities for supportive services that enhance independent living. The $37 million to be restored by this amendment would provide services to over 8,200 elderly and handicapped persons throughout the country.

The restoration of congregate housing services funding would be offset by an equivalent reduction in NASA's Civilian Science, Aeronautics, and technology development research programs that are specifically designed to aid U.S. commercial aircraft firms. These systems-oriented research programs to maintain commercial airline sales should be a private, rather than a public responsibility. Think tanks ranging from the Cato Institute to the progressive policy institute have agreed that government-sponsored research programs should be basic and primary, not industry-specific. Furthermore, the Congressional Budget Office has targeted the NASA programs for possible elimination in its March 1995 report entitled ''Reducing the Deficit: Spending and Revenue Options.''

The congregate Housing Services Program is strongly supported by housing advocates throughout the Nation, as well as the American Association of Retired Persons because it improves the quality of life for the most needy of older and disabled Americans and facilitates independent living. The average elderly program recipient is a frail, older woman in her mid seventies, living alone with an income of less than $10,000 a year.

The Congregate Housing Services Program is a proven, cost-effective mechanism to fund these important supportive services for seniors and the disabled. The benefits of congregate housing services for recipients receiving home care is only 25 percent of the average cost of institutional care.

Congregate housing is a real lifeline for many elderly and disabled tenants trying to avoid unnecessary confinement in expensive institutions such as nursing homes. Without congregate housing services, many elderly and disabled persons could end up in institutions like nursing homes because many have no families and can't take adequate care of themselves.

Mr. Chairman, I urge an ''aye'' vote on the Roybal-Allard amendment.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentlewoman's statement and look forward, since she has gotten a chance to offer this amendment, to her support on the bill.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS].

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, as you know and as Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD knows, we have discussed this problem very seriously and in depth. There is no question the services to the elderly and the handicapped under this program have worked very well in many instances. In some instances we have serious concern about the management of these programs.

□ 1545

Indeed, what we are doing here or were doing here was to accept the President's recommendation of rescinding this program as we try to reexamine all of the handicapped services throughout the housing programs. But in the meantime, because of the seriousness of the difficulty and because we do not know exactly where we should be going in the final numbers on this program and because I do have some questions about the way the gentlewoman would pay for it by way of cutting NASA, with reservation, I nonetheless am willing to consider the gentlewoman's argument and I will accept the amendment.

I have discussed it with my ranking member as well.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEWIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

The gentleman and I have discussed it, and I commend the chairman of the subcommittee for accepting the gentlewoman's amendment. I concur in the reasons for acceptance of it. I think it is a good amendment.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I congratulate the gentlewoman for bringing it to our attention in this serious way, and we accept the amendment.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and I assume the gentleman from Wisconsin has no requests for time either.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment No. 26.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. OBEY: Page 48, strike lines 10 through 24.

Page 54, line 18, strike ''$38,000,000'' and insert ''$24,110,000''.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is reserved.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] is recognized for 15 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO].

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would restore the much needed funding for veterans' health care facilities and equipment. It restores $206 million for veterans' health care and provides for an identical offset in NASA's science, aeronautics, and technology account.

The total NASA budget is $14.4 billion so this amendment cuts only 1.4 percent of the NASA budget so that we can afford better health care for veterans.

Mr. Chairman, there is little debate that this funding for veterans' health care is needed. This amendment restores funding to build six critically needed VA outpatient clinics and to replace worn-out medical equipment at VA facilities. Each of these clinic projects has been carefully considered and authorized. They are an essential part of the VA's effort to move away from costly inpatient care to delivering cost-effective outpatient care.

This shift will provide better care for more veterans at lower cost to taxpayers.

As I stated, the amendment provides for offsetting rescissions in NASA's science, aeronautics, and technology account. Total 1995 funding for this account is $5.9 billion, and it includes several unauthorized programs that are either new starts at a time when we can ill afford new starts or received large increases in 1995.

While these NASA programs undoubtedly have merit, we do have to make tough choices. So I ask my colleagues, what is more important, authorized projects to improve veterans' health care or unauthorized projects such as building new rockets and satellites? The clear choice must be veterans.

In fact, the cuts are in two programs: The advanced space transportation program and the veterans' small satellite technology program. The cuts would be sufficient to provide for the offset of $206 million. Funding for these two programs total $224 million, $18 million more than necessary for the offset.

The advanced space transportation program is funded at $162.1 million, and it is aimed at developing a reuseable launch vehicle to replace the space shuttle. This program is unauthorized. It was not thoroughly debated in either the authorization or appropriation committee. It is high risk, and it is extremely expensive.

The advanced small satellite technology program also is unauthorized. Despite that, this program received a budget increase of 400 percent.

Let me repeat that, 400 percent, from $12.5 million in 1994 to $61.9 million in 1995. How in the world can we afford to increase funding for satellites by 400 percent when we cannot afford better health care for our veterans?

Mr. Chairman, I know that there are several Members on the other side who will argue that they plan to offer different amendments that restore the VA funding with offsets in the national service program. I find that appalling in that it would force us to choose between serving our veterans and providing education for our children and needed services for our communities.

Let me say to my colleagues, this amendment provides a fairer offset for restoring the veterans' funding. The amendment cuts only 1.4 percent of the NASA budget. In contrast, the Stump-Solomon alternative would result in total rescissions of 72 percent of the national service budget. That would

devastate the national service program and break our promise to thousands of young people who are serving our communities across this country.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment sets the right priorities. It restores funding for veterans' health care. It prevents devastating cuts in the National Service Program, and it cuts NASA's budget, again, by only 1.4 percent.

I urge the adoption of this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] opposed to the amendment?

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the amendment, and I insist on my point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the gentleman's amendment because it seeks to amend a paragraph previously amended.

In the ''Procedures in the U.S. House of Representatives,'' chapter 27, section 27.1 states the following:

> It is fundamental that it is not in order to amend an amendment previously agreed to. Thus the text of a bill perfected by amendment cannot thereafter be amended.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment seeks to amend text previously amended and is therefore not in order.

I respectfully ask the Chair to sustain my point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does any Member desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I do.

The CHAIRMAN. The chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I would urge the gentleman to withhold on his point of order for a very simple reason. Absent the rule which was adopted, the amendment of the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO] would have been in order as an amendment to the previous amendment that was brought up by the gentleman from Louisiana.

The gentleman from Louisiana brought up the original amendment, the Roybal-Allard amendment, obviously under the rule, in order to preclude the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO] from offering the amendment to restore funds for veterans.

I think this is an example of how the rules are being used to establish a very unfair situation, which precludes Members from offering amendments which otherwise would be perfectly in order.

I would concede the gentleman's point of order, but I would suggest that this is just another indication of how cynical the overall rule was which was adopted by this House an hour ago.

Mrs. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, Republicans have become Robin Hood in reverse. They steal from the poor to give to the rich.

I support the DeLauro amendment to H.R. 1158 because Republicans do not care about the vulnerable in our society—the very young and the elderly.

The Republican method for raising money to give to the rich is to rescind funding for authorized projects such as the VA ambulatory clinics. They do not do this for humane reasons. They want to steal the clinics and give a tax break to persons that make over $100,000.

Give me a break. What kind of nonsense is this? It is Republican tricksters using old ideas from the 1980's—ideas that got us into this mess. If we do what Republicans want—destroy programs that help people, increase defense spending irrationally and give the rich tax breaks—we will end in economic ruin. It did not work in the 1980's and will not work now.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there other Members who wish to be heard on the point of order?

If not, under the precedents recorded at section 31 in chapter 27 of Deschler's Procedure, the point of order of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] is sustained.

For what reason does the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG] rise?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I offer amendment No. 75.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, since the amendment that was called up on the Democratic side was ruled out of order, does that mean that the recognition for amendments now reverts to the majority side, or does it still stay on this side?

The CHAIRMAN. It is the discretion of the Chair. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin seek recognition to offer an amendment?

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, yes.

Mr. Chairman, I will withhold. Could I inquire which amendment the gentleman is planning to bring up?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, this is amendment No. 75, which restores the veterans' appropriation.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, we might as well continue with the charade.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. YOUNG OF FLORIDA

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I offer amendment No. 75.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. YOUNG of Florida: Page 48, strike lines 10 through 24.
>
> Page 53, line 13, strike ''$210,000,000'' and all that follows through line 17 and insert ''$416,110,000 are rescinded.''.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG] is recognized for 15 minutes in support of his amendment.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that no one will be opposed to this amendment. Under those circumstances, is it possible under the rule to reach an understanding about sharing of time so the amendment may be discussed?

The CHAIRMAN. That is possible. The gentleman may also, by unanimous consent, request that time if there is no other Member standing in opposition.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman does not have to make a unanimous consent request. I will be very happy to share the time. What I would like to do is yield myself 5 minutes, 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS], and 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. STUMP].

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] is recognized for 15 minutes that the Chair would otherwise set aside for opposition.

There was no objection.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG].

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, the amendment called up restores the funding for the Veterans' Administration military care facilities. And the amendment No. 75 was actually filed by the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. STUMP], the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and the chairman of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON].

Amendment No. 80, which is one that I had filed at the same time, is identical, so I called up No. 75 and I am going to yield most of the time to the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] and the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. STUMP].

I just briefly want to say that today we are dealing with the Contract With America. At the same time when we talk about veterans issues and veterans medical care, we are talking about America's contract with veterans. One hundred thirty years ago this month, just outside this Chamber, just prior to the end of the Civil War, President Lincoln made that commitment. And he said, ''Let us strive on to finish the work we are in,'' and he said, ''to bind up the nation's wounds, to care for him who shall have borne the battle and for his widow and for his orphan.'' Those words are engraved in the walls of the Department of Veterans Affairs headquarters downtown as a reaffirmation of that commitment to our veterans. In keeping with that commitment to America's veterans, we offer this amendment today.

The amendment I offer today makes good on that contract with our veterans, one that predates Lincoln's words with its origins in the Plymouth Colony in 1636 and later the Continental Congress in 1776. Our Nation has always provided for the needs of those who

have come to the defense of our Nation, first by providing pensions for those disabled in battle, and beginning in 1811, by providing medical care. In fact the United States is acknowledged to have the world's most comprehensive system for providing assistance for veterans.

Today we honor our Nation's veterans by providing them with the finest medical care available. Unfortunately, in States such as Florida, which I have the privilege to represent, where the population of veterans continues to grow rapidly, and where veterans facilities provide service to thousands of other veterans visiting our State, the need for veterans medical care far outpaces our ability to provide services.

To address this problem, the Department of Veterans Affairs recommended to Congress last year the establishment of a number of relatively low-cost outpatient clinics that could expand the services available to veterans with inpatient hospital care. Because of or booming veterans population, the Department of Veterans Affairs recommended, and the Congress included funding for, two outpatient clinics in Florida, and four others elsewhere in our Nation.

These are urgently needed projects to provide for the immediate health care needs of our aging veterans population. In testimony before the Appropriations Committee last year, the Department of Veterans Affairs talked of the need for the outpatient clinic at Gainesville to replace the almost 30-year-old facility there, which is more than 35-percent space deficient. Space is so restricted there that a converted hallway serves as an emergency room to treat veterans.

The Orlando outpatient clinic and nursing home will replace leased space which was sized for a caseload half of what is being handled by VA personnel there. This project will not only move the VA out of the current undersized lease space, but it will take advantage of a tremendous opportunity to renovate the hospital at the Orlando Naval Training Center to not only provide much needed primary and preventive care, but also to meet the long-term needs of our veterans.

My amendment also will restore $50 million for the VA's medical equipment account, an account which the Secretary tells me already has a backlog of $800 million in needed purchases. This equipment ensures that veterans have access to and are receiving the most up-to-date treatment using the most advanced medical technology and equipment available in our Nation today. We should expect our veterans to receive no less.

Mr. Chairman, as provided for by the rule, my amendment would fully offset the cost of restoring these rescissions by increasing the committee's recommended rescission for the AmeriCorps.

The 103d Congress approved legislation establishing a national service corps over my objection. In voting against this legislation, I told my colleagues that our Nation should not be creating new and costly programs with growing long-term financial requirements at a time when we are trying to reduce Federal spending and eliminate wasteful and unnecessary programs.

Our Nation has a long and rich history of volunteering to help our neighbors in need. We do not need a new Federal program to pay Americans to volunteer, especially with Federal funds that will squeeze the resources available for higher priority needs such as caring for our Nation's veterans.

Mr. Chairman, our veterans are the finest national service corps that has ever served our country. We should honor them today by adopting this amendment to make good on our contract to provide our veterans in their greatest time of need.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. STUMP], the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS], the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], and myself jointly offer this amendment in the hopes that the House, as the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] has suggested, will consider it posthaste.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] to manage the rest of our time.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from California, [Mr. LEWIS] is recognized for the balance of the 15 minutes in support of the amendment.

There was no objection.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

I would like to speak to the House as to how we have come to this position on this amendment.

The committee is faced with some very, very serious difficulties interplaying between a variety and mix of serious programs under its jurisdiction. Members know that we had the responsibility for VA medical care funding. They also heard discussion already about housing rescissions in this package. There are problems in EPA, et cetera. They cut across the board of some 22 agencies.

As we looked at the question of was there room for any rescissions relative to the VA medical care, one recognizes initially that there are $17 billion in our bill that involve mandatory spending on those programs. Above and beyond that, there is $19.5 billion approximately in discretionary spending. It was our judgment that at least the House might consider looking at the bill they passed in appropriations for last year and rescinding the add-ons that took place in the Senate.

Frankly, the reason for those rescissions was not that we were targeting the specific building that was involved but, rather, we wanted to get the whole veterans discussion to conference with the Senate to decide what kind of new direction we should take in these programs that would do two things:

First, improve the quality and the efficiency of care to our veterans throughout our VA medical system. But second, to try to save some money in this category of spending as well, recognizing that if we are ever going to be able to balance this budget, everybody is going to have to participate. In this instance, we were attempting to make certain by way of the conference that whatever rescissions took place among veterans would be done fairly.

Having said that, the gentleman involved in this amendment have been very persuasive. The gentleman from Arizona [Mr. STUMP] indeed, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] all have been extremely helpful. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG] especially within our committee has been helpful. So with that we are essentially moving to replace the $206 million which was a rescission for veterans and in turn the funding that would counterbalance that restoring of money will come out of specific programs within CNCS that we, too, will discuss further as we move towards conference.

□ 1600

In the meantime, I believe that the work that has been done by the chairman, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. STUMP], especially has been most productive in this connection. I look forward to working with him regarding veterans' affairs in the months ahead.

Mr. STUMP. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from california, Mr. LEWIS, now controls the time.

There was no objection.

The gentleman from Arizona [Mr. STUMP] is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

Mr. STUMP. Mr. Chairman, let me say from the very beginning that I greatly appreciate the support that I received from the subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON]. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG], subcommittee chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, and the subcommittee chairman are to be commended for the job they have done in bringing this to the floor. I also want to thank my cosponsor, the gentleman from New York, GERRY SOLOMON, for what he has done.

Mr. Chairman, we are offering an amendment which sets forth a simple choice in Federal funding priorities. First, it strikes $206 million in cuts from V.A. medical care and construction accounts. Second, the amendment offsets an identical amount from the Corporation for National and Community Service.

The members of the Committee on Appropriations have done an extremely difficult task in bringing this rescission bill to the floor. They decided supplemental spending will be paid for, and they have done that. Unfortunately, the V.A. cuts included in H.R. 1158 are medical equipment purchases to the tune of $50 million, and outpatient construction projects for $156 million.

Mr. Chairman, these accounts are some of the highest priorities of my committee. The Committee on Veterans' Affairs' highest priority for this

year is going to be to reform eligibility standards for health care. We strongly believe that Congress should not cut funding for V.A. outpatient clinics while unobligated balances remain in a program such as AmeriCorps. AmeriCorps pays so-called volunteers to perform services that millions of Americans already do without seeking any financial reward.

In fiscal year 1994, volunteers contributed a total of over 14 million hours of their time over 92,000 regularly scheduled volunteers. Of the 20,000 AmeriCorps volunteers in the field today, over one-fourth are working in either Federal or State agencies. This is not a priority, Mr. Chairman. This is not even volunteerism.

Mr. Chairman, as I said at the onset, I believe the Stump-Solomon amendment, along with the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG] and the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS], presents a simple choice for Federal spending priorities. I believe this choice is crystal clear, and hope all Members will support our veterans over AmeriCorps, and also will support this amendment to final passage.

Current statutory requirements dictate a counterproductive bias in favor of costly inpatient treatment for veterans.

Cutting VA outpatient construction would be a tremendous setback to the Veterans' Affairs Committee's policy initiatives favoring a more rapid shift to outpatient care.

We strongly believe Congress should not cut funding for VA outpatient clinics and medical equipment while unobligated balances remain in a program such as AmeriCorps.

AmeriCorps pays so-called volunteers to perform services that millions of Americans already do without seeking any financial reward.

The Department of Veterans Affairs Voluntary Service [VAVS] is in its 48th year of service to this Nation's hospitalized veterans in VA health care facilities.

In fiscal year 1994, VAVS volunteers contributed a total of over 14 million hours of their time mostly from 92,534 regularly scheduled volunteers.

It is hard to think of a better example for America's youth than this program of true volunteers performing services to our veteran's without the expectation or need for financial reward.

AmeriCorps targets the same population group for its members as the military services, and they both use educational benefits as a major incentive.

In testimony before the House National Security Committee on March 7, 1995, the Marine Corps stated that in fiscal year 1994, the Marines did not achieve their enlistment contracting goals for recruiting.

For the first quarter of fiscal year 1995, all services failed to meet requirements for new enlistment contracts.

DOD's awareness and attitude study is the measurement tool for estimating the propensity of American youth to join the military.

Fiftysix percent felt AmeriCorps and other programs were better ways to get money for college than joining the military.

AmeriCorps is hurting military recruiting, and will be a much larger problem for recruiting if it is allowed to expand.

Rather than promoting American's desire for smaller and more efficient government, AmeriCorps is channeling its participants into Federal and State bureaucracies.

Of the 20,000 AmeriCorps volunteers in the field today, over one-fourth are working in Federal or State agencies.

This is not a priority.

This is not volunteerism.

Mr. Chairman, as I said at the outset, I believe the Stump-Solomon amendment presents a simple choice for Federal spending priorities.

I believe the choice is crystal clear and hope all Members will support our veterans and vote for this amendment.

ORGANIZATIONS SUPPORTING STUMP-SOLOMON AMENDMENT TO RESTORE VETERANS PROGRAM CUTS WITH AMERICORPS REDUCTIONS

Paralyzed Veterans of America.
AMVETS.
Air Force Association.
Air Force Sergeants Association.
Association of Military Surgeons of the US.
Association of the US Army.
Commissioned Officers Association of the US Public Health Service, Inc.
Chief Warrant & Warrant Officers Association of US Coast Guard.
Enlisted Association of the National Guard of the US.
Fleet Reserve Association.
Jewish Reserve Association.
Marine Corps League.
Marine Corps Reserve Officers Association.
Military Chaplains Association of the USA.
National Association for Uniformed Services.
National Guard Association of the US.
National Military Family Association.
Naval Enlisted Reserve Association.
Naval Reserve Association.
Navy League of the US.
Non Commissioned Officers Association.
Reserve Officers Association.
The Retired Enlisted Association.
The Retired Officers Association.
US Army Warrant Officers Association.
US Coast Guard Chief Petty Officers Association.
United Armed Forces Association.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STUMP. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON].

Mr. SOLOMON. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, we know what this amendment does. As the former ranking member on the Committee on Veterans' Affairs for a number of years, I can say that these outpatient clinics, especially with the aging veteran population we have in America, will save this Government money in the long run.

The reason we are taking the offsets from the National Service Corps is because of something that happened on this floor 2 years ago, when the National Service Corps legislation first came to the floor. I offered an amendment at that time which would not allow the funds for the National Service Corps to come out of the 602(b) allocations of the Department of Veterans Affairs, HUD, and independent agencies. Instead, they would come out of the education and labor 602(b) allocations, as it should be.

I was assured by the Democrat then-chairman of the Education & Labor Committee that my amendment would be supported in conference, and it would stay there is the legislation. Unfortunately, when that bill went to conference, the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor did not support my amendment. It was dropped.

What we are doing today, Mr. Chairman, is sort of a get-even. What should have been done 2 years ago is going to be done today. Once this amendment is adopted, it means that any future funding for the National Service Corps whether funding the corps is good or bad, and I think it is bad—veterans programs will not compete with the National Service Corps for Federal funds at a time when the existing appropriated funds for veterans barely cover the health benefits of those citizens.

On top of undermining military recruiting, ruining the true spirit of volunteerism, creating a new and costly bureaucracy, and serving less than one-half of 1 percent of the population, this National Service Program will steal the funds from veterans' hospitals, veterans' families, and veterans' benefits.

That is what I said 2 years ago. That is exactly the problem we are correcting today. That is why Members should support this amendment here today with a unanimous vote of this Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] is recognized for 15 minutes, and controls the time under his unanimous-consent request.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 6 minutes.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. LEWIS of California. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Point of order, Mr. Chairman.

I want to make a point of order that the gentleman's unanimous consent to have 15 minutes was not acted upon, because I yielded to him 5 of my 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Subsequently the Chairman put the request for unanimous consent and there were no objections.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] is recognized for 15 minutes, and controls 15 minutes.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida for his parliamentary inquiry.