I also want to say one more thing about the Clinton administration. They deserve a great deal of credit for the excellent response they have given to disasters that have occurred in this country. Jamie Lee Whitten deserves our gratitude and the President our commendation.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOGGETT].

Mr. DOGGETT. I thank the gentleman because in the last day and a half we have learned a great deal about rescissions. We have seen one giant rescission on the floor of this House as our Republican colleagues rescinded their commitment to the millions of American seniors that are counting on Medicare.

And now we get three more lessons:

No. 1, when it comes to making a choice, a choice between locking in savings from these cuts to deficit reduction and using it for a tax cut for the privileged few, the choice was easy; this House voted overwhelmingly to lock in those savings. But it was not 24 hours later than across the street the chairman of the Committee on the Budget said, ''Oh, it is all just a big game.'' And it was just a big game because all along they needed every dollar of those cuts to give out tax breaks for their friends.

Lesson No. 2: When it comes time to chop, who gets chopped first? Well, it is the middle-class families that are struggling to get up that economic ladder, to get their children educated, because the place that this rescission begins rescinding is in education and the Federal commitment to back up our local schools with education.

Lesson No. 3: Loopholes last. The Senate approved language that would be part of this rescissions bill to condemn the atrocious practice where some Americans can actually go out and burn their citizenship card and at the same time burn the taxpayer. Is that loophole provision in here? No, sir, it is nowhere to be found in this conference report.

We have heard a lot about disasters today. Well, let me tell you, as long as the priorities are to cut education first and to cut tax loopholes for the privileged last, that is a disaster.

I am glad to have an opportunity to vote against that kind of a disaster by voting against this conference report.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM.]

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

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this conference report.

Like many of my colleagues in the coalition and some beyond in my party, I believe in many of the rescissions included in this conference report.

I am absolutely dead set, however, against taking these spending cuts and using them for a tax cut or for other spending.

We had a way to guarantee that the cuts would go to deficit reduction. The Brewster-Minge lock box sealed up $66.2 billion over the next 5 years.

I am not only willing to make that sort of cut, I am eager to do so. But I am not going to give up Rural Health grants, AHEC money, Safe & Drug Free School money, funds for Vocational Education—and much more, just so that money can be used for tax cuts.

There has been a weakening of trust over the way the lock box in this bill was handled. An early understanding of $66 billion in savings disintegrated into something much smaller, $15.5 billion in this conference report.

I would love to vote for a rescission bill—but not for the sake of tax cuts. If the President vetoes this bill, I intend to support him in that veto for purposes of restoring the lock box.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Edwin Thomas, one of his secretaries.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 1158, EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR DISASTER ASSISTANCE AND RESCISSIONS, FISCAL YEAR 1995

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

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I just wanted to respond to the previous speaker.

All this discussion about a lock box and an agreement, the agreement was oral. There was no mention in the discussions with respect to future savings.

The past savings and current savings are in there in the Byrd amendment, which was passed in the Senate and agreed to in the conference. So that entire issue is by the boards. There is no savings going to tax cuts.

The Byrd amendment in the conference agreement makes sure that that is the case.

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

Ms. PELOSI. I wanted to make sure I heard the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations correctly. He said that was not an agreement; it was an oral agreement. Are we to conclude from that that an agreement, an oral agreement with the Republicans is not worth the paper it is written on?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. PELOSI. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. There was no paper. When I engaged in negotiations with the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BREWSTER], there was no mention of paper. We talked about saving of past efforts and current efforts. There was never any mention of future projected savings or future offsets.

Ms. PELOSI. The gentleman is saying the savings in the bill will not go for deficit reduction?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I am saying the Byrd amendment covers exactly word for word the agreement that was made. The gentlewoman fully knows that.

Ms. PELOSI. No, I do not.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], the ranking minority member of the committee.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I simply want to say that CBO has no trouble figuring out what the Brewster language meant. Because the Congressional Budget Office estimates that the Brewster lockbox would result in $66.5 billion in deficit reduction over 5 years.

The deficit reduction in this conference report is $15.48 billion. So it seems to me that the CBO, which is the neutral umpire which is supposed to keep all of us honest around here, understood what the Brewster amendment did. The Brewster amendment tried to dedicate all savings in the immediate year and out years for deficit reduction.

The conference report comes back and only dedicates $15 billion.

Now the chairman of the committee says, ''Oh, but that was the Byrd language.'' Let me make clear, Senator BYRD and I are in full agreement. Neither one of us wants to see these savings used to provide tax cuts for rich people. The difference is that Senator BYRD is in the other body, and the other body has a budget resolution that does not even contemplate using any of these savings for tax reduction. They contemplate using them all for deficit reduction, and so they never even dreamed that these funds would be used for a tax cut rather than for deficit reduction.

So do not try to say that the language in the conference report meets the test of the Brewster amendment. It does not.

CBO indicates the Brewster amendment would save $66 billion. This conference report only provides $15.48 billion for deficit reduction and makes available the rest for tax cuts.

Four hundred and four people in this institution voted not to do that.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO].

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

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule. We would not need this rule if we followed the rules of the House.

The fact of the matter is, besides being a bad bill in cutting youth employment and education programs and housing, this bill also puts our national forests up for sale. This bill, which left the House as a bad bill with the forest provision, mandates these cuts. It puts