

Boucher	Frost	Lucas
Brewster	Funderburk	Luther
Browder	Furse	Maloney
Brown (CA)	Galleghy	Manton
Brown (FL)	Ganske	Manzullo
Brown (OH)	Gejdenson	Markey
Brownback	Gekas	Martinez
Bryant (TN)	Gephardt	Martini
Bryant (TX)	Geren	Mascara
Bunn	Gilcrest	Matsui
Bunning	Gillmor	McCarthy
Burr	Gilman	McCollum
Burton	Goodlatte	McCreary
Buyer	Goodling	McDade
Callahan	Gordon	McDermott
Calvert	Goss	McHale
Camp	Graham	McHugh
Canady	Green	McInnis
Cardin	Greenwood	McIntosh
Castle	Gunderson	McKeon
Chabot	Gutierrez	McKinney
Chambliss	Gutknecht	McNulty
Chapman	Hall (OH)	Meehan
Chenoweth	Hall (TX)	Meek
Christensen	Hamilton	Menendez
Chrysler	Hancock	Meyers
Clay	Hansen	Mfume
Clayton	Harman	Mica
Clement	Hastert	Miller (CA)
Clinger	Hastings (FL)	Mineta
Clyburn	Hastings (WA)	Minge
Coble	Hayes	Mink
Coburn	Hayworth	Moakley
Coleman	Hefley	Molinari
Collins (GA)	Hefner	Mollohan
Collins (IL)	Heineman	Montgomery
Collins (MI)	Herger	Moorhead
Combest	Hilleary	Morella
Condit	Hilliard	Murtha
Conyers	Hinchee	Myers
Cooley	Hobson	Myrick
Costello	Hoekstra	Nadler
Cox	Hoke	Neal
Coyne	Holden	Nethercutt
Cramer	Horn	Neumann
Crane	Hostettler	Ney
Crapo	Houghton	Norwood
Cremins	Hoyer	Nussle
Cunningham	Hunter	Oberstar
Danner	Hutchinson	Obey
Davis	Hyde	Olver
de la Garza	Inglis	Ortiz
Deal	Istook	Orton
DeFazio	Jackson-Lee	Owens
DeLauro	Jefferson	Oxley
DeLay	Johnson (CT)	Packard
Dellums	Johnson (SD)	Pallone
Deutsch	Johnson, E. B.	Parker
Diaz-Balart	Johnson, Sam	Pastor
Dickey	Johnston	Paxon
Dingell	Jones	Payne (NJ)
Dixon	Kanjorski	Payne (VA)
Doggett	Kaptur	Peterson (FL)
Dooley	Kasich	Peterson (MN)
Doolittle	Kelly	Petri
Dornan	Kennedy (MA)	Pickett
Doyle	Kennedy (RI)	Pombo
Dreier	Kennelly	Pomeroy
Duncan	Kildee	Porter
Dunn	Kim	Portman
Durbin	King	Poshard
Edwards	Kingston	Pryce
Ehlers	Klecza	Quillen
Ehrlich	Klink	Quinn
Emerson	Klug	Radanovich
Engel	Knollenberg	Rahall
English	Kolbe	Ramstad
Ensign	LaFalce	Rangel
Eshoo	LaHood	Reed
Evans	Lantos	Regula
Everett	Largent	Reynolds
Ewing	Latham	Richardson
Farr	LaTourette	Riggs
Fawell	Laughlin	Rivers
Fields (LA)	Lazio	Roberts
Fields (TX)	Leach	Roemer
Filner	Levin	Rogers
Flake	Lewis (CA)	Rohrabacher
Flanagan	Lewis (GA)	Ros-Lehtinen
Foglietta	Lewis (KY)	Rose
Foley	Lightfoot	Roth
Forbes	Lincoln	Roukema
Ford	Linder	Roybal-Allard
Fowler	Lipinski	Royce
Fox	Livingston	Rush
Franks (CT)	LoBiondo	Sabo
Franks (NJ)	Lofgren	Salmon
Frelinghuysen	Longley	Sanders
Frisa	Lowey	Sanford

Sawyer	Stenholm	Vucanovich
Saxton	Stockman	Waldholtz
Scarborough	Stokes	Walker
Schaefer	Studds	Walsh
Schiff	Stump	Wamp
Schroeder	Stupak	Ward
Schumer	Talent	Waters
Scott	Tanner	Watt (NC)
Seastrand	Tate	Watts (OK)
Sensenbrenner	Tauzin	Waxman
Serrano	Taylor (MS)	Weldon (FL)
Shadegg	Taylor (NC)	Weldon (PA)
Shaw	Tejeda	Weller
Shays	Thomas	White
Shuster	Thompson	Whitfield
Sisisky	Thornberry	Wicker
Skaggs	Thornton	Williams
Skeen	Thurman	Wilson
Skelton	Tiaht	Wise
Slaughter	Torkildsen	Wolf
Smith (MI)	Torres	Woolsey
Smith (NJ)	Torricelli	Wyden
Smith (TX)	Towns	Wynn
Smith (WA)	Traficant	Yates
Solomon	Tucker	Young (AK)
Souder	Upton	Young (FL)
Spence	Velazquez	Zeliff
Spratt	Vento	Zimmer
Stark	Visclosky	
Stearns	Volkmer	

NAYS—6

Fattah	Gibbons	Jacobs
Frank (MA)	Gonzalez	Moran

NOT VOTING—7

Barr	Fazio	Pelosi
Cubin	Metcalf	
Dicks	Miller (FL)	

□ 1216

Mr. ROTH and Mr. WAXMAN changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I inadvertently missed rollcall No. 236, adoption of the committee funding resolution. Had I been here, I would have voted "aye."

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks, and include extraneous material, on House Resolution 107, the resolution just agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HANSEN). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 115 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 115

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for 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. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. General debate shall be confined to the bill and the amendments made in order by this resolution and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule for a period not to exceed ten hours and shall be considered as read. Points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI are waived. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of H.R. 1158 modified as follows: on page 56, after line 12, add as new titles IV, V, and VI the respective texts of titles I, II, and III of the bill (H.R. 1159) making supplemental appropriations and rescissions for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1995, and for other purposes, except the text of section 306 of H.R. 1159. The amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. Points of order against the amendment in the nature of a substitute for failure to comply with clause 7 of rule XVI or clause 2 of rule XXI are waived. No amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order unless printed as an amendment to H.R. 1158 or H.R. 1159, as the case may be, in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 6 of rule XXIII before March 14, 1995. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. Points of order against such amendments for failure to comply with clause 2(e) of rule XXI are waived. 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. Debate on each amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute and any amendments thereto shall be limited to thirty minutes. Notwithstanding any other provision of this resolution, all points of order against the amendments specified in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendment as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommend with or without instructions.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DREIER

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DREIER: Page 3, line 15, insert before the period " , and any

such amendment, or any amendment thereto, shall not be subject to a demand for a division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole'.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my very dear friend, the gentleman from south Boston, MA [Mr. MOAKLEY], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

(Mr. DREIER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks, and to insert extraneous material.)

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, this is the second time that the House is considering a supplemental appropriation for fiscal year 1995. The first was necessary to address critical shortages in the defense budget which were threatening the readiness and safety of our national security forces. The supplemental appropriations in H.R. 1158 are equally critical. They provide disaster relief for 40 States with the largest recipient being by State of California in order to respond to last year's tragic Northridge earthquake and the flooding that has taken place in California.

Prior to last month's consideration of the defense supplemental, Congress had a spotlessly consistent track record of disrespect for the taxpayer on this type of spending bill. No emergency supplemental had ever been paid for through offsetting spending cuts. When emergency spending was needed, the answer was always to pile it on top of the already monstrous deficit. "Charge it to the future, let them pay" was the attitude that we had around here.

Mr. Speaker, this is a new era of fiscal responsibility in the House. This emergency bill reduces deficit spending. The rule makes in order H.R. 1158, provides 1 hour of general debate, and waives clause 2 of rule XXI which prohibits unauthorized and legislative provisions against the bill.

The rule makes in order as original text for the purpose of amendment the text of H.R. 1158 combined with the text of H.R. 1159, except for section 306 of H.R. 1159. The amendment in the nature of a substitute is considered as read and subject to amendment for up to 10 hours. The rule waives clause 7 of rule XVI, the germaneness rule, and clause 2 of rule XXI against the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

Only amendments to H.R. 1158 and 1159 printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD before March 14, 1995 are in order. Debate on each amendment is not to exceed 30 minutes. Clause 2(e) of rule XXI requiring emergency designation is waived for each amendment. In

order that amendments promote fiscal responsibility to the same degree as the committee's bill, amendments are not in order if they cause the net level of budget authority to increase. In addition, budget authority must be redistributed within a chapter or title if there are no chapters.

Points of order are waived against 3 amendments that have been printed in the RECORD, all filed by Members of the minority.

These are a Brewster amendment providing for net savings from the bill to be placed in a deficit reduction lock box, and amendment by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA] appropriating net savings from the bill to deficit reduction, and an amendment by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] to strike section 307 of H.R. 1159 regarding the emergency salvage of dead and rotting timber.

Mr. Speaker, changing the culture of deficit spending is not easy. Deficit spending is ingrained in the very heart of the bloated Federal Government.

Mr. DOGGETT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DREIER. I would say to my friend, we have a number of requests for time over here, and I have a statement. Then I have members of the Committee on Rules to whom I will be yielding. I know that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY] will have time and I am sure be very generous with it as I am with our time.

Mr. DOGGETT. I have a question, not a statement.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, changing the culture of deficit spending is not easy. Deficit spending is ingrained in the very heart of the bloated Federal Government. But effecting that change is the right thing to do. Taxpayers recognize that many programs despite good intentions clearly do not work. They also are very appreciative of the fact that our new majority has a clear position on new spending. We step up and pay for it. Nobody who cares about our Nation's future hopes we revert to the old ways.

Mr. Speaker, the \$17.4 billion in very thoughtful rescissions reported by the Committee on Appropriations obviously far exceeds the level of disaster relief. However, this is only troubling to those who love the Federal bureaucracy. The committee did not set out to simply find the minimum amount of wasteful spending needed to offset the emergency funding. Instead, they set clear criteria to judge current programs and they rescinded spending that met one of the following conditions:

Spending that was not authorized.

Duplicative Federal programs.

Programs that received large funding increases in fiscal year 1995.

Programs with unspent funds piling up from year to year.

Programs that exceeded the level in the Clinton budget.

And programs that are wasteful or do not work.

To those around here who are committed to protecting the status quo, those are radical criteria which should not be utilized. But to the American taxpayer, Mr. Speaker, these standards are nothing more than common sense. I am happy to say that our new majority is using these as we proceed with this issue of spending.

The Committee on Appropriations followed a lengthy and very open process. They make a solid case that each and every rescission in the bill meets one of those stated criteria. The final total of \$17.4 billion covers the disaster relief and makes a real down payment toward a balanced budget. They deserve our support, Mr. Speaker.

Of course we are going to hear complaints here on the floor from big spenders. They do not oppose the \$200 billion deficit status quo. They look at the complete failure of the welfare state and say that the only problem is that we have not spent enough. Many of the same people who oppose the committee's rescissions opposed the balanced budget amendment because it did not include specific cuts. Now they get a first installment of our specific cuts, and how do they respond? They say, "No."

Others claim to oppose the cuts because the Committee on Ways and Means is going to report a bill that cuts taxes for working families. Besides the fact that families send too much of their hard-earned money to Washington already, if a Member does not like the tax package, vote against that. It is a Contract item, it will get here to the floor for a vote.

This rule debate really comes down to a very simple choice, Mr. Speaker. Some people want to continue to simply add new spending to the deficit. They always have an excuse why every program in the \$1.5 trillion Federal budget is too important to cut. On the other side are those who recognize that things have to change. We offer answers that are no more complicated or profound than those offered by every middle-income family that spends more than it earns.

□ 1230

We want to cut back a little here and there to work back to a balanced budget.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this very fair and responsible rule, support the Appropriation Committee's very find work.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD material on the amendment process under special rules reported by the Committee on Rules, 103d Congress versus 104th Congress, as follows:

THE AMENDMENT PROCESS UNDER SPECIAL RULES REPORTED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE,¹ 103D CONGRESS V. 104TH CONGRESS

[As of March 15, 1995]

Rule type	103d Congress		104th Congress	
	Number of rules	Percent of total	Number of rules	Percent of total
Open/Modified-open ²	46	44	19	83
Modified Closed ³	49	47	4	17
Closed ⁴	9	9	0	0
Totals:	104	100	23	100

¹This table applies only to rules which provide for the original consideration of bills, joint resolutions or budget resolutions and which provide for an amendment process. It does not apply to special rules which only waive points of order against appropriations bills which are already privileged and are considered under an open amendment process under House rules.

²An open rule is one under which any Member may offer a germane amendment under the five-minute rule. A modified open rule is one under which any Member may offer a germane amendment under the five-minute rule subject only to an overall time limit on the amendment process and/or a requirement that the amendment be preprinted in the Congressional Record.

³A modified closed rule is one under which the Rules Committee limits the amendments that may be offered only to those amendments designated in the special rule or the Rules Committee report to accompany it, or which preclude amendments to a particular portion of a bill, even though the rest of the bill may be completely open to amendment.

⁴A closed rule is one under which no amendments may be offered (other than amendments recommended by the committee in reporting the bill).

SPECIAL RULES REPORTED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE, 104TH CONGRESS

[As of March 15, 1995]

H. Res. No. (Date rept.)	Rule type	Bill No.	Subject	Disposition of rule
H. Res. 38 (1/18/95)	O	H.R. 5	Unfunded Mandate Reform	A: 350-71 (1/19/95)
H. Res. 44 (1/24/95)	MC	H. Con. Res. 17	Social Security	A: 255-172 (1/25/95)
		H.J. Res. 1	Balanced Budget Amdt	
H. Res. 51 (1/31/95)	O	H.R. 101	Land Transfer, Taos Pueblo Indians	A: voice vote (2/1/95)
H. Res. 52 (1/31/95)	O	H.R. 400	Land Exchange, Arctic Nat'l. Park and Preserve	A: voice vote (2/1/95)
H. Res. 53 (1/31/95)	O	H.R. 440	Land Conveyance, Butte County, CA	A: voice vote (2/1/95)
H. Res. 55 (2/1/95)	O	H.R. 2	Line Item Veto	A: voice vote (2/2/95)
H. Res. 60 (2/6/95)	O	H.R. 665	Victim Restitution	A: voice vote (2/7/95)
H. Res. 61 (2/6/95)	O	H.R. 666	Exclusionary Rule Reform	A: voice vote (2/7/95)
H. Res. 63 (2/8/95)	MO	H.R. 667	Violent Criminal Incarceration	A: voice vote (2/9/95)
H. Res. 69 (2/9/95)	O	H.R. 668	Criminal Alien Deportation	A: voice vote (2/10/95)
H. Res. 79 (2/10/95)	MO	H.R. 728	Law Enforcement Block Grants	A: voice vote (2/10/95)
H. Res. 83 (2/13/95)	MO	H.R. 7	National Security Revitalization	PQ: 229-100; A: 227-127 (2/15/95)
H. Res. 88 (2/16/95)	MC	H.R. 831	Health Insurance Deductibility	PQ: 230-191; A: 229-188 (2/21/95)
H. Res. 91 (2/21/95)	O	H.R. 830	Paperwork Reduction Act	A: v.v. (2/22/95)
H. Res. 92 (2/21/95)	MC	H.R. 889	Defense Supplemental	A: 282-144 (2/22/95)
H. Res. 93 (2/22/95)	MO	H.R. 450	Regulatory Transition Act	A: 252-175 (2/23/95)
H. Res. 96 (2/24/95)	MO	H.R. 1022	Risk Assessment	A: 253-165 (2/27/95)
H. Res. 100 (2/27/95)	O	H.R. 926	Regulatory Reform and Relief Act	A: voice vote (2/28/95)
H. Res. 101 (2/28/95)	MO	H.R. 925	Private Property Protection Act	A: 271-151 (3/1/95)
H. Res. 104 (3/3/95)	MO	H.R. 988	Attorney Accountability Act	A: voice vote (3/6/95)
H. Res. 103 (3/3/95)	MO	H.R. 1058	Securities Litigation Reform	
H. Res. 105 (3/6/95)	MO			A: 257-155 (3/7/95)
H. Res. 108 (3/6/95)	Debate	H.R. 956	Product Liability Reform	A: voice vote (3/8/95)
H. Res. 109 (3/8/95)	MC			PQ: 234-191; A: 247-181 (3/9/95)
H. Res. 115 (3/14/95)	MO	H.R. 1158	Making Emergency Supp. Approps.	

Codes: O-open rule; MO-modified open rule; MC-modified closed rule; C-closed rule; A-adoption vote; PQ-previous question vote.
Source: Notices of Action Taken, Committee on Rules, 104th Congress.

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

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from California for yielding me the customary half hour and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we have just listened to a masterpiece. We would never know from the conversation on the other side of the aisle that this bill cuts all of the low-income housing fuel for poor people, the \$17 billion includes the money for LIHEAP. The bill also cuts back on student loans, cuts back on food programs.

I have not heard a word about it. They talk about how important this rule is. I think it is very important. But we in the minority were not allowed to bring forth a lot of amendments. We were told what was in the bill, but we had no role in shaping it.

This is the most restrictive rule. It goes beyond anybody's imagination, and despite the promises to the contrary, it protects the Republicans from the cuts that we want to make against them.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard a lot of talk about cutting, but they did not mention the specifics. The low-income people, the most vulnerable of our vulnerable, as I say. There was actually testimony from the Republican side that the low-income heating program is not needed anymore. I do not know where some of those people come from,

but I know in Massachusetts we do not get a 5-day notice when we are going to have a freeze. We have people, we have pictures of people who have been frozen to death because heating units were shut off during a certain cold spell.

So I think we have to look at those things that really affect the poor people, those who are unable to help themselves.

They want to cut spending, sure they do. They want to cut spending so they can get that money in that pool to raise the tax breaks they are going to give to the high 2 percent of this country. That is very important. We have a list of corporations that will cease being taxpayers once this thing goes through. We will not hear about that though.

They want to cut spending for the elderly, for children, the working poor, but do not touch those corporations, do not touch those people in the high 2 percent on the capital gains tax.

Mr. Speaker, we have to make sure that the amendment satisfies the requirement, according to them, that it does not touch military projects; and it does cut more money from this bill than is needed because they are going to put that in a pot and use it for the tax cut.

Mr. Speaker, there are so many things that could be said but because of my restriction on time, I just cannot do it. But I want everybody in the Chamber or within the sound of my

voice to know that this is the bill that cuts low-income housing programs, this is the bill that cuts low-income housing, this is the bill that cuts low-income feeding, Meals on Wheels, WIC Programs, if Members feel they can vote for that bill under any excuse, then so be it.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I would add to the brilliant remarks of my friend from South Boston and say yes, this is the bill that gets us on the road to a balanced budget.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to my friend, the distinguished gentleman from Glens Falls, NY [Mr. SOLOMON], the chairman of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for the time and, Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule providing for the consideration of two supplemental appropriations and rescissions bills reported by the Committee on Appropriations. Taken together, these bills provide approximately \$5.4 billion in supplemental appropriations for disaster assistance primarily for the Northridge earthquake victims in California, but also for victims of other disasters in a total of 40 States.

But the truly remarkable thing about these bills is that the cost is fully offset by rescissions which not

only pay for the bills but produce reductions in Government spending totaling more than \$17 billion.

This is the first major step in the downsizing of this bloated Federal Government and moves us closer to the twin goals of lower taxes and lower deficits.

I cannot help but remember the debate about the balanced budget constitutional amendment when its opponents charged that it was all rhetoric but that there were no real cuts. Do Members remember that? Today we have the first installment of the real cuts.

These cuts will result in immediate savings because almost all of these cuts are in current fiscal year funding.

And on the subject of rhetoric, I hope we will not hear too much of the usual song and dance where the big spenders try to portray themselves as the ones with compassion. We have heard a little bit about this this morning already.

What is compassionate about burying our children and our grandchildren in debt? That is about the least compassionate thing I ever heard of. The people with true compassion are those who are trying to reduce the debt burden on future generations.

Mr. Speaker, we also need to be certain that we keep the facts in our discussion of this bill straight. For example, yesterday in the Rules Committee there was a strong attack on so-called cuts in the School Lunch Program until it was pointed out that there is nothing in the bill dealing with school lunches.

Then there was an attack on the \$25 million rescission in the Women, Infants and Children's Program. It turns out that the rescission will not affect anyone currently benefiting from that program. The entire rescission is from \$125 million in unspent funds left over from the 1994 appropriations.

In other words, the \$260 million increase provided for the program for fiscal year 1995 remains untouched, and that is a fact.

So we need to be certain that our words are accurately describing the situation. It is not fair to allege a program is being decimated when in fact the spending for the program will continue to increase, and that is exactly what most of this bill is all about.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to point out that at the appropriate time in the consideration of this bill, I myself, along with the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, the distinguished gentleman from Arizona [Mr. STUMP], will be prepared to offer an amendment to eliminate the rescissions in the bill which affect certain veterans programs. We have proposed to pay for that restoration of funding with additional cuts in the AmeriCorps Program, and I will have a lot more to say about that when the debate takes place.

The care of veterans who in many cases have risked their lives in defense of this Nation is a much higher prior-

ity than anything we will find in the so-called AmeriCorps Volunteer Program, which is not a volunteer program at all. When you get paid for something that is not volunteering.

Mr. Speaker, the bill before this House today is a historic move in the right direction, and I look forward to a very spirited debate leading to the adoption of this first major step to reduce the burden of bloated government on the American people.

Before this is over, we are going to restructure this Federal Government, we are going to shrink the size and the power of this Federal Government, and return it to the State and local governments where it belongs.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I think my friend the gentleman from New York, will not only shrink the size of the Government but he is going to shrink the size of the elderly population once they have no more fuel.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] the ranking member of the committee.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I would urge a "no" vote on this rule for a number of reasons. First of all, this fight between us today has nothing whatsoever to do with the amount of deficit reduction that is being proposed. Every amendment that I asked the Committee on Rules to make in order, and every amendment that they turned down that I tried to get made in order, would have cut exactly the same amount from the deficit as this proposal before us today. The only difference is that we would have cut that money in different places.

The bill before us is a contract on kids; the bill before us is a contract on old folks. It clobbers programs for both, and yet I think we ought to look at what it does not hit. It does not hit pork. We asked them to make in order the Coleman amendment so we could knock out \$400 million of congressional pork. The Committee on Rules said no, no, no, you cannot touch that.

It does not touch the Pentagon. We are told by such well-known "liberals" as Senator MCCAIN that we have at least 8 billion dollars' worth of waste in the Pentagon, and yet the Rules Committee says "oh, no, no, you cannot take a single dime out of there, precious precious, precious; better we go after the kids, better we go after the old folks." So that is what we are being asked to do today.

This bill is laughable, and so is the justification for it by the majority party. We have been told since January that the reason they were going to pass this bill is to create a kitty of money so they could finance their tax cut. So they go after veterans, they went after kids and old folks in order to create a nice pot of money for their tax package.

We found out in the Ways and Means Committee 2 days ago what that tax package is. They are going to provide 75 percent of the capital gains tax relief to people who make more than

\$100,000 a year. Do Members really think that is what the public voted for in November? Baloney.

What else are they going to do? They are going to repeal the alternative minimum tax on corporations. What does that mean? It means a laundry list of Fortune 500 corporations who used to get by with paying not a dime in Federal taxes will revert to form. And they will; I have a list here if anybody wants to see it. But then after we raised Cain about it, they say well no, we do not think we are going to use that money for tax cuts after all.

In the Committee on Appropriations when we tried to pass the Murtha amendment, which said that you could not use any of these cuts to finance the Republican tax cuts for the wealthy, every single Republican in the committee voted against that amendment. Now they have had a "religious conversion" on the road to Damascus. They say: "Oh well, Saint Paul told us that we better have a similar experience, and so what we are going to do now is we are going to pretend we are not going to use this for tax cuts."

I think that side of the aisle does not know what it is doing on this bill and the Congress should not pass this rule under those circumstances.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, the ranking minority member of the Appropriations Committee has chosen the rule for the supplemental appropriations bill to debate the tax bill. I encourage him to debate and vote against the tax bill when it comes up.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

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

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

There has been a lost of hue and cry about this bill over the last couple of weeks. But the fact of the matter is it has been a very open process through subcommittee and full committee, and we are proud to report that we are now bringing forward to the House the largest rescission package, the largest cut package in prior appropriations ever to come before the House of Representatives or for that matter the entire Congress, roughly a \$17.2 billion package of cuts in this year's budget plan.

Our critics think that Republicans want to take food out of the mouths of widows and orphans. In fact, Republicans are determined to help future generations of widows and orphans and everybody else in this country to survive. The fact of the matter is this is the first step toward a balanced budget. We will get to a balanced budget by the year 2002 and this is the first step.

The Chicken Littles, the liberals, the Democrats of this Congress who had 40 years to try to bring fiscal sanity and common sense to the American public

and totally abdicated their responsibility, with the budget presented by our President of the United States who refused to balance the budget this year, next year and every year into the future, by calling for \$200 billion deficits 1 year after another, have essentially said to us a balanced budget is not necessary and anything you cut causes pain to women, children, infants, the infirm, elderly, et cetera. The fact is our bill does not take a single person off the WIC rolls.

□ 1245

Actually it leaves in place a \$260 million increase in the program for fiscal year 1995.

They say we are cutting the school-to-work program. It leaves in place \$62.5 million more than the previous year appropriated. You can go down the list. There is always a reason to quarrel with all of the cuts that we have made.

Every program has a constituency. But, ladies and gentleman, if we do not make these cuts, we are going to run the risk of what happened in Mexico 10 weeks ago. With the devaluation of the peso, the collapse of their economic system, the prospects of recession or possibly depression, joblessness, massive unrest in the streets these are things that could happen in this country. I am not prepared to see that happen. As the new chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, I say we must work towards a balance budget.

That \$200 billion to \$300 billion in deficits year after year after year, a \$5 trillion debt load which amounts to \$20,000 for every man, woman and child in America is unacceptable. In 2 years, the interest on the debt that we have now will exceed what we spend on all of the defense of this Nation. Now, that is a frightening prospect, and what we have to do is start getting our fiscal affairs under control just like every man, woman, and child, every American family has to do in this country.

They have to balance the budget. They have to get outflow in line with income. And that is what we should be doing in this country. That is what we are attempting to begin by taking a small, modest step, with \$17 billion in cuts, \$6 billion in emergency spending, giving us \$11 billion in net cuts in last year's budget.

Now, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] said that he is against this rule. I might only say that if he had offered to support the rule, he would have gotten a lot more amendments. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] said that he would have liked to offer a lot of other amendments. He might have been able to, had he supported the rule, but he did not like this rule anyway. He was going to vote against it.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield? He mentioned my name. He will not yield to me?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin. What I said is true.

Mr. OBEY. Why do you not tell the whole story? You asked me if I would support the rule if you made my amendments in order. I told you not if you included the other language which was being objected to by 40 Members of your own party.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Actually you mentioned two other language. One part of the language is in. Part of the language is out.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Not at this moment.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Why do you not mention my name and then yield?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY].

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, is it not true, I ask the chairman, that when you were in front of the Committee on Rules you said that the LIHEAP program was no longer needed?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Indeed, I would, if I can reclaim my time. The gentleman full well knows that the LIHEAP program was created at a time of highly escalating energy prices, when the energy prices in this country because of the energy crisis of the 1970's were just running out of sight, and there were some people who felt that the poor people in the colder areas of this country needed that extra assistance. Well, energy prices are now about a third of what they were back then, and, yes, there are always going to be people in need of assistance, but we have hundreds and hundreds of programs of duplicating good intent, which have to be weaned out so that we can cut unnecessary bureaucracy, so we can eliminate the redundancies, so we can return to the taxpayer so much of the money that we have taken from him and so that we can lift the burden of regulation on the people of America.

Now, that is just an example. The gentleman from Massachusetts illustrated one program out of many that are affected here.

Now, nobody can say that Americans are not compassionate. We are so compassionate we are almost broke, and it is time to get our fiscal situation under control. It is time to begin with this one step toward a balanced budget.

Folks, if you do not like these cuts, you are not going to like the ones that come, but we are beginning in the right direction. We should begin with passing this rule, pass the bill, and go on and achieve a balanced budget so that our children and our grandchildren can have the same high standard of living that we enjoy today, and failure to act today almost guarantees disaster for them in the future.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to my dear friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. BEILENSEN], a very hard-

working member of the Committee on Rules and a man who tells the truth all the time.

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

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding.

I rise in opposition to the rule and to the legislation that it would make in order.

Mr. Speaker, as the Member of Congress who represents the congressional district that was hardest hit by the Northridge Earthquake last year, I deeply regret that I cannot support the legislation that provides much-needed funding for relief for victims of that disaster, as well as for victims of other disasters across our Nation.

That is because, unfortunately, the \$5.4 billion in emergency funding for disaster relief is contained in a bill that also slashes spending for a great many worthy programs. Combining these two matters—emergency assistance and rescissions—into one piece of legislation leaves us with the unfair choice of voting either for emergency assistance and against adequate funding for a great many other programs we support, or against emergency assistance and for retaining existing funding for those other programs.

The way the majority party has framed this choice does a grave injustice to the victims of the earthquake, and of the other disasters. It has made the provision of the relief they need, dependent upon cutting spending for public broadcasting, for housing assistance for the elderly, for student loans, for summer job programs, for veterans, and for a great number of other valuable programs which serve many of our Nation's pressing needs.

We don't mind having an all-out debate on whether we should cut these programs—we should have one—but we do object to holding emergency disaster assistance hostage to that debate. And that is exactly what we are doing by mixing \$5.4 billion of emergency disaster assistance with 17.1 billion dollars' worth of very controversial spending cuts.

There is a sound reason why emergency spending was exempted from the Budget Act's rules about spending offsets: so that disaster relief or spending for any other emergency, would not get bogged down in controversy over unrelated matters, and so that Congress could pass these bills quickly and speed relief to people who are in need of our help.

However, now that the majority leadership has decided that emergency spending needs to be offset, that is likely to change. In fact, since this legislation cut three times as much spending as it provides in emergency assistance, the controversy over it is likely to be made greater than if the spending were offset by an equivalent amount of spending, which would, in itself, be difficult to pass—but a much fairer way of dealing with this. The likelihood of this emergency assistance getting through the legislative process quickly, and relatively intact, is very slim.

If we are going to change the way we provide disaster assistance, we should do it by voting for such a change, not by leadership fiat. Before we decide to offset every provision of emergency assistance with spending cuts—or, as in this case—with 3 times the amount needed to offset the assistance—Members

ought to have the opportunity to ask themselves: If a disaster struck in my district, is this the way I would want relief legislation treated?

As someone who represents a district that has been declared a Federal disaster area a number of times in the last 3 years, I believe it is absolutely essential that we continue to treat disaster assistance separately from the way we treat other spending, and I think we are making a big mistake by not doing that now.

Not only does the combination of emergency assistance and spending cuts in one bill force an unfair decision on us, but the rule also leaves us with very limited options for making these spending cuts less onerous.

By limiting amendments to just those which meet very strict criteria, the rule makes it next to impossible to have a meaningful debate on spending priorities. In constructing amendments to restore spending for certain programs, Members were very limited in the ways they could construct the amendments. In many cases, they could not propose cuts in the programs they would have preferred to reduce, because those programs were outside the relevant chapter of the bill or were not cut in the bill as reported, and, therefore, not eligible for cuts under the rule.

To add to the restrictiveness in the way in which amendments could be drafted, many Members who wish to offer amendments will be prohibited from doing so because of the 10-hour time limit on the amendment process. There are about 40 amendments which were preprinted in the Congressional Record and which appear to meet the strict criteria of the rule. In 10 hours—which includes time spent on recorded votes—with a 30-minute time limit on each individual amendment, there will not be nearly enough time to consider all of these amendments—or even half of them.

In addition, because the rule protects an egregious example of legislating on an appropriations bill from points of order, the rule makes this already controversial bill even more so controversial. The rule waives clause 2 of rule XXI against consideration of the salvage timber provision, which would require cutting double the amount of timber which was cut from our national forests last year, and which would suspend all environmental laws protecting the preservation of our forests.

That provision, which makes a vast and unwise change in the policy governing logging in national forests, has no place in an appropriations bill. Had the Rules Committee left it unprotected from points of order—or had the committee struck this provision from the bill, as it did with the other controversial legislative provision in this bill, dealing with Medicaid funding of abortions for victims of rape and incest—we would not have to use any of our limited time on debating an amendment to strike this provision, and we would not be risking sending to the Senate a bill containing a provision which is likely to add to the time it will take to consider the bill in that body.

Mr. Speaker, this is an unfair rule that presents Members with an unfair decision on the bill it makes in order. I urge Members to vote “no” on the previous question, and “no” on the rule.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to Mr. Veteran, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY].

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, this is not out of my time that we get the props in here.

Mr. Speaker, the pictures around me are veterans who were wounded or hurt in the service and wounded in combat. I thought it was important that we have these pictures.

I rise in opposition to the rule. Many Members share my view on what the Committee on Appropriations has done, and they were wrong, Mr. Speaker, in rescinding more than \$200 million in funding to improve VA health care. And I was not permitted by this rule to offer a clean up-or-down amendment.

Now, veterans across the country are asking some hard questions about what is going on around here. Why, they ask, should it be necessary to fight to keep money already appropriated to improve VA health care? Why, they ask, should veterans have to find other cuts to keep funds needed for the VA? Why, they ask, cannot my Member of Congress have the chance to vote either yes or no on a straightforward amendment to restore VA funding?

In urging a clean amendment to restore the VA's \$206 million, the commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars has put it very well, and I quote, he said, “This Nation's veterans should not be placed in competition with other Federal programs for Federal dollars to fund new spending initiatives,” and the national commander of the American Legion is supportive of this clean amendment.

Now, my colleagues, generations of veterans have put their lives on the line. They did not ask any questions when they marched off to war. They did not know whether they were going to come back or not, and we owe them a debt, and I would hope you would vote against this rule that I was not given the opportunity to offer a clean up-or-down amendment.

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

Mr. MONTGOMERY. I am happy to yield to the chairman, my good friend, the gentleman from New York, who did not give me this opportunity.

Mr. SOLOMON. I thank the gentleman very much. And I am going to tell you I am a veteran, and I represent hundreds and hundreds and thousands of veterans. None of them in my district want us to be fiscally irresponsible. They support offsetting cuts in those areas that are not priority.

And I would urge everybody to vote for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. STUMP] and my amendment which is going to restore those veterans' cuts and is going to reduce the level of spending for something called National Service Corps.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. You have got the great veterans' organizations who totally disagree, totally disagree with you. You are wrong. The gentleman is totally wrong in what he said.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONTGOMERY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MOAKLEY. I want you to repeat what was drowned out in some catcalls when you made the statement. You said that you were refused an amendment, and the other amendment that is coming forward will not do what you want to do? Is that what you said?

Mr. MONTGOMERY. That is correct. I do not think we should go and take money away from other programs to fund veterans' programs. They marched off to war. They deserve a straight up-or-down amendment. We did not get it.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Just to even it out, I know the gentleman from Mississippi is a veteran. I am a veteran, disabled veteran, so we know where the veterans are.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. And I will be glad to let the gentleman have my charts.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES].

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I rise in total opposition to this rule. This resolution makes a travesty of the Democratic process and the rules of fair play. This rule is nothing but an attempt to divert attention to peripheral issues and deny the Congress and the American people the opportunity to discuss the real issues. I was not permitted to offer an amendment which would have restored \$2 billion to the veterans and housing programs that will be cut here today.

The debate today should be whether cuts should be made in the Veterans Administration, or in the summer jobs program, or in the Department of Housing and Urban Development. We should not be debating the question: Do you want to cut the VA or do you want to cut Americorps? The debate should not be on whether the veterans' program is more popular than Americorps. But unfortunately, that is exactly what we would have to do as a result of this rule.

They do not want the debate to be on whether a cut in the Corporation for Public Broadcasting is good policy. They are afraid of that debate. So they hide behind this artfully crafted gag rule and force the debate to be on whether you want to rob Peter to pay Paul. The Sophie's Choice they have left us is totally unfair, and totally unnecessary.

There is nothing in the House rules or in the Budget Act that requires such a rule. Even though not required to do so, these bills offset the supplemental funding provided by a ratio of nearly 3 to 1. Why are the extra rescissions included? To offset the tax increase proposed in the contract for America.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a “no” vote on the rule.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. WARD].

Mr. WARD. Mr. Speaker, as a freshman Member of this body, I feel I must

point out that what we are debating here is typical slick contract-driven baloney. What they are doing is saying to this House, "You cannot bring up issues and vote them up or down. You can only bring up issues in a very narrow and impossible to explain in 30 seconds convoluted system so that they do not have to vote on families, they do not have to vote on children."

They can vote on chapters and sections. It is just not right.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES].

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to this rule, because, among other things, the rule makes in order the Taylor timber salvage sale amendment which is a timber lobbyists dream.

The Taylor amendment is a congressional gift to the timber industry at a time when the timber companies are enjoying record profits. This amendment is not a part of the Republican Contract With America, and there is no need to rush it through. This amendment is a 13-page legislative bill that totally revises the law on timber sales, no hearings, no witnesses, no examination by a legislative committee.

I urge the House to oppose the rule.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ANDREWS].

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

Mr. Speaker, here is what this debate is about: This weekend Members of both parties are going to go home and have a town meeting, and someone is going to ask them if they are in favor of cutting spending or not. Most of us are going to say yes, we are in favor of cutting spending, and then someone in the audience is going to raise their hand and say, "Congressman, why did you vote to cut the aid that I get to pay my utility bill, my heating bill, when you could have voted instead to cut money from the savings and loan bailout or from the bureaucracy in the Agriculture Department or from the Export-Import Bank?"

If you vote for this rule, Mr. Speaker, if Members vote for this rule, here is the honest answer to that question: "I had a chance to vote for that kind of amendment, but I refused it. I had a chance to defeat this rule and let us bring to the floor amendments that would let us cut other areas that benefit corporate America and do not hurt seniors and kids and middle-income families, but I did not take that opportunity."

□ 1300

If this rule passes, this will be the day that the Contract With America was breached for the first time.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. KENNELLY].

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong objection to the rule and the rescissions that follow this rule.

The gentleman from Louisiana said that the LIHEAP program, the low-income housing energy assistance program, is no longer needed. Maybe if you live in Louisiana it is no longer needed. But tell that to the 5 million people, families headed by disabled, families headed by people who earn \$8,000 a year. Heat is still expensive, and it is still cold in New England.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly oppose this bill which is nothing more than an attempt to transfer wealth from the neediest in our country to those very well off, and to Fortune 500 companies.

For instance, and there are many examples, in 1993, more than 5 million households across the country, 1.7 million of them in New England, benefited from funding under LIHEAP. The program offers heating assistance to low-income, disabled, and elderly families; more than 70 percent of the recipients have annual incomes of less than \$8,000.

In New England, where our winters are long and harsh, low-income families pay nearly four times more of their income for energy than the average family.

Mr. Speaker, it would be hard to believe that this would be one of the first programs picked on, but it is even more unbelievable when you know it would go to pay for a fiscally irresponsible tax bill which loses \$188 billion over 5 years and \$630 billion over 10 years. A tax bill that is unfriendly to those in middle-income brackets and a tax bill that promotes tax shelter activity, not the new business activity that we need.

By combining debt financing and a new cost recovery depreciation systems, the bill would create something tantamount to a voluntary corporate income tax, or at least the economic equivalent of safe harbor leasing—the egregious tax loophole created in 1981 that led to unprecedented commerce in tax preferences.

This bill would lead to a dramatic increase in tax-motivated leasing transactions or artificial merger and acquisition activity.

Mr. Speaker, the bill before us today is a bad bill linked to an even worse bill coming in 2 weeks. I urge all Members to vote against this rule.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER].

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

Mr. ROEMER. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, this debate on this rule is not about Democrats that are for or against offsets; it is not about whether we are for balancing the budget. We are. I voted for the balanced budget amendment, the line-item veto, and I have brought many amendments to this floor, including an amendment to cut the space station billions of dollars to reduce the deficit.

This debate today is one about a fair rule to allow us cuts in corporate programs and subsidies, to help heat the kitchens and the bedrooms for senior citizens or to help pregnant women deliver healthy babies. It is about a rule that is about 70 years old. I voted

against Democratic rules when they were not fair. This is the first time I have risen against a Republican rule because it is a Russian rule; not of the Russia of 1995 but of the Russia of 1925.

Why not just have an up-or-down vote on this whole bill? We are not even given the opportunity to amend this.

Do the American people support cutting the CIA budget of \$28 billion or, as the Republicans want to do, cutting the WIC Program, cutting heating for senior citizens, cutting summer youth training programs? I do not think so.

Mr. Speaker, give us the ability to make those offsetting cuts and balance the budget.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to the time remaining on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HANSEN). The gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] has 11 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY] has 15 minutes remaining.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS].

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

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

Mr. Speaker, what a terrible rule. Cutbacks for heating programs for low income, for senior citizens, cutbacks in education, cutbacks for veterans, cutbacks for WIC. But we are not allowed to discuss cutbacks in corporate welfare, cutbacks in military spending.

Let us vote this rule down and develop a fair system of priorities for this country.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY].

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

Mrs. LOWEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule because it denies us the opportunity to make critical decisions about our spending priorities. This bill contains deep cuts in education and student aid, in assistance programs for seniors, in veterans programs, in health programs for pregnant women, and in antidrug programs. On the other hand, the bill contains no cuts in pork projects, no cuts in unnecessary weapons systems, and no cuts in wasteful programs. This bill cuts the muscle and leaves the fat. Worse, the rule doesn't give us chance to offer any real amendments to make the bill better.

For example, I had hoped to offer an amendment today to eliminate the cuts in funding to Public Broadcasting contained in this bill—but this restrictive gag rule would force me to make additional cuts in education or health programs that have already been cut too deeply. There are other programs

in the budget that I would like to cut instead, but this rule will not let me.

The \$141 million cut in funding for Public Broadcasting contained in this bill would result in 80 stations being forced to shut down and would mean the elimination of locally produced public television and radio shows. And this is only the beginning.

This cut was not made to save money—it was made to eliminate public television entirely. Make no mistake: this bill is a wrecking ball aimed straight at “Mr. Rogers’ Neighborhood” and at “Sesame Street.”

Mr. Speaker, it is clear that the Republican leadership is waging an ideological holy war against public broadcasting. Opposing this effort are millions of American families who watch public television and listen to public radio every day.

Mr. Speaker, this bill will mean a lot fewer cookies for my friend here—and as a mother of three children I can tell you that Cookie Monster and the other Muppets are among the best friends that any kid will ever have. Anyone who wants to take the Muppets off public television will have a lot of explaining to do to the children of America—and their parents too. Make no mistake: this debate is about Oscar the Grouch, and Big Bird, and Ernie, and Bert. The new Republican majority has put them on the chopping block.

Mr. Speaker, “Mr. Rogers’ Neighborhood” is much more popular than Mr. GINGRICH’S. “Sesame Street” is a far healthier environment for children than Capitol Hill. The Muppets are far more popular than this Congress, and we should think twice before we eliminate them.

Defeat the rule so that we can offer an amendment to save Sesame Street from the wrecking crew.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield 1½ minutes to my very dear friend from Redlands, CA. [Mr. LEWIS], the senior California member on the Committee on Appropriations.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of a very, very difficult rule. To say the least, when we are attempting to address this horrendous deficit problem which burdens our entire economy, it is appropriate to look back at the 1995 appropriations year. Deciding how you are going to make adjustments in wished-for growth in each of those programs is a difficult process.

I hear the word “cut, cut, cut, cut,” everywhere. What we are really talking about is an attempt to adjust decisions on spending within last year’s bill, and to decide that some of the appropriated growth could be cut back a little.

Every one of these programs are either going back to the President’s recommendations in the first place or they actually reflect efforts to rein in continued growth in programs where people services are involved.

There is little question that when people attempt to trade one program off against another, veterans versus NASA, assistance for people with AIDS versus space station, that makes it extremely difficult to understand the mo-

tives of those advocating smaller government.

We are attempting to start on that glidepath that will lead us to a balanced budget by 2002. The people who come to the floor who proudly say, “I voted for the balanced budget amendment,” and then come and suggest we cannot even begin to slightly readjust backward the \$1 trillion budget of last year are speaking out of both sides of their mouths.

The American public is not going to be fooled. I strongly urge you to support this rule.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, the next gentleman I will yield to probably could explain why the Republicans have taken this track. I yield 1 minute to our inhouse psychiatrist, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MCDERMOTT].

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

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, the question here is: Why are we making these cuts? Is it to balance the budget? I would say “no.”

Yesterday on the Committee on Ways and Means, on which I serve, we passed a bill that gives away \$700 billion over the next 10 years. That unbalances the budget by \$700 billion. These cuts are being made to pay for that tax cut.

Now, the tax cut goes to the most wealthy 10 percent in this country. Sixty percent of the benefit will go to the top 10 percent in this country. They will give a family credit to the 40 million families in this country—only the top 30 million. The bottom 10 million families in this country will not receive one dime for their children in a tax cut out of the tax bill we put through.

These cuts we are going through here today are simply to pay for a giveaway to the wealthy in this country. I think we ought to vote “no” on this rule.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON].

Mrs. CLAYTON. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I oppose this rule. This rule is a gag rule. This is a divisive rule. This rule only allows amendments that pit one good program against another good program. The \$25 million cut in WIC can only be restored by cutting at least an equal amount in agricultural research funds. The \$50 million in Veterans’ Administration medical care funding, and the \$156 million in VA hospital construction funding can only be restored by cutting wastewater treatment infrastructure financing and other worthy programs. Healthy Start money can only be restored under this rule by cutting money from the National Institutes of Health.

This rule is a classic case of robbing Peter to pay Paul. This rule is not unlike pitting sibling against sibling, or child against parent. Worse, Mr. Speaker, the rule allows debate and a vote on a bill that assaults the Nation’s poor. For example, the bill proposes a rescis-

sion of \$7.2 billion from the HUD programs—representing 42 percent of the entire rescission package. By cutting public housing programs, we will adversely affect 630,000 families with children and 530,000 elderly households. The cuts in the section 8 program will leave countless families with children and elderly virtually homeless.

The section 515 rental housing program will be nonexistent. In addition, the bill eliminates all—not some—but all funding for the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program. This program helps low-income families with home heating bills.

Mr. Speaker, what is going on here? Child nutrition programs are being cut. Housing assistance programs are being cut. And, assistance with heating bills is being eliminated. These are all basic needs. If this agenda continues, we will have millions of very hungry and very cold people, out on the streets.

While cutting these basic needs, the bill cuts \$1.7 billion from education programs. Programs that prepare our students to compete in an increasingly globalized world cut. Youth job training programs that provide work experience for students are cut. And, the bill goes further and deeper. Rural America and National Public Radio are like peanut butter and jelly—they are best together. In isolated areas, like eastern North Carolina, National Public Radio is the only reliable news source.

With this bill and proposed amendments, the demise of the Public Broadcasting System is certain. A total of 15.8 million people listen to NPR every week. The total Federal investment in NPR amounts to just 29 cents per American, per year. I ask each of my colleagues, are these cuts putting good programs against each other, in the Nation’s best interest? I think the answer is obvious. Vote against this rule and vote against the bill.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentleman from California [Ms. WATERS].

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

Ms. WATERS. I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me, and I rise in opposition to the rule.

Mr. Speaker, this rule is an abomination. I am fundamentally opposed to several elements contained in this bill, as well as the way it will be considered.

First, emergencies are emergencies. We should never have to cut programs which have already been budgeted due to an act of God. That is what this legislation would do.

The State of California has been the unfortunate site of several natural disasters recently. It is absolutely the role of the Federal Government to assist in these relief efforts. But, the way this bill is structured, we will create several new emergencies as we pay for relief from earthquakes and floods.

Cities cannot afford cuts in summer jobs. This program has helped avert social disasters in many communities throughout this country. Not any more.

Poor people cannot go without energy assistance. But this bill will freeze elderly people in the northeast because of an earthquake in California.

People need housing. But this bill would create a shelter emergency for thousands of

Americans because of a natural disaster in one region of the country.

Tell veterans why they do not need health care—health care which this Congress approved last year—because of a California earthquake last year. Anyone who has visited a veterans hospital in this country understands the number of emergencies that this bill will inflict on our Nation's veterans.

Last, this rule sets up false choices. It is a sham. This rule is not about robbing Peter to pay Paul. It is about taking away Peter's home to pay for Paul's tent.

The American people want a discussion about budget priorities. But that is not what is before us. This is a cold-hearted, slick, political way to punish poor and middle-income families because of unpredictable weather. It is using natural disasters to affect this Republic's Congress' mean-spirited political agenda. This whole process should be rejected.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER].

Mr. VOLKMER. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for yielding this time to me for the opportunity to speak against this rule.

Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of sorrow that we have to stay here today not only with this bill with which I disagreed on some of the provisions that took away my clinic in my veterans facility back in Columbia, MO, it took away my heating assistance during the cold winter months which will come up next year. But now it take away the possibility that we will save a lot of lives of the unborn with the Istook amendment, just like any amendment that would be offered to it, and strikes it from the bill. We do not an opportunity to save those lives of the unborn as a result of this rule.

Mr. Speaker, I am very disappointed in what I am now hearing from so-called pro-life forces on the majority side, that they are going to vote for this rule that will mean that more unborn are going to suffer the fate of an abortion and die as a result of this rule.

I strongly oppose the rule, I ask the Members to defeat the rule so that the Committee on Rules has to put back the Istook language and then we can vote on it fair and square in this House—either you are for it or against it—and not do it the way that the Committee on Rules has decided to do it and not give us a chance to vote on that language.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas, the Honorable Judge DOGGETT.

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

Mr. Speaker, the distinguished gentleman from California opened the debate on this rule by informing the House that this is a new era in addressing the deficit. And I have to agree with him completely. In fact, it is a brand-new, sparking era because as recently as last Friday I was engaged in colloquy here on the floor with the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules and the distinguished major-

ity leader, and they all informed me that it would be entirely out of order, under the rule proposed for this debate, to allocate even as much as 1 cent to deficit reduction.

So I am glad we made some progress, if it is indeed progress, here in the House, in that in the period between last Friday and now we have found out from the majority that they have a new interest in deficit reduction and indeed a new era.

I sought to engage the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] in a colloquy during his opening remarks concerning this sudden change. And I would propose, since he would not do it on his time, to do it on my time.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] this question: Do I understand that under this rule it is proper to allocate these savings, that there will be an amendment to allocate savings to deficit reduction?

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOGGETT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DREIER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I say, yes, it is the Brewster amendment which has been made in order. That is the same as the Crapo amendment.

Mr. DOGGETT. And the Murtha amendment that I was told last Friday would not be in order? I am glad to know that they are now in order.

Mr. DREIER. We want all these ideas to be considered.

I hope my friend, the gentleman, will support the rule now that we have done this.

I assume my friend from Texas, Mr. DOGGETT, will be supporting the rule.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my good friend, the gentleman from Wilmette, IL [Mr. PORTER], the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services of the Committee on Appropriations.

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

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

□ 1315

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule. It is a fair rule.

I read in the media today that several of our colleagues object to the rule as unfair because it requires amendments to have offsets, offsets in the same account, or subcommittee, in order to add back funds that have been rescinded.

Mr. Speaker, I am amazed at this. In 15 years the other party never went outside the accounts once, not once that I know of. I am amazed that with \$200 billion deficits people do not understand that our job is not to be here to serve each special interest and fund their program. Our job, the reason we are here, is to be responsible for the bottom line, for governing this country and getting our financial affairs in

order. The job of appropriators and the job of every Member in the House is to choose among competing priorities for spending, to choose among alternatives, to bring spending under control, to reduce the deficit and to take responsibility. The rule would require us to do exactly that.

Mr. Speaker, it is a good rule. It requires us to look at programs and determine if they have a national reason for being funded. We have to look at small programs that serve narrow constituencies at a huge expense and are expensive not only in terms of dollars, but also in personnel, and perhaps determine that they ought to be served under broader authorities; to look at programs and see if they might be better done in the private sector or by State and local government rather than by Federal Government; and, yes, to look at programs and determine they just do not work, if that is the fact.

Let me close, Mr. Speaker, by saying that this bill does not cut taxes. The arguments about cutting taxes are inappropriate here. I say to my colleagues, "When you're running \$200 billion deficits, and you cut spending by \$17.5 billion, that obviously reduces the deficit. Later, if you want to cut taxes, then you vote against doing that, as I will, and you ensure that you continue to reduce the deficit with this entire \$17.5 billion."

Mr. Speaker, that is exactly what we are doing here.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY]. We only have 1 minute for him unless the Members on the other side will be so generous as to donate time.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 15 seconds to my friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] very much for the usual consideration we get from the Republicans these days.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Are there any other Members over there who would like to donate 15 seconds?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HANSEN). The chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts for 75 seconds.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I came to the floor today with the hope that we could have offered an amendment along with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY] that would have restored the Federal fuel assistance. I had hoped to offer an amendment that would have gotten drug-addicted and mentally disturbed people out of public housing for senior citizens, and I had hoped to offer an amendment which would have made sure that poor children are not retarded by the time they reach school age by eating lead-based paint in their apartments, in addition to one that would have gotten drug dealers out of

public housing. They were not allowed to be offered because the Committee on Rules struck down the ability because, even though we would have paid for every single one of those programs, the Committee on Rules denied the Democratic Members the opportunity to offer amendments that would have gotten the job done.

My colleagues, I ask the people of this House to defeat this rule, to recognize that we are not allowed to offer amendments that look out for poor, and the vulnerable, and our senior citizens in this country by virtue of the gag rule that the Republicans have put on the Democratic Members of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HANSEN). The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] has expired.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, for a response, I yield 15 seconds to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I just want to point out to the gentleman currently on the books there are 163 job training programs, 240 education programs, 93 early childhood programs, 46 youth development programs. The redundancy and inefficiency of government today in providing meaningful services for the American people is incredible, and the American taxpayers pay for every one of them.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Tell me whether the programs work.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, with that I yield 3 minutes, not to the gentleman from Massachusetts. I am yielding it to the gentleman from Sanibel, FL [Mr. GOSS], a distinguished member of the Committee on Rules.

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in support of this democratically constructed, fair, and modified open rule.

Mr. Speaker, our first mission is to provide emergency disaster relief to the people of California and other States. This is what we set out to do, and I will yield to the gentleman when I am through.

Mr. MOAKLEY. I am just wondering what document the gentleman is reading from.

Mr. GOSS. Also under this rule we allow Members to set cutting and spending priorities and to offer further reductions in government spending, a new idea here.

Mr. Speaker, the broader vision today is to take on another important step toward fiscal responsibility and accountability to the American taxpayer. That is what we promised.

I want Members to know that passing this rule will give us the opportunity to make two crucial advances in the way we do business. First, we will have the opportunity to vote for emergency

disaster relief. That is entirely paid for, never been done before, new idea. We are paying for it, and at the same time we are making a major downpayment on our pledge to the American people to cut waste, reduce spending. That is what the vote was in November.

Last month I submitted my third annual list of spending cuts to the Committee on Appropriations. I am pleased and gratified to see that committee acted on several of those proposals in this package. Included, for instance, is a \$45 million rescission in the Economic Development Commission, a \$5 million rescission from the Legal Services Corporation, a \$3 million rescission from the Rural Electrification Administration, a \$5 million cut in TVA programs, along with several more cuts in areas I and others have targeted as wasteful spending, and, as the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] has just been reading from a long catalogue of redundancies, there is more to be done.

While we will hear some Members saying we are cutting too much spending in some cases, I am hopeful we can go beyond what the committees requested. I am proud to join with the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLUG] and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MINGE] and others in bipartisan support of an amendment to further cut the Appalachian Regional Commission, that rescission increasing the committee's cut of \$10 million to a full \$117.5 million.

Mr. Speaker, there are contentious items in this bill, including a big cut in veterans funding, which I personally opposed, but I am pleased I am going to have the opportunity to restore those funds by cutting lower priority projects. That is a very fair system. My State of Florida ranks 2d in veterans population, yet it is 34th in VA funding, so I am confident that we are going to find the necessary offsets in a National Service Corps to preserve funds for our much-needed veterans clinics for Florida where they have been promised, and they are needed and deserved.

Mr. Speaker, this bill demonstrates the progress we in the majority have made in cutting spending. We said we would pay for all the supplementals and reduce the deficit. We are keeping our promise. We said that we would get specific spending on spending cuts, and we are doing that today. I think the array of opposition shows that we are on target, we are hitting the mark, we are excising pet projects that have been overserved and overprovided for many years.

I urge support of this rule.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The minority has 7½ minutes remaining, and the majority has 3½ minutes remaining.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. HARMAN].

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

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, the need for rescissions and deficit reduction has never been greater, and I agree with the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER], my colleague, that it is time to step up to the tough choices. This rule, however, does not afford Members the opportunity to step up to a serious debate about responsible alternative ways to cut spending.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, the rule is arbitrary in forcing proponents of amendments to stay within chapters of the bill, chapters which have no more relationship to the real world than chapters from Alice in Wonderland.

"Then you should say what you mean," the March Hare went on. "I do," Alice hastily replied; "at least—at least I mean what I say—that's the same thing, you know."

And what do the rule's proponents say. "It too confusing to do otherwise."

Do they mean what they say? Or is this patronizing statement part of an effort to demean the independence, intelligence and integrity of every Member of this body.

Further, we could have prevented making disaster relief a political football where victims of disasters are pitted against some of the most vulnerable in our society, the aged, the young and the ill-housed, and we could have had an opportunity to delete the language preventing the President from issuing his executive order on permanent replacement of strikers.

I hail the last-minute addition of the deficit lock box, a concept I co-authored and vigorously support, but I am well aware that the majority opposed it in the Committee on Appropriations, it appears now because without it the rule would have failed.

I urge rejection of this rule. We can do better.

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

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

Mr. MINETA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule.

There are few issues we deal with in Congress which are as important as our responsibility under the Constitution to exercise the power of the purse—to decide where spending will be increased and where it will be decreased. And that is exactly what this supplemental and rescission bill is all about.

But this rule would very narrowly limit our ability to do our job, which is to consider alternative places to cut spending and to increase spending. This rule says that if we want to increase funding for a particular program, we can do it only if we find cuts in the same chapter of the bill. We may well prefer to make an offsetting cut in some other chapter or some other program, but under this rule we could not do that.

That is simply not right. We should make the offsetting cuts wherever they make the

most sense, not where they just happen coincidentally to have been put in the same chapter. There are amendments which will be offered to reduce a rescission for a particular program, and which I would want to support, but I will not be able to do so because the offsetting cut will be taken from a program which makes no sense to cut. And in fact, it may make no sense to the author of the amendment to make that particular cut, but he or she had to because that was the program which just happened to be in the same chapter as the program being restored. There may be other programs which would make perfect sense to cut instead, but we would be barred under this rule from making those more sensible spending cuts.

This is a totally arbitrary and artificial restriction on amendments to cut spending.

The rule before us, in my opinion, is a grotesque distortion of the principles of free and open debate that should prevail in this House.

I am not a stridently partisan Member of this House, and I have always done my best to work amicably with Members of both sides of the aisle.

But this rule put forward by the Republican Rules Committee, by restricting the cuts that can be offered to only those Republicans want to include, and protecting programs only Republicans want to protect, literally warps the nature of the spending debate in this House.

I will vote no on this rule. If it passes, I will refuse to cooperate with any Sophie's Choice amendment brought up under its structure and vote present.

These are not the country's choices, and attempting to portray them as such is a distortion of the process.

I also oppose the rule because it would protect provisions of the bill which violate House rules against legislating in an appropriations bill. Specifically, the bill lowers transit funding obligations ceilings and highway obligations ceilings in ways which clearly violate rule XXI of the House. Both Chairman SHUSTER and I urged the Rules Committee not to protect these violations of House rules, and yet that is exactly what the rule does.

Finally, I want to point out a very unfortunate provision of the supplemental and rescission bill with respect to California and with respect to any other State which might suffer natural disaster damage to its highways. When a natural disaster strikes, as flooding has struck California so severely in the past few days, damage to highways is often a substantial part of that damage, and highways are often the facilities which must most urgently be repaired, both for public safety reasons and for purposes of getting the area back on its feet economically. This bill would rescind all the emergency relief money for highways. In fact, it would rescind more money than exists in this program. The emergency relief fund in the highway program now has a balance of about \$300 million. This bill would rescind \$351 million.

What happens if we wipe out the emergency relief account? As the flood waters recede in California we are facing enormous amounts of emergency repair work to reopen highways. And we are likely to face additional flood damage further East in the coming months and hurricane damage in the Southeastern part of the country late in the fiscal year. If this bill is passed and wipes out the emergency relief account, the emergency

highway repair effort will have to struggle to find unobligated balances in other highway programs from which to borrow. We would either not get the emergency repairs done, or we would get them done at the expense of other highway programs in other States. And we would probably end up restoring the Federal money later anyway, resulting in no real savings to the Federal taxpayer anyway, but resulting in program delays in other States. This is a crazy way to try to get highway emergency repair work done, when everybody agrees this is work that urgently needs to be done.

The highway emergency relief rescissions in this bill are seriously flawed, and I want Members to know that this has the potential to create real problems in highway programs all across the country.

Mr. Speaker, we need the FEMA supplemental which is part of this bill. But the rest of this bill is seriously flawed, and the rule for the consideration of the bill effectively blocks our ability to correct the flaws in the bill. I urge a no vote on the rule, and then let's take a few days to bring forth a FEMA supplemental in a bill which makes sense, under a new rule which makes sense.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. FIELDS].

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. I rise in strong opposition to this gag rule, Mr. Speaker, and the reason why I rise in strong opposition is because I had several amendments that will address several serious, serious problems in this Nation, one being the summer jobs program.

I say to my colleagues: If you vote for this rule, this rule would not allow us to address the summer jobs program. There are 1.2 million young people that will be on the streets as a result of this rule and as a result of this rescission packet, 14,000 young people in a time that we need to get young people off the streets and into jobs and in a time that we want to take young people, older people or mothers off of welfare and put them on the payrolls. This amendment would not allow us to keep young people working during the summer.

Mr. Speaker, this amendment further takes away all the money—this rule will take away all the money for drug-free schools and communities. I have an amendment that would restore that money, but I will not be able to offer that amendment simply because this rule will not allow that.

Mr. Speaker, at a time when young people are using more drugs in our schools and communities, more guns in our schools and communities, we are still taking away all the money for drug-free schools and communities.

I offered three separate amendments to delete rescissions and restore funding for the TRIO Program, job training programs, and for safe and drug-free schools. Each of these amendments is not allowed under the rule we are currently debating.

The rule calls for offsetting rescissions to be made within the same chapter/appropriations subcommittee and within the same programs which have already been rescinded.

Under this rule, I would have to further cut into chapter VI. This chapter contains rescissions for programs I am committed to. I do not wish to further cut programs within this chapter. In my opinion, we have cut too far already. If I was going to cut I would cut further into the foreign operations chapter. Foreign operations appropriations were only cut \$93.5 million. This accounts for only 0.5 percent of rescinded funding; 99.5 percent of all funding cut was to domestic programs. Of these programs \$5.89 billion has already been cut from Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education programs.

Below, I list programs which I would have had to find further cuts in to make my amendment in order under this rule. Should I have cut deeper into the funding to keep this Nation healthy so that I could delete rescissions for training the youth of this country to be productive citizens and taxpayers? This is the type of decision we are faced with. I could not cut foreign operations programs.

Chapter VI—Labor-HHS-Education—\$5.89 billion has already been cut from this chapter.

Labor: \$2.3 billion cuts; of those cuts, I would have to make cuts beyond: Training and employment, \$2.285 billion; community service employment for older Americans, \$14.4 million; State unemployment insurance and employment service, \$12 million; OSHA, \$16.1 million.

Health and Human Services: \$1.727 billion cuts; of those cuts, I would have to make cuts beyond: Health and human resources, \$82.8 million; Centers for Disease Control, \$8.9 million; National Institutes of Health, \$70 million; Health Care Financing Authority, \$38.2 million; LIHEAP—low income home energy assistance—\$1.3 billion; community services block grant, \$27 million; Children and Family Services Program—crime bill—\$25.9 million; foster care and adoption assistance, \$150 million.

Education: \$1.626 billion cuts; of the cuts I list below, I would have to make cuts beyond: Education reform, \$186 million; title I for disadvantaged students, \$113.3 million; impact aid, \$16.3 million; school improvement programs—construction—\$746 million; crime bill, \$11.1 million; bilingual and immigrant education, \$38.5 million; vocational and adult education—tech prep and literacy—\$232.4 million; national and community service, \$210 million; public broadcasting, \$141 million; student financial aid, \$83.4 million; higher education, \$102.3 million; libraries, \$34.7 million.

These are just some of the programs that I would have to cut further to comply with the rule. This is ridiculous and uncalled for. I oppose the rule and urge Members to vote "no" on the rule.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER].

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I do not remember a rule like this. I do not remember a rule where it was preselected. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ANDREWS] is on the floor. He had a bill called A to Z that allowed 46 hours for any Member to pick any program to cut spending. But in this rule we only have the leadership's list

to choose from, and I say to my colleagues, If it's not on the list, you don't get your shot.

As a matter of fact, what is that for? To protect, I suggest, the projects they want to talk about, but not to do anything about.

My colleagues, I rise in opposition to this rule. If we pass this rule and bill, teenagers will have fewer jobs, children will be hungrier, older Americans will be colder, families will find housing less available, and veterans will be less cared for.

Yes, we need to cut spending, but let us do it not on the backs of children, veterans, and older Americans.

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

The appropriations process is inherently one of weighing priorities and making choices.

I am willing to make those choices—to bite the bullet and make the tough decisions that are necessary to bring our budget deficit under control. But this rule has made a farce of that process.

First, this rule requires that, if funding is to be restored to one program, offsets must be found in the same chapter of the bill.

I sit on two subcommittees—Treasury Postal and Labor-HHS-Ed. The idea that we can not weigh the importance of educating and training our children against the construction of a new building is ludicrous.

I am the ranking Democrat on Treasury Postal, but I would be the first to say that our Nation's children are more important than that construction. This rule prohibits us from making that judgment.

In addition, for the first time in my career in Congress, the rule requires that offsets come solely from programs which have already been cut at the subcommittee and full committee level.

All programs should share in the burden of necessary reductions. Instead, the Republicans have targeted programs for children, the elderly, and veterans for severe cuts or entire elimination—and then guaranteed that they would be cut still further by the adoption of these two provisions in the rule.

This rule also protects inappropriate authorizing legislation adopted by this committee with inadequate information, without holding any hearings, and against the strong objections of Mr. OBEY, the ranking Democratic member.

The original contract for American—the U.S. Constitution—promised an open, informed debate by educated citizens and their elected representatives.

This bill has been put together in haste, largely without hearings, and with inadequate consideration of its implications. It attacks the health, food, and education programs needed to create an active, informed democratic society of the future.

I urge you to vote against this rule.

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

Actually I have been corrected. Somebody informed me that there is money for low-income housing in the Republican legislation. They are building new prisons out of the crime bill, so there will be low-income housing available.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOLLOHAN].

□ 1330

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, the good news in this rule and this bill is we are funding disaster relief to California. The bad news is that we are taking money from across the country to fund it, instead of treating it as an emergency supplemental as we traditionally do. We are taking money from roads in the country, to pay for road reconstruction in California; from low-income housing across the country, to repair housing in California.

The rule and the reason why we oppose it is it prohibits the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES], who is the ranking minority member on VA-HUD, whose subcommittee is funding \$7.2 billion, one-third of this, it prohibits him from offering an amendment to restore with offsets some of that housing money, and prohibits the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY] from trying to restore the \$206 million from veterans programs.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule for those reasons.

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

Mr. Speaker, the problem here with the statement from my very dear friend, the gentleman from West Virginia, is that once again it is looking at the past. We no longer plan to spend dollars that we do not offset. We are going to be responsible in dealing with even disasters that exist.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my good friend, the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. PRYCE], a new member of the Committee on Rules, who played a key role in fashioning this rule.

Ms. PRYCE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for his leadership on this rule.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my strong support for this very fair rule. If some here have not figured it out yet, Mr. Speaker, we find ourselves in a new era of fiscal responsibility. Gone are the days of wrapping up huge bills on the Federal credit card and then passing the check on to our children and grandchildren. It is time to make the tough choices, the tough choices for the future of this country.

Thankfully, many of us here are ready to do that. The 104th Congress under new leadership is committed more than ever to requiring the Federal Government to live within its means. That includes paying for supplemental appropriations, even if they are designated emergency spending. How novel. We pay for what we are spending.

Now, changing the culture of deficit spending is no easy task. The American people need only look to the debate in the other body to see how hard it was to pass the balanced budget amendment. As hard as we worked, that effort was not successful. Even as we speak, those who have the insatiable

thirst for spending are working hard to weaken the line-item veto legislation.

This rule provides a reasonable, orderly procedure to consider these hard decisions in a manner that is fiscally responsible. Mr. Speaker, I believe that the Committee on Appropriations has taken brave, commendable steps to reduce the size and scope of Government and to put us on a steady course toward providing a more secure financial future for our children.

I urge my colleagues to support these bills and to adopt this very fair, reasonable rule. No doubt about it, these are tough choices. But these are tough times, and they require courage. Paint us as black as you will, but I am proud to be a part of the new culture of fiscal responsibility.

I urge my colleagues to join me. The alternative, the status quo, is a sin against our children. Vote for this fair rule.

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

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

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COLEMAN].

(Mr. COLEMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous material.)

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, hard choices? Great courage? For heavens sakes. You know what this rule does not permit? It does not permit us to put highway demo projects for cutting before this Congress. Oh, we could not do that. That is in somebody's district.

It has been referred to as pork by Members of the Republican Party ever since I have been here. But would they approve my amendment which would have allowed the Secretary to cut out those projects? No. You know why? They would rather take money away from children and school lunch programs. And they ought to call time, because they made a mistake and they can live with it.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the rule for H.R. 1158. This rule makes a mockery of the fair and open process we were promised by the Republican majority. Under the rule approved by the Republican majority, I will not be able to offer an amendment to correct a glaring inequity in H.R. 1158. My amendment would have done what H.R. 1158 does not do—cut out low priority highway demonstration projects.

Under the rule approved by the Republican majority, I will not be able to offer an amendment which would have authorized the Secretary of Transportation to cancel up to \$400 million in unobligated funds currently designated for highway demonstration projects in appropriations or authorization acts. Authority to cut this low priority spending was requested and submitted to Congress by the President in

his fiscal year 1995 supplemental proposals. My amendment would have required the Secretary to target only the lowest priority projects not yet under construction.

Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to a bill that looks first to slashing funds for the more than 1 million seniors who live in public housing, cutting funds for 50,000 to 100,000 pregnant mothers and infants from the WIC program, and eliminating funds for veterans' medical care facilities and equipment, without even considering the possibility of cutting wasteful highway demonstration projects.

I have to ask the question why certain items were not cut. Why is the \$1.9 billion in unobligated money earmarked for over 400 highway demonstration projects not touched in this rescission package? According to the Federal Highway Administration, there is nearly \$300 million in unobligated funds for highway demonstration projects funded in appropriations acts, and another \$1.6 billion in unobligated funds highway demonstration projects authorized in the Intermodal Surface Transportation Act [ISTEA] that are yet not under construction. Why has not one dime of this money been targeted for rescissions in H.R. 1158?

In these austere times when we are cutting programs for women, children, the elderly, and veterans, I believe that we have to take an-

other look at these highway demonstration projects. And, when we take a closer look, I think you will find that these are projects that have not been requested by the President.

When we take a closer look, we find that the Department of Transportation and the General Accounting Office have concluded that it will take some \$28 to \$30 billion to complete all of the earmarked highway demonstration projects authorized in either appropriations bills or authorization acts.

When we take a close look we find that the Federal Government is picking up the tab for many of these projects with the States have deemed to be a low priority for State funds or which are not even on State transportation improvement plans. If Congress is serious about making cutting wasteful spending, we need look no further than this group of projects to begin.

Mr. Speaker, if my amendment has been made in order under the rule, my amendment would have resulted in the cancellation of earmarked highway demonstration projects included not only in appropriations bills, but also in ISTEA. And, with good reason. ISTEA authorized more than \$6 billion in direct spending through the use of contract authority for 539 specially earmarked highway projects—triple the number and four times the amount of

congressional pork included in the previous highway authorization bills.

In 1991, when ISTEA was debated on the House floor, the now Republican majority leader had this to say:

Now what is wrong with the spending? I happen to believe we need to spend on infrastructure where it is needed in the public's general interest. This bill again spends first on where it is needed in the parochial interests, in the special interests, in the local interests, what they call pork barrel spending.

Clearly, a big part of the problem is that back door spending on highway demonstration projects is out of control. The appropriations bills are scored with the outlays that result from this spending. If we are going to rein in the pork barrel spending spree, we have to look at the millions of dollars funneled to special highway projects through both the appropriations and the authorization process. If Congress won't do the job of curbing wasteful highway project spending, we ought to give the Secretary of Transportation the tools he needs to get the job done.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert at the end of my statement a list of hundreds of highway demonstration projects that should be examined before we proceed further to cut children, the elderly, veterans, and the most disadvantaged in our society.

HIGHWAY DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS NOT UNDER CONSTRUCTION

[Unobligated balances]

State	Description	Unobligated balance
Misc. Highway Trust Funds		
Florida	17th St. Causeway Tunnel	3,291,616
Do	Biscayne Blvd/US 1 Connect Port Miami to I-395	2,400,000
Georgia	Railroad-Highway Crossings Demos, Augusta	1,013,334
Hawaii	Kihel-Haleakala Highway, Saddle Road	4,500,000
Massachusetts	Vehicular/Pedestrian Safety Demo	9,017,271
Michigan	M-84, Bay Road-Saginaw & Bay Counties	100,000
Missouri	Multi-Modal Transportation Center, St. Louis	640,000
Montana	I-90 Interchange, Belgrade	2,000,000
New Jersey	Rt. 21 Viaduct, Advance Property Acquisition	2,880,000
Do	I-78 Downtown Connector/Peddle St Ramp	1,504,000
Do	Rt. 21 widening, RR/Highway Bridge, Newark	1,200,000
New York	Design Improvement to Miller Highway, NYC	1,696,000
Do	Exit 26 Bridge, Schenectady	1,280,000
Pennsylvania	I-81, Wilkes-Barre, Exits 43-46 Corridor	2,880,000
South Dakota	New Castle-Vermillion Bridge	3,296,000
Indiana	SR67, I-69 to Muncie Bypass	4,992,000
Michigan	I-96 Bypass, Grand Rapids	768,000
Do	Maple Rd., Walled Lake	2,000,000
New Hampshire	Bridge Capacity Improvements	7,730,028
Pennsylvania	US 202, King of Prussia to Montgomery Ville	1,440,000
Subtotal		54,628,249
General Funds		
Arizona	Veterans Memorial Overpass	1,000,000
Do	U.S. 93 upgrade, Kingman-Lake Mead	1,000,000
California	US 101 HOV lanes, Marin County	500,000
Do	Mare Island access study	500,000
Do	I-15 widening, Victorville to Barstow	1,667,000
Do	State route 71, planning/design, Riverside Co.	1,000,000
Do	CA 113-I-5 improvements	500,000
Do	Highway 41 expansion	1,000,000
Do	Bristol St. improvement project, Santa Ana	1,000,000
Do	US 101 congestion relief, Sonoma County	500,000
Do	CA 113 railroad grade separation	668,000
Do	State highway 58 upgrade, Bakersfield	500,000
Do	Arden Garden connector, Sacramento	1,000,000
Do	CA 138 CA 14 to 50th Street, E. CA	1,000,000
Do	CA 905 congestion mitigation border facility	668,000
Do	Highway Bypass Demo, Prunedale, CA	8,132,240
Connecticut	Transportation center, Norwich	668,000
Florida	Causeway Tunnel/Bridge	5,225,000
Do	Port of Palm Beach Intermodal Facility	500,000
Do	I-4 Greenway Interchange, Orlando	1,000,000
Do	Fuller Warren Bridge, Jacksonville	5,000,000
Do	Airport Access road, Jacksonville	1,000,000
Do	NE Dade Bikepaths—North Miami	680,000
Do	NE Dade Bikepaths	247,564
Georgia	Railroad-Highway Crossing Demo, Augusta, GA	6,745,123
Do	Olive Road Crossing—Augusta, GA	1,635,000
Do	State road 611 connector with I-20	2,000,000
Do	Sidney Lanier bridge, Brunswick	1,850,000
Hawaii	Kihel road, Maui	2,500,000
Do	Saddle road	1,000,000
Illinois	Springfield—Eleventh Street Extension	549,032
Do	Bridge Construction—Hillsboro	529,434
Do	Bridge Construction—Hillsboro	378,530
Do	Veterans Parkway, Springfield	1,000,000
Do	Peoria-Chicago Highway	1,000,000

HIGHWAY DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS NOT UNDER CONSTRUCTION—Continued
[Unobligated balances]

State	Description	Unobligated balance
Do	US67/IL267 improvements	800,000
Do	Railroad-Highway Crossings Demo	8,330,669
Indiana	Rt 12 Relocation—E. Chicago Marina	46,962
Do	Indianapolis to Evansville (I-69)	2,120,975
Do	SR67 from I-69 to Muncie	4,093,831
Iowa	Des Moines Inner Loop	1,004,675
Kansas	I-35 Interchange—Salina	2,374,400
Louisiana	I-10/I-12 Baton Rouge bypass	500,000
Do	I-10, St. Charles Parish line to Tulande Ave	1,000,000
Do	I-10/I-610 intersection, New Orleans	10,000,000
Maryland	Corridor O	5,000,000
Massachusetts	Center Street Extension	3,360,000
Michigan	M-6 South beltline, Grand Rapids	1,000,000
Do	Rail consolidation project, Monroe	5,000,000
Do	M102/Grand River interchange	1,313,000
Minnesota	Wabasha St Bridge replacement, St. Paul	500,000
Missouri	I-255/Mo 231 intersection	535,000
Montana	I-90 interchange, Belgrade	1,104,000
Do	I-90 interchange, Belgrade	500,000
Nebraska	Missouri R. bridge, Springfield-Niobrara (NE/SD)	2,000,000
Do	Missouri R. bridge, Springfield-Niobrara (NE/SD)	2,240,000
Nevada	Pyramid interchange, I-80	5,500,000
Do	Rail Crossing Callente	1,331,280
New Jersey	I-280 Downtown connector-interim improvements	2,648,366
Do	Route 21 widening, Newark	5,187,741
Do	Route 4 bridge replacement	490,400
Do	Highway study—Route 21 Viaduct	2,547,000
Do	Highway Study—Route 208/Route 4 interchange	1,561,382
Do	Highway Study Route 4/Route 17 interchange	3,511,808
Do	Route 21/McCarter highway, Newark	4,500,000
New Mexico	PE Demo—Railroad Overpass in Las Vegas, NM	1,363,391
Do	US 70 frontage road, Las Cruces	1,000,000
New York	Exit 26 Bridge Project, Schenectady County	1,700,000
Do	Miller Highway from 59th to 72nd St, Manhattan	2,800,000
Do	Exit 26 Bridge Project, Schenectady County	3,600,000
Do	Meadowbrook State Parkway	3,600,000
Do	Mount Vernon Parking Facility	320,000
Do	Grand Concourse Ave, Traffic Impr. Bronx	425,000
Do	Exit 26 Bridge Project, Schenectady County	3,200,000
Do	NY 531 extension study, Ogden-Sweden	150,000
Do	Delaware St. reconstruction, Tonawanda	700,000
North Carolina	Peace St. Thomasville	625,000
Do	US 17 bridge replacement, Neuse River	3,000,000
Do	Unity St, Thomasville	625,000
Ohio	I-680 Access Ramps Youngstown	1,700,000
Do	I-680 Access Ramps Youngstown	2,250,000
Do	SR 124/7, Ravenswood connector	1,336,000
Do	Intermodal terminal, Fearing Blvd, Toledo	668,000
Do	US 30 widening, Wooster to Riceland	2,500,000
Oregon	Columbia Gorge Highway	2,255,200
Pennsylvania	Highway widening demonstration project	1,381,840
Do	Highway widening demonstration project	32,081
Do	Highway widening demonstration project	640,000
Do	State Route 711 Bypass, Ligonier	2,965,752
Do	US Route 202 Bypass Montgomeryville & Doylestown	22
Do	US220 Bald Eagle to Centre County Line	27
Do	PA North Philadelphia Intermodal Facility	4,640,000
Do	PA Center Avenue Extension	2,464,000
Do	US 202 King of Prussia and Montgomeryville	400,000
Do	I-81 in Vicinity of Wilkes-Barre	2,264,577
Do	State Route 711 Bypass	900,000
Do	Pier 98, Philadelphia	60,000
Do	US 15 Steam Valley-Sebring	1,500,000
Do	US 22/PA 217 bridge	600,000
Do	Blairsville Bridge	1,069,000
Do	PA 3011 Improvements, Scranton	1,000,000
Do	PA 14 Improvements, Bradford County	1,000,000
Do	US 22, Sec. B07 reconstruction	1,000,000
South Dakota	Missouri River Bridge, Vermillion, SD-Newcastle	2,000,000
Tennessee	Old Nashville Bridge	1,000,000
Texas	TX: FM-3464 from Mines Rd to I-35 in Laredo	1,600,000
Do	Texarkana Road improvement	1,379,960
Do	6th & 7th Sts. improvements, Brownsville	500,000
Utah	5600 West widening in West Valley City	1,572,000
Do	9th Crossing-Provo and E-W connector from US 89-189	5,051,474
Do	I-15 corridor improvements, Salt Lake City	1,500,000
Do	I-15/University Avenue interchange	1,500,000
Vermont	Bridge Safety Repair	208,871
Virginia	Pimmers point connector	1,000,000
Do	14th Street Bridge lane addition	1,000,000
Washington	SR 305 improvement, Bainbridge Island	672,000
West Virginia	Corridor D improvement projects, Clarksburg to OH line	7,123,410
Do	Highway study—Route No. 2	441,228
Do	Mercer/McDowell Counties, Route 52	5,000,000
Do	Riverside expressway, Fairmont	4,000,000
Subtotal		225,528,245
Total		225,528,245

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

[*These balances are subject to change]

State and section No.	Project description	NHS	Est const start	Cong. dist.	Amount available thru FY 1995	Amount obligated (02/24/95)	(*) Unoblig Bal (02/24/95)	New authorization 96-97
Alabama—1105(f)2	Upgr E/W Cor-RT 72	yes	no info	8	7,544,816	5,348,224	2,196,592	4,393,184
Alabama—1107(b)192	Imp to Anniston E Bypass US 431	unk	1995	3	6,952,000	200,000	6,752,000	4,048,000
Alabama—1107(b)30	Reconst W Tunnel Plaza Inter I-10 fr Va to Mobile Rv Tunnel	yes	1997	1	9,480,000	2,003,040	7,476,960	5,520,000
Alabama—1107(b)35	Const 4-lane Hwy to bypass Mont, AL	no	1997	2, 7	7,457,600	760,000	6,697,600	4,342,400
Alabama—1107(b)80	Black War Rv Br-AL	no	1995	6, 7	4,044,800	2,403,316	1,641,484	2,355,200
Total					35,479,216	10,714,580	24,764,636	20,658,784
Arizona—1106(b)74	Vet Memorial Inter/Palo Verde Overpass	no	1996	2	1,516,800	857,280	659,520	883,200
Arkansas—1103(b)4	Desha Co: Study for AR-MS Great River Bridge	unk	no info	no info	505,600	0	505,600	294,400

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

[*These balances are subject to change]

State and section No.	Project description	NHS	Est const start	Cong. dist.	Amount available thru FY 1995	Amount obligated (02/24/95)	(*) Unoblig Bal (02/24/95)	New authorization 96-97
Arkansas—1106(a)49	Imp US 65	yes	1995	3	24,016,000	1,701,610	22,314,390	13,984,000
Arkansas—1106(a)51	Study Bypass Alternatives for US 71	yes	no info	3	1,896,000	8,000	1,888,000	1,104,000
Arkansas—1106(a)53	Const of Replace Br across the White Rv	no	1995	1	1,580,000	538,400	1,041,600	920,000
Total					27,997,600	2,248,010	25,749,590	16,302,400
California—1104(b)1	Const of HOV Lns on I-70	yes	no info	37	4,676,800	0	4,676,800	2,723,200
California—1104(b)10	Const 1 Block Tunnel on Rt 15	no	no info	49	3,160,000	66,446	3,093,554	1,840,000
California—1104(b)11	Extend I-110	yes	no info	33	6,383,200	3,200,000	3,183,200	3,716,800
California—1104(b)14	Imp 3 Grade Crossing	no	no info	3	1,137,600	0	1,137,600	662,400
California—1104(b)15	Const 2 Park & Ride Facilities for I-80	yes	no info	3	4,866,400	2,032,800	2,833,600	2,833,600
California—1104(b)40	HOV Lane Imp on Lawrence Expressway	no	no info	15	6,383,200	5,534,670	848,530	3,716,800
California—1105(f)20	Imp on I-15 & I-40	yes	1995	40	26,914,400	3,775,792	23,138,608	21,785,600
California—1106(b)1	Bristol Street Project	no	no info	46	2,591,200	1,817,600	773,600	1,508,800
California—1106(b)36	Grade Separation Project	no	no info	37	4,171,200	0	4,171,200	2,428,800
California—1106(b)41	Conduct Environmental	no	no info	50	632,000	632,000	0	368,000
California—1106(b)46	Relocate a Portion of Atlantic Blvd	no	no info	33	2,970,400	320,000	2,650,400	1,729,600
California—1106(b)66	Gr separation projects (3)	no	no info	36	4,487,200	80,000	4,407,200	2,612,800
California—1106(b)71	Const of Public HOV Facilities	no	1995	46	9,353,600	1,147,469	8,206,131	5,446,400
California—1107(b)116	Const of Indust Blvd	no	1996	3	5,245,600	1,352,000	3,893,600	3,054,400
California—1107(b)12	Const of A, B, & C Segments of St. Rt 76	no	no info	48	9,100,800	400,000	8,700,800	5,299,200
California—1107(b)61	Widen & Reconst Bridge to Caltrans height standards	yes	1996	40	1,137,600	0	1,137,600	662,400
California—1107(b)71	Rt 156 Hollister Bypass	no	1997	17	568,800	403,200	165,600	331,200
California—1107(b)72	Rt 101	yes	1998	17	2,654,400	0	2,654,400	1,545,600
California—1107(b)82	1-880/Alvarado-Niles Rd Interchange	yes	1996	13	6,004,000	0	6,004,000	3,496,000
California—1107(b)86	Rt 58 Improvements	yes	no info	20, 21	2,970,400	4,700,000	-1,729,600	1,729,600
California—1107(b)87	Norwalk Blvd grade separation	no	no info	34	2,970,400	0	2,970,400	1,729,600
California—1108(b)15	Const of a Multi-Modal Transit Parkway	no	1997	29	5,624,800	1,502,000	4,122,800	3,275,200
California—1108(b)21	Upgrade Rt 87 fr 4 to 6 lanes	no	1996	16	9,353,600	0	9,353,600	5,446,400
California—1108(b)30	Extend rice Rd, Widen Hueneme Rd & Cons Rt 1	no	1996	23	5,624,800	320,000	5,304,800	3,275,200
California—1108(b)31	Imp Ground Access	no	no info	36	5,656,400	0	5,656,400	3,293,600
California—1108(b)36	Ave P8 Improvements	no	1996	25	2,275,200	0	2,275,200	1,324,800
Total					136,914,000	27,283,977	109,550,023	85,836,000
Colorado—1106(a)60	Upgrade Fram to Market Rd	no	no info	3	1,832,800	1,299,200	533,600	1,067,200
Connecticut 1106(b)9	Imp of Hwy and Transit Projects	yes	1995	3	6,383,200	1,839,070	4,544,130	3,716,800
DC—1104(b)6	Primary Intermodal System	no	no info	DC	4,297,600	0	4,297,600	2,502,400
DC—1106(b)10	Boundary Street Safety	no	no info	DC	4,297,600	0	4,297,600	2,502,400
DC—1106(b)70	SE/SW & Anacostia Freeways	yes	no info	DC	2,970,400	84,000	2,886,400	1,729,600
DC—1107(b)98	Hybrid Fuel Cell	unk	no info	DC	2,275,200	0	2,275,200	1,324,800
Total					13,840,800	84,000	13,756,800	8,059,200
Florida—1103(b)12	17th St Causeway, Tunnel/Bridge, FT. Lauderdale	no	1997	16, 17	8,595,200	1,185,003	7,410,197	5,004,800
Florida—1104(b)30	Broward Co, Hallandale Bridge	no	no inf.	16, 17	5,372,000	0	5,372,000	3,128,000
Florida—1106(a)28	Chattahoochee: Mosquito Creek Bridge	no	no inf.	02	1,516,800	0	1,516,800	883,200
Florida—1106(a)29	Upgrade SR-71, Rt 10-Rt 8	no	1997	02	1,832,800	407,638	1,425,162	1,067,200
Florida—1106(a)30	Upgrade SR-267	no	no info	02	2,970,400	0	2,970,400	1,729,600
Florida—1106(a)55	Brevard Co, Engineering Improv. SR-3	yes	1997	11	101,120	13,600	87,520	58,880
Florida—1106(b)42	Sarasota: Interchange at US 301 & Univ PKY	yes	no inf.	13	1,516,800	593,323	923,477	883,200
Florida—1107(b)196	Orlando, ROW acquisition	unk	no info	05, 11	61,620,000	0	61,620,000	35,880,000
Florida—1107(b)28	Brevard Co, Bridge SR 3 over Barge Canal	no	1995	11	4,360,800	0	4,360,800	2,539,200
Florida—1107(b)43	Hillsborough: I-4 from Tampa to Co line	yes	1995	07, 09	15,484,000	9,987,252	5,496,748	9,016,000
Florida—1108(b)16	Jacksonville: I-295 Interchange and access road	yes	no info	03, 04	4,487,200	0	4,487,200	2,612,800
Total					107,857,120	12,186,816	95,670,304	62,802,880
Georgia—1105(f)2	Upgrade East-West Corridor along route 72	yes	no info	7	3,531,616	433,047	3,098,569	2,056,394
Georgia—1106(b)4	Atlanta: Martin Luther King Dr.	no	1995	5	505,600	0	505,600	294,400
Georgia—1106(b)72	Atlanta: I-20 interchange at Lithonia Indust Blvd	yes	1996	11	7,078,400	128,000	6,950,400	4,121,600
Georgia—1107(b)202	Hwy improvements	unk	no info	no info	17,064,000	200,000	16,864,000	9,936,000
Georgia—1108(b)48	Augusta: RR overpass at 15th and Greene Sts.	unk	2000	11	3,728,800	158,400	3,570,400	2,171,200
Total					31,908,416	919,447	30,988,969	18,579,584
Hawaii—1107(b)203	Hwy improvements	unk	no info	02	3,792,000	0	3,792,000	2,208,000
Idaho—1104(b)31	Bannock & Caribou Co.'s Hwy Improv	yes	1998	02	6,383,200	160,000	6,223,200	3,716,800
Idaho—1107(b)190	Lewiston: New Road along FAU73444 In Bryden Canyon	unk	1997	01	2,464,800	0	2,464,800	1,435,200
Idaho—1107(b)191	Bear Lake Co: US-89 from Montpelier to Geneva	unk	1996	02	11,692,000	1,334,383	10,357,617	6,808,000
Idaho—1107(b)60	Bryden Co: Improve road WA State line to Lewiston	no	1997	01	3,349,600	480,000	2,869,600	1,950,400
Total					23,889,600	1,974,383	21,915,217	13,910,400
Illinois—1104(b)19	Fox River Valley: 8 bridges	unk	1999	14	5,245,600	1,657,512	3,588,088	3,054,400
Illinois—1104(b)4	East St Louis: Bridge Study	yes	1999	12	884,800	437,424	447,376	515,200
Illinois—11-7(a)1-	Study: Hwy 67 Alton to Jacksonville	yes	1999	18	1,580,000	385,744	1,194,256	920,000
Illinois—1106(a)31	East Louis to Carbondale Tollway Feasibility Sty	yes	1999	12	202,240	143,360	58,880	117,760
Illinois—1106(a)32	Mt. Vernon: 34th St Ext	no	1997	20	606,720	85,596	521,124	353,280
Illinois—1106(a)33	Feather Trail Road, Pulaski Co	no	no info	no info	695,200	85,285	609,915	404,800
Illinois—1106(a)34	Resurface SR 1: Cave-In-Rock to north of Omaha	yes	1999	19	1,137,600	0	1,137,600	662,400
Illinois—1106(a)36	Saline Co: Improve Rt 13	yes	1997	19	2,528,000	0	2,528,000	1,472,000
Illinois—1106(a)65	W. Central: Widen US 34	yes	1997	17	1,200,800	0	1,200,800	699,200
Illinois—1106(a)66	Bridge on US67 in NW IL	yes	1996	17	1,516,800	0	1,516,800	883,200
Illinois—1106(a)9	East St Louis: Study Access Rd to Jeff Mem Park	no	1999	12	151,680	0	151,680	83,320
Illinois—1106(b)14	Chicago: Various	unk	1995	1	2,338,400	204,367	2,134,033	1,361,600
Illinois—1106(b)17	Harvey: IL 1 Interchange	yes	1996	14	1,580,000	0	1,580,000	920,000
Illinois—1106(b)18	Markham: Sibley Blvd	no	1997	2	2,212,000	0	2,212,000	1,288,000
Illinois—1106(b)19	Chicago: IL 1 at 155th St	unk	1996	2	884,800	76,000	808,800	515,200
Illinois—1106(b)2	Metro East/St Louis MO Bridge Study	no	no info	12	632,000	0	632,000	368,000
Illinois—1106(b)52	Chicago: Eisenhower & Stevenson Connector	unk	1999	no info	3,033,600	0	3,033,600	1,766,400
Illinois—1106(b)53	Chicago: Museum of Science and Industry	unk	1997	1	22,120,000	2,840,000	19,280,000	12,880,000
Illinois—1106(b)54	Chicago: Skyway Bridge	unk	no info	1	8,974,400	74,222	8,900,178	5,225,600
Illinois—1106(b)55	Chicago: Cermak Rd Bridge	no	1996	1	5,814,400	488,927	5,325,473	3,385,600
Illinois—1106(b)57	Chicago: Cicero Ave	yes	1997	2	695,200	0	695,200	404,800
Illinois—1106(b)58	Chicago: 183rd St Reconstr	no	1997	2	948,000	0	948,000	552,000
Illinois—1106(b)59	Chicago: 111th St Reconstr	no	1996	3	1,580,000	337,411	1,242,589	920,000
Illinois—1106(b)6	Chicago: Study for road	unk	no info	1	101,120	0	101,120	58,880
Illinois—1106(b)60	Chicago: 111th St Upgrade	no	1995	14	1,580,000	236,000	1,344,000	920,000
Illinois—1106(b)61	Chicago: 111th St. Widen	no	1996	3	2,970,400	862,990	2,107,410	1,729,600
Illinois—1106(a)56	Chicago: Roosevelt Rd and Bridge (56) Improv	no	no info	1	8,974,400	4,861,264	4,113,136	5,225,600
Illinois—1106(b)16	Calumet Park Ashland Ave Bridge	no	1997	3	1,327,200	196,844	1,130,356	772,800
Illinois—1107(b)102	IL 17: Splear Rd to Rt 1	yes	1996	15	1,137,600	0	1,137,600	662,400
Illinois—1107(b)104	Ford Co: Replace 1.6 US 24	yes	1997	15	1,137,600	0	1,137,600	662,400
Illinois—1107(b)105	Watseka: US 24: Crescent City to IL 1	yes	1996	15	1,580,000	324,795	1,255,205	920,000
Illinois—1107(b)106	Replace Emington Spur Rd	no	1996	15	410,800	0	410,800	239,200
Illinois—1107(b)107	Improve New Lenox Rd	unk	1997	11	1,580,000	176,016	1,403,984	920,000
Illinois—1107(b)108	Improve Shorewood Roadway	unk	1996	11	821,600	0	821,600	478,400

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

[*These balances are subject to change]

State and section No.	Project description	NHS	Est const start	Cong. dist.	Amount available thru FY 1995	Amount obligated (02/24/95)	(*) Unoblig Bal (02/24/95)	New authorization 96-97
Illinois—1107(b)11	Chicago: Computer Mgt System	no	no info	1	2,717,600	1,926,400	791,200	1,582,400
Illinois—1107(b)120	Frankfort Twp: Improve Sts	no	1996	11	632,000	34,778	597,222	368,000
Illinois—1107(b)121	Matteson: I-57 Bridge	no	1996	2	2,275,200	396,723	1,878,477	1,324,800
Illinois—1107(b)122	US 150/IL 1 Belgium to South of Westville	yes	1996	15	2,401,600	0	2,401,600	1,398,400
Illinois—1107(b)123	US 45: Savoy to Tolono	no	1995	15	3,539,200	0	3,539,200	2,060,800
Illinois—1107(b)16	Frankfort: Road Improvements	no	1997	11	821,600	79,440	742,160	478,400
Illinois—1107(b)17	Plainfield: EJ&E Viaduct	yes	1997	13	632,000	0	632,000	368,000
Illinois—1107(b)32	Gallina: EIS on US 20	yes	no info	16	1,264,000	528,000	736,000	736,000
Illinois—1107(b)38	Mendon to West Point Rd: Hwy 336	no	1997	17	3,160,000	1,694,212	1,465,788	1,840,000
Illinois—1107(b)66	Jacksonville Bypass	yes	1997	18	9,985,600	527,153	9,458,447	5,814,400
Illinois—1107(b)95	DuQuoin Hwy Bridge	yes	1996	12	1,643,200	291,834	1,351,366	956,800
Total					117,254,960	18,952,297	98,302,663	68,275,040
Indiana—1104(b)35	Merrillville: Road & Overpass Construction	unk	2000	1	1,137,600	186,724	950,876	662,400
Indiana—1105(f)26	Improve Bloomington to Newberry segment	yes	no info	7, 8, 10	14,978,400	14,978,000	400	8,721,600
Indiana—1106(b)22	ROW Acquisition—West Lake Corridor	unk	1995	1	632,000	195,640	436,360	368,000
Indiana—1106(b)24	Hobart, Lake Station & New Chicago	unk	2000	1	2,717,600	416,320	2,301,280	1,582,400
Indiana—1106(b)62	Muncie: SR 67 Widening	unk	no info	2	6,320,000	0	6,320,000	3,680,000
Indiana—1107(b)97	East Chicago Marinal Access Rd	no	no info	1	5,372,000	2,403,142	2,968,858	3,128,000
Indiana—1108(b)45	Gary: US 12/20 to Lake	unk	1997	1	1,390,400	80,000	1,310,400	809,600
Total					32,548,000	18,259,826	14,288,174	18,952,000
Iowa—1106(a)108	Mason City Bypass	yes	1996	2	9,353,600	3,397,850	5,955,750	5,446,400
Iowa—1107(b)62	Freemont Co: Hwy 2	no	no info	4	5,498,400	0	5,498,400	3,201,600
Total					14,852,000	3,397,850	11,454,150	8,648,000
Kansas—1104(b)29	West Leavenworth Trafficway	no	1997	2	5,435,200	729,600	4,705,600	3,164,800
Kansas—1106(a)21	Lake Porter & LaPort Cos	yes	1996	2	8,279,200	1,140,800	7,138,400	4,820,800
Kansas—1107(b)044	Wichita: Interchange at Oliver St	yes	1997	4	4,171,200	4,171,200	1,214,400	3,643,200
Kansas—1107(b)154	Widen US Rt 81	unk	1995	1	4,424,000	2,942,432	1,481,568	2,576,000
Kansas—1107(b)155	Hutchinson Bypass	unk	2000	1	15,420,800	2,303,000	13,117,800	8,979,200
Total					37,730,400	11,287,032	27,657,768	23,184,000
Kentucky—1104(b)39	Louisville: Waterfront Dev. Roadway	no	no info	3	2,970,400	240,000	2,730,400	1,729,600
Kentucky—1106(a)98	Sount Central: Hwy 92 Study	no	no info	5	63,200	26,400	18,400	36,800
Kentucky—1106(a)99	Improve US 27, Jessamine	no	1995	6	5,814,400	0	5,814,400	3,385,600
Total					8,848,000	266,400	8,563,200	5,152,000
Louisiana—1105(f)21	North-South Corridor State line to Shreveport	yes	1998	4, 5	18,707,200	4,000	18,703,200	10,892,800
Louisiana—1106(a)113	Replace Louisa Bridge	no	1998	3	6,004,000	532,368	5,471,632	3,496,000
Louisiana—1106(a)17	Lake Charles: Access to Rose Bluff Industrial Area	no	1996	7	5,591,200	55,299	2,535,901	1,508,800
Louisiana—1106(a)18	Ambassador Caffery Parkway	no	1997	4, 7	9,416,800	68,000	9,348,800	5,483,200
Louisiana—1106(a)56	Baker: New Road Constr	no	1996	1, 4, 6	1,074,400	80,000	994,400	625,600
Total					37,793,600	739,667	37,053,933	22,006,400
Maine—1104(b)44	Bath-Woolwich: Carlton Bridge	unk	1997	01	6,320,000	2,640,000	1,840,000	3,680,000
Maryland—1107(b)4	Hartford Co: S Hampton Rd Brg	no	1996	02	632,000	0	632,000	368,000
Maryland—1107(b)6	Hartford Co: Watervale Brg	no	1995	02	695,200	0	695,200	404,800
Maryland—1107(b)7	Baltimore Co: Papermill Rd Brg	no	1996	02	3,349,600	0	3,349,600	1,950,400
Total					4,676,800	0	4,676,800	2,723,200
Massachusetts—1104(b)22	Boston: Bike & Ped Path	unk	2000	8	758,400	0	758,400	441,600
Massachusetts—1106(b)30	Lawrence: I-495 Improve	yes	1996	5	2,970,400	0	2,970,400	1,729,000
Total					3,728,800	0	3,728,800	2,171,200
Michigan—1104(b)32	Vienna Twp: I-75/M57	yes	1995	5	5,624,800	132,000	5,492,800	3,275,200
Michigan—1106(a)43	Ottawa: US 131 St Joseph Co	yes	1999	6	316,000	0	316,000	184,000
Michigan—1106(a)45	US 131 Holland, Ottawa Co	yes	1999	2	821,600	379,608	441,992	478,400
Michigan—1107(b)112	US 131 Cadillac to Manton to Traverse City	unk	1996	2	2,654,400	0	2,654,400	1,545,600
Michigan—1107(b)47	Grand Rapids: Connect I-96/I-196	yes	1999	2,3	4,360,800	1,821,600	1,269,600	2,539,200
Michigan—1107(b)54	Flint: Construct, Improve and widened of 5-land Roadway	no	1995	9	316,000	0	316,000	184,000
Michigan—1107(b)55	Flint: 5-lane Roadway Construction	yes	1995	9	568,800	0	568,800	331,200
Michigan—1107(b)89	Traverse City Bypass	no	1999	1	2,844,000	0	2,844,000	1,656,000
Michigan—1108(b)8	Road under Detroit City Airport runway	no	1997	14	2,717,600	0	2,717,600	1,582,400
Total					20,224,000	2,333,208	16,621,192	11,776,000
Minnesota—1105(f)22	Ave of the Saints, St. Paul to St. Louis	yes	1995	1	7,457,600	352,597	7,105,003	4,342,400
Minnesota—1106(a)88	Improve Mankato South Rt	no	1995	2	6,320,000	665,528	5,654,472	3,680,000
Minnesota—1106(a)91	Eden Prairie/Cologne: Twin Cities Corridor	yes	1995	3	5,498,400	380,000	5,118,400	3,201,600
Minnesota—1107(b)128	Hwy 53 Twig to Hwy 37	unk	1995	8	6,004,000	1,699,628	4,304,372	3,496,000
Minnesota—1107(b)129	Hwy 169 Grand Rapids to High City	unk	1995	8	5,688,000	144,000	5,544,000	3,312,000
Minnesota—1107(b)130	Hwy 61 Schoeder to Grand Marais	unk	1995	8	11,376,000	288,000	11,088,000	6,624,000
Minnesota—1107(b)133	Huck Hwy 37 & Hughes Rd	unk	1995	8	316,000	8,000	308,000	184,000
Minnesota—1107(b)159	Nicollet Co: C.A.S.H. 41	unk	1995	2	1,896,000	299,766	1,596,234	1,104,000
Minnesota—1107(b)81	Brooklyn Park: Hwy 610	unk	1997	3	22,752,000	590,072	22,161,928	13,248,000
Total					67,308,000	4,427,591	62,880,409	39,192,000
Mississippi—1104(b)28	Rankin Co: East-Metro Center Access Road	no	no info	3	2,907,200	356,646	2,550,554	1,692,800
Mississippi—1106(a)26	Natchez: Upgrade Hwy 61	yes	no info	4	221,200	0	221,200	128,800
Mississippi—1107(b)85	Pascagoula: Improve US 90	no	no info	5	2,717,600	333,386	2,384,214	1,582,400
Mississippi—1108(b)34	I-20 at Pirate Cove Rd	yes	no info	2	2,148,800	263,608	1,885,192	1,251,200
Mississippi—1108(b)35	Jackson Airport Connectors	no	no info	3	1,959,200	0	1,959,200	1,140,800
Total					9,954,000	953,640	9,000,360	5,796,000
Missouri—1104(b)5	Lindbergh Blvd and I-70 St Louis Lambert Airport	yes	no info	no info	9,353,600	0	9,353,600	5,446,400
Missouri—1105(f)22	Improve Ave of Saints St Paul to St Louis	yes	no info	9	20,270,136	0	20,270,136	11,802,864
Missouri—1105(f)3	Improve North-South Corridor along Hwy 71	unk	1995	7	2,275,200	1,612,800	662,400	1,324,800
Missouri—1107(b)40	Jefferson Co: Widen I-55	yes	2003	3	3,223,200	0	3,223,200	1,876,800
Missouri—1108(b)27	St Louis: Construct multimodal transp. facility	no	no info	no info	3,728,800	0	3,728,800	2,171,200
Missouri—1108(b)42	Kansas City: South River-front Expressway	unk	no info	no info	8,026,400	0	8,026,400	4,673,600
Total					46,877,336	1,612,800	45,264,536	27,295,664
Montana—1107(b)0194	Billings: Construct Shilo-90	unk	1997	1	6,952,000	568,388	6,383,612	4,048,000
Montana—1107(b)0195	Missoula: Construct Missoula Airport/1-90	unk	1997	1	4,424,000	542,127	3,881,873	2,576,000

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

[*These balances are subject to change]

State and section No.	Project description	NHS	Est const start	Cong. dist.	Amount available thru FY 1995	Amount obligated (02/24/95)	(*) Unoblig Bal (02/24/95)	New authorization 96-97
Total					11,376,000	1,110,515	10,265,485	6,624,000
Nebraska—1105(f)17	Improve Heartland Expressway	yes	1995	3	9,353,600	560,000	8,793,600	5,446,400
Nebraska—1106(b)39	Omaha: Improve US6	yes	1997	1	3,286,400	1,372,800	1,913,600	1,913,600
Nebraska—1107(b)50	Springfield: Missouri River Bridge Construct	no	1996	3	2,970,400	0	2,970,400	1,729,600
Total					15,610,400	1,932,800	13,677,600	9,089,600
Nevada—1104(b)9	Las Vegas: Spaghetti Bowl/US95 & I15	yes	1995	1	28,440,000	16,697,491	11,742,509	16,560,000
Nevada—1105(f)20	Improve I-15 & I-40 in CA, AZ, NV	yes	1995	1	10,500,000	3,616,000	6,884,000	0
Total					38,940,000	20,313,491	18,626,509	16,560,000
New Jersey—1103(b)7	Ocean City-Longport Bridge	no	no info	02	11,628,800	513,637	11,115,163	6,771,200
New Jersey—1106(b)34	Middlesex: Widen Rt 1	yes	1996	6,7,13	4,676,800	4,593,746	83,054	2,723,200
New Jersey—1106(b)35	Perth Amboy & Woodbridge Twps: Study River Crossings	yes	no info	06	1,580,000	343,557	1,236,443	920,000
New Jersey—1106(b)37	Parsippany, Troy Hills: Improve I-280	yes	no info	11	1,959,200	432,704	1,526,496	1,140,800
New Jersey—1107(b)125	Paulsboro: New bridge	no	no info	01	1,706,400	0	1,706,400	993,600
New Jersey—1107(b)73	Rt 21 Viaduct "NJ Transit Br" Acquisition	no	1999	10	9,353,600	6,198,608	3,154,992	5,446,400
New Jersey—1107(b)74	Widen Rt 21—Newark	no	1996	10	8,784,800	0	8,784,800	5,115,200
Total					39,689,600	12,082,252	27,607,348	23,110,400
New Mexico—1106(a)93	Clayton: Raton-Clayton Road	no	1995	3	5,877,600	619,910	5,257,690	3,422,400
New York—1104(b)07	Buffalo: Peace Bridge truck inspection facility	no	1998	29	12,324,000	2,773,000	9,551,000	7,176,000
New York—1106(b)48	Long Is: Southern State Pkwy	yes	1998	1,2	2,907,200	0	2,907,200	1,692,800
New York—1104(b)18	Long Island: Van Wyck Expressway	yes	1996	10,12	2,275,200	0	2,275,200	1,324,800
New York—1104(b)38	New York: Williamsburg to Holland Tunnel Bypass	yes	no info	8,12	2,275,200	0	2,275,200	1,324,800
New York—1106(a)4	Oneida: Upgrade Hwy	no	1996	23	5,056,000	1,428,800	3,627,200	2,944,000
New York—1106(a)70	Wayne Co: Improve Rt 104	yes	1997	27	4,044,800	0	4,044,800	2,355,200
New York—1106(a)9	New York: Miller Hwy	yes	2001	8, 15	9,859,200	4,440,398	5,418,802	5,740,800
New York—1106(b)49	Schenectady: Exit 23 Bridge	no	1995	21	3,602,400	0	3,602,400	2,097,600
New York—1106(b)73	Buffalo: Southtowns Connector	no	1999	30	5,372,000	1,008,000	4,364,000	3,128,000
New York—1107(b)163	New York: Ferry landing	unk	1996	8	1,264,000	0	1,264,000	736,000
New York—1107(b)164	New York: Foley Square	unk	no info	8	3,318,000	0	3,318,000	1,932,000
New York—1107(b)165	New York: FDR Drive	unk	no info	15,14	6,320,000	6,320,000	4,480,000	3,680,000
New York—1107(b)200	Binghamton: Study rehab of S Wash. St Brg	unk	no info	26	316,000	158,400	157,600	184,000
New York—1107(b)59	Amherst & Erie Cos: Rt263 & Rt78	yes	1996	27	4,803,200	1,269,414	3,533,786	2,796,800
New York—1108(b)12	Buffalo River/Gateway Tunnel	no	1999	30	12,766,400	1,560,000	11,206,400	7,433,600
New York—1108(b)28	Orange & Rockland: Park & Ride	no	1997	20	2,970,400	392,000	2,578,400	1,729,600
New York—1108(b)32	Intermodal Facility at Mt. Vernon Rail Station	no	no info	19	4,487,200	0	4,487,200	2,612,800
New York—1108(b)33	Orange Co: Stuart Airport Interchange Proj.	yes	1997	19	9,922,400	2,992,000	6,930,400	5,777,600
Total					93,883,600	22,342,012	76,021,588	54,666,400
North Carolina—1106(a)100	U-2519/X-2 Hwys Cumberland	yes	1996	1,7,8	10,048,800	7,123,200	2,925,600	5,851,200
North Dakota—1104(b)12	Bypass around Lincoln State Park	no	1996	1	695,200	496,000	199,200	404,800
North Dakota—1107(b)171	Grading & surfacing Richland Co.	unk	1995	1	379,200	637,600	-258,400	220,800
North Dakota—1107(b)183	Lincoln State Park-Morton Co.	unk	1996	1	2,022,400	80,000	1,942,400	1,177,600
Total					3,096,800	1,213,600	1,883,200	1,803,200
N Hampshire—1106(a)38	Ledyard Bridge reconstruction	no	no info	2	4,929,600	774,827	4,154,773	2,870,400
N Hampshire—1104(b)8	Nashua River Bridge	no	no info	2	758,400	0	758,400	441,600
N Hampshire—1107(b)153	Congression relief North Conway	unk	no info	1	3,981,600	1,700,000	2,281,600	2,318,400
N Hampshire—1106(a)47	Manchester Airport Rd. Improvement	yes	no info	1	2,528,000	370,600	2,157,400	1,472,000
N Hampshire—1106(a)37	Replacement of Winchester Bridge	no	no info	2	505,600	160,000	345,600	294,400
N Hampshire—1107(b)152	Study corridor Rte. 16	unk	no info	no info	1,264,000	896,000	368,000	736,000
Total					13,967,200	3,901,427	10,065,773	8,132,800
Ohio—1104(b)21	Toledo—study 6 corridors	no	no info	9	151,680	0	151,680	88,320
Ohio—1104(b)41	Dayton-Bicycle/ped facility	no	1997	17	1,896,000	0	1,896,000	1,104,000
Ohio—1106(a)1	Improvements Short Creek Hwy	no	no info	18	1,580,000	0	1,580,000	920,000
Ohio—1106(a)19	Rt. 68 Bypass—Clark, Champaign and Logan Counties	yes	1999	7	9,985,600	0	9,985,600	5,814,400
Ohio—1106(a)40	Belmont St. Bridge replacement	no	1998	17	758,400	0	758,400	441,600
Ohio—1106(a)41	Bridge St. Bridge replacement	no	1997	17	758,400	0	758,400	441,600
Ohio—1106(a)42	Niles: Belmont St. Bridge	no	1999	17	1,580,000	800,000	780,000	920,000
Ohio—1106(a)64	Const. interchgs rt.615 at I-90	yes	1996	19	2,970,400	0	2,970,400	1,729,600
Ohio—1106(a)92	Rt 30 Ext: E. Canton/Milerva	yes	no info	16	3,349,600	5,300,000	-1,950,400	1,950,400
Ohio—1106(b)20	Center St. Bridge replacement	unk	1997	17	7,710,400	0	7,710,400	4,489,600
Ohio—1107(b)1	Cadiz to Clarksville-US 250	yes	1998	18	12,640,000	0	12,640,000	7,360,000
Ohio—1107(b)197	Design & const. I-280 Bridge	unk	1997	9	23,384,000	0	23,384,000	13,616,000
Ohio—1107(b)65	US 68 Ohio River Bridge	no	1995	2	9,796,000	0	9,796,000	5,004,000
Ohio—1107(b)70	Brook Park: Access Rd.	no	no info	19	8,974,400	0	8,974,400	5,225,600
Ohio—1107(b)78	Akron: Kelly Ave. extension	no	1999	14	6,004,000	800,000	5,204,000	3,496,000
Ohio—1107(b)99	Rehab. Bridge on US 224	no	1999	17	632,000	250,000	382,000	368,000
Total					92,170,880	7,130,000	85,020,880	53,669,120
Oklahoma—1103(b)1	Bridge on Rt. 59, Delaware	no	1997	2	6,130,400	0	6,130,400	3,569,600
Oklahoma—1107(b)9	Tulsa-Upgrade US 75	yes	1997	1	8,848,000	6,272,000	2,576,000	5,152,000
Total					14,978,400	6,272,000	8,706,400	8,721,600
Oregon—1103(b)2	Ferry St. Bridge, Eugene	yes	1998	4	14,978,400	0	14,978,400	8,721,600
Oregon—1108(b)43	Columbia Slough Bridge	no	1996	3	1,327,200	144,000	1,183,200	772,800
Total					16,305,600	144,000	16,161,600	9,494,400
Pennsylvania—1103 (b)3	Alliquippa Ambridge Bridge Beaver County	no	1997	4	15,800,000	0	15,800,000	9,200,000
Pennsylvania—1104(b)2	Pratt Terminal Bridge, I-95, Philadelphia	no	1998	3	21,804,000	0	21,804,000	12,696,000
Pennsylvania—1104(b)26	Improve Towanda Township	yes	1997	10	5,561,600	0	5,561,600	3,238,400
Pennsylvania—1105(f)1	US 220 High Priority Corridor	yes	1995	5	32,042,400	1,760,000	30,282,400	18,657,600
Pennsylvania—1105(f)6	US 220-Bald Eagle to US 322	yes	1996	5,9	93,536,000	4,560,000	88,976,000	54,464,000
Pennsylvania—1106(a)106	US 222 reconstr. Berks Co.	yes	1999	6	4,171,200	720,000	3,451,200	2,428,800
Pennsylvania—1106(a)116	Carrolltown/Dubois: US 219	yes	2001	9,12	2,528,000	306,671	2,221,329	1,472,000
Pennsylvania—1106(a)68	Dauphin Borough to Speeceville	yes	1996	17	7,584,000	2,534,764	5,049,236	4,416,000
Pennsylvania—1106(a)7	US 219 Johnsonburg Bypass	yes	1996	5	8,848,000	484,065	8,363,935	5,152,000
Pennsylvania—1106(a)75	Climbing Lane Demo - US 15	yes	1995	5	8,721,600	0	8,721,600	5,078,400
Pennsylvania—1106(a)81	US Rt. 219 Meyersdale Bypass	yes	1996	12	30,336,000	8,972,000	21,364,000	17,664,000
Pennsylvania—1106(a)83	Laurel Valley Expressway	no	no info	12	3,160,000	644,000	2,516,000	1,840,000
Pennsylvania—1106(a)96	US Rt. 222, Lehigh Co.	yes	1997	15	948,000	480,000	468,000	552,000
Pennsylvania—1106(a)97	Rt. 33, Northampton Co.	yes	1996	15	10,617,600	5,392,000	5,225,600	6,182,400
Pennsylvania—1106(b)27	Chambersburg: I-81 interchange	yes	1996	9	1,162,880	131,560	1,031,320	677,120

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

[*These balances are subject to change]

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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