

Ballenger  
Barcia  
Barr  
Barrett (NE)  
Barrett (WI)  
Bartlett  
Barton  
Bass  
Bereuter  
Berman  
Bevill  
Bilirakis  
Bishop  
Bliley  
Blute  
Boehner  
Bonilla  
Bonior  
Bono  
Borski  
Boucher  
Brewster  
Browder  
Brown (OH)  
Brownback  
Bryant (TN)  
Bunn  
Bunning  
Burr  
Burton  
Buyer  
Callahan  
Calvert  
Camp  
Canady  
Chabot  
Chambliss  
Chenoweth  
Christensen  
Chrysler  
Clay  
Clement  
Clinger  
Coble  
Coburn  
Collins (GA)  
Collins (MI)  
Combest  
Condit  
Cooley  
Costello  
Cox  
Coyne  
Cramer  
Crapo  
Creameans  
Cubin  
Cunningham  
Danner  
Davis  
de la Garza  
Deal  
DeFazio  
DeLay  
Diaz-Balart  
Dickey  
Dicks  
Dingell  
Dixon  
Dooley  
Doolittle  
Dornan  
Doyle  
Dreier  
Duncan  
Dunn  
Edwards  
Ehlers  
Ehrlich  
Emerson  
English  
Ensign  
Eshoo  
Everett  
Ewing  
Fattah  
Fawell  
Fazio  
Fields (TX)  
Flake  
Flanagan  
Foglietta  
Foley  
Forbes  
Fox  
Franks (CT)  
Franks (NJ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Frisa

Funderburk  
Furse  
Gallegly  
Ganske  
Gekas  
Gephardt  
Geren  
Gilchrest  
Gillmor  
Gonzalez  
Goodlatte  
Goodling  
Goss  
Graham  
Greenwood  
Gutknecht  
Hall (TX)  
Hamilton  
Hancock  
Hansen  
Harman  
Hastert  
Hastings (WA)  
Hayworth  
Hefley  
Hefner  
Heineman  
Herger  
Hilleary  
Hinchee  
Hobson  
Hoekstra  
Hoke  
Holden  
Horn  
Hostettler  
Hoyer  
Hunter  
Hutchinson  
Hyde  
Inglis  
Istook  
Jackson-Lee  
Jefferson  
Johnson (SD)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Johnson, Sam  
Jones  
Kanjorski  
Kaptur  
Kasich  
Kelly  
Kildee  
Kim  
King  
Kingston  
Klug  
Knollenberg  
Kolbe  
LaHood  
Lantos  
Largent  
Latham  
LaTourette  
Laughlin  
Lazio  
Leach  
Levin  
Lewis (CA)  
Lewis (GA)  
Lewis (KY)  
Lightfoot  
Linder  
Lipinski  
Livingston  
LoBiondo  
Lofgren  
Longley  
Lucas  
Manton  
Manzullo  
Martini  
Mascara  
Matsui  
McCarthy  
McCollum  
McCrery  
McDade  
McHale  
McHugh  
McInnis  
McIntosh  
McKeon  
McNulty  
Meek  
Menendez  
Metcalf  
Mfume  
Mica

Miller (CA)  
Miller (FL)  
Minge  
Molinaro  
Mollohan  
Montgomery  
Moorhead  
Moran  
Murtha  
Myers  
Myrick  
Nethercutt  
Neumann  
Ney  
Norwood  
Nussle  
Obey  
Ortiz  
Oxley  
Packard  
Pallone  
Parker  
Paxon  
Payne (NJ)  
Payne (VA)  
Peterson (FL)  
Peterson (MN)  
Pickett  
Pombo  
Pomeroy  
Porter  
Portman  
Poshard  
Pryce  
Quillen  
Quinn  
Radanovich  
Rangel  
Regula  
Richardson  
Rivers  
Roberts  
Roemer  
Rogers  
Rohrabacher  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roth  
Royce  
Rush  
Sabo  
Salmon  
Sanders  
Sanford  
Sawyer  
Saxton  
Scarborough  
Schaefer  
Schiff  
Schumer  
Seastrand  
Sensenbrenner  
Shadegg  
Shays  
Shuster  
Sisisky  
Skeen  
Skelton  
Smith (MI)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Smith (WA)  
Solomon  
Souder  
Spence  
Spratt  
Stearns  
Stenholm  
Stockman  
Stokes  
Stump  
Stupak  
Talent  
Tanner  
Tate  
Tauzin  
Taylor (MS)  
Taylor (NC)  
Tejeda  
Thornberry  
Thornton  
Tiahrt  
Torres  
Torricelli  
Towns  
Traficant  
Visclosky  
Volkmer  
Vucanovich  
Waldholtz

Walker  
Walsh  
Wamp  
Ward  
Watts (OK)  
Weldon (FL)

Weldon (PA)  
Weller  
White  
Whitfield  
Wicker  
Wilson

Wise  
Wolf  
Wynn  
Young (FL)  
Zeliff

## NAYS—104

Abercrombie  
Andrews  
Becerra  
Beilenson  
Bentsen  
Bilbray  
Boehlert  
Brown (CA)  
Brown (FL)  
Bryant (TX)  
Cardin  
Castle  
Chapman  
Clayton  
Clyburn  
Coleman  
Collins (IL)  
Conyers  
Crane  
DeLauro  
Dellums  
Deutsch  
Dotson  
Durbin  
Engel  
Evans  
Farr  
Fields (LA)  
Filner  
Ford  
Fowler  
Frank (MA)  
Frost  
Gejdenson  
Gibbons

Gilman  
Gordon  
Green  
Gunderson  
Gutierrez  
Hall (OH)  
Hastings (FL)  
Hayes  
Hilliard  
Houghton  
Johnson (CT)  
Johnston  
Kennedy (MA)  
Kennedy (RI)  
Kennelly  
Klecza  
Klink  
LaFalce  
Lincoln  
Lowe  
Luther  
Maloney  
Markey  
Martinez  
McDermott  
McKinney  
Meehan  
Meyers  
Mineta  
Mink  
Morella  
Nadler  
Neal  
Oberstar  
Olver

Orton  
Owens  
Pastor  
Pelosi  
Petri  
Rahall  
Ramstad  
Reed  
Reigs  
Rose  
Roukema  
Roybal-Allard  
Schroeder  
Scott  
Serrano  
Shaw  
Skaggs  
Slaughter  
Stark  
Studds  
Thomas  
Thompson  
Torkildsen  
Upton  
Velazquez  
Vento  
Waters  
Watt (NC)  
Waxman  
Williams  
Woolsey  
Wyden  
Yates  
Zimmer

Bateman  
Jacobs  
Moakley

## NOT VOTING—7

Reynolds  
Thurman  
Tucker  
Young (AK)

## □ 1235

Messrs. STARK, OLVER, GORDON, SERRANO, GILMAN, Ms. DELAURO, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Ms. WATERS, and Ms. MCKINNEY changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. COSTELLO and Mr. WISE 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.

PERMISSION FOR SUNDRY COMMITTEES AND THEIR SUBCOMMITTEES TO SIT TODAY DURING 5-MINUTE RULE

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the following committees and their subcommittees be permitted to sit today while the House is meeting in the Committee of the Whole under the 5-minute rule.

Committee on Banking and Financial Services; Committee on International Relations; Committee on National Security; Committee on Small Business; Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure; and Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

It is my understanding that the minority has been consulted and that there is no objection to these requests.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DICKEY). Is there objection to the re-

quest of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object. It is my understanding we have been consulted and that there is no objection from our side, with the exception of the Committee on Resources, and I believe the gentleman from New York has taken them off the list, since there was objection.

Mr. SOLOMON. If the gentleman will yield, their name is removed from the list.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I salute the gentleman for doing that and I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DICKEY). Pursuant to House Resolution 208 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 2127.

## □ 1237

## IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2127) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes, with Mr. WALKER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Under the rule, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] will be recognized for 1 hour and 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER].

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

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, this is obviously a very difficult and contentious bill. It cuts \$6.3 billion from discretionary budget authority of \$67.2 billion, reducing it to \$60.9 billion.

It is a 9-percent overall cut. It is a cut that is necessary to help bring down deficits and bring our budget as quickly as possible into balance.

The cuts range from a high of 15 percent for funding for programs in the Department of Education to cuts in discretionary spending in the Department of Health and Human Services, which is 3.5 percent.

May I suggest to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle that cuts of 9 percent in a bill of this magnitude are not cuts that will cause the sky to fall. They are moderate cuts that allow the departments and agencies and programs under our jurisdiction to contribute to deficit reduction and ensure that we help bring the deficits down and stop asking our children and grandchildren to pay for what we receive.

Mr Chairman, we worked very hard on the bill. We attempted to use intelligence and thoughtfulness in addressing the priorities for spending for our country under our jurisdiction, and we looked very carefully at every single line item starting with the premise that everything in the bill must contribute something to helping us to reduce the deficit.

We asked ourselves, Mr. Chairman, whether a particular program needed to be a Federal responsibility or could it be done better in the private sector or by State government or local government?

We asked ourselves, does the program actually work? In other words, is it actually helping people, or is it simply providing work to the people in the departments either at the State, Federal, or local level?

We asked whether it met a national need, whether the administrative costs were too high in respect to the benefits to be derived.

We asked ourselves, was it duplicative of other programs?

Every single line item was measured against those criteria, and we undertook to reduce the discretionary spending under our jurisdiction and, at the same time, give commitments to national priorities that should be funded at a higher level.

For example, we provided \$11.9 billion to the National Institutes of Health, the NIH research done in teaching institutions across our country as well as intramurally at the NIH facility in Bethesda, Maryland. It provides research to combat disease and injury, helping people to live longer and healthier lives.

On the economic side, the United States leads the world in biomedical research and development. Federally supported biomedical research creates high-skilled jobs for our people and supports the biotechnology industry, which also leads the world in helping to generate a positive balance of trade for our country. The increase for fiscal year 1996 is \$642 million, an increase of 5.7 percent.

We, at the same time, removed numerous earmarks and instructions that placed political considerations ahead of scientific decisions as to the most promising avenues of research. We end earmarking of research funding and leave the funding priorities not to political considerations, but to science.

We increase funding for prevention programs by \$63 million, including funding for childhood immunization,

sexually transmitted diseases, chronic and environmental diseases, breast and cervical cancer screening, and infectious diseases. Programmatic levels are maintained for programs such as the preventive health block grant, the AIDS prevention activities, tuberculosis, lead poisoning and epidemic services.

□ 1245

We increased, Mr. Chairman, funding for the Job Corps program, which will permit the opening of four newly authorized centers, and, Mr. Chairman, we support student assistance very strongly by providing the largest increase in maximum Pell grants in history, and by funding the maximum grant at \$2,440, also the highest level in history.

We provide level funding for Federal supplemental educational opportunities grants, the work study programs and the TRIO program, which we consider a very high priority.

We do terminate 170 programs originally funded in fiscal 1995 at \$4.9 billion. Among those terminated are many of the 163 separate job training programs in the Department of Labor and the Department of Education and over 50 programs in the Department of Education that provide no direct services to students but instead fund research, technical assistance, information dissemination, or demonstration funds.

We terminate Goals 2000, Mr. Chairman, a program that also provides no direct assistance whatsoever to students but instead funds a variety of administrative and planning activities that school districts and States can well do without billions of dollars of Federal funding.

We focus OSHA funds more towards compliance assistance to prevent worker injury and away from enforcement, an after-the-fact solution.

We abolish the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Health with its allocation of 14 deputy assistant secretaries and six special assistants at a grade 15 or above, which the Department itself is in the process of reforming.

We increase assurance that Federal funds are not being used to support the advocacy of public policy. We reduce administrative costs by cutting overall administrative budgets in every single department, program, and agency by 7.5 percent and for congressional and public affairs offices by 10 percent.

Mr. Chairman, for the Department of Labor, we cut discretionary spending by \$1.1 billion, or 11.4 percent. This includes substantial reductions in certain job training programs, including the elimination of funding for the summer jobs programs, also previously rescinded because of their general lack of effectiveness. This decision reflects the need to prioritize programs and reduce spending as well as the fact the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities is in the process of consolidating these same programs.

As I mentioned, Job Corps is increased, one-stop career centers are level funded, Bureau of Labor Statistics is funded almost at level at \$347 million, a reduction of 1.3 percent, OSHA funds are shifted, as I mentioned, and the bill directs more of the Community Service Employment for Older Americans spending to local providers rather than to national contracts.

The bill also contains language to prevent implementation of the President's Executive order on striker replacements and to end pressure on pension funds to invest in economically targeted investments.

For the Department of Health and Human Services, the funding declines by \$1 billion, a 3.5-percent cut.

The bill funds the health centers activities at \$77 million above last year's level, \$756.5 million, and provides an increase of \$116 million for the maternal and child health block grant to \$800 million.

The bill presently folds the family planning program into the community and migrant health programs and the maternal and child health block grant, an idea that I do not support and will oppose when the amendment comes before the floor for our consideration.

We do provide level funding, maintenance funding, for the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention programs support, supporting a broad range of prevention programs and funding many others at last year's level, including the CDC AIDS prevention program.

Funding for breast and cervical cancer screening is increased by 25 percent to \$125 million.

We provide level funding for community service block grants at \$390 million, for child care and development block grants at \$935 million.

For the Ryan White AIDS program, funding is increased by \$23 million to a level of \$656 million, and NIOSH funding, Mr. Chairman, is reduced by 25 percent to \$99 million.

Funding for the Agency of Health Care Policy and Research declines by 21 percent to \$125.5 million.

We provide level funding for the mental health and substance abuse block grants at \$275 million and \$1.23 billion, respectively.

Funding for the LIHEAP program, low-income home energy assistance, is eliminated because the original justification for this program no longer exists and has not existed for many years.

The bill reduces funding for Head Start by \$137 million, or 3.9 percent, from last year's level, and even with this reduction, Head Start is still funded at over \$3.3 billion for fiscal year 1996. We are not at all hostile to Head Start. We are strong supporters of Head Start, but we do believe that it is necessary to send a message to those programs that are not being run properly that the funding will not go on forever without their cleaning up their act and providing the kinds of services

that we expect in a program that is well run.

The bill also changes current law by providing the States with the option of providing Federal Medicaid funds for abortion in cases of rape or incest and prohibits the use of Federal funds to discriminate against medical schools who do not include abortion training as part of their overall Ob/Gyn training and bans embryo research by NIH. I might say, Mr. Chairman, I do not agree with these provisions and will address them when we come into that section of the bill where amendments are being offered.

Mr. Chairman, overall, we have a 9-percent reduction. The largest departmental reduction is at 13 percent; the lowest is at 3.5 percent.

This is a responsible bill that chooses priorities for our country, funds those programs that are essential and working well to help people in our country. It is a bill also that contributes its share to deficit reduction and the need for us to put our fiscal house in order.

Let me say in closing Mr. Chairman, I believe we have done our job in a very thoughtful and responsible manner. I believe that we have made the reductions necessary to contribute to deficit reduction in a way that preserves essential and good programs.

To say that the sky is falling because we have reduced spending in this area is simply to vastly overstate the case. The Federal Government has grown for 40 years. It has grown without any control. It has grown on deficit spending that has raised our national debt to nearly \$5 trillion.

These departments have grown hugely. In the last 10 years alone, the Department of Education has gone from 120 programs to 240 programs, just in the last 10 years. We must get control over this process. We must get back to the core programs that serve people. We must trim the tree. Every once in a while you have to do that, Mr. Chairman. You have to look at all that has grown up and, however worthy it may be, it is very costly to administer. We do not need programs that are very tightly targeted with their own separate staff and administrator. We need to get back to core programs that really help people. That has been the thrust of our thinking in this bill. I think we have done a responsible job.

I commend the bill to all of the Members.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 17 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I have a great deal of respect for the gentleman from Illinois, as he knows. He has worked very hard, and he has dealt with all of us in a very fair way. But he is, frankly, caught in a maelstrom not of his own making. This is not a bill which he would have produced had he been able to control events.

Mr. Chairman, this is the worst appropriation bill that I have seen come

out of the Committee on Appropriations in the 25 years that I have had the privilege to serve the Seventh District of Wisconsin in this House.

Mr. Chairman, the public, in the last election, tried to send us a message. I think what happened in the last election is that working people for more than a decade saw their living standard fall. They have seen costs slowly rise, while their incomes have stood still or even declined in real dollar terms after you adjust for inflation. Young workers see that it takes two workers per family to maintain the same kind of living standards that you could maintain a generation ago with one person in the workplace.

You have what many people call the sandwich generation. They are desperately worried about how to take care of their retired parents at the same time that they are trying to find enough money to send their kids to school. And I think for many years individual Americans have been looking in the mirror when they get up in the morning and saying, "Hey, what am I doing wrong?"

But in the 1990's I think they have come to understand that it is not just them. I think they have come to understand that everybody is being squeezed. And in 1992, President Clinton was elected because I think the public wanted him to pursue a solution to fundamental problems.

In 1994 they were not satisfied with the progress that they thought had been made. They saw a national failure on health care. They saw too much time being devoted to marginal issues, and so they put our Republican friends in charge. And I think what they were hoping was that by doing so, that would force both parties to work together to produce a common agenda on common ground for the common good of the greatest number of people in this country. They wanted us to deliver a dollar's worth of service for a dollar's worth of taxes. They wanted programs that were as well managed as they were well meaning, and I think they wanted us to weed out unnecessary spending and make Government smaller and make Government work better at the same time.

I think they also wanted a war on special interest domination of the Congress and the Government.

Now, certainly I think many of us in the Democratic Party got the message. If we did not, we would have had to be deaf. And I think many of us are willing to work to try to pursue that kind of agenda. But this bill goes far beyond that.

This bill eliminates a number of unnecessary and duplicative programs. I say "good." It makes additional cuts in the name of deficit reduction. Maybe we are not thrilled about that because some of these programs we deeply care about, but we understand it is necessary. But it goes far beyond that and, in doing so, becomes the meanest and the most vicious and extreme attack

on women and kids and workers of any appropriation bill in the postwar era.

It reveals in the process enormous differences between my party and the Republican majority about the priorities that ought to be given to raising the quality of our children's education, to protect the health and dignity of workers, both in the workplace and at the bargaining table, and to provide the skills necessary for workers to compete in a changing world economy. And it shreds the vulnerable and those who are often cruelly neglected in a materialist society.

Next to the fight over Medicare, this bill is the epicenter of what I call the Gingrich counterrevolution. As I said, some of the cuts are necessary to help reduce our Federal spending, but this bill goes far beyond that because the economic game plan, of which this bill is a part, is insisting that we provide, among other things, some very large tax cuts for some very rich people.

If you take a look at what is being prescribed, you understand what I mean. We are being told by our Republican friends that we need to eliminate the corporate minimum tax. This is a list of companies who, from 1982 to 1985, paid no taxes whatsoever, despite the fact that they made one whale of a lot of money. We are going to return to those good old days because our majority party friends want us to eliminate the minimum tax that those corporations have to pay. So we will go back to the good old days when AT&T, DuPont, Boeing, General Dynamics, Pepsico, General Mills, Trans America, Texaco, International Paper, Greyhound, you get the idea, all the way down. You see, those corporations, during the 1982 to 1985 period, made \$59 billion in profits, \$59 billion in profits. Yet in many of those years they escape paying a dime in taxes. We are going to gouge Medicare and gouge programs in this bill to help finance that kind of nonsense.

□ 1300

If we take a look at the Federal Reserve studies which have been done on what happened in the 1980's, this shows who has gotten what and what has happened to the American dream in the 1980's.

The Federal Reserve shows that from the end of World War II to roughly 1979, beginning of 1979, indeed a rising tide did lift all boats in this country, because whether one was in the bottom 20 percent of income in the country, or in the middle, or in the top, everybody's income rose, even after inflation. And so everybody, despite the fact that we had the Vietnam war, despite the fact that we had the race riots after Martin Luther King was killed, this society hung together because everybody was getting a piece of the growing economic pie. But from 1979 through the latest year for which the Federal Reserve has been able to compile statistics we see that, instead of growing together, this country has been growing

apart. I say to my colleagues, If you're in the bottom 20 percent of income, you have lost a bundle since 1979. If you're in the middle, you have lost ground. Only if you're in the top 20 percent of income earners in this country have you done well, and especially the richest 1/2 million families in this country have done exceedingly well because the new Federal Reserve study shows that the richest 1/2 million families in this country, about 1/2 percent of the total family number, have increased their share of national wealth since 1980, the beginning year of the Reagan revolution. They've increased their share of national wealth from 24 percent of the Nation's wealth to 31 percent.

Mr. Chairman, that is a huge expansion of wealth for the wealthiest people in this society who already had a awful lot. The wealth for those few families increased by a greater amount, by almost twice as much as the entire national debt increased during that period. And yet our Republican friends on this side of the aisle think that that is not enough disparity, that is not enough trickle-down which starts by taking care of the needs of people in the top berths.

So they have produced a tax package which has a distribution table roughly this way:

The average tax cut per family from the House tax bill is mighty slim for someone in the bottom 40 percent, or even in the middle of this society, but, oh man, someone in that top 1 percent, \$20,000 in a tax cut. So we are going to chisel on programs for poverty-ridden senior citizens, and we are going to chisel on the aid that we provide local school districts to help educate the most difficult to educate kids in this society in order to provide those folks a \$20,000 tax cut.

Mr. Chairman, that is what is behind this bill, and that is why this bill is so wrong.

If we take a look at what is happening, the biggest cut in this bill is aimed at the aid that we have traditionally provided local school districts, some \$2 1/2 billion. Going to clobber chapter 1. Going to clobber "Drug-Free Schools" that helps schools teach kids to avoid drugs before they get hooked. Going to clobber vocational education. Going to lay it to the School to Work Program which helps non-college-bound kids move out of high school into the world of work and helps them to try to find someplace that will give them a good bit of training to transition into the work force. The main results from that, my colleagues can be assured, will be lower educational quality and higher property taxes.

For the first time in 34 years the Federal Government is not going to make a contribution to the Stafford student loan program. I would bet my colleagues that a good third of the people in this Chamber, if they are 30 years of age or older, used that Stafford program when they went to col-

lege, but now we are going to have an awful lot of folks who have climbed the economic ladder of opportunity pulling that ladder up after them by not making a contribution to that program. Goals 2000 to improve educational quality: bipartisan, started under George Bush, wiped out under this bill.

The next biggest hit comes on the vulnerable, the seniors, the disabled, and the poor kids in this society. In the late 1970's Senator Muskie and I started a program to help low-income people, mostly seniors, pay their fuel bills, heat their houses in the wintertime, cool them in the summertime, because we got awfully tired of seeing senior citizens who had to choose between paying their prescription drugs and keeping their house warm in the winter. So we passed a low-income heating assistance program.

We just had almost 800 people in this country die in a heat wave 3 week ago, and lots of Governors put out press releases saying, "We are going to release emergency money under the Low-Income Heating Assistance Program that the Federal Government has just given us so that we could help people in that situation." Guess what? Under this bill there is not going to be any more funding available to provide that kind of emergency relief because the program is wiped out. Eighty percent of the people who use that program make less than \$10,000 a year, one-third of them are disabled, so that is just another of the grace notes in this bill.

Under this bill we are going to have thousands of students who are learning to teach handicapped kids who are going to lose their scholarships to do that.

Under Healthy Start; it was started by President Bush to attack infant mortality in communities where it is more than twice as high as the national average. That program is going to be cut in half under this bill. Thirty-six thousand babies are going to die in this country this year.

Head Start, which the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] and others will talk about later: 45,000 to 55,000 kids going to be tossed out the window on that program, and we are essentially going to be saying to local school districts, "You find a way to take care of it, kiddo. We're not going to do that anymore."

Both parties talk a grand game on welfare reform, and yet this bill clobbers virtually every program on the books to move people from welfare into work. It clobbers the dislocated worker program, it clobbers adult job training, and it hammers State vocational educational grants.

And what disturbs me more than anything in this bill is the attack it makes, the attack it makes on the protections that workers have a right to expect will remain: protections for worker health, protections for worker safety, protections for their bargaining rights. There are deep cuts in the Labor Department enforcement here

which will make it easier for some corporations to make a profit, no doubt. It will also make it easier for those corporations to violate wage hour laws. It will make it a lot less risky for them to set up bogus pension systems. It will make it a whole lot easier for corporations to abuse workers who try to organize to get better pay. So that is another one of the "grace notes" in this bill.

All in all what this bill is going to do is make it harder for ordinary people to hang on to a middle-class lifestyle, and it is going to make workers more vulnerable to the whims of their employers who want to avoid paying the minimum wage, or the 40-hour week, or rules for fair labor practices, or standards for a safe working environment.

I think what we are regrettably witnessing in this bill—and indeed across the board in this Congress, but especially in this bill—I think we are witnessing a giving up on our efforts to be one people with a common interest and a common cause. We are ceasing to be a country with a large and growing middle class. Instead we are accepting the fact that we are going to have fewer and fewer tickets into the middle class, and we are accepting the fact that we are going to have a level of insecurity for those in the middle class that used to be associated with being poor. We are becoming in my view a society with a very rich people and a great number of people trying desperately to hang on to some semblance of what is left of a middle-class living standard, and not many people in between, and this bill makes all of that worse.

Mr. Chairman, this bill savagely cuts financial support for crucial programs that have been used by millions of Americans to help work themselves up the economic ladder. And the New Centurions who are running this House, I think, after having made it themselves are perfectly willing to pull that ladder up after them, and my response is, "Shame on you, shame on you. You ought to know better."

This bill also contains a number of legislative riders which are slipped into this bill literally in the dead of night because that is when we met, from 9:30 at night until 3 in the morning. And those provisions rip into the protections that we provided workers and working families for decades. We will be offering amendments to try to strip that language out, but we will not be offering amendments to fix this bill financially because this bill is beyond repair because of votes previously already cast in this House which locks this subcommittee into an allocation of resources which will allow this Congress to continue to fund the B-2, for instance, over \$1 billion a plane. That is the cost of the B-2, just one B-2 bomber, and we are buying more than the Pentagon asked for, more than the President asked for, more than the Joint Chiefs of Staff asked for. Just

one of those babies would pay the tuition costs of every single kid at the University of Wisconsin, Madison, for the next 12 years, to put it in perspective.

While we are going to be gutting the programs for the people in this bill, Mr. Chairman, we are going to continue the production, or we are going to begin production, of the F-22 in the Speaker's home State; \$70 billion for that airplane to complete production. That is more than we have got in this entire bill in discretionary spending, for everything that this bill is supposed to do for education, and workers and seniors.

So we will be trying to make people understand, as we go through the amendment process, what is at stake, not inside the beltway, but for people out there in the country, and we will be trying to focus people's attention on the vote on final passage. There are going to be a lot of Members offering amendments, what I call get-off-the-hook amendments, or what I call holy picture amendments to try to pose for holy pictures and look good on a little narrow issue on this bill, hoping then people would not notice that they voted for final passage. The only way to correct the gross injustices in this bill is to vote the bill down, send it back to the committee, insist that the committee redo its budget allocation process so that we do not have to gouge seniors, gouge our future education prospects in order to provide a big tax cut for some of the richest people in this country.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. One of the most profound and thoughtful statements I have ever heard, I say to the gentleman.

I wanted to talk about the gentleman's charts for a moment because I thought they were so ominous. The way I read the gentleman's tax-cut chart, that last one is for the upper 1 percent? Is that correct?

Mr. OBEY. Yep, 1 percent.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. The upper 1 percent, and the reason I thought it was important to point it out is, as I understand the chart before that, it is broken into 20 percent—

Mr. OBEY. That is right.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. So what the gentleman is saying there is while the upper 20 percent had been doing much better, obviously, than the lower 20 percent, with this tax cut we are forgetting even the upper 19 percent of that 20 percent. We are just going for the 1 percent; we are going for the really fattest of the fat cats.

Mr. OBEY. Well, I guess what I would say is we have been told that this bill represents payback time, and I guess when we see this chart, we can see who is getting paid back.

□ 1315

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, let me say about the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] that I appreciate his contributions in working with the majority and the Members on his side who are excellent members of our subcommittee as well. He has contributed throughout the process in marking up and reporting the bill. It has not been easy for any of us, and I appreciate his kind remarks, and I feel that we have worked very well together and have done our best in addressing the difficult problems in the bill.

I might say regarding his chart, the one that shows the quintiles of income for people in the country, that that chart is completely misleading because it deals only with income. Income used to be a very easy quantifiable measure, but the difficulty was that the very times he worries that the income has gone down, we began a process in our country of providing worker benefits through employment health benefits, pension benefits and the like that are not reflected in his chart.

Mr. Chairman, he also ignores Government transfer payments. There is nothing in there that takes account of food stamps, Medicaid and like programs. So the chart measuring only income does not measure the well-being of families at all, and I believe that no one should believe that the chart really reflects the condition of families across this country.

I might say about the tax package, Mr. Chairman, that I agree with what the gentleman said about taxes. We should not be making tax cuts at this time. I did not support the tax cut provisions. I believe we should make tax cuts when we have balanced the budget and not before. A question of timing. I certainly think that they are not appropriate right now, and I might agree also with the gentleman, this is not the time to provide huge funding for the B-2. Even though it is wonderful technology to have, we do have other problems that have to be addressed. I have never supported funding for the B-2 bomber.

Mr. Chairman, let me talk about some of the other things the gentleman has talked about and set the record straight. On Perkins loans, which he called Stafford loans, the Perkins Loan Program is already funded at \$6 billion. Yes, it is true we did not add \$158 million of new capital to that account, but the account is a revolving account with \$6 billion out there. I might say that if every person who borrowed a Perkins loan repaid it, we would never need to add capital to the account except as the number of students rise that might need it. There is a very adequate fund available to students who need help in this country. We have not cut that at all. We simply were not able, in this budgetary environment, to add to it.

We talked about the LIHEAP Program earlier. I would have supported it in 1979 because Federal policy caused

the second Arab oil embargo. It did raise prices unconscionably, and the poor were terribly affected by the fact that heating oil and energy costs generally went through the roof. Today, however, energy costs and heating oil are at historic lows. The Federal policy has long since gone. There is no crisis, and yet the program continues on and on and on.

Do we have needs in this country among the poor? Of course, we do. Is it the Federal responsibility to address every one of those needs? It seems to me it is the responsibility of the utilities and the States which regulate them to handle that problem, as they always did in the past, and not for the Federal Government to create a program that simply is unending. A very expensive program indeed.

The gentleman talked about chapter 1, title I, the program for economically disadvantaged students. It would be wonderful to fund that forever, except for one thing: The program does not work. The very schools that the program sends its money to in the inner cities are failing our students. All the money in the world is not going to change that and it has not changed that.

In fact, the schools are in awful condition. What is going to change it is the very thing my State is doing. If I can say to the gentleman, we have said to the city of Chicago, which has among the poorest public schools in America, end it. Get rid of your board of education, get rid of all your bureaucracy and levels of administration.

We are turning over to the mayor of the city of Chicago the entire responsibility for the schools; and, believe me, the mayor will straighten them out. One of the great problems with school funding in America is that it supports huge bureaucracies that do not help students one whit. All you have to do is look to our major cities and see that that money is money truly down a rat hole. It is not working to help kids.

Healthy Start. Healthy Start is a demonstration program. We support that program. It is going to terminate this year. We did cut the funding for it to terminate it a little earlier, but it is not an ongoing program. It is not any thing other than a demonstration program. We think it works well, and maybe should be reauthorized, but that is not up to the Committee on Appropriations.

Head Start I addressed earlier. Let me say once again we strongly support Head Start, but we do not support sending money into new Head Start programs where it is poorly administered and we are not getting value for the money. That is why we made a very small cut in a program of over \$3 billion that will keep the program going but send a message that we want that money spent well and wisely.

Job training: 163 programs. The gentleman talks about the dislocated

workers program, the displaced workers program, for example. What about it? The Department of Labor, in its own departmental evaluations says that short-term skills training has not been successful in producing earning gains for dislocated workers. Only a minority of displaced workers are likely to enter long-term training if the option is offered to them.

Frankly, Mr. Chairman, the program is not a very good program and should have received and did receive the kinds of cuts that we made in it. We need effective programs that work for people, and the authorizing committee is in the process of reforming that entire area and I think we are going to see that happen.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to take just a minute to thank the members of our subcommittee before I recognize the chairman of the full committee. Again, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], our ranking member. He has done an excellent job, and it is a very difficult assignment for him to have this ranking membership in addition to being the ranking member on the full committee.

We also have five new members of the subcommittee: The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ISTOOK], the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MILLER], the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. DICKEY], the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS], and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WICKER]. All of them have done a wonderful job on our subcommittee and in their work on this bill.

I also want to thank the staff of the Committee on Appropriations, the full committee. They have been extremely helpful to us every step of the way, as they have been to all the subcommittees during this very difficult appropriation season in the House. I would like to remind the Members of the House that this committee has managed the passage and signature of the President of two rescission bills already, including the largest rescission in history just signed by the President. The staff has done an excellent job.

I would like also, Mr. Chairman, to thank the staff of the minority membership, Mike Stephens, who has done an excellent job in representing the minority, and he has worked cooperatively and courteously with all of our staff. Our staff has done wonderful, wonderful work, headed by our clerk, Tony McCann, Bob Knisely, Sue Quantius, Mike Myers, Joanne Orndorff, and Jennifer MacKay. All have done wonderful work. Jennifer is on detail from the Department of Health and Human Services. She has been a very big help to us all year long and we appreciate having her.

Let me take this opportunity, if I may, Mr. Chairman, to thank the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations [Mr. LIVINGSTON]. I cannot think of a tougher job than his job. I do not know when he has time to get even a minimal amount of sleep. He has

played a tremendous role in getting this bill through the subcommittee markup and through the full committee. His help had been invaluable. I want him to know how much all of us appreciate it. He has done a splendid job under very, very difficult circumstances throughout the year, and all the major appropriation bills, hopefully, including this one, will have been passed on our August recess. That accomplishment is a real testimony to the leadership of our chairman and the importance of his excellent staff.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON].

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

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend, the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER], the chairman of the Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education for his very kind remarks and for his outstanding efforts on behalf of this very difficult and complex bill. It was a hard task for him to approach preparing and presenting this bill because he does care so deeply about each and every one of the items that are the subject matter of the bill. He has done a splendid job. This bill meets our budget targets, and I commend him, all of the staff, and all of the members of the committee on both sides of the aisle.

I want to say to my friend, the ranking minority member of the committee and the subcommittee, that I have enjoyed working with him through this very rigorous process. He and I do not agree on every single issue, and, as you will soon hear, certainly not on the issues involving this bill or his last statement, but we have had a good working relationship.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin briefly.

Mr. OBEY. As the gentleman knows, Will Rogers said once that when two people agree on everything, one of them is unnecessary.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I would hope the gentleman has just proved that neither one of us is unnecessary. One of us will win, and I hope it is me.

At any rate, I want to commend him for the way he has handled his business on the subcommittee and on the committee. He is a great Member of Congress. He believes deeply in the institution, and I personally enjoy working with him very much, and would say to the Members that I think he is totally wrong on this bill.

In fact, Mr. Chairman, I think his statement on the floor is a representation, a very good representation, of a very failed and flawed philosophy that has gone dry over the last 60 years. It has ended. Socialism does not work anymore. We now know you cannot reach into the pockets of the taxpayer and expect them to rise up and be

happy about spending money on every neat idea that some legislator happens to come up with, and that is what this bill has come to be. We have never scaled this bill back, and for that reason we now have redundancies and inefficiencies and unnecessary spending, wasteful spending, riddled all through the bill.

I rise, Mr. Chairman, in support of the bill as it has been confected by this subcommittee and hope that the Members will pass the bill on the House floor and send it to the Senate, and, ultimately, to the President. I think it represents a real transformation; a realization that, yes, there has been a revolution of political thought; that we cannot afford every good idea or every neat idea that comes down the pike, and that we can do things differently. We can actually give money to those who need it. We can help people survive without simply throwing money at every idea that tries to address every single problem.

In fact, Mr. Chairman, the debate today goes way beyond this bill. It is really about the legacy that we leave our children, about the contract we signed with the American people last September, and about the mandate that the American voters gave to all of us in November. That mandate is to balance the budget, to end duplication in Federal programs, and to downsize government agencies. To paraphrase the debate earlier in the year on the Republican budget: Why do we need to balance the budget? The chairman of the Federal Reserve, Alan Greenspan, said it best: So that our children will have a higher standard of living than their parents.

Now, Mr. Chairman, how long can we really expect to continue to strap American citizens with a national debt that is approaching \$5 trillion, a debt that equates to over \$18,000 for every man, woman, and child in America? That debt, just like the debt on your credit cards, is gathering interest at a rapid rate. So rapid in fact, that within a year and a half, the interest on the debt that we pay will exceed what we spend on the National defense of this country.

The fact is we have to rein in spending. We have to start saving and economizing. Government spending is not the be-all end-all to all of our problems. We have thrown money for too long at too many problems and gotten too little result. Now we realize if we do not start balancing our books, just like every family in America has to do and every business in America has to do, that this Nation will, like many other nations, go bankrupt.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think that is a legacy we want to leave our children or grandchildren. Even with the Republican budget that balances spending by the year 2002, total Federal spending will continue to grow by hundreds of billions of dollars.

□ 1330

In fact, we would just slow the increase in spending with our budget between now and then to an annual 3 percent growth rate as the economy grows. We are not stopping all spending. We are not even cutting real spending. The Government budget will continue to grow at an annual rate of 3 percent with the bills that we have passed this year.

Under the Republican budget for Medicare that you have heard so much about, it will still increase at an astronomical 6.4 percent a year. Until this and other appropriations bills that have come to the floor this year, nondefense domestic discretionary spending since 1985, according to this President's own fiscal year 1996 budget submission, has increased, even in inflation-adjusted outlay dollars, by 28 percent, grown by 28 percent since 1985.

Means-tested entitlements, those programs over which we have little or no control because they are written into law, and anybody who qualifies gets the money, have increased by 38 percent since 1985. Still, despite what others would have you believe, this is the first annual Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education appropriations bill since 1986 that actually decreases spending from the previous year, and I say for good reason.

It is a follow-up to the reductions we made in the rescissions bill, the \$17 billion rescission bill the President now has, after one veto, finally signed into law. So that was the first step the President called it down payment on a balanced budget. But in this bill, we take that further. Yes; we do eliminate programs and downsize and streamline programs in this bill, because we believe that we can provide assistance to the truly needy without simply having more wasteful, inefficient, redundant, unnecessary, or abusive programs.

We believe that it is not necessary to have 163 programs across 15 departments and agencies doing the same thing in terms of Federal employment training programs or Federal job training. We believe that it is not necessary to have 266 Federal programs across 8 departments and agencies for youth at risk. We believe that it is not necessary to have 80 Federal welfare programs or 167 Federal programs across 16 departments and agencies, according to the GAO, for housing purposes, or 90 programs across 11 departments and agencies doing early childhood programs, or 240 education programs, or at least six different programs funding family planning.

We can hone these down. We can separate these programs, these redundancies and these inefficiencies, and we can have fewer programs with less bureaucracy and still provide probably more money to the people that are really in need. We can do without this wasteful idea of simply raising money from the American taxpayer and throwing it at good ideas.

In this bill, after the cuts that have been described by the gentleman from Wisconsin who preceded me, we still provide \$68.1 billion in discretionary outlay spending for hundreds of domestic programs. We still provide a total of \$278 billion in spending when you include mandatory programs under this committee's jurisdiction.

We provide \$11.9 billion for the National Institutes of Health; \$642 million over last year's level, which represents a 6-percent increase.

We have increased funding for prevention by \$62 million for such programs like breast and cervical cancer, childhood immunization, and infectious diseases. We have provided over \$2.16 billion for the Centers for Disease Control programs, an increase of \$39 million over last year, and \$802 million for the maternal and child health program, which is \$116 million over last year's level.

We increased the Job Corps funding to open four new centers; total spending for Job Corps is \$1.1 billion in this bill. In this bill we provide the largest increase in history for the maximum Pell grant, \$2,440 per individual.

This bill provides new funding of \$6.9 billion for funding for student financial assistance, and combined with the carry-over Pell grant funding, the total is \$7.7 billion for student assistance, an increase of \$103.9 million over last year's level, and they say the sky is falling. We are not giving enough to students.

The bill provides, among other things—here is a good one. We have heard the President, we have heard those in Congress who decry the cuts say the sky is falling, the Sun is rising in the West. Head Start, the one they talk about so much, we are cutting it all the way back from \$3.5 billion to \$3.4 billion; \$3.4 billion will be spent on Head Start alone, up from \$2.2 billion in 1992. And where does that money come from? From the American taxpayer, the generous American taxpayer. The taxpayer that genuinely cares deeply about America's children, is contributing this year, under this bill, \$3.4 billion for Head Start, as well as \$4.3 billion for foster care and adoption assistance, \$2.8 billion for the social services block grant, \$1.2 billion for the substance abuse block grant, \$1 billion for the jobs program, \$934.6 million for child care block grants, \$77 million for the aging programs, or the administration of aging programs, \$428 million for community services block grant, \$357 million for the congregate nutrition services, and \$275.4 million for the mental health block grant. And they say the sky is falling, the world is coming apart because we are not spending enough money on people?

The money comes from the taxpayer. We owe them the responsibility to weed out the waste, the inefficiency, the abuse, the redundancy, the unnecessary spending. That is what we try to do, and we do not neglect our poor, our needy, our elderly, or middle class.

In fact, there has been some talk about those tax benefits. I have another chart, not blown up unfortunately, but here is the Republican tax proposal. People whose income is under \$20,000 get 5 percent of the proposed tax benefit. The people making between \$20,000 and \$30,000 of income get roughly 10 percent of the proposed tax benefit. The people making between \$30,000 and \$40,000 get 15 percent of the benefit. Those making between \$40,000 and \$50,000 get 15 percent of the benefit. If you add all these together and include the people making under \$75,000, all of these people get 65 percent of the tax benefits. For the \$500 child credit proposal, 75 percent of this tax benefit goes to those making under \$75,000 in the aggregate.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I will have to tell you that there has been a lot of hype. There has been a lot of overplay, a lot of scare mongering. People say that this bill should not be adopted because it cuts. It spends a total of \$278 billion for good causes, and that is \$278 billion from the American taxpayer. It is not unfair, it is not unwise, it is not devastating. It is a good bill, it is a critical bill, it should be passed, and I urge its adoption.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3½ minutes.

Mr. Chairman, just very briefly to respond to the previous two gentlemen, I would say first to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER], he suggests that our tax charts are not accurate. Is the gentleman truly suggesting that the middle-class families in this country have done better the last 10 years than the super rich? If he is, I would respectfully suggest somebody is smoking something that is not legal. I do not think anybody else sees it that way.

The gentleman says that the Perkins loan is amply funded. All I can tell you is there are going to be 150,000 students who are not going to be able to be helped by the Perkins loan program this year if we do not make a contribution to it.

The gentleman says in terms of low-income heating assistance, there is no crisis. Good gravy, 600 people died in Chicago just 2 weeks ago because they were overcome by heat. The low-income heating assistance program is the program that is supposed to help folks like that. No crisis?

The gentleman says that because schools are in trouble, we ought to cut back on chapter I. To suggest you ought to cut back on the major program we have to help local school districts educate the toughest to teach kids in their districts, to suggest we ought to cut that back and somehow that is going to improve education performance is, I think, backwards.

The gentleman says that we should not worry about the dislocated worker program; 193,000 fewer workers aren't going to get help on job training after they have lost their jobs, through no fault of their own. Is that the answer America is going to give to the workers

who have fallen victim to programs like NAFTA and GATT? I hope not.

With respect to the gentleman from Louisiana, he recites a great number of small programs that ought to be eliminated. He is beating a dead horse. We have already said 15 times we support the elimination of those programs. Fine.

The gentleman says that this bill is an end to socialism. Well, with all due respect, I do not think helping kids to get an education is socialistic. I do not think helping workers to get job training is socialistic.

I ran into one young woman in the community of Rhinelander in my district, 22 years old, I think she was. She was in school, in a 2-year school. She had a couple of kids. She and her husband split because her husband had beaten the living devil out of her time after time after time. She was homeless for 2 months last year, yet she kept going to school every day trying to make something of her life, and she was using a Perkins loan and other educational help. Is it socialism to help a person like this? Nonsense.

The gentleman says we should stop throwing money at programs. I agree. Why do not you join us in eliminating the B-2 and the F-22? We will save a whole lot more money than we are spending in this bill.

The gentleman says that we are going to provide plenty of money for the truly needy. Here is a list of the truly needy giant corporations in this country who are going to wind up again paying no taxes whatsoever because of the Republican party insistence on eliminating the corporate minimum tax.

The gentleman says you are going to have some benefits to lower income people in the tax bill. Undoubtedly. But they will be table scraps in comparison to the caviar given to the people at the top of the income scale.

The gentleman says we should not worry because this bill is spending \$68 billion in discretionary funds. It is not. It is spending \$62 billion. If it was spending \$68 billion, we would not be having this fight.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I point out, as regretful as that incident was when all those people died because of the heat, not one of them was saved by the existing LIHEAP program which is in full operation today. The LIHEAP program did not do them any good.

Second, the B-2 bomber, a \$13 billion investment, is estimated may end up saving us well over \$640 billion over the long haul because of its payload. This is the weapons system for the future. It really has no place in this debate, because that is talking about the defense of this Nation.

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

Mr. Chairman, with all due respect, it does have a place in this debate, because your allocation gave the Pentagon \$7 billion more than the President asked for. You have cut at least \$7 billion out of this bill. That is the problem.

□ 1345

Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER], a member of the subcommittee.

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

Thomas Jefferson said that the nation that expects to be both free and uneducated expects that which never was and will never be. As a result of that philosophy, America has historically invested in its children, both at the local level, the State level and, yes, at the Federal level as well.

We do so because we believe it is absolutely critical for the success of America's way of life. We believe it is absolutely essential if we are to remain competitive in an increasingly global economy where young people in America are not just in competition with kids from California or Maryland or Florida or Louisiana or Maine or Wisconsin, but are in competition with kids who are educated in Japan, in Germany, in Taiwan, all over the world. Therefore, we have made a commitment to making sure that every one of our children is educated.

The chairman of our committee, Mr. LIVINGSTON, has shown a chart at least 15 times now, I think I have seen it. He loves that chart. It is his Head Start chart. It shows how much money we are spending.

My colleagues, the reason that escalated in 1989, and 1990, and 1991, and 1992 and 1993 is because the Congress and President George Bush agreed, we were not doing enough. The bill was not vetoed. In fact, President Bush suggested increases. What the gentleman from Louisiana did not tell my colleagues is that more than 50 percent of the young people in America eligible for Head Start are falling through the cracks, that we are not investing in the over 50 percent of the young people for whom there are no seats in Head Start.

All of us in this Nation lament the fact that so many young people are falling into lives that are negative, that are going to make them tax takers rather than taxpayers. They will not be positive, participating citizens in our community. We see them on television. And we lament and we get angry, and we say, what is happening?

Government clearly cannot do it all. We have got to have parents do a better job in education. We have got to have our schools doing a better job. But we will not solve the problem by disinvestment. A party that believes in the capital system, in the free market system knows full well if you do not invest your capital, you will not get a return. Bottom line.

Now, I only have 4 minutes. The education budget that is presented by this

bill would be opposed by the ranking member of this subcommittee, the Republican with whom I served for so many years, Silvio Conte. He would not countenance this bill. And Bill Natcher, the former chairman of this subcommittee, I am aware lamentably, is turning over in his grave.

I said earlier at a press conference that Bill Natcher used to say, "If you take care of the health of your people and the education of your children, you will continue to live in the strongest and best nation on the face of the earth."

Now, I am a Democrat. My good friends and colleagues on that side of the aisle could shrug their shoulders, oh, there go the Democrats again. All they want to do is throw money at problems. The States ought to educate people.

My colleagues, let me call to your attention a statement made by Terrel Bell. Most of you will recall this is not a Democrat, this is the Secretary of Education appointed by Ronald Reagan, his first Secretary of Education, when he first came into office, saying that he wanted to have a revolution in this country. Let me tell you what Secretary Bell believes of this budget, not the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], not the gentleman from Maryland, [Mr. HOYER], not the Democratic side of the aisle, but Terrel Bell, the Secretary of Education under Ronald Reagan.

Statement, July 13, 1995: "The drastic and unwarranted education cuts made in Congress by the House Appropriations Subcommittee," this subcommittee, this bill, "must be restored or we will undercut community efforts to help better educate our children." Ronald Reagan's Secretary of Education.

He goes on to stay, Secretary Bell, Secretary of Education under Ronald Reagan, "I hope the rest of Congress will take a different view."

We urge you to reject this bill. that is a different view than the subcommittee and committee took.

Listen, my colleagues, what Terrel Bell says: "The education of our children is too important to fall victim to this attack against education that serves a narrow agenda not supported by those who know and care about education."

He concludes with this: "The American people support educational excellence, not political extremism."

My colleagues, the person calling for the rejection of this bill and opposition to political extremism was Secretary Terrel Bell of the Reagan administration. Reject this bill.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING].

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I would like to pick up on the last couple words that were just mentioned: educational excellence. I want to stand here today to take partial responsibility for the slowing down of the growth

of funding of Head Start and chapter 1. It is based specifically on what the gentleman just said: educational excellence.

That is not what we have been getting in Head Start in many instances. That is not what we have been getting in chapter 1 in many instances. Anything other than educational excellence. And I have crossed this country for 20 years telling these people we want excellence. We do not want to just know how many new people you added. We do not want to know how much more money you spent. We want to know what the results are. And we do not have any studies that show us anything to indicate that \$40 billion in one program and \$20 billion in another program have done great things to improve the lives of those young people and make them productive citizens.

But what has happened every time I have spoken all over this country about insisting on educational excellence? Those who run the programs say, not face to face but behind my back: We do not have to pay any attention to you. We know the Congress of the United States is going to give us more money. We know that every President, it does not matter which side of the aisle they come from, are going to ask for more money, and so we are going to get more money and we do not have to worry about excellence. And what a disadvantage we have done to disadvantaged children in this country in Head Start in many instances and in chapter 1 in many instances.

What we are saying with this slight decrease is, now is the time to step forth and offer programs that are based on quality, that offer programs that will show us that in their third year, fourth year, fifth year of school, they have made dramatic increases and the Head Start has remained. The only studies we have to show that we have moved forward in these areas are in community college towns, where the mentors are college students who are out there doing what we should have been doing in Head Start and what we should have been doing in many of the chapter 1 programs. That is teaching parenting skills and improving the literacy skills of the parents so when the child goes home from a Head Start or a chapter 1 experience, they have someone to help them to improve, not just a couple hours they may be in a school setting.

So I am not ashamed that I am one who has asked us to slow down temporarily these increases until we get the kind of quality that will give disadvantaged students an opportunity to be advantaged. In many instances, that is not happening today.

Very few Members have spoken out, in all of these years of \$40 billion of spending in the one program and \$20 billion in the other. All we have ever heard about is, we need more money because we are not covering enough people; we should be covering more. I have always said, covering them with

what? If you are not covering them with quality, you are doing them a disservice.

So I would hope that we would use those two words, educational excellence, to frame this discussion, not how much money we can spend, not how many people we can cover, but how much we can do to help them get a piece of the American dream. We have not been doing that successfully in many of these programs throughout the United States.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES].

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 2127, the bill establishing fiscal year 1996 appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education. For many years, I have been one of the members of this subcommittee who have put this particular bill together. Until now, I have always taken pride in this bill which our beloved deceased chairman, Bill Natcher used to call the people's bill. This is the first time that I have come to the floor opposing the Labor-HHS-Ed appropriations measure. I oppose H.R. 2127 because of the devastating physical, social, and economic burden it places on the backs of our children, the elderly, and hard working families.

Nevertheless, I want to acknowledge the leadership and fairness of our distinguished subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. JOHN PORTER, as well as the leadership of the distinguished ranking member, Mr. DAVID OBEY of Wisconsin.

The 602(B) allocation for this bill is \$9 billion, or 13 percent, below the fiscal year 1995 allocation. While some of the cuts can be justified, far too many of them will create critical quality of life problems for the people for whom this bill is intended.

Within the Department of Labor account, in overall discretionary programs, funding is cut 24 percent, or \$2.7 billion, below the fiscal year 1995 appropriation level. More specifically, funding for summer jobs is eliminated, denying jobs to over 600,000 young people who need and want to work. The \$446 million cut in the dislocated workers program will deny re-employment services to hundreds of thousands of laid-off workers.

With the Department of Health and Human Services account, funding for the LIHEAP is eliminated. The \$55 million, or over 50 percent cut in the Healthy Start Program means that over 1 million women would be denied critical prenatal health care. Funding for family planning is completely eliminated.

Within the Department of Education account, funding is cut 16 percent, or \$4

billion. The \$1.1 billion cut in title I concentration grants means that more than 1 million educationally disadvantaged students would be deprived of the academic assistance they require in reading and math. Funding for safe and drug free schools is cut by \$266 million, or nearly 60 percent below the current funding level. Critical cuts are also made in funding for Howard and Galaudet Universities.

Drastic cuts are also made in a number of other quality of life programs including congregate meals, services for the homeless, substance abuse and mental health, unemployment insurance, and employment for older Americans. I ask my colleagues to be mindful that this is just a glimpse of the devastation contained in H.R. 2127.

The measure also takes extensive liberties with respect to authorizing legislation. An unbelievable number of authorizing provisions are contained in this appropriations bill—ranging from abolishing the Office of the U.S. Surgeon General, to restricting women's rights, to gagging political advocacy, to denying worker protections.

Mr. Chairman, I can understand and support a balanced approach to addressing our Nation's fiscal difficulties. But, I cannot support balancing the needs of the wealthy on the backs of our children, the elderly, and families. I urge my colleagues to defeat H.R. 2127.

□ 1400

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA].

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Chairman, I would like to engage in a colloquy with the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to express to the gentleman my concern over the defunding of the Office of Emergency Preparedness. As we know, this Office is charged under the Presidential decision document, NSC-39, to coordinate the health and medical response of the Federal Government in support of State and local governments in the aftermath of terrorist acts involving chemical and biological agents. The Office is also responsible for coordinating the Public Health Service interagency plans and activities to prepare for and respond to the consequences of natural disasters and terrorism, with particular emphasis on weapons of mass destruction.

Since 1992, the Office has responded to Hurricane Andrew, the Midwest flood, the Southeast flood, the Northridge earthquake, and the Oklahoma City bombing.

Mr. Chairman, I express this concern with the image of a rescue worker carrying a small child from the wreckage and devastation of the Oklahoma City bombing. No matter how much we wish to put this terrible tragedy behind us, it is indelibly etched in our minds, and serves as a grim part of our country's history. I feel very strongly that this Office should continue its good work.

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

Mrs. MORELLA. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I would tell the gentlewoman that our subcommittee is fully aware of the important work performed by the men and women of the Office of Emergency Preparedness. The subcommittee's action is in no way a devaluing of their efforts and of the need to respond to national emergencies. The subcommittee only removed the Office as a line item in the agency's budget. The Secretary of Health and Human Services still has the discretion to keep this operation functioning if she deems it a priority.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman very much for that clarification. I would also like to engage the chairman in a colloquy with my colleague, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. MORELLA. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. DAVIS. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding to me, Mr. Chairman.

I applaud the leadership of the chairman of the committee and the assistance of the chairman of the Committee on National Security, the gentleman from Florida, BILL YOUNG, in continuing funding for the DOT extramural AIDS program in the Labor-Health and Human Services-Education appropriations bill. As we know, the Army Research and Development Command was originally tasked by Congress in 1996 as lead DOD command for HIV-AIDS research. This research has focused on the practical aspects of screening, prevention, and early-stage treatment affecting military readiness and national security. The Army Medical Corps has a long history of battling infectious diseases that threaten military personnel, and the success of the Army's program has been due largely to the unique character of military life.

Mrs. MORELLA. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I also want to thank the chairman of the committee for so wisely continuing this program. I also want to thank the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG] for his assistance.

Mr. Chairman, it is our understanding that the Army is interested in only focusing research on finding a vaccine for HIV-AIDS. However, with the 10- to 20-year validation period for a suitable vaccine, the importance of maintaining a vigorous research treatment program for those military personnel who are already infected is obvious.

I would ask the chairman of the committee, is it his intention that the \$25 million provided for DOD AIDS research in the bill is to continue the natural history cohort and the domestic clinical studies, including the chemotherapeutic program and the immune reconstitution program?

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentlewoman from Maryland will con-

tinue to yield; yes, it is our intention to fund the continuation costs of the DOD research project. I agree it is an important research and treatment program and should be continued.

Mrs. MORELLA. I thank the gentleman very much for his leadership in this regard and I reiterate my thanks to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG].

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes and 10 seconds to the distinguished gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI], a member of the subcommittee.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I thank our ranking member for yielding time to me, and also for his leadership on this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the bill, with the greatest respect for our colleague, the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER], but I oppose the bill and hope that all of our colleagues will oppose it, because it is fundamentally flawed and must be rewritten.

Mr. Chairman, this is a sad day for the Congress, and, therefore, for the country. It has always been a great privilege to serve on the Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education of the Committee on Appropriations, a place where a bill is developed to provide the funds and directions for America's future.

Others have referenced the gentleman from Kentucky, Mr. Natcher, and, I am sure they will, Mr. Conte, but as Chairman Natcher would always say, "If you educate your children and take care of the health of your people, you will live in the strongest country in the world." Mr. Conte agreed. That definition of strength is one that we should keep before us as we establish budget priorities in this Congress.

Mr. Chairman, our budget should be a statement of our national values, and our national values should measure our strength, not only in our military might, which is very important to our country, but also in the health, education, and well-being, as Mr. Natcher said, of our people.

While there was often controversy over the Hyde amendment, issues like the Hyde amendment, in the past there was no question about the broad bipartisan support for the programs in this bill. For many years, our subcommittee operated on the basis of consensus, without even taking a vote. Both parties worked constructively to fashion a truly bipartisan statement of priorities for these programs. The bill was a unifying factor between our two parties in this Congress.

All that has changed. This bill has become an ideological battleground. It has driven a wedge into this Congress, because it declares war on American workers, it erodes decades of progress for women, it declares war on education, it targets for punishment the most vulnerable people in America.

Some argue that this bill is just part of the pain associated with balancing

the Federal budget. If that is all that was going on here, then the bill would be at least understandable, but this debate is about priorities within the budget limitations, as I mentioned earlier.

Mr. Chairman, while recognizing the need for us to have the strongest possible defense, it is hard to understand why we are moving more than \$5 billion more into the defense and military construction projects, funds that were not even requested. The Republicans have decided to focus the drastic cuts on the Labor-HHS-Education and VA-HUD bills. Even if the defense-related programs were frozen rather than taking the same proportional hit as other bills, we would have about \$4 billion more for this bill, enough to make it a much better bill.

I remind our colleagues that this bill takes a hit of \$10 billion. We go from \$70 billion to \$60 billion. On top of all of this, the Republican leadership is insisting on a tax break for the wealthiest Americans, putting even more pressure on the most defenseless in our population. We want to give more money to defense and take money from the defenseless. I think it is wrong.

I think the bill started out bad, it was a very dark night, as our ranking member, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] mentioned, in the dark of night when this bill came out of subcommittee, then it got even worse as it moved through 3 days of full committee markup. By adopting five amendments which were part of the issues alert of the Christian Coalition, the bill became worse. Those included attempting to gag public interest advocacy, limiting further a woman's right to choose, prohibiting human embryo research, interfering with the private sector's accreditation of graduate medical education, and eliminating, if Members can imagine this, Mr. Chairman, title X, family planning. In doing that, the majority has made a bad bill terrible.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote against this most unfortunate legislation.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4½ minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY].

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to say at the outset that I have great respect for the chairman of the committee, and we have worked together on many of the issues in this bill, and also, of course, for the ranking minority on this committee. I understand the terrible choices that our chairman and our ranking minority had to face with us, because this bill, the bill that really reflects the priorities of this Nation, was cut \$10 billion. Therefore, although I am rising in strong opposition to the bill, it has no reflection on the chairman's commitment to some of the issues we face.

Mr. Chairman, this piece of legislation has always been called the people's bill, but today the people will find

out whether Congress truly understands their needs and the needs of their families. They will find out how serious we are about making investments in our most precious resource, our children. The people of this Nation will learn whether it matters to Congress if elderly Americans have the means to heat their homes in the winter and cool them in the 100-degree summer heat, or we are going to just stand by when elderly people lose their lives; 100, 200, 300, 400, 500. These are people, real people with families. They will discover if we are truly committed to giving young people with little hope and laid-off workers with few opportunities the means to find a job.

Today the American people will find out whether Congress is willing to disregard our children and make unprecedented cuts in education, cuts which will deprive local schools of billions of dollars and hardworking college students of the aid they need to have a shot at the American dream.

Mr. Chairman, as a mother of three and a former PTA president, I can tell the Members that this bill will have a devastating impact on America's children and our community schools. Let us not make any mistake about it, this bill will lead to increased local property taxes, because our mothers, our parents, will not stand for their children not having the best education they can. Therefore, if we cut, guess where it is going to come from? Cut here, pay at the other end.

We will also vote on whether to force poor women who are the victims of rape and incest to carry those pregnancies to term. We will vote to eliminate an unprecedented intrusion in this bill into medical school curriculum which will endanger the health of women. We will have an opportunity to restore critically needed family planning funds.

It is shameful, and I am embarrassed to serve on this committee where I was once so proud, to be at a place in history where we are zeroing out family planning funds. Make no mistake about it, that is exactly what is happening in this bill. Members are going to hear all kinds of alibis, but we are zeroing out family planning funds.

Yes, I am pleased that the increases at the NIH were not on the Christian Coalition agenda. I am pleased that important investments, investments in breast cancer research will continue. I am pleased that the CDC breast and cervical cancer screening program is still alive. But this bill takes women backward. The GOP leadership has proudly touted its plan to reduce the deficit.

Today we are seeing, Mr. Chairman, we are seeing what that plan will mean, what GOP priorities really are. This bill cuts spending, but it does it on the backs of average Americans and on the backs of the Nation's most vulnerable citizens. These cuts in education, training, student loans, low-income energy assistance, are being

made to finance the Republicans' proposal to provide a tax cut for the most privileged, and to build new weapons that the Pentagon did not even ask for.

As I sat in committee and subcommittee, Mr. Chairman, two things were very clear: first, this bill was deeply flawed from the start, because it was a direct outgrowth of mixed-up Republican budget priorities. We need to go back to scratch. We need to fix this bill.

Then the bill was made even worse as the Christian Coalition sent their legislative language and had everyone dutifully follow it, passed that legislative language, passed that special interest language that hurts workers and flies in the face of basic constitutional rights.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot support this bill. Let us send it back and do it right.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to one of the new and very able members of our subcommittee, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MILLER].

□ 1415

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to put this bill in its proper context. The 104th Congress is in the midst of the most important debate about America's domestic future since the New Deal. The debate is not about accounting numbers and line items, although that is what much of the public will hear in this debate. In fact, at its core, the debate is about what kind of America we want to be in the 21st century.

Mr. Chairman, America is at a crossroads. As we close the 20th century, we are faced with one great battle. The American people have defeated fascism and communism and spread democracy around the world. Now we are faced with the threat of the national debt. The challenge is to leave our children a legacy of both peace and prosperity. We must ensure that the American dream lives on. An America that enters the 21st century free from deficits will be a strong America that has resources to meet its obligations for Social Security and Medicare and to the American taxpayer. That is what this debate is about. We are making the tough choices to start on a glide path to a balanced budget.

The most obscene thing we have done in this Congress is to build up these horrendous deficits and the national debt. Let me put in perspective what this is. The national debt is \$4.9 trillion. Now, if you divide that by the population of the United States, that amounts to \$18,800 for every man, woman, and child in the United States; \$18,800 for every man, woman, and child.

We have a Congresswoman on the Republican side who is going to have a baby next year. When that child is born, that child immediately inherits an \$18,800 debt. My wife and I, we have two children. For a family of four, that means I have a \$75,000 debt that the

Federal Government has spent that I have inherited. The interest on that debt amounts to \$5,264 a year. It takes \$439 a month for my family to pay for the interest on the national debt.

Mr. Chairman, next year, and in 2 years, we are going to spend more money on interest on the national debt than we do for the entire national defense. That is insane, and it makes no sense. And that is what the real debate is about today, is the fact that we have a debt that we need to clear up and move to some fiscal sanity in our process.

Mr. Chairman, solving this process does not mean 7 years of pain and sacrifice. Far from it. If we can balance the budget in 7 years, Alan Greenspan says, that will lead to a 2-percent reduction in interest rates. Let me explain what a 2-percent reduction in interest rates might mean.

For a family having a \$75,000 mortgage, if they refinance it or get a new home, that is \$100 a month less that they have to spend on that \$75,000 mortgage. For small business, that is going to give an incentive for them to invest more, to create jobs, and to improve our economy.

By balancing this budget and moving on that glide path, we are going to stimulate the economy and help restore the American dream. We need to stop spending more money here in Washington.

Mr. Chairman, in 1950, the average American family spent 5 percent of their wages in Federal taxes. Now we are spending 24 percent to send to Washington for a bloated Federal Government. Unless we cut spending and eliminate the deficit, the tax burden will continue to grow.

Mr. Chairman, the President has offered an alternative vision of America in the 21st century: \$200 billion deficits as far as the eye can see. He says the problem is to big and we just cannot deal with it right now. Now, not only is that a defeatist attitude, it is counterproductive. The job of balancing the budget does not magically get easier a decade from now. In fact, it grows exponentially more difficult.

First of all, the more debt we build up, the more interest rates payments will grow. In other words, we lock in more and more spending. But more importantly, starting in the year 2008, the first of the baby boom generation begins to retire, and the costs of Social Security and the Medicare programs explode. How can we justify putting off the day of reckoning on this budget?

Mr. Chairman, I believe this is a moral issue. We all know the challenge we face. The facts are the facts. We have a moral obligation to meet this challenge now, and we know the problem becomes virtually insurmountable in 10 to 15 years. If we fail, we will have failed the test of our time.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is fair, and spent \$60 billion on some of the most important programs in the Federal Government. The cruelest thing we can

do for the young people today and for future generations is keep building up the debt. We must get this deficit under control and get our fiscal house in order. This bill makes a significant down payment on a balanced budget. It is some of the tough choices we are going to have to make in the appropriations process. That is the most important issue we are facing, balancing the national debt, and the moral and economic imperative of our time, and this bill meets that challenge.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLAY], the ranking member of the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities.

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

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to condemn this bill as the meanest, most vicious, most inhumane appropriations bill I have seen during my long career in the Congress. I implore my colleagues, on both sides of the aisle, to reject this cruel legislation and send it back to the Appropriations Committee with an instruction to produce a much more compassionate and fair-minded bill.

Mr. Chairman, once there was a time, when Democrats and Republicans worked together to expand access to education. Once there was a time when Democrats and Republicans supported efforts to help children raised in poor communities get a head start in life. Once there was a time when Democrats and Republicans believed that the role of Government was to protect the weak—from unsafe working conditions, oppressive employers, and dishonest pension managers.

That time has passed. To the Republican leadership in this House, people do not matter, profits do. To the Republican leadership, the role of Government now is to enhance the privileged and the powerful at the expense of the poor.

Mr. Chairman, the corporations and individuals unfairly enriched by this bill read like Who's Who among Fortune 500. The Republicans all but placed an ad in the Wall Street Journal that reads: "This House is for sale! And, if you've got a gripe with OSHA let the Republicans know; they'll gut funding for OSHA inspectors and render the agency impotent."

The Republicans are now abusing the appropriations process to carry out the political agenda of the radical right. This bill is polluted with the legislative wish list of the Christian Coalition. Through massive, unconscionable cuts in education, public education is being seriously crippled. These cuts support the thinking of religious extremists. Ralph Reed of the Christian Coalition has said "We should defederalize education policy. \* \* \* Our top legislative priority at the Christian Coalition is to abolish the Department of Education." And, Jerry Falwell said re-

cently "I hope to see the day when \* \* \* we won't have any public schools. The churches will have taken them over again and Christians will be running them. What a happy day that will be." These cuts in this bill will have Falwell dancing in his pulpit.

Mr. Chairman, provisions in the bill reflect promotion of a sinister, cynical agenda that is out of sync with mainstream Americans. In the middle of the night, Republicans rammed through crippling revisions in job safety, pension, and labor laws. They turned the appropriations process into a half-way house for those unscrupulous business people who would criminally expose their work force to unsafe and unhealthy working conditions.

Mr. Chairman, this is a critical time in our Nation's history, a time to better equip our Nation to compete in the world economy; a time to expand, not cut, job training opportunities for displaced workers; a time to expand, not cut, Head Start; a time to expand, not cut, college financial aid. This is no time to destroy the bridges to prosperity and opportunity.

Mr. Chairman, in the final analysis this bill is so bad it is beyond repair, and I urge my colleagues to vote against it.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO].

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this legislation which attacks children, seniors and working families to pay for a tax cut for the wealthy. I call it the American Dream Destruction Act.

The American Dream promises our people that if you work hard, if you play by the rules, this country will provide you with opportunity and with security. This bill betrays that promise. It betrays the promise of educational opportunity by cutting funding for education, from Head Start to safe and drug-free schools. It betrays the promise of opportunity for our workers by cutting crucial health and safety protections that help them on their job, and by cutting retraining, and that help could be provided to them if they lose that job.

This bill also betrays the promise of security for our seniors by cutting energy assistance and nutrition programs that help seniors to pay for their heating bills and to stay healthy.

Mr. Chairman, my colleagues from across the aisle say that they are only making these cuts to balance the budget. They would like you to believe that this is a shared sacrifice with a noble purpose. But folks, this is not a shared sacrifice, and there is nothing noble in asking our most vulnerable citizens to pay for a tax break for the wealthiest citizens. There is nothing noble in that. It is amoral.

The American people want us to cut waste, but unneeded tax subsidies to giant corporations are wasteful. Taxpayer-funded advertising for multi-

national corporations is waste. Special tax loopholes for billionaire expatriates are waste. The Republican leaders in this House can never seem to find waste in any program that helps their wealthy campaign contributors; they can only find waste in programs that help the working families of this Nation.

Mr. Chairman, balancing the budget is about making choices. This bill makes bad choices, choices that will hurt children, hurt seniors, and hurt working families, all to fund a tax cut to the wealthiest Americans. Vote against this bill.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to our colleague, the very able gentleman from Texas [Mr. BONILLA].

Mr. BONILLA. I thank the chairman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] has done so much work on this bill and has produced a bill that I am strongly supporting. This is a proud day for America, to be able to take one appropriations bill, cut \$9 billion out of it, and still preserve good programs in this country, like Head Start, community and migrant health care centers, TRIO, and programs like the National Institutes of Health. Imagine that.

We are hearing a lot of Members come forward today with the same old song and dance that we have cut education to give a tax cut to the rich. Other days before today we have heard them say that we are trying to help the military to provide tax cuts at the expense of the poor, and we are providing tax cuts for the rich to cut volunteers in the park. You name it, everything is being tagged for the same reason, and we all know that this is not true. These are all lies that are just continuously spread to try to stop the agenda that the American people want us to move forward.

So instead, let us talk about the truth. In the dark of the night, there was an attempted midnight massacre by the opposition when Member after Member offered amendments to cut Medicaid for poor States. However, today, when the cameras are on and the lights are shining and C-SPAN is broadcasting, there will not be a single Member to come forward and offer an amendment like that to see what really happened as this bill was being drafted. Why is this happening? Because they are afraid that the American people may see them saying one thing and doing another, and really discover the truth about what is going on around here.

Mr. Chairman, this bill makes tough choices. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER], the chairman of the subcommittee, has brought this House a bill which reflects responsive and thoughtful decisions to support national priorities, not parochial priorities, and to reduce the deficit by cutting lower priority and duplicative programs.

Mr. Chairman, no matter how you slice this bill, we have over \$60 billion

of discretionary spending in this bill. For some Members, it is never enough. If Members want to take pot shots at this bill, go right ahead. We do not claim to be perfect. We know that adjustments can be made to improve on what we are doing. But we are trying the best we can as a Republican majority to make the tough choices necessary that the American people are calling for.

Mr. Chairman, with over \$60 billion in discretionary spending, let me give you two examples of how much \$1 billion is. One billion seconds ago this country was in the middle of the Bay of Pigs. One billion minutes ago the world went from BC to AD on a calendar. In this bill we have over 60 of those billions. Again, for some Members, that is not enough; it is never enough.

If Members would not support a rescissions bill that cut only 1 percent of Federal spending this year that we proposed earlier this year, I do not anticipate support from Members when we want to cut 13 percent out of a spending bill. If Members would not support a rescissions bill that restored some fiscal sanity, they will not support a bill that tries to cut and consolidate 163 Federal employment training programs, 266 Federal youth at-risk programs, 90 Federal early childhood programs, 340 Federal families and children's programs, and 86 Federal teachers training programs.

□ 1430

How much is enough? It is never enough for the opposition.

I guess the dollar figure like that is whatever it takes to bow down to those special interest liberal groups.

Members will make all kinds of complaints against this bill, some based on facts and some are not based on facts. Either way, I am reminded of the old saying that says, "It takes a carpenter to build a barn, but just one jackass can knock it down."

There is a new way of thinking in Congress. After 40 years of the same old "throw money at the problem and pose for holy pictures," let us have just 1 year to try it our way. What do my colleagues say? Give us a chance to do it one year our way and see what happens.

The President made a statement last week saying that he would not allow our people to be sacrificed for the sake of political ideology. I agree with him. Our people are the taxpayers of this country that sent us here last November to get our fiscal house in order.

We must reject those who are slaves to the National Education Association, slaves to the American Bar Association, and other special interest groups, and others who always want more money, more money, more money, more money, without ever spending their own money.

So, Mr. Chairman, if my colleagues favor this new philosophy that we are bringing forth, I ask them to please support this bill. It is a good bill. It is

a bill that is the result of many tough decisions.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman I yield myself this time to answer the nonsense that I just heard from the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BONILLA]. The gentleman from Texas is objecting to the fact that we are not offering the amendments on the House floor that we offered in the subcommittee. The answer is, we cannot do that because the rules of the House prevent that kind of en bloc transfer.

I would be happy to do that if the gentleman wanted to vote on them, but he does not want to. I do not blame the gentleman for being sensitive on the issue of surplus Medicaid compensation in some States.

To correct the gentleman, we did not cut Medicare. What we tried to do is take into account the fact that my State winds up getting from the Feds only 55 cents out of every dollar for the cost of dealing with a Medicaid patient. Texas only gets from the Federal Government 64 cents out of every dollar for the cost of dealing with a Medicaid patient, but the State of Louisiana gets 75 cents out of every dollar.

The gentleman from Texas consistently, in the subcommittee, voted to take money out of his own State of Texas and give it to Louisiana, because he voted against amendment after amendment to try to equalize the formula between States.

So, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman voluntarily, in his own committee, voted to give away from the State of Texas \$66 million for summer jobs. He voted to take away \$21 million from Texas for dislocated worker training. He voted to take away \$29 million under Goals 2000. He voted to take away almost \$100 million from Texas under title I, because he insisted on seeing to it that it kept going to States like Louisiana. I do not blame the gentleman for being sensitive on that issue.

I would also make one additional point. He said "Let us have it our way for a year." The reason we have gotten in this debt is because Ronald Reagan came into office and told us if we just passed his budget in 1981, that in 4 years we could cut taxes, we could double military spending, and still balance the budget.

Mr. Chairman, this chart demonstrates the promise versus what happened. These bars demonstrate that in 1981, President Reagan said: Pass our package, the deficit will go down from what was then \$55 billion to zero over 4 years' time.

Guess what? The Congress did it the gentleman's way. The Congress swallowed the Reagan budget and guess what. We only missed the deficit target by \$185 billion, because under the policies rammed through this place by the party of the gentleman from Texas,

with 29 or so misguided souls on my side of the aisle mistakenly joining them, the deficit went from \$55 billion not to zero, as Ronald Reagan promised, but to \$185 billion.

Mr. Chairman, If the gentleman from Texas cannot get his story straight about what happened in subcommittee, he should at least get history straight.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK].

(Mrs. MINK of Hawaii asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong opposition to the Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education appropriation. This bill demonstrates the most significant difference between the Democrats and the Republicans. We seek to invest in the people of this Nation, they seek to destroy that investment, not only through elimination and cutting of programs, which this bill does with unmeasured precedent, but by using this bill to push through their legislative agenda to weaken the rights of workers, women, and the most vulnerable in our Nation. Never before have we seen such a systematic abuse of the legislative process in order to get the agenda of the majority passed.

At every turn this bill attacks long-held rights and protections for people in this country including provisions which weaken the rights of workers, takes away first-amendment rights of the people who work through nonprofit agencies, eliminates reproductive rights for low-income women, even if they were raped or a victim of incest, and weakens enforcement of equity for women in intercollegiate sports.

A legislative rider in this bill attempts to weaken the enforcement of title IX of the Education Act Amendment of 1972. Title IX is the law which prohibits sex discrimination in federally funded educational institutions. As one of the coauthors of this legislation I am proud of title IX and its success in protecting equal rights for women in education and in increasing intercollegiate athletic opportunities for women. I am deeply disturbed that the Appropriations Committee would allow a provision in their bill which circumvents the legislative process, and is clearly intended to weaken the enforcement of title IX.

The rider prohibits the Department of Education Office of Civil Rights from enforcing title IX after December 31, 1995, unless the Department has issued objective policy guidance on complying with title IX in the area of intercollegiate sports.

While on its face this provision may seem harmless—a simple request for clarification on how to comply with title IX—do not be fooled. This provision pushed by opponents of title IX is clearly an attempt to force the Office of Civil Rights to weaken its enforcement standards, because of a misperception that men's sports are being hurt by overly aggressive enforcement of title IX.

This is simply not true. Since the passage of title IX, for every new dollar spent on women's sports, two new dollars have been spent on men's sports. The standards schools must meet under title IX are minimal. A school simply has to show that it is improving its women athletic program or that it is meeting the needs and abilities of its women students in order to be in compliance with the law. I would argue that these standards are far too lenient.

The Department of Education opposes this language because it is unnecessary and micromanaging the Department, the NCAA does not like this language, colleges and universities think this language goes too far, and most importantly the women of America do not want this language because they know it is an attempt to turn back the progress we have made toward equity in intercollegiate sports.

In addition to title IX, this bill is also used to eliminate other rights for women—reproductive rights. Legislative language prohibits Medicaid from paying for abortions for low-income women, even women who have been raped or victims of incest. This provision denies women their constitutional right to reproductive freedom.

The bill also attacks workers rights. Limitations on the National Labor Relations Board's enforcement mechanisms in resolving a labor dispute means that companies can continue to commit unfair labor practices including firing of workers, strong arm tactics to influence the outcome of the dispute, efforts to prevent employees from organizing a union or issue illegal bargaining demands, while NLRB is reviewing a case.

The bill prohibits the enforcement of a child labor law which protects children under 18 from injury and death from cardboard and paper balers and halts efforts to protect the health of workers who work with computers and other office machinery by prohibiting the implementation of OSHA's ergonomics standards.

Prohibition of the Executive order on striker replacement is simply a slap in the face to the workers of this Nation. It is a clear indication that the majority party does not believe in workers' right to organize and fight for their rights through a union.

I am alarmed by the inclusion in this appropriations bill of 12 pages which strip away individual rights guaranteed to each and every one of us to petition our government for any reason whatsoever. Title VI of this bill states that you cannot get any Federal funds if you participate in political advocacy.

This bill if passed would prohibit any person who received a Federal grant under any law, not just this act, from speaking out on any matter relating to laws whether, State, Federal, or local. The prohibition against political advocacy which includes attempts to influence legislation or agency action explicitly prohibits communication with legislators and their staffs. The definition of "grantee" includes the entire membership of the organization who are explicitly prohibited from communicating with legislators or urging others to do so.

This bill disqualifies anyone from receiving a Federal grant if for 5 previous years it used funds in excess of the allowed threshold.

Further anyone receiving Federal grant money cannot spend it on the purchase of goods and services from anyone who in the previous year spent money on political advocacy in excess of the allowed limit.

Political activity is defined as including publishing and distributing statements in any political campaign, or any judicial litigation in which Federal, State, or local governments are parties, or contributing funds to any organization whose expenses in political advocacy exceeded 15 percent of its total expenditures.

This title of the bill is totally and completely unconstitutional. It is a blatant unlawful effort to stifle dissent and advocacy. It is contrary to basic principles of our democracy. It is a gag law. It must be defeated.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ISTOOK], another able member of our subcommittee.

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Chairman, the public is demanding that the Congress reduce Federal spending. The message from the elections was clear, the constant messages we receive from our constituents are clear; they are demanding that we do so. They realize that we have built a gigantic Government bureaucracy of social programs and Government handouts that are cruel. They are cruel because they are killers of initiative, killers of self-reliance, and destroyers of the family.

Do the American people lack compassion because they want to bring down the size of Government? Of course not. Do Members of Congress, whether they be on this side of the aisle or on that side of the aisle, lack compassion because they see the necessity to reduce Government spending and to do it in social programs? Of course not.

Mr. Chairman, we all prove our individual compassion by what we do with our own time, our own efforts and our individual dollars. We do not prove we have compassion by reaching into the wallets of the American taxpayers and extracting, under force of law through the tax system, more and more money. That proves that we believe in taking from other people, not that we have personal compassion.

Compassion is measured by what we do individually and what we help people to be able to do for themselves, not with the Government programs that destroy initiative, that have brought down this country, that have generated the national debt that will be the ruin of the next generation of our children and our grandchildren, if we do not bring spending under control and do it now.

Mr. Chairman, this bill, compared to the task before us, is easy. The spending reductions in this bill are about \$6.5 billion below what was spent last year and about \$10 or \$11 billion below what the President wanted to spend. But even after the reductions are made, the budget will still be almost \$200 billion out of balance in the next fiscal year.

Even after these cuts that some people think will make the sky fall, it is still going to take years and years of effort to be able to meet our target of balancing the budget by the year 2002.

Mr. Chairman, any Member who thinks that this bill contains tough decisions should not come back for an-

other term in the next few years, because the decisions will only get tougher. It is a choice: Cut spending now or visit ruin upon our children with a bankrupt Federal Government and a Federal Government that, according to figures released by the Clinton administration, would insist upon taking 83 cents out of every dollar that our children make in their future, over their lifetimes, in the amount of taxes they have to pay if we do not get spending under control, if we do not balance the budget.

The overall spending reductions in this bill, Mr. Chairman, are only 11 percent. Yet, we are told it will be the ruin of American civilization. That is hogwash, and people know it.

What my colleagues on the other side of the aisle want is a system of more personal dependency upon Government bureaucracy. I disagree with them on that. I believe the American people disagree with them.

I applaud what the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] has done on this. The gentleman has things in this bill that frankly he does not want to do. The gentleman has programs that he likes, that he thinks are good programs. Yet, for the good of the entire country, he has been willing to put them forward to reduce and even zero out programs that he individually likes because he recognizes the scale of the problem. I applaud the fashion which the gentleman from Illinois has handled it, the fairness to all sides on the issues.

I applaud the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], chairman of the full committee, and I note, for the benefit of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], the very charts that he has had published in the report show that the State of Louisiana will have almost \$100 million less coming to it in Federal spending under the bill already. In fact, if my rough figures are correct, I believe Louisiana takes a greater dollar hit than the State of Wisconsin does under this bill.

Mr. Chairman, that is not the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations trying to protect people back home; it is the chairman working for the common good of the entire country, and I applaud those efforts.

It is tough, but it is going to get tougher. This bill is important toward balancing the budget, toward correcting mistakes that have been made in the growth of the Federal bureaucracy and the duplication.

Mr. Chairman, I certainly urge support of this entire bill.

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

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

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. Chairman, first of all, President Clinton 2 weeks ago said that he would veto this bill because the Republicans have approved \$36 billion in cuts in education and

training over 7 years. In contrast, the President's proposal balances the budget while increasing investment in education and training by \$40 billion over that same 7 years.

In my State of Texas, Republican cuts of \$2.5 billion will harm working families. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ISTOOK] used the term "hog-wash." I agree with him.

Statements of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations seem to indicate that he believes that the philosophy here is one of socialism, if we do not do what the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ISTOOK] and the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] say we need to do.

Second, the gentleman from Pennsylvania stands up and says we need educational excellence, and the gentleman speaks all over the country about it.

□ 1445

We ought to start putting our money where our mouth is. We are told in this bill we are going to downsize and streamline. What did you do to Goals 2000? Eliminated it.

Ask the Governors around the country, both Republican and Democrat, whether or not they think that is a good idea. They do not think it is a good idea. In fact, they consider it one of the dumbest things they have seen in a long time.

Let me tell you what else you did. You took 1,043 out of 1,053 school districts in my State of Texas that we have been using a program called Safe and Drug Free Schools to prevent crime, violence, and drugs, to keep drugs away from the kids in the school room, you cut that program. You have also seen to it that we are not going to increase any access to college. We are going to deny programs, in fact, to 23,400 kids in Texas in 1996 alone. You are probably going to force them to drop out of school. That is what your idea is about educational excellence, the future for the children of America.

You are cutting in all the wrong places. That is what is wrong with the Republican plan. Each and every one of you stand up here and says, "Oh, we have got to do this." Wrong, wrong, wrong. Read your bill. Compare that to the President's budget for a balanced budget in 10 years. Take another look at it. You are making a big mistake. This is a bad bill.

Mr. Chairman, President Clinton said 2 weeks ago that he would veto the bill approved by the House Appropriations Committee since it slashes critical education and training initiatives. Republicans have approved \$36 billion in cuts from education and training over 7 years. In contrast, the President's proposal balances the budget while increasing investment in education and training by \$40 billion over 7 years. In Texas, Republican cuts of \$2.5 billion over 7 years would harm working families:

Head Start: President Clinton proposes to expand Head Start to serve 50,000 additional children nationwide by 2002. Republicans

have approved cuts that would deny Head Start to 180,000 children nationwide and 12,512 children in Texas in 2002 compared to 1995.

Improving basic and advanced skills: President Clinton's budget completely protects title I, which helps students from disadvantaged backgrounds with reading, writing, mathematics, and advanced skills. Republicans would cut funding by \$1.1 billion in 1996, denying this crucial assistance to 1.1 million students nationwide and 99,600 students in Texas.

Goals 2000: With strong bipartisan support, the President created Goals 2000 to help communities train teachers, encourage hard work by students, and upgrade academic standards in schools. The President calls for almost \$700 million in 1996. Republicans would eliminate Goals 2000 and deny to Texas funding affecting as many as 1,428 schools.

Safe and drug-free schools: While President Clinton strongly supports Safe and Drug-Free Schools, Republicans want to gut the program, which 1,043 out of 1,053 school districts in Texas use to keep crime, violence, and drugs away from students and out of schools.

Increasing access to college: President Clinton would increase annual funding for Pell grants by \$3.4 billion and raise the top award to a record \$3,128 by 2002. The GOP would deny Pell grants to 23,400 students in Texas in 1996 alone, possibly forcing them to drop out of college.

National service: AmeriCorps offers young people a hand in paying for their education if they lend a hand to their communities. Republicans would eliminate AmeriCorps and deny 3,171 young people in Texas the chance to serve in 1996.

Job training: President Clinton's GI bill for America's workers would streamline Federal job training efforts and provide skill grants for dislocated and low-income workers. The President would provide 800,000 skill grants of up to \$2,620 in 1996. Republicans would cut funding by \$68.3 million and would deny training opportunities to 28,688 dislocated workers in Texas in 1996.

Summer jobs: Summer jobs are an important first opportunity for many low-income youths to get work experience. President Clinton wants to finance 600,000 jobs this summer. Republicans would slash the President's school-to-work initiative and eliminate summer jobs, denying jobs to 42,491 Texas youths in 1996 and 297,437 Texas youths over 7 years.

Student loans: While the President strongly supports the student loan program, Republicans want to raise student costs for loans by \$10 billion over 7 years. The GOP cuts could raise the cost of college education by as much as \$2,111 for 260,700 college students and as much as \$9,424 for 37,200 graduate students in Texas.

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. DICKEY], a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. DICKEY. Mr. Chairman, cut spending first; that is the mandate that I got when I came here and not only have I gotten it but it has been repeated time and time and time again by those folks whom I represent.

One way you can cut spending is by tax cuts, and what happens is if you

have tax cuts, you just lessen the amount of money that comes into the government. The government then shrinks to match its budget, and we have less government, less intrusion, and less waste.

Another way is to cut spending in the true sense of the word, and that is what we are doing to the tune of \$9 billion in this bill. I think it is a credit to what the committee has done rather than a criticism, seeing the criticism we have gotten.

When we went to cut this budget, we went to the source of the people who knew best, where waste was, where the fat was, where the excesses were. We went to the agencies. Time after time after time after time, we asked those agencies, "Please, do you realize that we have got to cut spending? Do you realize that if we do not, our country is going to become insolvent, that we are not going to be able to take care of our kids, that we are not going to be able to take care of our elderly people? Will you help us, agency, will you help us pinpoint where it is we can cut so that we are laymen, the people sitting here trying to do our job in cutting spending first, can do it more intelligently?"

But, no, we were stonewalled. Not a one came in and said, "This is where we should cut." Not a one said, "We want to help you. We want to be a part of this partnership, and we want to do what is best for America." What was said was, "We have got this program going. We have had these programs 30 or 40 years. We own them, and as long as we can own them, you are not going to take them away from us, and if you do, you are going to do it by the hardest." That is exactly what we have done. We have taken \$9 billion. We said, "Okay, we are going to cut here and here and here," all the time asking for help, asking from those people who knew where the excesses were.

Some of the times after we cut the bills, people would come up to us and said, "Oh, if we just knew what you were after, what you were going to do, we would have told you this particular program overseas did not work, or this particular program is really full of excess and waste." All I said a couple of those times was, "Why didn't you tell us? Why didn't you tell us?"

All right, then, let us go to the architects of this. For 30 or 40 years the people who controlled this House, this Congress, put bill after bill after bill in here so they could have a perfectly good HHS Committee deliberation, and everybody could go and say, "Here is some more money. Here is what you can do, because we are afraid to say 'no' to you, and we want immediate gratification rather than to do what is best for the country."

We went to those people. What did they say? They said with their eyes and not with their mouths, "Yes, we have got you out there. I know we have got you out there." We could not have gotten back in. We did not have the way, the credibility of anything else to get

back in. "We are going to let you do it." "We are not going to help you." Stonewalled.

So what did we have to do? The buck stopped. We have to go. Now, as we come back in, we are bringing this thing in in compliance with the commandment from the American people, the very people who are the architects of this are complaining all the way and criticizing us for doing what they know in their hearts, and it shows in their eyes, what is right, and that is we cut spending first for the sake of our country in a patriotic way.

We are going to make mistakes because the deck is stacked against us. Those of us who want this, the deck is stacked up here against us. We are going to make mistakes, so what we have to do now is do the best we can conscientiously, do the best we can to cut spending, to be obedient to the mandate from the American people and then, when things are calmed down, go back to these agencies and say, "Now will you, please, help us?" "You all know better. Do not leave it to laymen. Will you, please, help us?" "Help us find the right way to cut, the best way to cut."

But right now all we are trying to do is just to shrink it. Without money, there has to be something that is done by the agencies that is efficient, efficiency is in place.

I call upon this body, the American people, all of these agencies, the opposition, to work together, get in alignment.

We are in a step process right now, and we are willing to take the heat. We are willing to take the criticism. We are willing to take that which is really contradictory when the opposition says that you all are mean-spirited and do not care and are not compassionate. We are willing to take that for your sake and for our sake. But what I hope is that we will leave enough of conversation, enough of a relationship so we can get together with these agencies and with the opposition when this is all over and we do our job and do a better job of spending cuts for the sake of the American people and in love of the American people.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN].

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, life and politics are a matter of choices. This Congress has made spending choices and is about to make one today.

Let me tell you some of the choices this Congress has made. Under Republican leadership, this Congress has decided we will continue to give farm payments to wealthy individuals with more than \$100,000 off-farm income.

The same Republican leadership comes to us today and says, "But we are going to have to cut money for title I for kids in the classroom." The Republican leadership tells us, "We must continue to spend millions of dollars every year subsidizing the tobacco industry," and the Republican leader-

ship comes today in this bill and says, "But we are going to have to tell 150,000 young men and women across the United States we cannot help them pay for their college expenses," kids from working families denied the opportunity of an education.

The Republican leadership tells us we have to spend billions of dollars on wasteful B-2 bombers and then turns right around and tells us we cannot afford Head Start to take kids in the toughest family situations in America and give them a fighting chance.

The Republican leadership tells us we have to waste millions of dollars on star wars, a welfare program for defense contractors.

Then they come to us today and say, "We are going to have to cut LIHEAP," the program that provides some assistance to the poorest, usually elderly, who are trying to survive in the cold of winter and in the heat of summer.

The Republican leadership comes and tells us we have to give \$300 billion in tax breaks, mostly to the wealthiest people in this country, and yet we have to turn around and cut the money that is available for the agencies that make sure that the workplaces in America are safe for our employees, that there is money for workers who have lost their jobs because the plants move overseas, workers that need retraining, people who want protection so their pension benefits will be there when they are retired. We cannot afford that, according to the Republican leadership.

The Republicans are there for the wealthy farmers, for tobacco, and for defense contractors, but they are not there when American families really need them.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GENE GREEN].

(Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, like a lot of the other colleagues on this side of the aisle, I think this today is a defining moment in our short term in the 104th Congress. We have dealt with a great many of the appropriations bills, but when we see what is happening to the education and job training provisions and the Department of Labor, we see where the intent really is.

Like my colleague from Arkansas, who is on the other side of the aisle, I would like to balance the budget and aim for that glide path to a balanced budget. But the way this bill is doing it is the wrong way to do it.

We hear every morning in our 1-minute and all during these appropriations bills how we need to balance the budget, to save our children's futures so our grandchildren and children are not going to have to pay off the debt. This bill cuts job training, education funding, so those children will not be able to have that education to be able

to even afford themselves much less pay off the debt.

We have to look to the future in our country. That is the beauty of our Nation. We have children that are in elementary school now who are utilizing chapter I funding to be a better citizen 10 years from now, 12 years from now.

By voting for this bill today and cutting the funds now instead of expecting that investment in those children, we are cutting off our nose to spite our face. It is amazing that we are willing to say we want to save our children from what they are going to have to pay, and yet we are cutting public education funding and we are cutting student loans.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BECERRA].

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

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Chairman, we hear in this debate that we are being told that some programs have to be trimmed, we have to trim this tree; Head Start, for example, is being penalized because some programs apparently did not run or were not managed as well as they should have been.

Yet I remember \$500 toilet seats. I remember \$100 screw drivers. I remember the costly travel junkets, and I remember the heavy cost overruns in the Department of Defense, and I see that they do not get penalized. In fact, they are rewarded. They are rewarded with \$8 billion more in funding than they even requested.

Tree trimming? I call it butchering. When we go out there and tell our children in our schools that their programs will not be there, those are being hacked; when we tell our workers that safety for all of our middle-income workers has been axed; when we tell our senior citizens section 8 housing subsidies will not be there to help them pay for their high cost of living and their rent, that is being sacrificed, what we are telling people is that the dream Americans have for their children is just that, it is just a dream.

Let us be serious. We are not putting money into deficit reduction when we make these cuts. You could save every single penny we are cutting out of education by just cutting a fraction of the tax cuts that are going to go to the wealthiest of Americans in this country in this House's tax bill. We do not come even close with all the cuts we have made in education in paying for those wealthy tax cuts.

Let us be serious, let us let America know where we are heading in this Congress. It is not for the American family.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. VELÁZQUEZ].

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Labor-HHS appropriation bill. This destructive legislation takes aim at the people

who need the most help—women, children, students, the poor, and the elderly. At a time when we should be giving individuals a helping hand, this bill sentences the poor to a life of poverty and despair—all in the name of a tax break for rich corporations and the wealthiest Americans.

One of the most devastating parts of this legislation is the \$3.8 billion that is cut from educational spending. Even more alarming, bilingual and immigrant educational programs stand to lose \$104 million. I wonder which one of my Republican colleagues would like to explain to the thousands of bilingual students like those at Public School 169 in my district, why the programs that serve to educate them deserve a 50 percent cut?

It's ironic that this Congress is lecturing the Nation on welfare reform, yet systematically denying every opportunity for people to become self-sufficient.

Another terrible blow will come from the elimination of the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program. Many seniors in the Lower East Side of my district depend on this program to survive. Have we already forgotten last month's episode in which hundreds of seniors died senselessly because they were unable to afford the costs of an electric fan? If we do not maintain funding for this critical program, the next time the temperature climbs into triple digits or drops below zero more people will die.

Then there will be no one to blame for these shameful cuts but ourselves. By then, it may be too late. Shame, shame, shame on all of us. I urge my colleagues to vote against it.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WOOLSEY].

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I compliment the leader, the ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations, for all she has done on this.

If this bill passes, Mr. Chairman, the Gingrich Republicans will be showing a triple feature down at your local movie theater. It will be "Dumb and Dumber," with sick and sicker and poor and poorer, and let me tell you, folks, it is not going to be a bargain matinee. No doubt about it, this sweeping and radical legislation is going to cost us dearly in the long run.

□ 1500

My colleagues, I could go on and on about the other faults of this bill. It is antichoice, antifamily planning, it is antiwoman, all of the provisions that are much too much and numerous to mention. But one thing is for sure. This bill will go down in history as the declaration of war on our children, on women, on the poor, on working families, and on seniors.

Mr. Chairman, I urge all Americans who care about education, the well-being, health, and safety of their loved ones, to tell their Representatives to oppose this bill.

My friends, this Congress has passed some bad legislation, but this bill is worse than I ever thought possible. It is the epitome of the us-versus-them mentality which plagues the legislation and the debate of the 104th Congress.

This divisiveness has no place in a national dialogue. It has no place, because, it leads to elitist and dangerous policy, never more clear than in the bill we are debating today.

We must defeat the Labor-HHS bill because it abdicates this Government's greatest responsibility: to make life better for those who are uneducated, untrained, poor, sick, or disabled. It signals the end of the Federal Government having any obligation, whatsoever, in the education, training, and health and safety of our people.

Make no mistake, this is sweeping and radical legislation. It guts our education and training system. It makes a mockery of our efforts to get families off welfare. And, it puts the health and safety of all American workers at serious risk.

First and foremost, this bill flies in the face of the American people's belief that education must be our Nation's No. 1 priority. It cuts Head Start for 5 year olds; safe and drug free schools for 10 year olds; summer jobs and vocational education for 15 year olds; and financial aid for students of all ages.

Is this any way to take care of our Nation's most important special interest: Our children? Absolutely not. And, what about all the talk we hear from both sides of the aisle about getting families off welfare?

Well, combined with the harsh Republican welfare plan passed earlier this year, this bill makes it next to impossible for a mother to get a job and get off welfare. While the Republican welfare plan shredded the safety net, this bill burns the ladder to self-sufficiency—effectively trapping families in permanent poverty. And, what about families who are working hard every day in our Nation's factories, plants, and mines.

As a member of the Economic and Educational Opportunities Committee, I have heard loud and clear from these families that they are frightened by the new majority's efforts to weaken workplace health and safety rules. Over and over again, spouses, parents, and children tell me that they are willing to see some of their taxes go toward enforcing health and safety rules, so they can be assured that their loved ones will come home from work at night safe and sound.

That's a reasonable tradeoff for our families, and that's a sound investment for our Nation. The majority, however, does not see it that way.

The Labor-HHS bill makes it clear that the Gingrich Republicans would rather invest in a tax break for the fat cats, than the education, training, and health and safety of American workers.

In fact, if this bill passes, the Gingrich Republicans will be showing a triple feature down at your local movie theatre: It will be "Dumb and Dumber"; with "Sick and Sicker"; and "Poor and Poorer." And, let me tell you folks, it is not going to be a bargain matinee. No doubt about it, this sweeping and radical legislation is going to cost us all dearly in the long run.

My friends, I could go on and on about the other faults of this bill. It is antichoice; antifamily planning; and antiwomen provi-

sions—but they are much too numerous to mention. But, one thing is for sure, this bill will go down in the history as a declaration of war on our children; women; the poor; working families; and seniors.

I urge all Americans who care about the education; well-being; health and safety of their loved ones to tell their representatives to oppose this abomination of a bill.

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WICKER], a member of the subcommittee.

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

Mr. WICKER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. BONILLA] for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I came to Washington with 72 other freshmen Republicans to change the way Washington does business. This has included a number of important reforms ranging from requiring Congress to live under the same laws as everyone else to ensuring that the young men and women in our Armed Forces will never again serve under foreign generals. I am proud to be a part of this freshman class which I believe has forever changed the way Washington works.

But, Mr. Chairman, while we have taken many steps to restore the American people's belief in Congress, I believe the most important step is our commitment to balance the budget, and this Labor HHS, Education appropriation bill is an important part of that commitment.

Over the last 40 years our Government in Washington has grown out of control. Today the national debt is \$4.8 trillion, and the President will soon ask the Congress to raise the ceiling to enable us to borrow even more money; that is, more money to pay for a spiraling bureaucracy today that will be paid for by our children tomorrow, by the very children that are shown in this photograph that I have with me today. At the current rate of Federal spending the national debt for these children will rise to \$6½ trillion in 5 short years.

Now, these figures are incomprehensible. In more digestible terms, a child born today will pay over \$187,000 in his lifetime in principal and interest on the national debt. Is there a parent or grandparent in America today who would knowingly hand one of these children a bill for \$187,000 to pay for our own excesses? I think it is fair to ask, Mr. Chairman, are our children really getting their money's worth? Let us look at the Federal Department of Education, for example. Since its creation the Department of Education has more than doubled its budget, from \$15 billion to over \$31 billion. More than 240 programs exist within the Department today, nearly doubling in size since 1980. Yet the uncontrolled growth of the Department of Education has not increased our children's test scores. Sadly, we have seen a steady

decline in student performance as parents and local communities have less control over the children's education.

No doubt, Mr. Chairman, when we get to the title of the bill dealing with education spending, we will see opponents of this bill parading with charts and perhaps dressed in Save the Children neckties claiming to be advocates on behalf of children. The truth is that many will hide behind the children to make their case for Federal bureaucrats who are in danger of losing their jobs. I would submit to my colleagues that those of us who are interested in balancing the budget and reducing the national debt on these children are the real advocates of children in today's current debate.

Mr. Chairman, it is also important to point out that we can balance the budget by the year 2002 by slowing the rate of growth of Federal spending. While people talk about cuts, the truth is that we will spend \$1.8 trillion more over the next 7 years than we are spending today, \$1.8 trillion more than we are spending today. This bill is a prime example of the fact that we can balance the budget by funding programs that work and by cutting redundant, wasteful programs. This bill takes a myriad of duplicative and intertwining programs and reshapes them into a leaner and smarter Government.

For example, the Federal Government now funds 163 job training programs, over 15 departments and agencies, with 40 inter-departmental offices. Each of these programs has its own bureaucracy swallowing tax dollars which never make it outside the Beltway. Equally astounding is the fact that of these 163 Federal programs to train workers to find jobs, less than half can tell us whether or not their participants receive jobs, and 40 percent cannot even tell us how many people they are training.

Mr. Chairman, we must ask ourselves is it morally right for these children to pay for a Federal Government:

which currently funds 119 housing programs across 10 different departments and agencies;

which currently funds 86 federal teacher training programs across 9 departments and agencies;

which currently funds 266 programs to help youth at risk across 8 departments and agencies;

which currently funds over 80 Federal welfare programs; and

which currently funds 340 programs for families and children across 11 departments and agencies to the tune of \$60 billion annually.

Mr. Chairman, I urge a "yes" vote on the bill.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield a minute and a half to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SAWYER].

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

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] for yielding this time to me.

I have been listening with care to the remarks we have heard from the other side. They talk about the importance of looking to the future, and I agree that we must look to the future, we must recognize the imperative that we all face to reduce the debt that we face as a nation. That debt will come down on our children. But in understanding where we need to go in the future, we also sometimes can learn important lessons from our past. No lesson has been more important than the last two times we have been in this level of indebtedness.

In the period following the Civil War, the most devastating conflict this Nation has ever faced and in the period following the Second World War when our level of indebtedness compared to our economy was even more devastating than we face today, both were times of industrial transition, much like what we face across this Nation, a time in which people's jobs are less secure than they have been in the past, and in both circumstances we need to learn the lesson that took place in both of those times. In the period following the Civil War we put in place the Land Grant Colleges Act. We turned 200 small institutions into 3,500 institutions of higher education, and job development and nation building in this country that not only helped us grow, but helped us grow beyond the level of debt that we faced at that time. Again, at the end of the Second World War we invested in the education and training of an entire work force as a million men came back from that conflict. We put them to work at building their skills so that they could go to work building the industrial productivity of an entire nation.

Those are the lessons from the past that we need to learn as we address a bill that fails to take advantage of them in building for our future.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WATERS].

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I was going to offer six amendments today, one on Head Start, Healthy Start, dislocated workers, summer jobs, School-to-Work Program, and Foster Grandparents Program, putting money back in, but then I realized, even if all of those amendments had passed, I could not vote for this bill. This bill is so outrageously bad that there is no way I could support it. It devastates education and job training.

Mr. Chairman, since I can only speak for a short time, I came to speak about Head Start. I know about Head Start. It changed my life. I was just a little teacher aide, a mother of two children, went to work for the Head Start Program. They encouraged all of us to continue our education, the parents and the workers. I went back to school and received my degree, and so did many of the parents in that program. We learned how to help children build self-esteem, we learned how to get parents involved in the budget, and we learned

how to get people making decisions about their children's education.

Mr. Chairman, I saw Head Start change lives, change families, change communities. How can my colleagues say they care about children and take away money from Head Start? This is a wonderful program that not only helps children and families, it breaks the cycle of poverty.

I say to my colleagues, all of you Republicans who say you care about children, shame on you that you would do away with the program that everybody agrees is a good program that's helped America. These children need Head Start. Only 50 percent of the children in America who need Head Start are being served by Head Start. I wish there was some way I could convince you not to do this awful, terrible bill that is going to hurt so many children, but I know I can't. You're going to slash this program. You're going to get rid of some of the programs in this country that support Head Start.

Mr. Chairman, there is nothing we can do about it but vote against this awful bill, and I believe there are some Republicans who are going to stand with us on this terrible bill.

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, I yield a minute and a half to the distinguished gentlewoman from New York [Ms. MOLINARI].

Ms. MOLINARI. Mr. Chairman, in the brief time that has been allotted me I would like to speak about the increases in funding that the Labor-HHS bill before us provides, recognizing, and gratefully so, the increasing trend of violence against women. This bill provides, as my colleagues know, an increase of over \$40 million from last year's spending just on the Labor-HHS side, the majority of it, \$35 million, going to rape-prevention programs. We had \$400,000 for a domestic violence hotline, \$400,000 for youth education, \$4 million for community programs, \$100,000 for a Center for Disease Control domestic violence study, and an equal amount of \$32.6 million for a battered women's shelter. This billion under this year's funding provides \$72.5 million to complete our contract with the Violence Against Women bill.

Now add that to the additional funding that we provided in State, Commerce, and Justice where we sent from \$25 million in last year's funding request to \$125 million in this year's funding request, and I am extremely proud of the work that has been done under the Republican Party to fulfill our commitment in the Violence Against Women Act. I want to thank Chairmen PORTER, ROGERS, LIVINGSTON, and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN], for bringing this to our attention, and also I want to thank the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY], for leading a bipartisan effort to make sure that this funding was in place.

Again I want to commend my colleagues because this is an important initiative as we see the numbers rise

where three out of four women will be victims of violent crimes. We have adequately responded with the resources at hand.

Mr. OBEY. I am awaiting my last speaker. I yield 1½ minutes to myself in the meantime.

Let me simply say, Mr. Chairman, that we have been told many times today by our Republican friends that we have to cut the deficit. Of course we do. And I am certainly willing, and so are the rest of us, to see education, and job programs, and seniors programs take their fair share of deficit reduction. But what we are not willing to do is to see them take a double hit so that they can spend \$70 billion on the F-22, which we do not even need for 15 more years, or that they can continue to spend almost \$1½ billion a plane to buy more B-2's than the Pentagon itself has asked for. We also do not think we ought to continue three different separate subsidies for the nuclear industry. We are not willing to gut the NLRB and the protections it affords to workers in this country so that we can free up corporations to deal with their workers like chattel instead of dignified human beings. And we are certainly not willing to see these programs take a double hit so that we can provide a \$20,000 tax cut for somebody making \$300,000 a year.

There are some 17 separate special riders in this bill that have no business here. Many of them are flat-out gifts to special interests. There is absolutely no reason in the name of deficit reduction to provide those slippery-slope riders, none whatsoever, and so I think that on all grounds there is a very good reason to oppose this bill.

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. FOWLER].

□ 1515

Mrs. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 2127 with regret, because it has come important provisions which I support. It contains a title on political advocacy that will end taxpayer subsidies for lobbyists. It shifts OSHA funding priorities away from enforcement and toward helping to make workplaces safer, and it increases funding for the National Institutes of Health by 5.7 percent, preserving our commitment to biomedical research.

However, this legislation also has huge flaws, including disproportionate cuts in the area of education. If it passes, the Safe and Drug Free Schools Program will be cut by more than half. Vocational and adult education will be cut by 23 percent, and the Head Start Program will be reduced by \$137 million.

The bill cuts funding for seniors as well, including reducing the National Senior Volunteer Corps by \$21 million and cutting senior nutrition programs, and cutting senior nutrition programs, which fund the very successful Meals-on-Wheels Program—which provides the only daily meal many senior citizens receive—by nearly \$19 million.

I recognize and support the need to reduce spending, but the cuts in this bill are not properly prioritized.

The bill also contains some obvious contradictions, especially over family planning. My colleagues who worked on this bill want to eliminate family planning and—at the same time—reduce abortions, unwanted pregnancies, and the size of the welfare rolls. That does not add up—and in fact, this bill would increase abortions and welfare dependency I cannot in good conscience support that.

Finally, the issue of Medicaid-funded abortions in the case of rape or incest is not adequately addressed in this bill. Although Mr. KOLBE, Ms. PRYCE, and myself had an amendment which would have provided a commonsense solution to this problem, we were not allowed to offer it.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill so that we can go back and make it better.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire of the gentleman, does he have just one remaining speaker to close?

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I think we have just 1 minute remaining.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] does have 1 minute remaining. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT], the distinguished minority leader.

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

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to denounce this mindless and mean-spirited package of budget cuts and to urge every one of my colleagues to cast their vote against it. This appropriations bill is more than a handful of budget reductions to balance the Nation's budget, it is more than a few policy changes about which we could rationally and reasonably disagree, Mr. Chairman, this appropriations bill is a dagger pointed at the heart of working Americans. It is a dangerous repeal of basic standards and protections that have been in place in this country for nearly a century. If we pass it, America in the 1990's will look more and more like America in the 1890's.

Mr. Chairman, like the days of the Robber Barons, we will have a Republican America where hard-working people are overworked, underpaid, and underprotected. We will have a Republican America where corporate titans wreak trickle-down tax cuts while we slash education, slash job training, slash summer jobs, and any chance of protecting average workers from abuse and exploitation.

Is that really what we should be doing? Is that really what America voted for last November; a Congress that doles out tax breaks for the few and partisan punishment for the many?

Mr. Chairman, the sole central purpose of this Government is to fight for

working families and the middle class, to work as partners with the private sector, to lift up wages and incomes and our standard of living. That used to be a bipartisan commitment in this House. Judged by that goal, however, we are already in a crisis. Wages and incomes have been falling for all but the wealthiest Americans for a decade and a half, and, thanks to failed Republican policies, two-thirds of all the new wealth in the boom years of the 1980's went to the top 1 percent of earners. The bottom 80 percent actually saw their wealth decline in that period.

Mr. Chairman, in the midst of a business boom, the Labor Department recently reported the greatest yearly wage decline in nearly 150 years. If you do not know what that means, come back to my district, or many of the districts across the country. Go door to door and meet the families that I meet: Parents who work two and three jobs, barely ever seeing their children; couples that spend their precious time together fighting over their bills and their inability to pay their bills.

Are we proud of this legacy? Does that bad turn really deserve another? That is why Democrats have resisted a Republican agenda that slashes Medicare, student loans, and education to pay for a tax cut for people that have it made. We cannot afford a transfer of wealth in this country for people who work to people who are wealthy and no longer work.

Mr. Chairman, I suppose we could differ on supply side policies, but who, in good conscience, can support today's assault on workplace decency and children's opportunity? This bill slashes education, it slashes training, it slashes the standards under which our workers have been protected. The result is a damaging downward spiral: Even more children starting school unhealthy and unable to learn; even more Americans unable to find jobs and prepare for them; even more of the sweat shop standards that Democrats and Republicans together used to strive to eliminate for nearly a century. These are not partisan issues. These are human issues.

When it comes to enforcing basic standards and decency, Government has a role. When it comes to ensuring access to education and health, Government has a role. This bill not only denies it, it destroys it. A vote for this bill is a vote against America's working families. A vote for this bill is a vote for a lower standard of living. A vote for this bill is a vote for a meaner, tougher America where the dream of rising wages will be nothing but a mirage.

This is not the vision of our people, Mr. Chairman, and it is not what the people of this country want. I urge Members on both sides of this aisle to reject this bill as wrong headed and mean spirited, and to stand together in a bipartisan way and say that we can do better for the working people of this country.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of the time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I take great umbrage on the words "mindless" and "mean spirited." I might say that the subcommittee worked very thoughtfully and, I think, very intelligently to provide cuts of about \$6 billion on a base of \$70 billion.

What I really take issue with is that the Democrats just do not get it. They do not seem to understand that we have to get spending under control; that we have to get the deficit down; that the special interest, serve them all, business as usual that has gone on in this Congress for the last 40 years is over.

Mr. Chairman, we are going to get our fiscal house in order. We are going to do it thoughtfully and intelligently. We are going to make the cuts necessary in order to accomplish that end. I might say it is fascinating to me to listen to the sky is falling coming from the other side of the aisle when the cuts in our bill are not cuts at all. The bill is going up, because entitlement spending is raising it by \$11 billion over last year.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, you have to put all of this in perspective and understand that the hyperbole from the other side is simply that, hyperbole.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate on the bill has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the amendment numbered 1-1 printed in part 1 of House Report 104-224 is now pending.

Reading of the bill for further amendment shall not proceed until after disposition of the amendments printed in part 1 of that report, which will be considered in the order printed, may be offered only by a Member designated in that report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for 10 minutes, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

After disposition of the amendments printed in part 1 of the report, the bill, as amended, shall be considered as the original bill for the purpose of further amendment under the 5-minute rule.

Further consideration of the bill for amendment shall proceed by title and each title shall be considered read.

Consideration of each of the first three titles of the bill shall begin with an additional period of general debate, which shall be confined to the pending title and shall not exceed 90 minutes, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations.

It shall be in order at any time during the reading of the bill for amendment to consider the amendments printed in part 2 of the report. Each amendment printed in part 2 may be offered only by a Member designated in

that report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

During further consideration of the bill for amendment, the chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition to a Member who has caused an amendment to be printed in the designated place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Those amendments will be considered read.

Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the following amendments (identified by their designation in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD) may amend portions of the bill not yet read for amendment, shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question, if offered by the Member designated:

Amendment No. 36 by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY]; and

Amendments 60, 61, and 62 offered en bloc by the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI].

Debate on each of the following amendments—identified by their designation in the RECORD, "unless otherwise specified"—and any amendments thereto, shall be limited to 40 minutes, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent of the amendment:

Amendment No. 36 by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY];

Amendment No. 70 by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES];

Amendment No. 30 by the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY];

An amendment by the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE] proposing to strike section 509 of the bill;

Amendment No. 64 by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SKAGGS].

An amendment by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO] or the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] proposing to amend title VI of the bill; and

An amendment by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] relating to the subject of political advocacy.

Except as otherwise specified in the rule, the time for debate on each other amendment to the bill and any amendments thereto shall be limited to 20 minutes, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent of the amendment.

After a motion that the Committee rise has been rejected on a day, the Chairman may entertain another such motion on that day only if offered by the Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations or the majority leader or their designee.

Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may postpone until a time during further consideration in the Committee of the Whole a request for a recorded vote on any amendment.

The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may reduce to not less than

5 minutes to the time for voting by electronic device on any postponed question that immediately follows another vote by electronic device without intervening business, provided that the time for voting by electronic device on the first in any series of questions shall not be less than 15 minutes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1-1 PRINTED IN PART 1 OF HOUSE REPORT 104-224 OFFERED BY MR. PORTER

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate amendment No. 1-1 printed in part 1 of House Report 104-224.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment Number 1-1 printed in Part 1 of House Report 104-224 offered by Mr. PORTER:

On page 4, line 17, strike "\$3,109,368,000" and insert: "\$3,107,404,000"

On page 5, line 17, strike "\$218,297,000" and insert: "\$216,333,000"

On page 16, line 20, strike "\$130,220,000" and insert: "\$134,220,000"

On page 33, line 12 and line 15, strike "\$2,136,824,000" and insert: "\$2,134,533,000" and

On page 37, line 7, strike "\$4,543,343,000" and insert: "\$4,544,643,000".

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] will each be recognized for 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER].

#### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I believe that under the rule it is indicated that the manager's amendments, No. 1 and 2, will be disposed of before we proceed further at this point, but I also heard as part of the rule that amendments could be rolled in the discretion of the Chair.

Is it the Chair's intention to dispose of these amendments if recorded votes are requested at this time; or would the Chair intend to roll the votes until later in the day?

□ 1530

The CHAIRMAN. It would be the Chair's intention to roll the votes until later in the day.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the first amendment I intend to offer would do four things. The first would be to increase funding for Runaway Youth—Transitional Living in the Administration for Children and Families, in the Department of Health and Human Services by \$1.3 million to a level of \$14.9 million. This funding level will permit the continuation of all currently funded projects.

Second, it would increase funding for International Labor Affairs in the Department of Labor by \$4 million. This increase will allow the Department to fund its portion of the International Labor Organization's International Program for the Elimination of Child Labor and to carry out other human

rights activities conducted by that office. This \$4 million increase is to be confined to those activities only.

Third, it would reduce funding for the Medicare Contractors budget by \$2.3 million. HCFA indicated in fiscal year 1995 claims were below estimated levels and that \$5 million was available for reprogramming. This reduction, along with the reduction approved by the committee, would reduce fiscal year 1996 funding by \$5 million.

Four, it would reduce funding for State Unemployment Insurance and Employment Service Operations by \$2 million. Throughout the bill, Federal administration costs were reduced by 7.5 percent. With this reduction overall, the State administrative account will have been reduced 3 percent.

Mr. Chairman, I would encourage adoption of the amendment.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair wishes to correct a statement just made to the gentleman. The Chair is in fact under the rule entitled to roll a vote, should it occur, on amendment No. 1. However, on amendment No. 2, the Chair is not under the rule permitted to roll that vote. That vote will have to be taken immediately following the debate on amendment No. 2.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, on the first amendment offered by the gentleman, we have no objection.

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on amendment No. 1-1 printed in part 1 of House Report 104-224 offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1-2 printed in part 1 of House Report 104-224.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PORTER

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment numbered 1-2.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 1-2 printed in part 1 of House Report 104-224 offered by Mr. PORTER: On page 76, line 12, after "applicant" insert: ", except an individual person,"

On page 77, lines 7 and 8, after "grantee" insert: ", except an individual person,"

On page 84, line 13, strike ", or" and insert: ",,"

On page 84, line 14, strike "or"

On page 84, line 15, after "to" insert: "or distribution of funds by"

On page 84, line 15, before the period insert: "and the provision of grant and scholarship funds to students for educational purposes" and on page 85, line 7, after "grantee" insert: ", except an individual person,"

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] will be recognized for 5 minutes, and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] will be recognized for 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER].

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the second amendment I am offering would, first, correct an error in the drafting of the bill with respect to title VI. It would insert two phrases that were approved by the committee but were inadvertently left out of the version that was sent to the printer.

Second, it would make a technical change in title VI by inserting language to exempt individuals from the requirements of title VI. This simply clarifies the intent of the legislation, and, again, I would urge the adoption of the amendment.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, let me simply say here that I think it is important to understand that this is not just a technical change. As I understand it and as the gentleman from Colorado will point out shortly when I yield to him, this language not only accomplishes the technical changes desired by the chairman of the subcommittee, but also makes a substantive change to carve out individuals from the prohibition in the Istook amendment that should not be here in the first place.

So, it is an effort to put a rose on a pig, so-to-speak, and that does not mean that the pig is still anything but a pig.

So I do not have any objection to the fix-up, but I want people to understand, it does not improve the general picture of the animal.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SKAGGS].

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Let me just point out to my colleagues, if you can envision a jalopy that is up on blocks in somebody's backyard, the headlights have been shot out, the engine has been partly dismantled, the tires and wheels are gone, it is basically rusted out. This is a rough analogy to the quality of legislative product that we are now referring to as the Istook amendment.

What the gentleman's amendment will do to this disarray, mechanically and philosophically, is basically perhaps to replace the oil gasket. But we still have a jalopy that is unfit for human habitation, much less legislative consideration in this body.

It does go farther than merely correcting the clerical error that occurred when this was considered in the full Committee on Appropriations, as the gentleman from Wisconsin has pointed out. It also attempts, unsuccessfully I might add, to repair one of the fundamental flaws in this whole cockamamy scheme, which is to try to fix it so it does not apply to normal human beings, individuals that receive some kind of Federal grant. But it only

goes partway in doing that. We will have further discussions of that later on, I am sure.

So it reflects, as will be the case over and over again as we discuss this ill-considered proposition, the incredibly sloppy conceptual work that was done originally in cobbling it together for ill purpose, and the incredibly sloppy drafting work that reflects the incredibly sloppy thinking.

Having said that, this clears up a little bit of the slop.

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

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, if I may say so, I, as the gentleman from Colorado and the gentleman from Wisconsin know, opposed the inclusion of this entire title in our bill. This I think would, however, improve the intent of what the gentleman from Oklahoma had when he offered the amendment that included title VI. I would therefore say it makes the product better, and would support it for that reason. The gentleman might want to oppose it for exactly the same reason.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to reclaim my time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SKAGGS].

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Chairman, I cannot avoid commenting on the gentleman's characterization that this is attempting to improve on the intent of the gentleman from Oklahoma in offering this. His intent is unimprovable. This change certainly makes the bad impact of this provision somewhat diminished.

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

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ISTOOK], the author of title VI.

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Chairman, I want to express appreciation for the comments of the gentleman from Colorado. I realize he opposes the thrust of the legislation and has his own concerns about that. As the gentleman correctly said a moment ago, even though he does not like the bill, at least in his opinion it is an improvement. This is certainly intended to clarify the intent and to correct the scrivener's error that was made when things that were in the actual amendment as offered in appropriations were inadvertently left out in the bill printing process.

We have certainly tried to be responsive to the concerns of the Members on the other side, and the corrective amendment I think certainly addresses those. I appreciate what modicum of favorable comment the gentleman was able to make in candor. I thank the

gentleman. If there is no other debate on this, I would urge adoption of this technical correction.

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

Mr. ISTOOK. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Chairman, there is a simple way we can improve this even further.

Mr. ISTOOK. I think I can anticipate that, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the solicitude about improving the gentleman's proposal. I think we can make a very, very quick and brief act of mercy on it that will effect the real improvements necessary.

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman. I realize we are very much opposed on the legislation as a whole, and we certainly do anticipate going forward with it. But this does, through the technical correction, make sure that we are addressing some concerns. I would urge adoption of the amendment.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on amendment No. 1-2 printed in part 1 of House Report 104-224 offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes, namely:

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate title I.

The text of title I is as follows:

#### TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

##### EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING ADMINISTRATION TRAINING AND EMPLOYMENT SERVICES

For expenses necessary to carry into effect the Job Training Partnership Act, as amended, including the purchase and hire of passenger motor vehicles, the construction, alteration, and repair of buildings and other facilities, and the purchase of real property for training centers as authorized by the Job Training Partnership Act; title II of the Civil Rights Act of 1991; the Women in Apprenticeship and Nontraditional Occupations Act; National Skill Standards Act of 1994; and the School-to-Work Opportunities Act; \$3,180,441,000 plus reimbursements, of which \$2,936,154,000 is available for obligation for the period July 1, 1996 through June 30, 1997; of which \$148,535,000 is available for the period July 1, 1996 through June 30, 1999 for necessary expenses of construction, rehabilitation, and acquisition of Job Corps centers; and of which \$95,000,000 shall be available from July 1, 1996 through September 30, 1997, for carrying out activities of the School-to-Work Opportunities Act: *Provided*, That \$50,000,000 shall be for carrying out section 401 of the Job Training Partnership Act, \$65,000,000 shall be for carrying out section 402 of such Act, \$7,300,000 shall be for carrying out section 441 of such Act, \$830,000,000 shall be for carrying out title II, part A of such Act, and \$126,672,000 shall be for carry-

ing out title II, part C of such Act: *Provided further*, That no funds from any other appropriation shall be used to provide meal services at or for Job Corps centers.

##### COMMUNITY SERVICE EMPLOYMENT FOR OLDER AMERICANS

To carry out title V of the Older Americans Act of 1965, as amended, \$350,000,000.

##### FEDERAL UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS AND ALLOWANCES

For payments during the current fiscal year of trade adjustment benefit payments and allowances under part I, and for training, for allowances for job search and relocation, and for related State administrative expenses under part II, subchapters B and D, chapter 2, title II of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended, \$346,100,000, together with such amounts as may be necessary to be charged to the subsequent appropriation for payments for any period subsequent to September 15 of the current year.

##### STATE UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE AND EMPLOYMENT SERVICE OPERATIONS

For activities authorized by the Act of June 6, 1933, as amended (29 U.S.C. 49-49I-1; 39 U.S.C. 3202(a)(1)(E)); title III of the Social Security Act, as amended (42 U.S.C. 502-504); necessary administrative expenses for carrying out 5 U.S.C. 8501-8523, and sections 225, 231-235, 243-244, and 250(d)(1), 250(d)(3), title II of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended; as authorized by section 7c of the Act of June 6, 1933, as amended, necessary administrative expenses under sections 101(a)(15)(H), 212(a)(5)(A), (m) (2) and (3), (n)(1), and 218(g)(1), (2), and (3), and 258(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended (8 U.S.C. 1101 et seq.); necessary administrative expenses to carry out section 221(a) of the Immigration Act of 1990, \$125,328,000, together with not to exceed \$3,109,368,000 (including not to exceed \$1,653,000 which may be used for amortization payments to States which had independent retirement plans in their State employment service agencies prior to 1980, and including not to exceed \$2,000,000 which may be obligated in contracts with non-State entities for activities such as occupational and test research activities which benefit the Federal-State Employment Service System), which may be expended from the Employment Security Administration account in the Unemployment Trust Fund, and of which the sums available in the allocation for activities authorized by title III of the Social Security Act, as amended (42 U.S.C. 502-504), and the sums available in the allocation for necessary administrative expenses for carrying out 5 U.S.C. 8501-8523, shall be available for obligation by the States through December 31, 1996, except that funds used for automation acquisitions shall be available for obligation by States through September 30, 1998; and of which \$125,328,000, together with not to exceed \$738,283,000 of the amount which may be expended from said trust fund shall be available for obligation for the period July 1, 1996, through June 30, 1997, to fund activities under the Act of June 6, 1933, as amended, including the cost of penalty mail made available to States in lieu of allotments for such purpose, and of which \$218,297,000 shall be available only to the extent necessary for additional State allocations to administer unemployment compensation laws to finance increases in the number of unemployment insurance claims filed and claims paid or changes in a State law: *Provided*, That to the extent that the Average Weekly Insured Unemployment (AWIU) for fiscal year 1996 is projected by the Department of Labor to exceed 2.785 million, an additional \$28,600,000 shall be available for obligation for every 100,000 increase in the AWIU level (including

a pro rata amount for any increment less than 100,000) from the Employment Security Administration Account of the Unemployment Trust Fund: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated in this Act which are used to establish a national one-stop career center network may be obligated in contracts, grants or agreements with non-State entities: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated under this Act for activities authorized under the Wagner-Peyser Act, as amended, and title III of the Social Security Act, may be used by the States to fund integrated Employment Service and Unemployment Insurance automation efforts, notwithstanding cost allocation principles prescribed under Office of Management and Budget Circular A-87.

##### ADVANCES TO THE UNEMPLOYMENT TRUST FUND AND OTHER FUNDS

For repayable advances to the Unemployment Trust Fund as authorized by sections 905(d) and 1203 of the Social Security Act, as amended, and to the Black Lung Disability Trust Fund as authorized by section 9501(c)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, as amended; and for nonrepayable advances to the Unemployment Trust Fund as authorized by section 8509 of title 5, United States Code, and section 104(d) of Public Law 102-164, and section 5 of Public Law 103-6, and to the "Federal unemployment benefits and allowances" account, to remain available until September 30, 1997, \$369,000,000.

In addition, for making repayable advances to the Black Lung Disability Trust Fund in the current fiscal year after September 15, 1996, for costs incurred by the Black Lung Disability Trust Fund in the current fiscal year, such sums as may be necessary.

##### PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION

For expenses of administering employment and training programs and for carrying out section 908 of the Social Security Act, \$83,505,000, together with not to exceed \$40,974,000, which may be expended from the Employment Security Administration account in the Unemployment Trust Fund.

##### PENSION AND WELFARE BENEFITS ADMINISTRATION

##### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for Pension and Welfare Benefits Administration, \$64,113,000.

##### PENSION BENEFIT GUARANTY CORPORATION PENSION BENEFIT GUARANTY CORPORATION FUND

The Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation is authorized to make such expenditures, including financial assistance authorized by section 104 of Public Law 96-364, within limits of funds and borrowing authority available to such Corporation, and in accord with law, and to make such contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal year limitations as provided by section 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended (31 U.S.C. 9104), as may be necessary in carrying out the program through September 30, 1996, for such Corporation: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$10,603,000 shall be available for administrative expenses of the Corporation: *Provided further*, That expenses of such Corporation in connection with the collection of premiums, the termination of pension plans, for the acquisition, protection or management, and investment of trust assets, and for benefits administration services shall be considered as non-administrative expenses for the purposes hereof, and excluded from the above limitation.

##### EMPLOYMENT STANDARDS ADMINISTRATION SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for the Employment Standards Administration, including

reimbursement to State, Federal, and local agencies and their employees for inspection services rendered, \$246,967,000, together with \$978,000 which may be expended from the Special Fund in accordance with sections 39(c) and 44(j) of the Longshore and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Labor is authorized to accept, retain, and spend, until expended, in the name of the Department of Labor, all sums of money ordered to be paid to the Secretary of Labor, in accordance with the terms of the Consent Judgment in Civil Action No. 91-0027 of the United States District Court for the District of the Northern Mariana Islands (May 21, 1992): *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Labor is authorized to establish and, in accordance with 31 U.S.C. 3302, collect and deposit in the Treasury fees for processing applications and issuing certificates under sections 11(d) and 14 of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended (29 U.S.C. 211(d) and 214) and for processing applications and issuing registrations under Title I of the Migrant and Seasonal Agricultural Worker Protection Act, 29 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.

## SPECIAL BENEFITS

## (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the payment of compensation, benefits, and expenses (except administrative expenses) accruing during the current or any prior fiscal year authorized by title 5, chapter 81 of the United States Code; continuation of benefits as provided for under the head "Civilian War Benefits" in the Federal Security Agency Appropriation Act, 1947; the Employees' Compensation Commission Appropriation Act, 1944; and sections 4(c) and 5(f) of the War Claims Act of 1948 (50 U.S.C. App. 2012); and 50 per centum of the additional compensation and benefits required by section 10(h) of the Longshore and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, as amended, \$218,000,000 together with such amounts as may be necessary to be charged to the subsequent year appropriation for the payment of compensation and other benefits for any period subsequent to August 15 of the current year: *Provided*, That such sums as are necessary may be used under section 8104 of title 5, United States Code, by the Secretary to reimburse an employer, who is not the employer at the time of injury, for portions of the salary of a reemployed, disabled beneficiary: *Provided further*, That balances of reimbursements unobligated on September 30, 1995, shall remain available until expended for the payment of compensation, benefits, and expenses: *Provided further*, That in addition there shall be transferred to this appropriation from the Postal Service and from any other corporation or instrumentality required under section 8147(c) of title 5, United States Code, to pay an amount for its fair share of the cost of administration, such sums as the Secretary of Labor determines to be the cost of administration for employees of such fair share entities through September 30, 1996: *Provided further*, That of those funds transferred to this account from the fair share entities to pay the cost of administration, \$11,383,000 shall be made available to the Secretary of Labor for expenditures relating to capital improvements in support of Federal Employees' Compensation Act administration, and the balance of such funds shall be paid into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may require that any person filing a notice of injury or a claim for benefits under Subchapter 5, U.S.C., chapter 81, or under subchapter 33, U.S.C. 901, et seq. (the Longshore and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, as amended), provide as part of such notice and claim, such identifying information (including Social Security ac-

count number) as such regulations may prescribe.

BLACK LUNG DISABILITY TRUST FUND  
(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For payments from the Black Lung Disability Trust Fund, \$995,447,000, of which \$949,494,000 shall be available until September 30, 1997, for payment of all benefits as authorized by section 9501(d) (1), (2), (4), and (7), of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, as amended, and interest on advances as authorized by section 9501(c)(2) of that Act, and of which \$26,045,000 shall be available for transfer to Employment Standards Administration, Salaries and Expenses, and \$19,621,000 for transfer to Departmental Management, Salaries and Expenses, and \$287,000 for transfer to Departmental Management, Office of Inspector General, for expenses of operation and administration of the Black Lung Benefits program as authorized by section 9501(d)(5)(A) of that Act: *Provided*, That in addition, such amounts as may be necessary may be charged to the subsequent year appropriation for the payment of compensation, interest, or other benefits for any period subsequent to August 15 of the current year: *Provided further*, That in addition such amounts shall be paid from this fund into miscellaneous receipts as the Secretary of the Treasury determines to be the administrative expenses of the Department of the Treasury for administering the fund during the current fiscal year, as authorized by section 9501(d)(5)(B) of that Act.

OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH  
ADMINISTRATION

## SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for the Occupational Safety and Health Administration, \$263,985,000 including not to exceed \$65,319,000 which shall be the maximum amount available for grants to States under section 23(g) of the Occupational Safety and Health Act, which grants shall be no less than fifty percent of the costs of State occupational safety and health programs required to be incurred under plans approved by the Secretary under section 18 of the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970; and, in addition, notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302, the Occupational Safety and Health Administration may retain up to \$500,000 per fiscal year of training institute course tuition fees, otherwise authorized by law to be collected, and may utilize such sums for occupational safety and health training and education grants: *Provided*, That none of the funds appropriated under this paragraph shall be obligated or expended to prescribe, issue, administer, or enforce any standard, rule, regulation, or order under the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 which is applicable to any person who is engaged in a farming operation which does not maintain a temporary labor camp and employs ten or fewer employees: *Provided further*, That no funds appropriated under this paragraph shall be obligated or expended to administer or enforce any standard, rule, regulation, or order under the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 with respect to any employer of ten or fewer employees who is included within a category having an occupational injury lost workday case rate, at the most precise Standard Industrial Classification Code for which such data are published, less than the national average rate as such rates are most recently published by the Secretary, acting through the Bureau of Labor Statistics, in accordance with section 24 of that Act (29 U.S.C. 673), except—

(1) to provide, as authorized by such Act, consultation, technical assistance, educational and training services, and to conduct surveys and studies;

(2) to conduct an inspection or investigation in response to an employee complaint, to issue a citation for violations found during such inspection, and to assess a penalty for violations which are not corrected within a reasonable abatement period and for any willful violations found;

(3) to take any action authorized by such Act with respect to imminent dangers;

(4) to take any action authorized by such Act with respect to health hazards;

(5) to take any action authorized by such Act with respect to a report of an employment accident which is fatal to one or more employees or which results in hospitalization of two or more employees, and to take any action pursuant to such investigation authorized by such Act; and

(6) to take any action authorized by such Act with respect to complaints of discrimination against employees for exercising rights under such Act:

*Provided further*, That the foregoing proviso shall not apply to any person who is engaged in a farming operation which does not maintain a temporary labor camp and employs ten or fewer employees.

## MINE SAFETY AND HEALTH ADMINISTRATION

## SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for the Mine Safety and Health Administration, \$185,154,000, including purchase and bestowal of certificates and trophies in connection with mine rescue and first-aid work, and the hire of passenger motor vehicles; the Secretary is authorized to accept lands, buildings, equipment, and other contributions from public and private sources and to prosecute projects in cooperation with other agencies, Federal, State, or private; the Mine Safety and Health Administration is authorized to promote health and safety education and training in the mining community through cooperative programs with States, industry, and safety associations; and any funds available to the Department may be used, with the approval of the Secretary, to provide for the costs of mine rescue and survival operations in the event of a major disaster: *Provided*, That none of the funds appropriated under this paragraph shall be obligated or expended to carry out section 115 of the Federal Mine Safety and Health Act of 1977 or to carry out that portion of section 104(g)(1) of such Act relating to the enforcement of any training requirements, with respect to shell dredging, or with respect to any sand, gravel, surface stone, surface clay, colloidal phosphate, or surface limestone mine.

## BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS

## SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for the Bureau of Labor Statistics, including advances or reimbursements to State, Federal, and local agencies and their employees for services rendered, \$296,993,000, of which \$11,549,000 shall be for expenses of revising the Consumer Price Index and shall remain available until September 30, 1997, together with not to exceed \$50,220,000, which may be expended from the Employment Security Administration account in the Unemployment Trust Fund.

## DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT

## SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for Departmental Management, including the hire of three sedans, and including up to \$4,056,000 for the President's Committee on Employment of People With Disabilities, \$130,220,000; together with not to exceed \$303,000, which may be expended from the Employment Security Administration account in the Unemployment Trust Fund.

## WORKING CAPITAL FUND

The language under this heading in Public Law 85-67, as amended, is further amended by adding the following before the last period: "Provided further, That within the Working Capital Fund, there is established an Investment in Reinvention Fund (IRF), which shall be available to invest in projects of the Department designed to produce measurable improvements in agency efficiency and significant taxpayer savings. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Labor may retain up to \$3,900,000 of the unobligated balances in the Department's annual Salaries and Expenses accounts as of September 30, 1995, and transfer those amounts to the IRF to provide the initial capital for the IRF, to remain available until expended, to make loans to agencies of the Department for projects designed to enhance productivity and generate cost savings. Such loans shall be repaid to the IRF no later than September 30 of the fiscal year following the fiscal year in which the project is completed. Such repayments shall be deposited in the IRF, to be available without further appropriation action."

ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR VETERANS  
EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING

Not to exceed \$175,883,000 may be derived from the Employment Security Administration account in the Unemployment Trust Fund to carry out the provisions of 38 U.S.C. 4100-4110A and 4321-4327, and Public Law 103-353, and which shall be available for obligation by the States through December 31, 1996.

## OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For salaries and expenses of the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, \$44,426,000, together with not to exceed \$3,615,000, which may be expended from the Employment Security Administration account in the Unemployment Trust Fund.

## GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 101. None of the funds appropriated in this title for the Job Corps shall be used to pay the compensation of an individual, either as direct costs or any proration as an indirect cost, at a rate in excess of \$125,000.

SEC. 102. Section 427(c) of the Job Training Partnership Act, as amended, is repealed.

SEC. 103. No amount of funds appropriated in this Act for fiscal year 1996 may be used to implement, administer, or enforce any executive order, or other rule or order, that prohibits Federal contracts with, or requires the debarment of, or imposes other sanction on, a contractor on the basis that such contractor or organizational unit thereof has permanently replaced lawfully striking workers.

SEC. 104. None of the funds made available in this Act to the Department of Labor or the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation may be used—

(1) to implement or administer Interpretive Bulletin 94-1, issued by the Secretary of Labor on June 23, 1994 (59 Fed. Reg. 32606; 29 C.F.R. 2509.94-1),

(2) to establish or maintain, or to contract with (or otherwise provide assistance to) any other party to establish or maintain, any clearinghouse, database, or other listing which—

(A) makes available to employee benefit plans (as defined in section 3(3) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974) information relating to the status of investments as economically targeted investments referred to in such Interpretive Bulletin,

(B) provides assistance to employee benefit plans (as so defined) or any other party to develop or evaluate investments as economically targeted investments referred to in such Interpretive Bulletin, or

(C) identifies investments with respect to which the Department or the Corporation will withhold from undertaking enforcement actions under such Act by reason of their status as economically targeted investments referred to in such Interpretive Bulletin,

(3) to administer or otherwise carry out the contract entered into by the Department of Labor designated "Contract No. J-9-P-4-0060" or any other similar contract entered into by the Department or the Corporation (except to the extent required by applicable law to provide for the immediate termination of such contract), or

(4) to promote economically targeted investments referred to in such Interpretive Bulletin, either by direct means, such as lecture or travel, or by indirect means.

SEC. 105. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used by the Occupational Safety and Health Administration directly or through section 23(g) of the Occupational Safety and Health Act for the development, promulgation or issuance of any proposed or final standard or guideline regarding ergonomic protection or recording and reporting occupational injuries and illnesses directly related thereto.

SEC. 106. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no funds shall be expended by the Occupational Safety and Health Administration for the enforcement of the Fall Protection Standard published at subpart M of 29 CFR part 1926, until 30 days after a new standard has been promulgated by the Secretary of Labor ("the Secretary").

The Secretary shall develop this standard no later than 180 days after the enactment of this Act. Until the publishing of the revised final rule, the Occupational Safety and Health Administration may only expend funds designated for the enforcement of an interim fall protection standard which adjusts all height requirements referenced at subpart M of 29 CFR part 1926 from 6 feet to 16 feet.

SEC. 107. None of the funds appropriated in this Act may be obligated or expended by the Department of Labor for the purposes of enforcement and the issuance of fines under Hazardous Occupation Order Number 12 (HO 12) with respect to the placement or loading of materials by a person under 18 years of age into a cardboard baler that is in compliance with the American National Standards Institute safety standard ANSI Z245.5 1990, and a compactor that is in compliance with the American National Standards Institute safety standard ANSI Z245.2 1992.

SEC. 108. None of the funds appropriated in this Act may be obligated or expended by the Department of Labor for the purposes of enforcement and the issuance of fines under Hazardous Occupation Order Number 2 (HO 2) with respect to incidental and occasional driving by minors under age 18, unless the Secretary finds that the operation of a motor vehicle is the primary duty of the minor's employment.

This title may be cited as the "Department of Labor Appropriations Act, 1996".

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] will be recognized for 45 minutes, and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] will be recognized for 45 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER].

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, total discretionary funding for the Department of Labor is \$8.4 billion. This is a reduction of \$1.1 billion below fiscal year 1995's revised

amount and a reduction of \$3 billion below the President's budget request.

In addition, the bill includes \$1.9 billion for entitlement spending in the Labor Department. This is a reduction of \$583 million below fiscal year 1995 and \$3 million below the budget request.

The budget includes substantial reductions in certain job training programs, including elimination of funding for summer jobs program, also previously rescinded because of the general lack of effectiveness. This decision reflects the need to prioritize programs and reduce spending, as well as the fact that the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities is in the process of consolidating these very programs.

We also believe that these job training programs under the Job Training Partnership Act are, on the whole, less than effective, in that taxpayer funding is not getting full value out of these funds. Job Corps funding, however, has increased \$31 million over last year, which will allow funding for four new centers which were approved in prior years and are opening in 1996. No additional new centers were approved beyond the ones already approved in prior years.

The total for Job Corps is \$1.1 billion. We know that this program is expensive, but we believe that in the majority of centers, it is more successful in dealing with the very disadvantaged population than are the other principal job training programs which we have reduced very substantially. The committee has made it clear that the Government is to take all necessary steps to straighten out those centers that are not performing up to standards. I might say Job Corps, Mr. Chairman, addresses the most at-risk youth in our society.

The bill directs more of the Community Service Employment for Older Americans funding to States rather than to national contractors. We think the States can do a better job in this area. The national contractors have been in this program for 25 to 30 years, and there is essentially no competition in the program. They are simply renewed each year, year after year, by the Department of Labor. This includes AARP, the National Council on Senior Citizens, and the National Council on Aging. We believe these matters should be handled more at the State level.

One-stop career centers are level funded at \$100 million. We believe this is adequate to maintain this program at current levels until we see whether it is going to do what the administration says that it will do. This sounds like a good concept, but there are so many job training programs operating, according to GAO, 163 of them, that it is not at all clear that a new Federal grant program is going to coordinate and pull all of this together. Congress needs to take legislative action to clean up this maze of job training programs. We are hopeful that this will be

accomplished by the authorizing committee.

We fund State unemployment insurance administrative costs at roughly the same as the 1995 level. This bill includes \$2.3 billion for States to administer the unemployment benefit program. We expect that the States will tighten their belts on administrative costs, just like the Federal agencies are doing in this bill.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics is funded at \$347 million, a decrease of only 1.3 percent. We provide full funding for the revision of the consumer price index, and we expect the Bureau of Labor Statistics to give this a very high priority.

OSHA funding is reduced by 15 percent and shifted to emphasize compliance assistance. We increased funding by 19.2 percent over enforcement activities, where we cut funding by 33 percent for Federal enforcement and 7.5 percent for State enforcement.

□ 1545

Language is also included to prohibit OSHA from issuing a standard on ergonomic protection. This agency serves a useful public purpose, but it needs to arrange its priorities from being a policeman to a more cooperative and consulting role.

The bill also contains language to prevent implementation of the President's Executive order on striker replacements and to end pressure on pension funds to invest in economically targeted investments.

This language, along with other language included in the bill, was included at the request of the authorizing committee. The bill reduces administrative costs throughout the Department by cutting overall administrative budgets by 7.5 percent and the congressional and public affairs offices by 10 percent. The bill includes nearly \$1.5 billion for Labor Department salaries and expense costs in 1996.

We believe that the Department can make do with that amount and still accomplish its essential duties under the law.

Overall, this bill substantially downsizes the Department of Labor. We think that we have reduced programs that do not work very well and have reduced overhead and administrative costs in a reasonable way. We have fully maintained the Job Corps. We have tried to redirect the priorities of the Occupational Safety and Health Administration. And we have provided adequate funding for the Department to carry out its essential responsibilities under the law.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, working people pay most of the taxes to support the activities of Government. Yet the activities of Government that are most being chopped by this bill are those that help workers, that help the children and the

families of workers by way of education, training, and health.

Our Republican friends are evidently not satisfied that between 1980 and 1993 only 97 percent of all of the income growth that occurred in our country went to the wealthiest 20 percent of people in this society. The rest of the 80 percent in this society had to settle for sharing that tiny little 3 percent. And yet this bill will in fact make that situation worse.

They think workers have too much power in the marketplace. In my view that is a joke. Yet their bill goes ahead and guts the ability of the NLRB to enforce laws to protect workers on everything from wages and hours to the minimum wage. It savages the ability of OSHA to provide a safe and healthy workplace; \$1 out of every \$4 that were present a year ago to defend the interests of workers in this society will be gone under this bill, \$1 out of \$4.

This bill, for instance, provides a healthy appropriation for the National Institutes of Health. I applaud that. They deal with diseases that anybody can get, whether you are the CEO of a plant or the janitor at that same plant. But the National Institutes of Occupational Health and Safety is supposed to be that one agency which does the research, the medical research which is supposed to underlie the actions that OSHA then takes to protect the health of American workers.

That agency is savaged. All ability to train occupational health workers in that agency is ended. Its budget, the budget to provide the desperately needed research, is gutted. I think the majority party ought to be ashamed of itself.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI], who will begin essentially our side of this 1½-hour discussion on title I, focused on the problems that it presents to American workers.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member for yielding time to me, and once again for being such an articulate spokesperson for America's workers and America's families.

There are many reasons to be against this bill. Many of them have been enumerated in the debate thus far, and we will hear more later.

But this part of the bill, title I, deals with the war on American workers that this legislation has declared. Indeed, regardless of comments to the contrary from the majority Republican side, this legislation cuts \$10 billion, \$10 billion in programs that relate to family planning in title 10, workers protections, health, education. The list goes on and on.

This section, title I, goes to, as I said, the war on American workers. The Republican majority with this bill says to the American worker, essentially: Get lost. When it comes to your safety in the workplace, your pension protections, your employment standards and collective bargaining and job security, forget it. That is what the majority is saying.

This takes place at a time when workers in America are menaced by corporate downsizing to increase profits, the bottom line for corporate America, globalization, putting many U.S. jobs offshore, and the technological advances which we all support. Those factors make it even harder to understand why the Republican majority would strike out at the American worker at this very difficult time in our economic history.

We hear a great deal about competitiveness, how can we compete with our European and our Japanese competitors when they respect their workers? The American workers are the most productive workers in the world. Yet our reward to them is to say, in this bill, the law of the jungle will prevail. Laissez-faire reigns. We are not interested in your progress.

This committee bill reverses decades of progress to protect American workers. Out of respect for those American workers, I offered an amendment to restore funding for seven critical worker protections. Unfortunately, this amendment is not in order under the rule. Therefore, I want to explain to Members the implication of these cuts on American workers.

A vote for this bill, and I think every Member should be very conscious of this when they put their card in the machine, a vote for this bill is a vote for a 33 percent cut in safety and health enforcement in our country. Currently, 6,000 Americans are injured on the job each day, and these injuries cost America more than \$112 billion a year. So it does not even make economic sense to make this foolish cut. These preventable injuries have a direct impact on American families.

In addition to that, they have a cut of 25 percent in safety and health research. Are you ready for this, my colleagues? Even General Motors is opposing this cut. This research ultimately saves the Nation billions of dollars annually in medical costs. Of course, the health care costs borne by the industry directly impact on the price of product, making global competition an issue as well. That is why General Motors is opposing this cut. Why do we not?

There are also cuts in mine safety. This means fewer mines will be inspected, exposing more miners to injury.

There are other reductions proposed in pension protections. The reductions proposed in this bill place in jeopardy working families' pensions. These cutbacks will result in pension plan losses of at least \$100 million, and the number of pension fraud cases pursued will decline by 20 percent.

Employment standards enforcement is cut by 25 percent. These reductions will mean that \$25 million in back wages owed to some 50,000 workers will not be recovered.

Mr. Chairman, for the record, I am putting elaboration of all of this in, but in the interest of time I am just

going to proceed to collective bargaining. The collective bargaining protections are cut by 30 percent. This is absolutely appalling. The National Labor Relations Board was created in 1935 to bring order to labor disputes.

This bill cuts 30 percent of the funds for the NLRB and handcuffs the board's ability to enforce existing laws and safeguards on employees rights and employers protection. The NLRB guards against unfair labor practices both by employers and employees. This is a direct attack on the basic rights of both.

The dislocated worker assistance program is cut by 34 percent. This means that 193,000 workers who lose their jobs in 1996, through no fault of their own, will not receive training.

Rapid advancements in technology, defense downsizing, corporate restructuring, and intense global competition result in structural changes necessary for economical growth. This program works. The inspector general has reported that workers served by this program were reemployed, remained in the workforce, and regained their earning power. Continuing our investment in dislocated workers is essential.

The cuts in these seven programs for worker protection, along with a long list of legislation provisions—limiting the authority of agencies to enforce child labor laws, laws which protect workers' right to organize, and regulations to protect occupational safety; and language blocking the President's Executive order regarding striker replacements—constitute a war on the American worker.

Mr. Chairman, American workers are the engine of our economy. They must be treated with dignity and respect. They also deserve a safe workplace. Despite our budget challenges, we should not retreat on worker protection. Cuts that will result in increased workplace accidents and fatalities will cost our society. This is the wrong place to cut back. Shame.

Mr. Chairman, we will go into this more as we try to bring up other amendments. All I am saying here today is that, if Members in this Chamber care about the American worker, they will vote against this bill.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Bentonville, AR [Mr. HUTCHINSON], a member of the Economic and Educational Opportunities Committee.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman on his leadership that he has displayed on this very fine appropriations bill. I also want to commend my chairman on the Subcommittee on Workforce Protections, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BALLENGER], for the work that he has done on OSHA reform.

We have had a number of OSHA hearings in recent months in which we have heard repeatedly the kind of horror stories of OSHA overkill. So I am very glad to support this bill, particularly because of the OSHA provisions in which we reduce funding for enforcement, investigation and imposition of penalties by 33 percent while increasing compliance assistance by 20 percent, as we can see on this chart.

This bill simply redirects OSHA's current philosophy of assessing excessive fines and penalties to one where OSHA will be required to work with and assist small businesses in their efforts to promote health and safety in the workplace. So we reduce the funding by 33 percent on the enforcement side while increasing funding by 20 percent on compliance assistance.

Surely it is not too much to ask of the Occupational Safety and Health Administration to work with small businesses to ensure the health and safety of their employees. After all, that is why OSHA was created.

We heard so many stories, but this story was faxed to me, and it is very typical of the kinds of stories we heard on OSHA overkill in our hearings. This small businessman operated for 21 years. None of his employees ever had a lost-day injury, not one. No workmen's compensation claim was ever paid. Yet after 21 years, that OSHA inspector came in, filed 21 alleged violations.

He said the allegations were that he was exposing his employees to hazards such as not having a crane operators manual, and not having instructions on how to pour diesel fuel, and not having a list of hazards on how to handle gasoline, grease, and concrete.

I will make a long story short. That happened in 1991, 4 years. After he contested the allegations, after he contested the citations, 4 years later and hundreds of thousands of dollars in legal costs later, all of the citations were vacated.

Would it not make a lot more sense had that inspector simply said, you have got 30 days to make the corrections on where we see violations and where you are out of compliance? The small businessman makes those corrections, and we go on with a good, safe workplace, saving the taxpayers of America hundreds of thousands of dollars in litigation costs.

That is what this bill moves toward. It refocuses its priorities toward assisting businesses in having a safe workplace.

OSHA inspectors are simply misguided in their efforts to promote a safe workplace. In recent years, eight of the 10 most cited standards by OSHA have been paperwork violations. With OSHA, it is regulation, inspection, citation and fine, fine, fine, and we want to change that.

We have heard that the 11-percent cut overall in Labor-HHS appropriations, the sky is falling, you have heard apocalypse now. You have heard, as one speaker said, that it is a declaration of war on the children. There has been a lot of talk about hurting our children. They say they are worried about our children. I want to say I am worried about our children. My son, about a year from now, will be getting married to a wonderful, wonderful bride. A few years from now they will be starting a family. His first child will be my first grandchild, and I am wor-

ried about them. I am worried about the future we are giving them. I am worried about the \$18,000 debt that that little grandchild will inherit, the day he is born or she is born.

I am concerned about the \$187,000 that they will pay in taxes just to pay interest on the national debt. So, when we talk about the children and the impact of this bill upon the children, please think about that. Think about the burden that we are imposing. And you will hear, as we have heard, that the minority leader said this bill is a dagger aimed at the heart of the children. No, it is not. It is a dagger aimed at the heart of runaway social spending. You heard that it is a war on American workers. No, it is not. It is not a war on American workers. It is a war on job-killing deficit spending.

□ 1600

It is time we made the start. This bill does that. Let us pass a good Labor-HHS appropriation bill.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. KENNEDY].

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Chairman, I believe when 17 Rhode Islanders died on the job in 1992, that we are not doing enough to protect worker safety; but the Republicans in this bill are saying that we are doing enough. In fact, they are saying that we are doing too much to protect workers.

Just think about this for a moment, Mr. Chairman. When 6,000 workers die every year, and there is one worker-related fatality every 5 seconds in this country, the Republicans in this bill we say are spending too much money on worker safety. This is madness.

Since worker safety protections were put in place in order to address trenching fatalities, the number of workers killed has declined by 35 percent, and hundreds of trenching accidents have been prevented. In one instance, an OSHA inspector in a Cleveland construction site said that the workers had to wear fall protection gear while working on a scaffolding 70 feet above the ground. Four days later that scaffolding collapsed, 4 days later, while none of the workers were injured, because they were all wearing the protective gear that OSHA told them they should wear. This is the reason we need to protect it.

Mr. Chairman, since the agency was charged with protecting worker safety, and since it was put in place, overall workplace fatalities have declined 57 percent, so why is this bill cutting its budget by 33 percent? Obviously, as the Member just said, to save money. That is obvious. The question is, save money for what? Save money and lose jobs? Save money and lose lives? Save money so that the richest 1 percent of this country can get a \$20,000 tax break? To me, that is deplorable, and we should not allow it.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Hickory, NC [Mr.

BALLENGER], the chairman of the Subcommittee on Workforce Protections of the Committee on Economic and Education Opportunities.

Mr. BALLENGER. I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, there has been a lot of talk about how if we make any cuts in OSHA enforcement we will directly endanger American workers. That kind of statement presumes that only the strong enforcement arm of OSHA stands between workers and serious injury and death. I think we all know that that's nonsense. Employers in this country have a lot more reasons than OSHA for providing safe workplaces. The fact of the matter is that once one cuts through the rhetoric, the evidence of an overall effect of OSHA in reducing injuries and deaths over the past 25 years is at best very limited.

It has been claimed that OSHA works because workplace fatality rates have decreased by more than 50 percent since the OSH Act was passed. In fact, workplace fatality rates have declined steadily since the end of World War II, and in fact the fatality rate decreased more during the 24 years prior to OSHA than it did in the 24 years after OSHA was created.

OSHA itself cites a 1993 study which, OSHA claims, "confirmed that in the three years following an OSHA inspection and fine, injuries at the inspected worksite decline by as much as 22%." In fact, OSHA is trying to make that study's conclusions far more positive than the authors were. The authors of the study did estimate that in their sample of companies that had been inspected and fined there was a 22-percent decline in injuries over 3 years. The companies in the sample were very large manufacturing facilities; thus the number of injuries suffered was relatively high compared to all worksites in the United States. The authors did try to extrapolate their findings from this sample to all employers, and concluded that OSHA probably reduced overall injuries by about 2 percent. Indeed, nearly all economists' attempts to estimate the overall effect of OSHA on workplace injuries have concluded that the effect is between 0 and 3 percent.

Since OSHA began the Federal Government has spent over \$4 billion directly in implementing and enforcing the OSH Act and directed that billions more be spent by American employers to comply. Why is there so little evidence that OSHA has had a significant effect on workplace safety and health?

If you talk to safety and health directors across this country, what you realize is that OSHA's preoccupation on enforcement is not only not effective, but often counterproductive. Let me just read a few comments from a safety and health director of a major printing company.

During the 1980's and my first five years with Donnelly, my department's focus was compliance based. During this time period, our accident rates and workers' compensa-

tion costs increased dramatically. During this time frame, we averaged about 10 OSHA inspections per year. None of the citations related to the main reasons our accidents were occurring. To use an analogy, all of our citations were for not putting a band-aid on a cut—none were for what was causing the cut. In the beginning of 1992, we returned to our historical focus of managing safety and not compliance. With the return to our historical focus on accident prevention, we achieved an accident rate reduction of 16%, a lost time accident rate reduction of 15% and a workers' compensation cost per claim reduction of 24% from 1991 through the end of 1994.

In my position, I spend approximately 50% of my time on OSHA compliance issues and our plant safety coordinators spend approximately 80% of their time on compliance activities. The majority of our resources are dedicated to paperwork and programs that are not the cause of our problems. OSHA could be a helpful resource in our efforts to prevent accidents, but the agency needs to be refocused.

The problem is that OSHA's emphasis has been on compliance with regulations, many of which have only indirect or minor relationship to safety. More reasonable regulations, combined with other strategies which focus on safety and health rather than punishment—expanded consultation services, incentives for good safety records, provision for private sector workplace reviews, more leeway for employee participation and safety committees, and directing that enforcement focus on serious health and safety concerns—will make OSHA more effective, as well as less onerous.

Reforms to OSHA are badly needed. We are trying to reform OSHA in my subcommittee. This appropriations bill is a realistic reflection of where OSHA is today. Don't be deceived by the talk about increased worker injuries. The evidence just doesn't support those claims.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS].

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

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, this bill is not merely about saving money. Very little money is saved in the reductions, the cuts on OSHA. This is about micromanaging the Department to achieve certain targeted objectives.

There is a conspiracy to wipe out OSHA. There is a conspiracy to destroy the effectiveness of OSHA. Thirty-three percent of the enforcement budget is cut, 33 percent is cut from an already small work force. With the number of inspectors that OSHA has presently, it would take them 86 years to inspect every business establishment in America one time, 86 years already. Now they are going to cut that by one-third. There is a conspiracy.

Mr. Chairman, that conspiracy is documented in a Washington Post article, two articles, which appeared July 23 and 24, and I intend to submit them in the Committee of the Whole for the RECORD, the entire two articles from the Washington Post. These articles

expose the fact that there is a covert war to obliterate OSHA and MSHA. This conspiring has been underway since the beginning of the 1994 election campaign.

The Post article indicated that the down payment for the contract to assassinate OSHA was \$65,000 in North Carolina. I am certain that similar war bonds for the destruction of OSHA and MSHA were being purchased in other States, also. They are specifically going after certain aspects of OSHA to please the business community. The world already knows how the Republican Party has turned over the Waco investigation to the NRA. That is well documented.

Thanks to this article in the Post, we now know that certain parts of what I call the Death and Injury Act in the authorizing committee was turned over to similar outside vested interests, and certain aspects of this appropriations bill have been turned over, to be written by outside interests.

Mr. Chairman, we are talking about life and death. We are talking about a bill which will go after the standards which protect the health and safety of American workers. Fifty-six thousand workers die per year. Ten thousand died last year directly on the job. The rest of them died as a result of complications suffered by conditions on the job or diseases contracted on the job, but 10,000 died directly.

In North Carolina, we know about the 25 people who were killed in one fire in a North Carolina plant that had not been inspected by OSHA. In Georgia, on March 17, 1994, Mr. Sangster, an employee of the Industrial Boiler Co., was killed while attempting to test fire a boiler. The boiler exploded and the left front door struck Mr. Sangster, killing him. There were quite a number of such deaths in the State of Georgia. I mention that because there are prominent Members of the State of Georgia delegation on the committee seeking to assassinate and destroy OSHA.

Also in Georgia, on April 18, 1994, a Mr. Powel, an employee of Harbert-Yeargin Co., was killed while in the process of erecting scaffolding. He bent over to pick up his hammer and his safety lantern got caught in an ungraded drive shaft. Mr. Powel was dragged into the shaft and killed.

In Pennsylvania, where the head of our authorizing committee that is out to assassinate and destroy OSHA resides, on December 13, 1993, a Mr. Rever, an employee of Hartlaub's Used Cars and Parts, was crushed to death. No safety chain assembly was being used, nor was the vehicle jacked and blocked as it is supposed to be to prevent the falling. As a result, when Mr. Rever used an impact wrench to remove parts, the van fell on him, crushing his head and chest.

Mr. Chairman, this is a life and death matter for American workers. Not only the members of labor unions but all American workers are affected. Since

OSHA has existed, the number of deaths and injuries have gone down. We must save OSHA from this micro-managing, and the authorizing language in this bill, which is part of the appropriations for appropriation, is part of the conspiracy to destroy it.

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

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Chairman, there are so many cuts on middle-class working Americans in this bill, it is hard to know where to start. However, one example is an organization called the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health, including the Southwest Center at the University of Texas in Houston. That is not in my district, but what that center and other regional centers do affect people across this country in every congressional district.

This program is purely scientific. It is a research organization. It is headed by scientists, not by politicians, not by bureaucrats, but scientists who are trying to prevent injury and illness in the workplace, to protect people so there are not lawsuits, so there is not government interference, so there is not an accident or an illness to start with. It is that program that is about prevention, not prosecution, that is about research, not redtape, that gets slashed in this Republican proposal.

By cutting this proposal, what Republicans are doing to middle-class working Americans is to cut research to improve the protective clothing for our firefighters, to cut research to cut out the investigation of new ways to improve respirators for our pilots, to cut research in painful and debilitating illnesses, like asbestosis and lead poisoning, that affect workers in the workplace, to cut research about workers who get crushed by machinery, who get crushed in accidental rollovers of large equipment.

Additionally, the Republicans abolish vital training and education programs that produced 2,700 health and safety professionals last year. They proceed to kill continuing education programs that taught 150,000 working men and women last year about the dangers of injury and illness. The goal of all these programs is to prevent injury and illness before it occurs. Stop the testing, stop the training, close the labs, turn out the lights. That is what this program is all about.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM].

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

Mr. Chairman, I think the committee has struck a good balance with what we are trying to accomplish in this Congress, and what we are trying to accomplish in this Congress, in my opinion, is to fulfill the mandate of the November election. Unfortunately, some of my colleagues apparently believe that caring is equated and shown by

how much commitment you have to fund bureaucracies in Washington, DC.

I would like to tell them the best I can that people in this country understand we can care without spending billions and billions of dollars on Federal bureaucracy. I care about safety in the workplace, but what I have been elected to do is reform government so we have a government that is efficient, that meets the needs of the people, and I think our OSHA structure does not meet the needs of the American businessman nor the American worker. When 8 out of 10 violations are paperwork violations, you can have a safe workplace but it may not be OSHA safe.

□ 1615

For every dollar that you take away from a small business or a large business, that is a dollar you take out of the pocket of an employee who works for that business.

Mr. Chairman, reality has finally come home to Congress. The reality is that we are broke up here. We are looking at ways to save money, but we want to do it in an efficient way without hurting people. We can care about the American worker without funding OSHA at the extent that people up here want it funded. There is not enough money in the printing press to satisfy the needs of some of the people that serve in this body to fund Washington, DC.

Mr. Chairman, I had a city councilman come up to me and talk about the EPA reforms that we are engaging in. He says, Congressman, what are you going to do if I dump raw sewage in the river? I said, well, the EPA is going to get you, because we have not changed that. That is still a bad thing to do. However, one thing you forget, Mr. City Councilman, is your citizens are going to throw you out of office.

People care in our community. One way to regulate what happens in the community is to have people involved without bureaucrats in Washington, DC always being involved. What we have done in this bill is we have reduced the enforcement gotcha provisions and we have replaced it with money to help people comply.

If you want to make your workplace safe, we are going to reinvent government so that you can come and talk with us and we will sit down and talk with you about how to make the workplace safe, rather than sending in a bunch of inspectors and take money out of your pocket because the paperwork does not add up. That is the new Congress, that is what I got elected to do.

One way to make sure nobody ever gets hurt is to do away with the ability to have a job in America. If we do not control our spending and the way we regulate in Washington, DC, we are not going to have any workplace injuries because nobody is going to have a job. That is what this Congress is about, trying to reinvent government with

some reality in the way it is run in Washington, DC.

The working stiff, I heard that mentioned 20-something times in my committee. I serve on the Workplace Protection Subcommittee with Secretary Reich. Well, let me tell him this, that in my district the average income is \$13,200. I am the first Republican to get elected in 120 years. I am the first person in my family to graduate college because my parents worked hard. Let me tell you, the working stiff has broke the code. Caring and funding Federal bureaucracies do not necessarily go together.

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, this Congress has passed some bad legislation, but this bill is worse than I ever thought possible.

It actually signals the end of the Federal Government's obligation, to protect the health and safety of the workers of our Nation.

I am a member of the Economic and Educational Opportunities Committee, a committee I call the Opportunity to Cut Everything Committee and working families from across this country have told me they are frightened by the new majority's efforts to gut workplace health and safety rules and support.

These workers' families tell me they are willing to see some of their taxes go toward enforcing health and safety rules, so that their loved ones come home at night from work safe and sound.

Mr. Chairman, that's a reasonable tradeoff for our working families, and that's a sound investment for our Nation.

This bill, however, makes it clear that the GINGRICH Republicans would rather invest in a tax break for the fat cats, than invest in the health and safety of American workers.

I urge all Americans who care about the health and safety of their loved ones to tell their representatives to oppose this bill.

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, this bill does not trim, it literally guts Occupational Safety and Health by one-third and will adversely impact millions of workers across this country. This very morning an individual was killed in my district in an oil refinery. He was using high pressure hydroblasting equipment to clean refinery equipment, was hit by water sprayed at a pressure of in excess of 10,000 pounds per square inch, and was killed. This accident could have been prevented.

Mr. Chairman, 55,000 workers die in our country and another 60,000 are permanently disabled each year in work-related deaths and injuries. Just in my region in the last 6 months there have been 11 work-related fatalities, a record number, two electrocutions, a

fall from an elevated platform where no fall protection was used, an individual crushed by a forklift, a woman who was working on structural steel and was killed by a piece of that steel, a worker overcome by fumes while filling a rail car with CO<sub>2</sub>. Let us stand up for people who work. Let us value life. Vote "no" on this bill.

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

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

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I am here to speak out against the 25-percent reduction to the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health.

NIOSH is the only Federal agency charged with conducting research to identify the causes of work injuries and diseases and develop approaches by which workers can be protected. This is not to be confused with OSHA. OSHA does not conduct research, although they rely on it.

Every day 17 Americans die from work injuries and illnesses. Every week 67,000 workers are disabled by workplace injuries and illnesses. What is more disappointing is the fact that most of these illnesses and injuries are preventable.

NIOSH has been making a difference to working men and women. Research and studies conducted by NIOSH has led to a reduction in work-related injuries, however, we still have a long way to go.

In July 1991, a 47-year old female had her entire scalp from the back of the neck to the browline removed.

Other workers have needed amputation and on average about 16 workers have been killed annually in entanglements involving rotating drive lines on agricultural machinery.

In 1991, NIOSH eased public concern over an unknown hazard and a possible link between use of video display terminals and a cluster of miscarriages.

At that time, there were over 7 million women operating video display terminals [VDTs] and there had been widespread concern that the cause of the highly publicized clusters of miscarriages among workers were caused because of exposure to VDTs. But thanks to NIOSH, these stories have happy endings. NIOSH published the definitive report that found no connection between VDTs and miscarriages. The NIOSH relieved anxiety of both employers and workers.

We must continue to protect our nation's workers. Do not support these cuts.

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FAWELL].

Mr. FAWELL. Mr. Chairman, I certainly rise in support of this legislation.

I would like to make reference to several of the labor references which are in the legislation. We have heard a lot of talk about the fact that there are tragic cuts being made here, but people often overlook some of the labor legislation we have on our books which are wasting a great deal of money.

One reference I would like to make is the economically targeted investments which have come to light as of recently. There we have the Department of Labor that has entered into what they call economically targeted investment, being investments in projects selected primarily for the social benefits that they purport to generate rather than the financial return and safety that they would give to America's pensioners.

We are talking here about the ERISA law, which has been a tremendous success in this Nation, by the way, and it is private financing which is going into the private infrastructure in investments. It is all done voluntarily by employers under the ERISA law.

Under that law for the last 20 years we have had this tremendously effective private pension plan project in this land of ours, the fiduciaries of ERISA and the pension plans rely upon what is called the prudent man rule, which is a very simple, basic rule that is well understood by the fiduciary community, the investment community, in this land.

Along comes the Department of Labor, and they issue what is called an interpretation of the prudent man rule, which is Interpretive Bulletin-94 that was issued in February 1994, where they try to interpret what is a socially beneficial investment, basically. Then, they follow that up by contracting for more than \$1 million to implement what they refer to as a clearinghouse.

This was done in September 1994. Indeed, they went ahead, without any congressional clearance, to give a contract to Hamilton Securities Advisory Services at a cost of over \$1 million to design and develop and operate a clearinghouse for the promotion, basically, of these economically targeted investments.

But the word that the financial community gives to the Department of Labor is, do not waste these millions of dollars in that regard. Do not promote or encourage or push any specific class of investments. You do not have to do that, because we have a very effective working prudent man rule in this land which has worked very well in regard to what is a proper investment being made in the private pension community.

Of course, what the Department of Labor would like to do is to be able to look at that \$3.5 trillion of pension funds which are out there, having been successfully invested, and they would like to, of course, steer those investments into what they deem to be socially correct, but that simply is not required. If economically targeted investments are just as sound as other investments, which is what the Department of Labor likes to say, then promoting them through a clearinghouse at a cost of over \$1 million just to get it started is superfluous, because the market obviously will direct capital to them.

Mr. Chairman, another area where we are spending money, for instance, and do not have to do at all, is the Presidential Executive Order 12954 which prohibits Federal contractors from hiring permanent replacement workers in an economic strike. Now, the President ignored completely that for 60 years the established labor law in America was that the workers did, indeed, and do, indeed, have the right to strike.

Also, as a last resort which no employer wants to ever utilize, the employer has the right to hire permanent replacement workers in a economic strike if indeed he finds that he has no other course but to go out of business if he cannot take that particular course.

Now, it is amazing to me that the President would just go ahead and take this action when there is no implied right, no basis in law under the procurement law, which he claims is his basis, to be able to enact a law like this. Presidents cannot just simply declare what the law shall be. It is not only not based on any kind of law, but also it is unconstitutional.

Mr. Chairman, we should think on these things as we criticize what this new Congress is trying to do.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLAY].

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

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Chairman, let me tell my colleagues what the cut proposed in this bill to the budget of the Pension and Welfare Benefits Administration [PWBA] will mean to working people and their families.

It means that a New York woman who needed emergency surgery to correct problems related to her breast cancer would have faced bankruptcy to pay her hospital bills.

It means that a group of Kansas City employees would have lost all the hard-earned money they contributed to their employer's profit sharing plan when the employer failed to forward their payroll deductions.

It means that more than 13,00 annuitants of terminated pension plans would not have been protected with a guarantee of more than \$200 million when their insurance company failed and went into receivership. These are examples of the conscientious people the PWBA helps.

Mr. Chairman, this bill will seriously endanger the security of workers' pensions and health benefits. It will make hard earned pensions and benefits much more vulnerable to thieves and scoundrels. This bill could be called the "Pension Grab Authorization Act."

The Republicans propose to slash the budget for the Pension and Welfare Benefits Administration for fiscal year 1996. The PWBA is a lean, mean pension watchdog. In fact, a recent Brookings Institution report praised the PWBA as "The most highly leveraged operation in the entire Federal government." On average a single employee of

the PWBA oversees \$4.8 billion in assets. So while the Republicans talk about eliminating wasteful bureaucrats, they contradict themselves with this cut. And while the Republicans talk about protecting pensions, they contradict themselves with this cut.

Three trillion dollars in pension and health assets covering more than 200 million Americans are protected by the agency. This enormous amount of money is an inviting target for flim-flam artists and embezzlers.

Last year, the PWBA responded to 158,000 requests for assistance. And its cases resulted in 141 criminal indictments and restored \$482 million in pension wealth to workers. But if the Republicans have their way, \$100 million that belongs to workers won't be recovered. One out of five pension thieves the agency would have indicted will be able to commit fraud with no repercussions. And 30,000 requests for information and assistance from working families concerned about their health care and pension benefits won't be answered.

Mr. Chairman, despite their claims to the contrary, the Republicans are willing to jeopardize workers' hard-earned pensions and benefits by gutting the PWBA. Vote against this bill.

□ 1630

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, the massive crippling in this bill of the National Labor Relations Board is a punitive effort to restrict the agency responsible for ensuring the rights of workers to organize and bargain collectively.

This agency was created in 1935 to bring order and reduce violence in labor organization disputes. The agency has served our Nation for over 60 years, guarding against unfair labor practices by both employers and employees.

Mr. colleagues who want to gut the NLRB should consider whether or not they really want disputes to be settled back in the streets, because that is where we are heading. In fact, with these massive cuts, it is going to take over 1,000 days before decisions are rendered by the NLRB. By disabling this agency, this bill strikes a hard blow against working Americans.

Mr. Chairman, let us stand up for working families. Let us vote "no" on this bill.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Tucson, AZ [Mr. KOLBE], my colleague on the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to discuss the Labor-HHS-Education bill before us today. Although we are now on title I, my comments are more general in nature.

Chairman PORTER deserves credit for the outstanding job he has done in his subcommittee. He has been patient in the face of extremely difficult cir-

cumstances as one bad amendment after another was attached to his bill during the full Appropriations Committee consideration. Unfortunately, this bill has now become a tar baby. Through no fault of the chairman, the Labor-HHS-Education bill is now fatally flawed.

Let me enumerate some of the problems I have with this bill. First, it contains extremely restrictive language on a woman's right to choose. It prohibits from receiving Federal funds ob/gyn residency programs that provide abortion training. The message we are sending is that while abortion is legal in our country, we are not going to train physicians on how to safely perform this procedure. This is an unprecedented Government intrusion into medical education.

Second, this bill contains a provision which allows Federal funds to be available for abortion under Medicaid in the cases of life of the mother, rape, or incest. However, States are only required to provide abortions under Medicaid in the case of life of the mother.

This language was added during full committee consideration of the bill as a States' rights issue. I had an amendment, that was not made in order, which would have reinstated the current Hyde language that makes Medicaid abortions available in circumstances involving life of the mother, rape, or incest. But, it would relieve the States of any financial participation in cases of rape or incest if they choose not to fund them.

Last year, there were all of two Medicaid-funded abortions in the entire country in cases of rape and incest. This amendment was a fair compromise for Members who support States' rights, but who recognize that poor women who are pregnant as a result of a heinous crime like rape or incest should not be discriminated against in the process. Unfortunately, Members of this body will not have the chance to vote on the Kolbe-Pryce-Fowler amendment. I therefore will sponsor with Congresswomen LOWEY and MORELLA a motion to strike this language—though I would have preferred my reasonable alternative.

Third, the bill zeros out critical money for family planning services—though we have an opportunity to restore this when we take up the Greenwood amendment.

Finally, this bill includes a measure which provides for much needed Federal grant reform. I strongly support the substance of this measure which will curb Federal subsidies for political advocacy groups. I have serious reservations, however, about attaching this very complicated and large bill to an appropriations bill without the benefit of hearings or a markup in the authorizing committee.

I wish that I could stand here today and tell you I support this bill. It is in line with the budget resolution. It reduces overall spending by \$6.8 billion over current funding levels and termi-

nates 176 overlapping programs—helping to move us toward a balanced budget by 2002. The bill also increases funding for the National Institutes of Health, cuts the bureaucracy at the Department of Health and Human Services, maintains funding for community and migrant health centers and increases Pell grant levels. It reforms labor and OSHA rules that are in need of reform. Coming out of the subcommittee it was a good bill.

Unfortunately, with the changes made in the full committee, the bad outweighs the good in this bill and I must oppose it.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

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

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, we can argue over the size of the budget cuts, but we also know that very often a budget cut of not a tremendous amount can cripple an agency, and that is unfortunately what our colleagues on the other side of the aisle intended to do when they sought the cuts against the National Labor Relations Board.

This is the arbiter of America's workplace. This is where employers and employees go to get a resolution to the conflicts that erupt in the workplace. This is where employers go to get issues resolved, and employees go so they can go back to work, they can go about their business, they can provide for their families, they can provide for their businesses and get on with life.

But what has happened is that they now seek to attack the National Labor Relations Act both through the budget and legislative language that would prevent the National Labor Relations Board from seeking an injunction if they find activities, by both unions and employers, which are so egregious that they prevent a fair election from taking place. They want to enjoin those actions. The National Labor Relations Board does not enjoin those actions; they go to the district court and they make a case.

Now they are changing the number of votes you will need on the board to go and get that injunction. Why? Because one of our colleagues is upset with the rendering of an injunction against Overnight Transportation Co., whose actions were so egregious that in 19 regions, action after action was sought against them because of what they were doing to their employees, withholding wage increases and promotions and the job opportunities of anybody who wanted to organize that workplace.

They made a determination that a fair election could not be conducted unless the injunction was offered.

What did our colleagues from Arkansas do? They wrote a letter and threatened the National Labor Relations Board and they said, "If you issue this

injunction, we have the ability to take action against you," and they did. They cut their budget by 30 percent to cripple the agency.

Mr. Chairman, this means that businesses and worker organizations will be stymied in their efforts to reconcile the differences that exist in the workplace, but it also means that the National Labor Relations Board that uses injunctions in only 6 percent of the cases against unions and 2 percent of the cases against employees, but egregious cases they are, will now be rendered ineffective from doing that. That is the goal.

That is what is wrong with this legislation. Time and again, we see private agendas coming into appropriations bills to undermine the laws of this country. If you have a problem with the National Labor Relations Board, we have an Education and Labor Committee. We will deal with that just as we are dealing with OSHA.

But that is not what is going on in this legislation, Mr. Chairman. There is a private agenda, and there are campaign contributions, and threatening letters by Members of Congress to an agency. When that does not work, because they are an independent agency, we now see them being punished in the legislative process.

It is unconscionable that a nationwide independent agency like the National Labor Relations Board would be threatened and then stricken with these kinds of budget cuts and this kind of punitive action against them, when in fact they provide the basis on which workers and employers can get a fair shake about the terms and the conditions of working in that place of employment.

Mr. Chairman, we now believe we have the most productive workers in the world in any industry we point to, but what we do here is a deliberate attempt to go after those workers to stymie their ability, to get a decision rendered on a timely basis so that they can get on with providing for their families.

This legislation, time and again, strikes, through legislative language, on an appropriation against the protections that workers need, against the protection that employers need, so that they can conduct productive workplaces.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote against the legislation.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. WARD].

Mr. WARD. Mr. Chairman, I want to tell this House about someone who took off work to travel all the way to Washington to argue against this bill. His name is Donnie McDonald. Donnie worked at the Canny Creek mine in Muhlenberg County, KY, from 1963 to 1989.

In 1974, Donnie was in an accident where a loaded coal rail car fell on him. He lost his arm and was off work for 6 months. But he went back to work and worked for another 16 years.

Donnie says that because of the Mine Safety Administration his line of work is much safer today than it was in 1974 but he warns that we cannot go back to the kind of loose regulation we used to have in the mining industry. He says that the \$15 million cuts that this bill will impose in Federal mine safety efforts will do just that and that we should defeat this bill.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Topeka, KS [Mr. BROWNBAC].

Mr. BROWNBAC. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the bill today.

The bill does a number of things that I think are very important and necessary. What it does immediately is, it makes tough choices and it does it now. It cuts \$11.1 billion out of a \$256 billion set of funding. It does so now and does not put off future decisions so that we do not have higher deficits into the future.

Mr. Chairman, I have heard a lot of talk on the floor recently about private agendas or that we need to help people out. We clearly do. I would contend the best way to do that is to pass bills like this one that cut back on Government funding. They cut back on Government programs so we can get to balance.

The cruelest thing we can do to the people of our Nation is to continue to add to this deficit. This bill terminates 170 programs, so we can get to balance, and it does so now. It is what we need to do.

Mr. Chairman, this is not a private agenda; this is a nation's agenda of balancing the budget, and that is what we have got to do. We have a nation's agenda of balancing the budget, and it involves making tough choices.

Mr. Chairman, the committee has done an excellent job of doing that. I commend them and rise in strong support of this bill.

□ 1645

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO].

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I rise to strong opposition to this assault on working men and women made to pay for a tax cut for the wealthy. This bill doesn't just pull the rug out from under American workers, it pulls out the entire floor.

The deepest cut is made in crucial worker training and education programs that help displaced workers get back into the workforce. That cut is shortsighted and wrongheaded.

The American people are this country's greatest asset as we try to compete in a global economy. But, this bill puts people dead last. It puts working families dead last. It says—if you lose your job, you're on your own.

I know about the need for worker retraining. I live in a State that has lost more than 200,000 jobs over the last several years. Many of those jobs have been lost because of the defense build down. Many of those jobs aren't coming back.

And, the bad news just keeps coming for my State. We now face a plant closure at the AlliedSignal tank engine plant in Stratford, CT, in my district. The decision by the Army to close this facility will mean that we lose another 1,400 jobs. These workers in Connecticut, and workers like them all across the country, need our help.

Defense workers aren't looking for a handout. They're looking for a helping hand. After years of working to maintain our country's strong national defense, these workers are now being told that their skills are no longer needed. Their work helped us win the cold war, but now they are the ones being left in the cold.

The Republican leaders in this House say they are cutting across the board in order to balance the budget. They want us to believe that this is a shared sacrifice for a noble purpose.

But, this sacrifice is not shared and it is not noble. There is nothing noble in asking people who are out of work to pay for a tax cut for the wealthiest Americans.

Mr. Chairman, we have an obligation to help our displaced defense workers. We have an obligation to provide them with the training and education they need to get back on their feet. This bill fails our obligation to defense workers and that's why I will oppose it.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Lexington, NE [Mr. BARRETT], a member of the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities.

Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the provision in H.R. 2127, that would prohibit the enforcement of President Clinton's Executive order, banning the use of permanent replacement workers on Federal contracts of \$100,000 or more.

To put it simply, I believe that the President's Executive order is unconstitutional, and is a direct challenge to the prerogatives of the Congress to set labor law. The President's order—in the opinion of many—is nothing but a backroom deal to coddle favor with labor unions, and is a direct challenge to decades of well-established labor law which permits the use of permanent replacement workers.

Allowing employers to hire permanent replacement workers has been a long-standing right that employers have used, though sparingly, in order to countermand the union's use of the strike. I wouldn't say that either option in today's workplace is perfect, but it has provided a careful balance that has enabled neither side to claim an unfair advantage.

Instead of allowing this issue to be settled by Congress, the President has circumvented Congress and has allowed purely political goals to enter into the fray of employer-employee relations.

As a member of the Economic and Educational Opportunities Committee, I believe the committee has rightfully recognized the improper use of the

President's Executive order, by reporting out H.R. 1176, which would make the order null and void.

Mr. Chairman, the provision in H.R. 2127 preserves the right of Congress to set labor laws, and would reverse a dangerous precedent-setting Executive order. I urge my colleagues to vote against any amendment to strike these provisions.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I encourage my colleagues and others to examine what we have just heard from the last speaker. This is a situation, or as Ross Perot used to say, here is the deal. You are an American worker, you are under contract, your employer violates the contract. What is left for you to do? Well, you probably try that cherished American right: You withhold your labor in protest.

Most Americans support that. Not these Republicans. They say if you go to that cherished American right of withholding your labor, you are fired, you're fired. You are a woman, kids at home, you are trying to make it, you have this job, you are fired, you lose health care. Same thing with a man, of course. You lose your position, you lose your retirement, you lose your tenure, you lose everything you put in that company, you are fired.

Somebody is permanently hired for your job, and you are not offered it back. You are fired. Why? Because you dared to withhold your labor, because the boss broke his part of your deal, his part of the contract. But you? You are fired.

Bill Clinton, President Clinton, said, well, we are not going to let you use Federal money to do that, to fire these people. If you have a job and the taxpayers are paying for it, you cannot fire these American citizens just because they withhold their labor under the law, legally withhold their labor. The Republicans say oh, yes, you can, you can fire them. That is extremism run nuts, and that is what is in this bill, extremism run nuts.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mount Holly, NJ [Mr. SAXTON].

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, if I said to all the folks here who are in this room that I wanted to talk to you for a couple of minutes about how pension fund managers invest pension moneys, I would see a bunch of people yawn and you would all think it was pretty boring, and you would be right. But if I said to you that I want to talk to you about your pension check when you retire, the size of it and the security of it, and to be sure that it would come every month, I am sure there would be a lot more interest.

But if I said to you and anybody else that could hear that the pension fund, total amount of pension fund moneys

in our country, has grown since 1983 from a level of about \$1.5 trillion to about \$4.8 trillion today, you know, that is kind of hard to relate to. But if I said to you that particularly people who are beginning to think about retirement that that pot of money is where your paycheck is going to come from after you retire and that it should be protected with all due diligence, that would be interesting.

So let me talk about that for a minute, because the Clinton administration, particularly Secretary of Labor Robert Reich, has done some things over the last year which I think are very unsettling for people who are beginning to think about retirement, particularly if their savings for their old age are invested in private retirement funds, because you see, in June 1993, Secretary Reich reinterpreted the law that provides safeguards for those savings in private pension funds.

Secretary Reich calls the program economically targeted investments. What he is saying to the people that manage all of that money for us so that we can retire with it, "We want to change the rules a little bit to permit you to do some things that you were not permitted to do before," because, before, they were considered to be too risky and, in my opinion, while nothing has changed to make the things that Secretary Reich would like us to do less risky, he wants us to go ahead and begin to invest in other kinds of things with other people's money that they are saving for their retirement. Now, I think it is a bad idea.

For years, what the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FAWELL] refers to often as the "prudent man" rule was followed, and in the late 1960's and early 1970's, private pension funds began to have some problems, and so in 1974, and I think correctly, the Congress passed a law known as the Employee Retirement Income Security Act, which we refer to as ERISA. It says clearly that the people that manage those moneys in private pension funds must follow one rule, that those moneys must be invested for the sole purpose of providing benefits to the participant in the plan, the sole purpose. Secretary Reich would like us to do some other things with the money and is encouraging pension fund managers to do so, to invest in socially good programs, to make social investments, to invest in housing projects, to prop up a failing company if it means jobs for a community.

They are worthy goals, but if I want the moneys that I am investing for my old age in a private pension fund invested in those kinds of investments, then I will take my IRA fund and invest in some social good.

Most people do not choose to do that, and Secretary Reich, in my opinion, should not be encouraging pension fund managers to do that with my money either and the money of all the Americans, the 600,000 or so that I represent, and I think you will agree, Members on

both sides of the aisle, that you do not want your constituents' money tampered with in an unsafe investment either.

This bill cuts back on funding that Secretary Reich and his staff are using for the purpose of encouraging pension fund managers to make these investments.

Now, we have lots of information that says that these are not good investments and they are not safe. For example, in one study at the University of Pennsylvania, Olivia Mitchell determined that the public pension funds which were required to make certain investments generated lower rates of interest, lower returns, and were less safe.

So I urge everyone to support this bill the way it is.

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

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

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, we do not need to look at theories or predictions as to what will happen when OSHA is cut the way it is cut in this bill. I think OSHA is a agency in need of reform, and I am sure there are some bureaucrats in OSHA who are not necessary and who ought to go. That is not what this bill is going to do.

Make no mistake about it, this bill means fewer inspectors, fewer inspections, and more risks for workers. We do not need to theorize or guess what happens when you have too few inspectors or too few inspections.

We do not have to look to the future. We can look to September 1991, in Hamlet, NC, when the North Carolina Occupational Safety and Health Administration, with too few inspectors, too few inspections, underfunded, permitted a facility, a chicken packing plant that had committed egregious violations prior to September of 1991, to create a situation where 25 people burned to death. That is what we have to look for. That is why we should oppose this bill.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. OLVER].

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I want to tell this House today about someone who came to Washington to argue against this bill. This is the gentleman that I am speaking about. His name is Jim Hale. He is a resident of Chattanooga, TN.

He works in the construction industry. He is opposing this bill because his brother was killed 30 years ago at the age of 23 in a construction accident.

Jim will tell you that construction is a dangerous trade under the best of circumstances, and he will tell you that since he started working, it has become

much safer, that it is safer because Federal rules that require employers to take steps have made it safer in these last 30 years or so. Jim believes that his brother might be alive today, that his brother would have had an opportunity to get married and raise kids if the protections that we have today had been there in the 1960's, and he feels so strongly about that that he took off work and came here to oppose this legislation that takes us back to the 19th century.

□ 1700

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. TUCKER].

Mr. TUCKER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to say that the appropriations bill before us is fraught with cuts in programs that are important to the working men and women of this entire country, a 30-percent cut in the National Labor Relations Board, a 33-percent cut in OSHA, elimination of the summer youth employment program, and cuts in funding for job training for dislocated workers. The working men and women of this Nation deserve our gratitude and our thanks, Mr. Chairman, for a job well done. Instead we offer this bill which guts the very programs and protections we, as a Congress, created for them. We should reward them for their hard work, not punish them.

There is much more than just the labor provisions that are wrong with this bill. This bill is fraught with all kinds of problems, but the labor provisions are enough in and of themselves to say no to this bill, and, therefore, I urge my colleagues to say no to this bill.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I know that there is a drive here to provide a great deal of deregulation in order to provide much more freedom in this society. That may very well be legitimate, but I think we ought to ask who is going to be free, what will they be free to do, and who will they do it to?

I want to give my colleagues some examples of who they will do it to. Take Jack Gray Transport, Inc. Truck drivers who worked in their facility in North Carolina began an organizing campaign in January of 1994, and they signed cards trying to recognize the union. In response their employer coercively interrogated those employees about their union activity, they threatened them with a loss of jobs if they did not sign a letter disavowing support for the union, and finally they laid off eight members of the organizing committee. Based on the facts, the district court used the injunctive relief at NLRB which is now available to prevent further action by that company, and they helped save those workers' jobs. That injunctive authority would be eliminated by this bill.

Krist Oil Co. in Michigan and Wisconsin. In 1993 a man by the name of Richard Johnson found out that their pay was being cut by being required to perform additional duties for insufficient compensation. They met at a park to discuss what appeared to them to be a wage crisis. They wrote a letter politely raising a number of questions. Two days later the company fired Mr. Johnson, in part, it conceded later, because of that letter. Cashiers Yvonne Mains and Jodi Creten were fired after presenting the complaints by their store employees to a supervisor during a meeting at one of their homes. Mains told the boss that the employees were considering contacting the union. The company wrote a letter notifying Mains of her termination because she was, quote, creating a mutinous situation, end of quote. Again the NLRB used their injunctive relief to provide those workers with help. That would be gone under this bill.

Wilco Manufacturing Co.: On June 2 of 1994 the union was certified on the day of the election itself. The employer interrogated employees about their election, about their election votes, and threatened them with discharge and other reprisals for voting for the union. The board sought 10(j) injunctive relief in order to prevent further damage to the workers.

One example of workers who are not protected:

On August 28, 1989, the Gary Enterprises company fired Jerry Whitaker for having previously filed an unfair labor practice charge with the Board. The Board decided in Mr. Whitaker's favor. The company ignored both the Board and the report. After being discharged, Whitaker had a hard time finding work, and finally took a job hauling logs. He had a heart condition, and frequently complained to his wife that the driving job was killing him. He was required to spend nights away from home, and had no money for lodgings. He slept in his truck. One morning, while the contempt case was pending before the court, Whitaker was found dead in his truck from a heart attack at age 55. The Board is still trying to collect the backpay owed to his estate by the company.

That is the kind of case that today could be considered for the injunctive relief which is being squeezed out of the law by the legislative provision in this bill.

People on that side of the aisle talk about OSHA as though it was created by a bunch of left-wing social engineers. The father of the OSHA statute was a man by the name of Bill Steiger, a respected Republican Member of Congress from Wisconsin who, when I came to this House as a freshman, was my best friend here.

We have had some successes under OSHA. The fatality rate is down 57 percent for workers in this country, and OSHA has contributed to that in a very significant way.

Along with Silvio Conte I helped create at OSHA the first fine-free consultation service, and we provided for some narrow exemptions in the case of small business and small farms. We did that all on a bipartisan basis.

Mr. Chairman, I would urge our Republican friends not to walk away from a bipartisan commitment to OSHA, to OSHA enforcement and worker protection. I urge them not to make this issue a partisan issue. Vote against this bill because of these provisions.

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING].

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FAWELL] for a response to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

Mr. FAWELL. Mr. Chairman, I simply wanted to respond to the previous speaker when he indicated that the 10(j) injunction had been eliminated.

Now that just is not so. The 10(j) injunction will be alive and well. It will require the usual equitable grounds to be shown before one gets a preliminary injunction, because a preliminary injunction means they get the final determination ahead of time, but understandably they must be able to show a likelihood of success, an irrevocable and irreparable harm, and a balance of the hardships between the complainant and the respondent, and that the injunction relief is in accordance with public interest.

So, that is the accurate way of setting that forth.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, the American system of collective bargaining is based on the balancing of interest and risk, including the right to strike, the right to maintain business operations during a strike, if necessary, by hiring replacement workers. The executive order takes away this balance in the Federal contractor arena. Permanent replacement is not the same as being fired. Permanently replaced workers have a right to be recalled until they get equivalent employment, and they may vote in union elections for 12 months. But the issue in relationship to this legislation is who has the responsibility under our form of government to legislate, who writes the laws, who passes the laws. I do not think there is anybody in this Chamber, anybody in the Congress, anybody in the United States, that does not understand under our form of government we do that, not the executive branch, and what the President has done is usurped our power, and we should guard our power jealously. The separation of powers was put together very carefully, and we should make sure that we guard that.

So, the issue is who has the responsibility to legislate, who has the responsibility to pass laws, and the answer is very clearly we in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI].

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I again thank the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], the ranking member, for yielding this time to me and for his leadership on these workers' issues. I think it was perfectly appropriate that he closed his part of the debate on this in speaking about individuals and how this policy so cruelly affects them and speaking in their own words. I, too, want to bring to the attention of our colleagues and individual case of how people are affected by the cuts in this legislation. I want to tell the House about someone who traveled to Washington all the way from California to argue against this bill. Her name is Beverly Reagan, and she is a Republican. She votes Republican, but came here to fight against the passage of this bill.

Beverly is a food service worker. She works for private contractors at a U.S. Navy base. Repeatedly these contractors have won bids to operate food service facilities and then failed to make the pension and health insurance benefits that were required under the terms of the contract.

Beverly and her coworkers have had the experience of going to the doctor and finding that the health insurance that they thought was there to cover their expenses was not there at all. She is not alone. Tens of thousands of Americans find themselves in the same situation each year. And like Beverly, the only recourse they have is the Pension and Welfare Benefit Program in the Department of Labor.

This bill cuts that program.

I urge my colleagues to do what Beverly is asking and vote against this bill, protect the health benefits and pension plans of our constituents, and vote "no" on this legislation. This is only one of many cuts in the bill that deal harshly with the American worker. The cuts in these seven programs for worker protection, along with a long list of legislation provisions limiting the authority of agencies to enforce child labor laws, laws which protect workers' right to organize, and regulations to protect occupational safety, and language blocking the President's Executive order regarding striker replacements constitute a war on the American worker.

When I was interrupted by the gavel earlier, I was talking about this dislocated worker assistance program which I want to call to our colleagues' attention once again, which is being cut in this legislation by 34 percent. This means that 193,000 workers who lose their jobs in 1996 through no fault of their own will not receive training. Rapid advancements in technology, defense downsizing, corporate restructuring, and intense global competition result in structural changes necessary for economical growth. This program works. The inspector general has reported that workers served by this program "were reemployed, remained in the workforce and regained their earn-

ing power." Continuing our investment in dislocated workers is essential.

Of all the cuts in this bill, it is so very difficult to understand why, with all of our talk of free trade, et cetera, we will not deliver on our promise to dislocated workers who are affected by that kind of change.

Mr. Chairman, American workers are the engine of our economy. They must be treated with dignity and respect. They also deserve a safe workplace. Despite our budget challenges, we should not retreat on worker protections. Cuts that will result in increased workplace accidents and fatalities will cost our society.

There is only one word to describe this, Mr. Chairman: Shame.

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

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] for yielding this time to me.

This entire bill just shows how mean-spirited and radical the Republicans have been with this proposal, and it really is for shame because from the moment this Congress began we have seen the majority try to hurt working men and women of America, we have seen them purge the name of Labor from the old Education and Labor Committee, we have seen them refuse to raise the minimum wage, we have seen them cut OSHA now here by about a third. More American workers are going to die and be injured on the job because of these OSHA cuts. We have seen them slice the National Labor Relations Board which monitors unfair labor practices. We see them slice money, cut money, for dislocated workers.

Why hypocrisy. We talk about getting people off the welfare rolls, and here we have workers that are losing their jobs, and we want to cut funding to help them locate new jobs; Davis-Bacon, which pays prevailing wage, that is cut.

So, we have a pattern here, and this bill fits that pattern.

In my 7 years in Congress this is the most disgraceful appropriations bill I have ever seen, and it ought to be defeated.

□ 1715

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. DICKEY], a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. DICKEY. Mr. Chairman, I have a button here that I am not allowed to wear, but I will show it. It says, "Why does the NLRB have 628 lawyers?"

Why does the NLRB have 628 lawyers? What happened in committee with the NLRB appropriation was something like this. The chairman came in with a 15 percent reduction in the NLRB budget. I did not think that was enough so I scurried around and got an amendment together, and I said 15 percent more is what is more like it. A total of \$52 million in reductions.

The \$26 million that I put in that particular amendment was done only after I had tried to find some way to do otherwise.

First, when the NLRB came to our committee, I asked them, "Please help us find a way to cut this particular department. Will you do that?" The answer was no. I got the general counsel, the general counsel of the 628 lawyer law firm to come to the office, and I said, "Will you help me? Will you tell me just what you can do to cut the expenses created by these 628 lawyers?" The eighth largest law firm in the United States was in his jurisdiction, and I said, "Can you help? He says, "Oh, heaven sakes, I cannot do that because we have such a caseload." I said, "Is there nothing we can do?" He said, "No, there is nothing we can do."

Mr. Chairman, I said, "OK, if they are going to stonewall us and say no to that and not help us, from their position of expertise, then we were going to have to cut blindly in some way to get their attention and help the American people and reach this deficit."

Here is what they have at the NLRB, and maybe others can tell me if there is anyplace to cut. There are over 2,000 employees. I have mentioned that it is the eight largest law firm in the United States. They have 628 lawyers that they let loose on American business and industry. Each NLRB Commissioner has between 18 and 22 lawyers assigned to him or her.

Mr. Chairman, our Supreme Court Justices, with all of their responsibilities and load, only have five. So we have all the way from 18 to 22 for the NLRB Commissioners, each one have that many lawyers, and the Supreme Court Justices only have 5. They have a D.C. office building that pays rent of \$21 million per year. It costs \$21 million a year for rent to keep up a house for these lawyers, to keep them going.

In Los Angeles alone they have three different offices so they can have more lawyers closer to business and industry, to interrupt the business and to interrupt workloads and cost our economy untold amounts of money. Here these people are saying they do not have any room for cuts. They are not going to help us with this. There are 50 field offices.

Mr. Chairman, we went to the committee, and after some hour and a half, maybe 2 hours of listening to the committee members talking about title I for the children and Head Start for the children, this 15 percent was not sent back that we were going to cut in this amendment. It was not sent back to the deficit, it was not taken to any other programs except Head Start.

Mr. Chairman, we have 628 lawyers on this side and we have all these children in Head Start, and there are some persuasive arguments that Head Start, in fact, is needed. I said, "We will take the \$26 million from the lawyers and put it over here in Head Start. Will you vote for this particular provision if that

is the case?" Eight people on that committee said, yes, they would vote for that; that lawyers are not in the priority position when you compare them with children. We will take from lawyers and give to the children. The liberals on that committee, to the person, all five, said, no, we will vote for the lawyers. We will keep the \$26 million in this burgeoning legal intrusive type of department, one that will not tell us what to cut. We would rather go with lawyers than children.

Mr. Chairman, I tell everyone this because it should give them an idea of how this particular Congress has existed for all these years. The argument about children, and the argument about Head Start was not the last time we found out that people were not sincere. We also had an amendment to transfer \$135 million from the oldest American project of some sort, \$135 million from that to Head Start. That was voted down also.

Mr. Chairman, what we are having here is a commitment to lawyers. Not everyone will understand it, if they are not businesspeople. Those who are business people will understand it. Lawyers are not deal makers, they are deal breakers. I say we vote for this and support the amendment and the economy.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate on title I has expired.

The Chair will now recognize Members for amendments in title I.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. STOKES

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, number 70.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STOKES: on page 2 line 15, strike \$3,180,441,000 and insert \$3,185,441,000, on line 16, strike \$2,936,154,000 and insert \$2,941,154,000, and on line 21 strike \$95,000,000 and insert \$100,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the unanimous-consent agreement of today, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES] and a Member opposed will each be recognized for 20 minutes.

The chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES].

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, while the bill's \$55 million, or 22-percent cut in school-to-work would devastate the viability of this initiative, my concerns extend well beyond this symbolic amendment to the broader devastating funding cuts in career and employment training.

Mr. Chairman, while global competition requires a highly trained workforce, while our technology driven and increasingly changing labor market requires a highly skilled work force, and while the American business community recognizes the importance of training, the majority on the committee have gutted funding for employment training.

No job training or re-employment initiative whether for our youth or

older Americans was safe from the majority's budget ax. The 60 percent, or over \$2 billion, cut in employment and related training means that 194,000 dislocated workers, individuals laid-off through no fault of their own, will be denied the re-employment and skills training services they desperately need to re-enter the work force; 80,000 Americans will no longer have access to the employment training they need to compete in the job market; 3 million individuals will be denied vocational education skills training they need to earn higher wages; over 275,000 young people will be denied the employment training they so desperately need; and over 600,000 youth will be denied summer jobs they need. It is important for us to realize that the unemployment rate for teens is three times that of the general population. And, for African-American teens, the rate is more than six times higher than that of the general population. In fact, the unemployment rate is approximately 40 percent.

Employment training works. Mr. Chairman, the real wages of American workers are declining and there is growing disparity between the rich and poor. Base closings and corporate downsizing are devastating American families. According to the Department of Labor, 2.5 million workers will be permanently laid off in 1995. Employment training is the key to better jobs and higher wages for the American people. Skills matter, job training pays off. Skilled high school graduates earn approximately 19 percent more than their nonskilled counterparts. Skilled college graduates earn over 40 percent more than their nonskilled counterparts.

Now is not the time to gut employment training. I ask my colleagues to restore the Nation's investment in the future of the American people. Overturn the \$446 million cut in dislocated worker re-employment assistance, the \$299 million cut in vocational education, the \$55 million cut in school-to-work, and the over \$300 million cuts in adult and youth employment training. And, my colleagues, overturn the majority's elimination of summer jobs for America's youth.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 2127 is bad for our children, the elderly, families, and the country. I strongly urge my colleagues to join me in defeating H.R. 2127.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois wish to be recognized in opposition to the amendment?

Mr. PORTER. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has raised the value of job training programs generally, and I would agree that there are some that do some good. There are others that do not at all.

For example, if we look at adult job training and we look at the Department's own reviews, they indicate the program is not very effective. The inspector general audit reports indicated only 53 percent of the participants in the adult job training obtained jobs. Furthermore, of the ones who got jobs, half said they found them without JTPA assistance. Last year the IG testified the program is being asked to address educational failures, physical dependencies, and emotional and physical disabilities with no demonstrated pattern of success. The IG said in testimony in 1993 that we continue to find phantom JTPA participants, bribery, and overbilling by consultants and contractors, abuses by brokers and other middlemen, and just plain stealing of JTPA funds by those who administer as well as participate in the program. In other words, there have been problems in the program.

Youth job training. Little evidence that the program is successfully training people for the future job market. The Department's own evaluation shows this program has been found to be unsuccessful in raising youth employment or earnings, and that it does not appear that JTPA youth training has had significant positive impacts.

The Summer Youth Employment Program. The program has not provided permanent skills training or education. It is basically an income supplement and the jobs are public sector jobs that do not meet critical needs. The Department's own reviews indicate that subsidized work experience "has generally not had long-term positive effects on employment in earnings."

The Displaced Worker Program. Effectiveness of short-term training has been questioned by departmental evaluations. According to the Department of Labor, short-term skills training has not been successful in producing earning gains for dislocated workers. Further, only a minority of displaced workers are likely to enter long-term training if the option is offered to them.

The School-to-Work Program that is the subject of the gentleman's amendment. Here we have seen a program that still, even with the cut, would receive nearly twice what it received in fiscal year 1994, and we had to make a cut here for budgetary reasons, obviously. This is a program that will be under intense pressure to turn the program into a permanent subsidy rather than a demonstration program, which it is, and I would simply have to rise and oppose the gentleman's amendment for that reason.

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

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLAY], the ranking minority member of the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities.

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

□ 1730

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding the time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES]. School-to-work is an initiative that should command broad-based bipartisan support. Of all of the provisions in this bill, the proposal to reduce job training for dislocated workers is among the dumbest. As a result of Republican priorities, 193,000 workers who lose their jobs through no fault of their own will not receive retraining in 1996.

This ill-conceived effort is ill-timed. Last month, the Base Closure and Realignment Commission recommended closing 132 military bases, disrupting 100,000 careers. In June, U.S. corporations announced more than 40,000 job cuts.

Let us look at some of the school-to-work success stories. Cassandra Floyd-Dade, of California, had been a clerk-typist at the Norton Air Force Base, earning \$8.27 per hour. After being laid off, she entered classroom training to become a nurse. She completed her coursework with flying colors and passed the licensing exam. She now works at the Robert Ballard Rehabilitation Hospital, earning \$12 an hour.

There is Susan Day. She was a nuclear technician at the Charleston Naval Shipyard. Before leaving the shipyard, she took advantage of training in business fundamentals. Then she and two of her friends opened a computer retail outlet in one of the most competitive fields in business today.

There is also Jeffrey Bartlett, who lost his job at the University of Minnesota in August of 1992. He collected unemployment benefits for 4 months before finding out about dislocated worker training. The services helped him with his job search and his computer skills. In August 1993, Jeff found a job at the Metropolitan Sports Commission. He has since moved on to become a facilities manager for a computer firm. His salary is now higher than it was when he lost his job at the University.

Mr. Chairman, training for dislocated workers actually works. It gives workers and their families renewed hope. Shame on those who want to cut it. Vote no on this bill.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. DICKEY], a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. DICKEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a case here that the Summer Job Program is obviously just a cash distribution system that our Government has set up. It is a 12-week program. I see it because I am in the restaurant business and we have a surge of business during the summer, and we go out and try to find people to work for us during that period of time, just the

period of time that coincides with being out of school.

What we find is we find ourselves competing with the Federal Government and we cannot cut it. We cannot match it, because the Federal Government does not require anything of the people who they give money to other than you be at your home, we will come pick you up or come to the office somewhere around—come into the city hall, or whatever it might be, somewhere around 9 o'clock, and we are going to have you go out and stand in some ditch and act like you are doing something.

Now, what harm is what? What harm is that? First of all, let us look at it from the standpoint of our Government. It is wasting money. It is saying we want to give you sugar rather than protein and calcium. We do not want to give you any skills.

When I see someone is on a job program coming into my business with that on the resume, I say aha, we are going to have to undo what that person has learned from being a part of the welfare system and being a part of the cash distribution system that our Government gives, and then after we work that out, we are going to have to teach them what it is like to really try to satisfy customers, to really be accountable, and to really have some consequences from their actions.

That is what we are doing in this particular program. I cannot see in 12-week programs that we are doing anybody any good. We cannot find workers. We find people during the summer that we find we cannot satisfy the demand because workers are off doing those sort of things.

I just think what we need to do is, if nothing else, for the consideration of the kids, get us off this program, have the money brought back into the Government, and watch when people smile and say our tax dollars at least are not being wasted on a cash distribution system called the Summer Jobs Program.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LEVIN].

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

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I have been listening to the explanations for the majority position. Your bill is extremism run amuck. It rips whatever mask is left off of so-called concern about the people of this country.

I want to speak to the millions of Americans who will be permanently laid off in the next 2 years. To 46,000 of you, the Republican majority says "Forget it, no training in employment services." To 84,000, the Republican majority says "Tough luck, no training grants for you." And what does the Republican majority have for the kids of America? Your training grants are cut 80 percent; your summer jobs are eliminated.

I have seen training work in Michigan in the Transition Program, those

laid off who were building tanks for this country, nowhere to turn. The transition center in Sterling Heights has helped these people get back on their feet. And you come here today and mock those programs. Shame on you.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I just heard the previous speaker say that the Republican position on the bill on the floor is extremism run amuck. After listening to him, I think his statement is hyperbole run amok. The fact of the matter is again we hear this Chicken Littleism. "The sky is falling. Call Henny Penny. The world is going to come apart at the seams."

My goodness; \$270.9 billion is appropriated in this bill to help people. A major credit card, perhaps the biggest domestic credit card in the history of the free world, paid for by the courtesy of the American taxpayer, to help people in need.

Now, he says all the job programs are going to be eliminated. All the people that ever lose their job in the next year, move from one job to the other, are going to be without help.

My goodness, there are currently 163 separate programs for Federal employment training operations, across 15 departments and agencies, with 40 interdepartmental offices. That is according to the GAO. That is what the General Accounting Office says. For the youth at risk on which we hear the concerns of the gentleman from Ohio, there are 266 additional Federal programs across eight departments and agencies.

For JTPA, the training program that the gentleman talked about that sometimes works and sometimes does not, we would spend \$3.3 billion; \$1 billion on the JOB Program; another \$1.1 billion on Job Corps.

Sooner or later we have to get some common sense. The fact of the matter is, the inner-cities are in deplorable condition because we have taxed the people who run businesses out of the cities and left the poor folks who just do not have the opportunity to gain employment to remain.

Now, it seems to me that common sense says that maybe we ought to stop doing the things the way we have been doing them over the years. Maybe we ought to be giving tax incentives to businesses to return to the cities, and let the real purveyor of wealth, the private sector, take over and generate the jobs to put poor kids in the inner-cities to work.

The gentleman has no more compassion for those out of work than I do. I will tell you that I have been working in summer jobs since I was 14 years old. I believe in summer jobs. I think that summer jobs are important for youngsters. They train them for skills that

they will need in later life. But the Government is not the employer of last resort.

The fact of the matter is, the only useful skills that employees acquire on the job emanate from the private sector. If we can encourage every business in America to go into the inner-city and hire one kid, then we will make a remarkably better gain toward reducing unemployment in this country than the current programs that the gentleman is complaining about that are being trimmed back.

We can consolidate. We can trim. We can scale back. We can save the taxpayer money. We can make the programs more efficient. And in the long run we can put more kids to work, give them more training, and give them better skills, so that they in turn will be productive citizens. And when they get a little bit older, maybe they will be rich enough to go out and hire other kids and put them to work.

The hue and cry, from the liberals who have shown us their policies that have failed day in and day out for the last 60 years, is just intolerable. It is hyperbole run amuck. The gentleman's amendment should be discarded.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], the distinguished ranking member of the full Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to respond to my hyperventilating friend from Louisiana if I could. Let me simply say that we are resisting the cuts in worker training for one very simple reason: Because corporate profits are headed up, and wages are headed down, and we would like to see the two traveling upward together. That is why we are doing it.

There are millions of Americans who are going to be downsized out of their jobs this year. It would be kind of nice if we provided them the same thing every other industrialized society does, which is some decent job retraining. It would also be kind of nice if we did not ignore kids who are not going to college. That is the purpose of the School-to-Work Program, to take kids who are not going to college, who usually flounder around for 3 or 4 years in our society, unlike other societies who provide a good number of apprenticeship programs. We want to take those kids, put them in a program tying together their high school, their technical school, and employers, and give them a track into a decent job.

This bill cuts the guts out of most of these programs. We passed NAFTA last year and we passed GATT, and I did not vote for them. But what we told workers at the time was "Look, don't worry; if you are going to lose your job, you will get some retraining help."

Instead, what you are doing is cutting 34 percent out of training programs. There are going to be 193,000

American workers who cannot get help which they would have gotten previously under the displaced worker program.

Now, you talk about all of the duplicative programs in labor. The fact is, and you know it, the Secretary of Labor is already reorganizing those programs. He is consolidating a lot of them, and we said, five times now, we support the elimination of those programs in this bill. Write it down. We support the elimination of that duplication. What we do not support is cutting job training by one-third so you can provide a \$20,000 tax cut for somebody making \$300,000 a year. That goes too far.

□ 1745

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas, Mr. GENE GREEN, a member of the Economic and Educational Opportunities Committee.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

I am proud to serve on the committee, the authorizing committee, and let me talk about some of the things that are being cut. The job training, 17 percent less than what was spent last year; dislocated workers, 31 percent less than what was spent last year; the school-to-work that our ranking member talked about, 22 percent. School-to-work is a program designed to be successful because it takes those young people who may graduate from high school and not have anything to do, but it gets them before they get there, so they can have that skill that they will be able to sell.

This bill takes away our future because it cuts the job training for the young people. It cuts the adult training for people who are laid off, the dislocated workers. It cuts the summer jobs for next year.

I know on the rescission bill we fought long and hard and had summer jobs restored for this year. That is great. But if our chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], said anything, we need more than the 1,000 jobs that we may have in Houston. We need 18,000.

I hope private business will step up like he said and do it. But that does not mean we need to cut out the summer jobs that are across the country that are provided by the summer youth program. In Houston we have 6,000 young people who would not be working this summer without that. If we pass this bill today, they will not have that job next summer.

We need to triple that amount but not to cut it from the Federal program.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Just to respond to the gentleman from Wisconsin, the School-to-Work Program was \$50 million just 2 years ago. The figure in the bill is \$95 million. That is almost a 100-percent increase in 2 years. The fact that we are

not increasing it 400 percent is what is sticking in the gentleman's craw.

I have to say that with \$3 billion remaining in the JTPA Program, I think we are making a very, very healthy commitment to America's workers and protecting them at the same time we are rationally and reasonably downsizing spending throughout Government.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BONILLA], our colleague on the Appropriations Subcommittee.

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, I would like to begin by saying that one of the most fortunate occurrences that I have been fortunate to be part of in the last 2½ years is the privilege of having worked with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES] on the subcommittee. He is one of the most thoughtful and most sincere and a man with strong convictions and every day works very hard for the people of his district in trying to do the right thing for this country.

I rise, however, today in opposition to this amendment. I would like to make a couple of points in my remarks.

First of all, I would like to point out how strong the Republican support has been for TRIO programs, which will be debated in a later portion of this bill, but is a strong, strong job training program that leads to job training. It keeps kids in school, and it helps them get a degree in higher education and, therefore, be a contributing member of society as they enter the workforce.

We have also supported very strongly in this bill, to show our commitment towards job training, the Job Corps program. This bill provides 1.1 billion for the Job Corps program. Job Corps prepares our disadvantaged youth for the workforce. Its strength lies in providing students with the skills to help them succeed later in life.

I have a Job Corps program in Laredo, TX, which is one of the most outstanding programs that is run in this country. It has done so for many years. The kids that you see come through that program turn out to be responsible, well-behaved members of society and go on to lead productive lives in the workforce. Laredo sets an example for the rest of the country. There are other programs in other parts of the country as well that are part of the Job Corps program that work very well.

Even though we are expanding Job Corps, we have also sent a clear message to those running Job Corps facilities across the country. That message is and says very strongly that, if you are mismanaged and will not be effective, we will change leadership or shut you down. We are closing two centers, and we instruct the Department of Labor to think about closing some of the chronic poor performers under the Job Corps program.

Two weeks ago the latest performance figures were released by the Department of Labor. They showed that 7

out of 10 Job Corps people found jobs or went on to further their education. This is a good, solid record. Oftentimes representatives from training programs have come before our committee that were part of the 163 job training programs that we have. Often they cannot cite success stories like the Job Corps training program can. The report also shows that students placed in jobs are earning good wages, with nearly half working on jobs related to the training they received while enrolled in the program; again, a good way to measure the success of Job Corps.

Job Corps is the only program of its kind serving at-risk youth. The alternatives, welfare, unemployment, or incarceration, are more costly and lack any short- or long-term benefits. Job Corps is an investment which continues to yield returns for businesses, communities, and the youth who go on to better their lives.

I am sure if Job Corps graduates like heavyweight champion George Foreman were here today, they would thank this Congress for its leadership in funding the Job Corps program.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1¾ minutes to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, this bill is not about change; it is about retreat. Anybody listening would be confused about whether we are spending more or less.

Here are letters from America's mayors, Republicans and Democrats that say, do not do it. Do not do this to job training. Do not do this to summer youth. Why? Because they know we are spending less. We are sending them less, Republicans and Democratic mayors alike.

If we are to remain competitive in the world marketplace, we need to make sure that our workers, yes, including the new workers that will come on into the workplace market, have the skills necessary to move ahead. This is a terrible bill.

For my State of Montana it would be devastating. We would reduce adult training funding in my State in this bill, reduce it by more than \$1,500,000.

The bill will reduce youth training funds to go to my State by close to \$4 million. It eliminates every single dollar of summer youth program for the State of Montana and for every other State in this country.

The chairman on the Republican side might say that is not a cut, to go from what we spend today to zero next summer. The chairman would be wrong.

Finally, let me tell Members this: I serve along with the good chairman, the gentleman from California [Mr. MCKEON], a Republican chairman, of the committee that has redesigned the Job Training Partnership Act. In a bipartisan way we agreed to a 20-percent cut in job training funds. That is not what this bill does. This bill cuts funds for youth 54 percent and for everyone else in this country 27 percent. On a bipartisan basis, the education authoriz-

ing committee has accepted 20 percent and no more. You are cutting beyond us.

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

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. RANGEL].

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

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Chairman, let me thank the Republicans for their candor in how they intend to resolve some of the problems.

I wish the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations was on this floor because now I fully understand, having been born and raised and living in the inner city, that our problems were and have been today the fact that we taxed the rich too much. And if we relieve the rich of this burden of tax, they will come back to the inner cities where they fled.

What we are trying to do is to do for those who are held hostage in the inner city the same thing that we do for Americans no matter where they are born: to give them hope, to give them vision, to give them job training, to give them opportunity, to allow them to look forward to raising a family; and to be able to live the American dream.

You keep talking about how much money you are giving. Where do we get this idea of reducing the rate of increase? What we are saying is that if the poor are getting poorer and coming up in larger numbers, you do not cut back the resources that are necessary to give them the strength to get back on their feet to become Americans. What have you cut? Have you cut out communism, socialism, or any of the things that Americans want get rid of? No; you are honest enough to cut those things and stand up to the American people, summer jobs for our kids, school-to-work programs, one-stop employment centers—that is not welfare, my brothers and sisters—and drug treatment to have people be able to stand on their feet.

It is a shame what you are doing in order to make the rich even more rich.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 45 seconds to the gentleman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE].

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Ohio for his leadership. As I shred this sheet of paper this symbolizes the rights of Americans under this legislation. Under this bill, American workers simply have no rights. Passing this legislation results in a loss of money for Job Corps, and a loss of money for summer jobs. This legislation disregards the need of job training for dislocated workers. And simply, we are not listening to our constituents, for we are not listening to the school districts in Houston, the colleges in Houston that say school-to-work programs do work.

With a 22-percent cut, I do not know what we are saying to the American worker and to the young student who

needs to have an opportunity. I certainly do not know what we are saying to those who are advocates of valuable social policy who are to now be gagged by this particular legislation so that they cannot speak out on issues dealing with those least able to access government.

Mr. Chairman, I would say that I rise to support the Stokes amendment because I do believe that the school-to-work program is a valuable tool in providing students real career options. I do believe that the Bill of Rights works, the Constitution works, and I do believe that we should support the Stokes amendment because we are doing nothing under this present legislation but eliminating the rights of Americans and taking away training and retraining opportunities for Americans.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, would the Chair advise how much time remains on each side?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES] has 4½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BONILLA] has 6 minutes remaining.

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

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING].

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, the tragedy with the amendment is the fact that, and I suppose that is why it was presented, it gives 40 minutes of talk time. It gives no money to do all the things that Members are talking about doing in job training, et cetera.

When you look at the authority in relationship to the amount of money available, you cannot do any of those things. So basically, the amendment gives 40 minutes of talk, zero of dollars in relationship to doing the kind of things Members are talking about. I just want to make sure that everybody understands that.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. WYNN].

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

Mr. Chairman, I just do not understand the reasoning of the Republicans. They say they want to fight welfare and put people to work. But they cut job training programs. They say they want to fight crime, they want to straighten out our young people, but then they cut summer jobs programs and school-to-work programs. I just do not understand.

They are cutting the vocational education program by \$300 million or 27 percent. People ask me at town meetings, why do we not have apprenticeship programs like they have in Germany to give our kids technical skills? They say, Congressman, our jobs are going overseas. What are we doing to improve the skill level of our young people? Sad to say, I will have to tell them, the Republicans want to cut vocational training by 27 percent.

We talk about our young people. We say we ought to get our young people on the proper career tracks. But they cut the school-to-work program by 22 percent. I do not understand.

This puts seniors into a job environment that actually creates jobs. Then they talk about fighting crime, but they are cutting summer jobs. They are cutting almost 600,000 possible summer jobs, 7,000 jobs in my State of Maryland.

Mr. Chairman, I just do not understand their reasoning.

□ 1800

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. DICKEY], a member of the committee.

Mr. DICKEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to respond to three different accusations that have been made. The middle class understands what the members are saying about who the rich are. It is anyone who works and pays taxes. It is the middle class that we are trying to help. If we are helping the middle class and we are helping other people, they want to be helped, and the heck with whether or not other people are being helped also, so they are not being fooled.

Better training comes for our young people in businesses, where they need to be accountable in their consequences. We do not need to start our kids on a welfare program by teaching them they are doing something when they are not. Abstract training is not any good. We know that.

One hundred sixty-one million dollars was attempted to be restored in the subcommittee for Head Start. We need to stop talking about this particular provision, because not one vote on those restorations came from the liberals on that subcommittee, not one vote. They voted to keep programs that they think of as higher priority than Head Start, so we ought to stop the talk.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 45 seconds to the gentleman from California [Ms. WOOLSEY].

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask my colleagues, do they not know that before Congress passed the school-to-work program last Congress, America was the only industrialized country that did not have a national program to prepare young people to go directly from school into a job? That is why last Congress we crafted a bipartisan plan to give students who are not going to college the knowledge and skills they need to move directly from high school to high-skills, high-wage careers.

The school-to-work program gives all young people the chance to support themselves and their families, and to be able to participate in the American dream. The school-to-work program is a sound investment in the future of our youth and of our country. I urge my colleagues to support the Stokes amendment.

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

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I would ask the Chair, do I have the right to close under my amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BONILLA], who advocates the committee position, would have the right to close, and the gentleman from Texas is presently reserving the balance of his time.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to whether the gentleman from Texas has other speakers?

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, we have no additional speakers at this time, and no objection if the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES] would like to close.

Mr. STOKES. I accept the gentleman's offer that I be able to close.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES] is recognized for 2 minutes and 45 seconds.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gesture on the part of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BONILLA]. Let me say that it has been a pleasure to serve with him on this subcommittee, and there are many matters upon which he and I agree and upon which we have worked jointly.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, let me just respond to remarks made by the chairman of our subcommittee, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER], where he made reference to consolidation and elimination of small programs. We agree to that. We also have agreed to the elimination and consolidation of these programs, but we also support funding of the training programs, because they work.

I want to just cite from the adult training program valuation: "It is the only federally funded job training program that has undergone a major controlled evaluation. The national JTPA impact evaluation showed that participants earned 10 to 15 percent more than those who do not go through some form of education or training."

Mr. Chairman, those of us who have seen unemployment in our cities, those of us who see in some cities black youth unemployed in excess of 50 percent, those of us who walk the streets in our districts and have people yell at us "Hey, Stokes, how about a job," this is a meaningful way of us trying to provide an opportunity. We have told people over and over again that "All you have to do is work hard in this society, work hard on the job, and you can become a success in life. You can have a part of the American dream." This is what we are asking for here today: Give these young people and give these adults in our society a part of the American dream.

When we talk about the middle class, we are not talking about a lot of Americans who will never be able to get into the working class without a chance to just work a job. We owe every American that opportunity. This amend-

ment would provide the opportunity for us to do that.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there other amendments to title I?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

the Chairman. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. OBEY: On page 18, strike lines 17 through 24.

On page 19 strike out all beginning on line 1 through line 14 on page 20.

On page 20 strike out lines 15 through 22.

On page 20 strike out all beginning on line 23 through line 12 on page 21.

On page 21 strike out lines 13 through 23.

On page 41 strike lines 6 through 8.

On page 51 strike out all beginning after "1996" on line 12 through line 18 on page 52.

On page 54 strike lines 6 through 18.

On page 58 strike all beginning after the word "purposes" on line 20 through page 60 line 8.

On page 69 strike lines 12 through 17.

On page 70 strike all beginning on line 17 through line 8 on page 71.

On page 71 strike all beginning on line 7 through line 15 on page 72.

Strike title VI of the bill beginning on page 76 line 1 through line 7 on page 88.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the unanimous-consent agreement of today the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] will be recognized for 20 minutes in support of his amendment, and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BONILLA] will be recognized for 20 minutes in opposition to the amendment.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I have often had constituents ask me the following question: Why does Congress always seem to have so many riders attached to bills that have nothing whatsoever to do with what those bills are supposed to accomplish? If this bill passes, they are going to be asking a lot more of those questions, because this baby sets a new record in terms of illegitimate legislation on what is supposed to be a budget bill. There are 29 pages of legislative riders stuffed into this bill, which is supposed to be a budget bill to fund education and health care and social service and labor programs, 29 pages.

I want to tell the Members, there is a clear pattern emerging in this House. We saw it on the bill earlier this week, the HUD bill, on the environment, and we are seeing it all across the board on this bill. There are 17 different items that should not be here that were stuffed in because either Members have individual gripes with programs or

agencies, or else because the authorizing committee chairmen do not apparently have the courage to bring these bills before us out of their own committees, so that we can debate those policy issues and have amendments offered to them the way we can in the authorizing process, and we cannot do that in the appropriations process. Therefore, I think we are having a clear pattern.

Whether the issues affect women, whether they affect workers, whether they affect health, safety, or bargaining rights, they are rolling back basic law in a bill which is not supposed to write new law but only supposed to provide funding for budget items. I want to give the Members one example. Virtually every time I am in my district going through some plant or some business I run into somebody in an office, usually a woman at a typewriter, with a device on her wrist. I say, "What is the problem?" She says, "I have carpal tunnel syndrome."

OSHA is in the process of trying to develop a standard to protect workers from a malady which costs \$20 billion a year, motion injuries, \$20 billion a year. Yet, they are not going to be allowed, under a legislative rider attached to this bill, they are not even going to be allowed to collect data on those injuries. They are not even going to be allowed to prepare a possible standard, because the whiz kids on that side of the aisle have said, "No way. We know better than the agency charged with the responsibility for enforcing the law."

We have another provision which says that the President cannot weigh in and try to help workers who will see their jobs replaced when they go on strike by permanent strikers. I will tell a little story. Last year I was in my district. A company that I helped get an industrial park for, so they could develop their company in a new location in my district, that company decided they wanted their workers to have to work Sundays.

The workers had been willing in most cases to work Sundays, but they wanted to maintain the option, because some of them wanted a little room for family and a little room for church on Sundays. Therefore, they went on strike when they could not get the company to leave working Sundays on a voluntary basis. Three days after they went on strike, that company started advertising to hire permanent replacement workers.

Shame on people like that, shame on that company. Yet, what you do is ram a provision in this bill which says that the President cannot take any action whatsoever to help on that front.

Then there is the Istook amendment. This is the Constitution of the United States, article I. Unless Members have read it, if they have not read it lately, let me read what it says: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, or abridging the

freedom of speech or the press, or the right of the people peaceably to assemble and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances." Yet, we have the Istook amendment, which says that if you happen to get any kind of a Federal grant, even if you are using your own money, you have to zip your lip. You can no longer lobby the Government on matters of public policy.

Does it say that for defense contractors? Oh, no. Lockheed can continue to run full-page ads supporting this multi-billion dollar or that multi-billion dollar program. Do we try to stifle them? No. It is only the nonprofit organizations, who are trying to in many cases help people in this society who are at the lowest rung of the ladder.

Mr. Chairman, there are some people on the Republican side of the aisle who are offended by that. We already have laws on the books about illegal lobbying. That is clear. What they are trying to do in addition to that is to stifle freedom of expression and the right to redress one's own Government with one's own money. That is going too far. A lot of Republicans on this side of the aisle know that, as well as a lot of Democrats.

This bill has traditionally been a bipartisan bill. I appeal to my Republican friends on this side of the aisle, do not abandon that bipartisan tradition on this bill. They know this goes too far on a number of items, including these legislation items that have been attached and rammed through this bill, many times over the objection of the chairman himself.

Mr. Chairman, I would urge the Members, return this bill to the middle ground. Get rid of this stuff. If Members want to bring these legislative items up, have guts enough to do it through the right process. Have the right chairman from the right committee who has jurisdiction bring it up and debate it here, full-blown, so we can amend these crazy items, and possibly get them in a position where we can have both parties support them. If they are not willing to do that, I ask them to take out the junk. We also got it removed in the HUD bill last week. We lost by one vote. Let us hope we have a better result this time around.

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

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, we are opposed to this amendment presented by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY]. It strips out a lot of hard work and a lot of issues that we attached to this bill that are going to do a lot to help the American people. I am proud of the guts that members of this committee on our side showed in trying to advance some of these issues. I will point out two, because there are other Members who have other issues to discuss as well.

The first I would like to discuss involves ergonomics. Ergonomics is one of these words that has small business

in America shaking in its boots, because it is another tool, a potential tool that OSHA is going to use to impose unfair fines and unfair burdens and unfair paperwork on small business across this country. Ergonomics is a fancy term for designing jobs and tools to fit the physical and physiological limits of people.

In the private sector, there have been many efforts so far to improve productivity, to try to help the working environment so people are at work more often, have fewer absences, fewer injuries, and fewer illnesses. This is a great tribute to the commitment that the private sector and small business has to helping their employees. There is a myth that exists on the other side of the aisle that somehow employers are not interested in keeping workers on the job, keeping them safe, keeping them productive, and somehow that we are simply concerned about removing any worker safety that exists in this country.

OSHA was born many years ago as a good idea that now, like many cases, is a government program that is out of control. The pendulum has now swung too far in the wrong direction. We have OSHA now that is a four-letter word in the offices of many small businesses in this country.

Ergonomics is an overly ambitious, burdensome, and possibly the most expensive and far-reaching and intrusive regulation ever written by the Federal Government. We are not opposed, long-term, to implementing ergonomics rules in the workplace. We just say at this time that we cannot let OSHA move forward with an aggressive agenda, a burdensome agenda, with no scientific background, with no research to base their efforts on. We must give OSHA and those responsible for worker safety time to develop a thoughtful, scientific basis for implementing any kind of rules related to ergonomics. We are simply asking in this bill, which is part of this bill now we want to protect and therefore must work to defeat the Obey amendment, to preserve the ergonomics aspect of this bill.

□ 1815

Mr. Chairman, I would also like to address something in this bill that the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] is trying to strip, and that is the amendment I put in to prohibit funding of the office of the Surgeon General. I thought I was doing the current president and future Presidents a great service by eliminating funding for the Surgeon General.

How much time has the executive branch spent on this issue? How much time has the Senate spent on this issue, which has served to do nothing more than embarrass the White House in the last several months in trying to fill this job? The Surgeon General serves no role in terms of policy-making. It is simply a public relations job that the President has at his disposal.

You have a person walking around the country dressed in one of these uniforms, and it looks like they work on the Love Boat creating controversy all around America. So we do not need this anymore. We want to save the executive branch and the Senate a lot of grief and agony in the future by not allowing this to happen.

Mr. Chairman, I want to emphasize that we think advocating good health care policy is important, and this could be done by an assistant secretary out of Health and Human Services, or is a role that could be filled by the head of the Centers for Disease Control in Atlanta, or the private sector could provide leadership in this role via the American Medical Association, or many other groups that do a lot of work to advance good health care policy in this country. Therefore, eliminating the office of the Surgeon General is not in any way to say that we are not interested in advocating good health care policy.

Mr. Chairman, please vote against the Obey amendment, because it strips these two elements which are among a list of good reforms that the majority is trying to implement in this bill.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SKAGGS].

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Chairman, one of the many, many virtues of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin is that it would strike from this bill the incredibly ill-conceived provision generally referred to as the Istook amendment, which attempts to control speech and political advocacy in this country. It is often described as if the only objective were to keep Federal funds from being used for Federal lobbying. That is already essentially against the law.

This proposal would go far further than that innocent-sounding purpose and fundamentally put the Federal Government in the business of crippling the ability of anyone who is covered by this amendment to participate in the political life of this country.

Mr. Chairman, if it were to become law, large numbers, probably millions of Americans, would end up having to file, or participate in the filing, if you can conceive of this of a certified annual report detailing their political activity. Incredible.

The proponents of this amendment often trot out a picture of a pig eating Federal dollars. I guess that pig is supposed to represent farmers and small business people, the Girl Scouts, the Red Cross, the YMCA, the U.S. Catholic Conference, some of over 400 organizations that are opposing this provision. The proponents say their purpose is to keep these people and organizations from spending more than a minimal amount of money to affect Federal policy, but the real guts of this is to keep Americans from spending their own money, their own money, on political advocacy.

It flies in the face, as the gentleman who opened this debate indicated, of the first amendment, whether we are talking about university researchers, churches getting funds for day care centers, companies receiving help for displaced workers, gun clubs being allowed to do target practice on a Federal reservation, on and on and on, being swept into this incredible proposal.

Perhaps worst of all, this amendment would establish a big government, big brother system of political controls. It would bring about the creation of a national database of political activity, and if you can believe this, a master computer file in Washington, DC, covering everything from communications to contributions made by covered groups and their employees, managed by the Government of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, a shame, an absolute shame. How any of us who took an oath to uphold the Constitution could stand still for this kind of nonsense on the floor of the United States House of Representatives in a free land, especially those who've spoken over and over again about wanting to restrain the reach of the Federal Government, is absolutely incredible.

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COMBEST], the distinguished Chairman of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Chairman, I thank my most able friend from Texas for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY]. In particular, I am concerned because it would strike a provision in this bill that denies funding for the Department of Labor to enforce the Hazardous Occupational Order H.O. 12, which prohibits teenagers from merely loading a baler.

I have been involved in this issue ever since these outdated restrictions were brought to my attention by grocers in my district who were fined by the Labor Department for violating H.O. 12. A fine of up to \$10,000 can be issued every time a cardboard box is simply tossed into a silent, nonoperating baler by teenage employees under 18.

Unfortunately, efforts to change this regulation through the Labor Department fell on deaf ears and that is why we are here today arguing against this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, in typical bureaucratic form, it took 7 months for the Labor Department to respond to a letter signed by over 70 Members on both sides of the aisle that requested a revision of H.O. 12. The Labor Department did not even have substantial evidence to support the prohibition of teenagers to load nonoperating balers. In addition, in the last Congress, language was included in this very bill that instructed the Labor Department to do a review of H.O. 12.

If I remember correctly, in the last Congress the gentleman from Wisconsin and the gentleman from Ohio, the chairman of the committee and the subcommittee. The Labor Department then promised to issue a notice of proposed rulemaking by May. We have heard nothing yet.

Mr. Chairman, you will hear that this provision will undermine child safety, but that is a far cry from the truth. The Labor Department admits it only has 11 documented cases involving baler-related accidents, but in 6 of these there was operation of the baler, and under the provision in the bill, operation of the baler would still be illegal.

One case the Labor Department lists happened next to a baler when a piece of metal happened to fall that was leaning against it. In another documented case an individual had a paper cut when they picked up the box.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment should be defeated.

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. NORWOOD].

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise to strongly, strongly oppose this amendment on many grounds, but for the point of this debate, let us just talk about his language that strikes the provision to control OSHA and ergonomics. Now, what is ergonomics? Ergonomics is simply repetitive motion. It might occur from playing tennis, it might occur from skiing, it might occur from fly fishing, perhaps it even can occur from using a computer too long.

If we have ergonomics, what really does it do? Well, they call it repetitive strain injury. I think we can all agree that there is such a thing. All of us over 50 know that there is repetitive strain injury. But how pervasive is it? Well, do not bother to find out. There is no correct answer.

Mr. Chairman, OSHA estimates that such injuries account for 60 percent of all workplace illnesses. The Bureau of Labor Statistics says that that figure is 7 percent. The National Safety Council thinks, well, maybe it is 4 percent. Well, that is the problem, the reason repetitive strain injury is the workplace's most complicated and controversial problem.

Now, beyond the fact that we know that there is such a thing, there is little agreement on this subject. One problem is that no one can determine the scope of the phenomena. Remember, these divergent statistics are offered by OSHA and the National Safety Council, but another involves the question of cause and effect, a science that is very muddled at best when it involves RSI, repetitive strain injury.

For instance, two secretaries work the same hours every day. One develops stiffness in her fingers and the other does not. An assembly line worker suffers from crippling backaches. His colleague who works right beside him and

does the same thing whistles all through the day.

Now, did the employer's work cause the pain, or something else? What should an employer reasonably be expected to do about this? The way OSHA looked at the issue, every job would become a disorder waiting to happen. In its zeal to protect workers' health, the agency drafted a report identifying risk factors on the job from heavy lifting to working in cramped spaces. The 4-inch thick, 600-page document offers guidance to companies in reducing those risks. OSAH's regulations would have affected everyone who moves or works on the job.

Mr. Chairman, medical science cannot yet determine the cause. It affects everyone, and medical science cannot pinpoint the cause. This will not change the basic fact that there are not always clear causes or remedies for RSI. You cannot mandate a fix if the fix is not out there. However, we have an agency today who would mandate a fix. We have an agency today, and people in that agency, that we cannot allow to write ergonomic standards. We all want health and safety in the workplace, but this particular OSHA should not be allowed to do such a dangerous thing to the economy of this country and the consumers of every one of our districts.

Mr. OBEY. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ANDREWS].

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

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend from Wisconsin for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, this act is misnamed. It should be called the Special Interest Relief Act of 1995. One of the special interests that is no doubt dancing with glee over the contents of this act is the student loan industry, which has siphoned over \$1 billion a year from the taxpayers of the United States of America, until 1993 when we adopted what I think was a good Republican idea called competition. In 1993 we said we would have two student loan systems compete with each other side-by-side. One was the expensive and complicated status quo system run by the banks, and the other was a new, more efficient system run through the college campuses called direct lending.

Everything that we have seen from around the country, Mr. Chairman, says, direct lending is winning. Students like it, universities like it, taxpayers like it, but the special interests who profit from the student loan system most certainly do not.

So what they have done in this bill is to cut off the competition at its knees. Language in this bill which would be removed by the Obey amendment says, direct lending will be effectively killed, dead and buried as a result of this. That is wrong. It is wrong for taxpayers because direct lending costs less than the bank-based system. It is

wrong for students and administrators because around this country, a vast majority of them have said that they prefer the direct lending system. Perhaps most importantly, Mr. Chairman, it is wrong as a matter of process. It is wrong because it is based upon a CBO report which cooked the numbers.

Mr. Chairman, anyone who follows this issue and is familiar with it knows that the conclusion that somehow or another the direct loans cost more than guaranteed loans was a conclusion CBO was told to reach for reasons of political convenience, and it is also wrong, Mr. Chairman, because this debate and this issue is being tucked away in this appropriations bill.

Mr. Chairman, the special interests of the student loan industry know that they cannot win a fair fight on this issue, because they do not have the facts on their side. So what they have done is to load it up in this bill, tuck it away in a corner where a lot of other issues will take precedent and it will not see the light of day. The Obey amendment is a way to correct that and bring us into the light so that there can be a fair and balanced debate. For that and many other reasons I would urge my colleagues to do the right thing and vote "yes" on the Obey amendment.

□ 1830

#### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

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

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. WALKER). The gentleman will state it.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, as you know, the Chair is considering rolling some votes. The next amendment scheduled to be discussed, depending upon whether or not my amendment passes, is the Pelosi amendment, which, in contrast to my amendment, is only trying to remove some of the legislative language with respect to some labor problems or worker problems.

Mr. Chairman, my question is this: How do we proceed to the Pelosi amendment if we have not actually had a vote on my amendment; and should we not, therefore, vote on my amendment before we proceed to the Pelosi amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has the authority to postpone the votes. The inconsistency of the amendments does not necessarily impact on the Chair's decision with regard to postponement.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, further parliamentary inquiry.

Is it the Chair's intention to roll the vote on the Obey amendment now before us?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is at the present time considering that matter and leans toward postponement of votes.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, since we are not at a point where the Chair has to make that decision, I would urge that the Chair make that decision in consultation with both sides, not roll-

ing that specific vote, so that we could, if it fails, proceed to the Pelosi amendment; unless, of course, the committee wants to accept the amendment, in which case we do not have any need to go to the Pelosi amendment.

Mr. Chairman, in fairness to both sides, I think it would not make sense to vote on the Pelosi amendment, or spend the time debating it, if mine passed. I am not asking for a determination now, but I would urge the Chair to consider that problem.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will take the gentleman's point under advisement.

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY], the Republican whip.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Chairman, I hope Members are watching this debate and paying very close attention to what the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] is trying to do. It is a huge amendment that affects a lot of issues that are very important to a lot of Members.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is trying to remove legislative language that deals with striker replacement. In a situation where the President has, in my opinion, stepped way beyond the bounds of his authority by writing legislation through Executive order, we are trying to correct that.

The gentleman also strikes a provision in the bill that I think is very, very dangerous, if Members do not know about it and vote for this amendment, and that is the legislative language that prevents the raiding of pension funds by the Department of Labor, a position that has gotten a lot of people exercised about a new way of spending, designed by the Secretary of Labor, by going in and raiding pension funds.

The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. NORWOOD] has already talked about the ergonomic standards, another example of overzealous regulatory agencies trying to write regulations on an issue that the scientific community has no consensus on, yet they are trying to write regulations that would have a severe impact on jobs in this country.

The gentleman is also attempting to stop summer jobs. In this bill, we have language that prohibits the Labor Department from stopping individuals under the age of 18 from using cardboard balers in grocery stores. Right now, they are trying to stop high school kids who work summer jobs in grocery stores from operating the cardboard balers in those stores. The gentleman strikes that language.

Also, those that understand, particularly in light of the recent Surgeon General, we do not need a Surgeon General in this country. The gentleman strikes the language that does away with the Office of Surgeon General. We go on and on and on.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] even includes some of the abortion language, so those

Members who consider themselves pro-life had better look very carefully at this amendment, because it strikes the language that stops medical experimentation on human embryos outside the womb. I do not think anybody is offering a single amendment to strike that particular language.

I understand the point that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations, is making. The point is, he is upset with legislating on an appropriations bill.

Mr. Chairman, let me just say that in taking over the majority in the short period of time that we have had, we did not have time to legislate through the normal process; and we feel that it is very important to do these kinds of things to stop an overzealous administration from accomplishing some really bad things.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the Obey amendment.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

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

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, we should support the Obey amendment because this legislation is just such an incredibly comprehensive raid on the rights of American workers.

Whether those American workers seek to have a bargaining position with their employer over their working hours, terms, wages and conditions, where that right is taken away because of the attempt here to overturn the President's Executive order; whether those workers seek to work in a safe workplace, where we see as serious a problem as the ergonomic standards being set aside in this bill; going even further, not letting OSHA collect the data. Apparently, the Republicans on this side do not know this when they see it.

Let me tell my colleagues, we see it every time we get on an airplane. We see a flight attendant with their hands in the braces; people that cannot do the job on the airplane, because their hands are in braces.

We see it on the assembly line and we also see it when almost 3 million claims are paid for the injuries that are suffered for this.

Mr. Chairman, the question is, do we stick our heads in the sand, as the Republican amendment would have us do, or do we go out and try to meet this problem? This is about whether or not our workers get to continue to be able to work without disability or whether they are sent home from the workplace and they are put on disability and they see that their ability to support their families is dramatically reduced.

This is about our families. This is about Americans. This is about people who go to work every day and do not want to be hurt, yet 2.7 million of them file claims and were paid. Mr. Chair-

man, we know the kind of workplace loss that that takes.

We see it in our own offices. There are people walking around this Capitol with braces on their hands, on their elbows and shoulders from that kind of work. Do we not owe it to them?

Mr. Chairman, we also know that employers and insurance companies recognize it. They are trying to develop a safer workplace. They are redesigning machine tools and redesigning the assets to the people working on the assembly lines.

Somehow the Republicans have just lost sight that these are people; these are families; these are bread winners; these are spouses; these are mothers; these are fathers; these are sons or daughters who are out there working.

Do they not deserve a safe workplace? The answer in this legislation is "no" from the Republican side of the aisle.

I think we have got to understand it extends even further in terms of the workers, where there is disagreement in the workplace between employer and employee. They make it much more difficult to go and get those conflicts resolved. What does that mean? That means it costs business more money, it costs workers wages and we do not get on doing what this country does very well, and that is produce goods and services, not only for this country, but for the international economy.

Mr. Chairman, why is this necessary? Because they will not deal with this through the authorization process as opposed to the appropriations process.

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ISTOOK], a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Chairman, I find it interesting that some people object now, saying that we should not do other things on appropriations bills. I looked at last year's version of this very same piece of legislation when the other party was in power and there were in excess of 30 examples of what we call authorizing language on the appropriations bill.

Mr. Chairman, this is nothing new or unique; it is something that is common. But what is not common in this place, Mr. Chairman, is the type of outcry that we have heard from the special interests, because they realize they are threatened by this piece of legislation.

This piece of legislation defunds special interests. This bill is to stop the system of patronage, that has gone on through so much of the government bureaucracy, that hands money out to allies of the governing party and uses them to come back and lobby the taxpayers.

We have steps, not only by reducing the level of spending in this bill, but we have what we call the grants reform language, the stopping of welfare for lobbyists that goes to the heart of the problem.

Mr. Chairman, we will never get spending in this country under control if we do not stop using taxpayers' money for advocacy of political positions. This bill contains the language to correct it.

Mr. Chairman, I heard the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SKAGGS], my friend, say, "Oh, this is going to create a national database." My goodness, I hope the gentleman realizes that lobbyists already have to register. There is already a database. There is a database of grantees. There is nothing new in that.

Mr. Chairman, perhaps some people want to hide from public view the amount of money that is going to special interest groups. The President of the United States, yesterday, decried the special interests in Washington. Here we have a bill to take money away from them to make them stop taking advantage of the taxpayers and people treat it as though the sky is falling.

Mr. Chairman, this bill on so many fronts addresses the problems with how Washington operates, the way that taxpayers' money is used to fund giant bureaucracies in the private sector, as well as the government sector. This bill is to put a halt to that.

Mr. Chairman, the Obey amendment tries to gut this piece of legislation. It needs to be defeated and the bill as a whole needs to be passed.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER].

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Obey amendment and I want to make an observation to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ISTOOK], my friend with whom I serve on two of the subcommittees. The fact of the matter is, we have not had a bill since I have been a member of the Committee, January of 1983, in which this kind of language was protected. Not one in that 14 years. It was not protected last year or the year before that or the year before that or the year before that.

Mr. Chairman, what has happened not just in this bill, but in numerous bills, the authorizing committees have been ignored and we are trying to jam through legislative language on appropriations bills.

Mr. Chairman, we ought to reject it. Pass the Obey amendment.

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. TALENT].

Mr. TALENT. Mr. Chairman, I think this amendment highlights the philosophical differences between the parties. We believe in Americans and what they have built on their own. We think workers and employers, subject to reasonable rules and regulations, are pretty capable of creating jobs and economic growth and not helpless and unable to protect their own safety.

The other side believes that we are going to have massive problems, unless these people are minutely watched by

an agency whose record is largely unblemished by success, and I refer to the Occupational Safety and Health Administration.

Mr. Chairman, I want to talk specifically about the fall protection standard, which is in this bill and on which there were hearings in my subcommittee.

□ 1845

The fall protection standard OSHA recently applied to all work above 6 feet in height, it was at 16 feet, they applied it to all work above 16 feet, which means it applies to all residential remodeling, all residential roofing, and, Mr. Chairman, everybody in this business, management, labor, everybody hates it because the workers have to tie on these harnesses and these lanyards and move anchors. It is tremendously inefficient, and it is unnecessary, and they resent the Federal Government telling them, experts in this, what they have to do in order to protect themselves.

OSHA says if we get full compliance with this fall protection standard at 6 feet, and every roofing job and every remodeling job in America, and I guess they are going to have cars in every subdivision to watch people, if we get full compliance, it will save 20 lives every year. I asked the head of OSHA, "How much does this increase the costs of these jobs?" Because the evidence we have, again pretty much undisputed, was that it would increase the cost of labor on the jobs about 10 percent, because the workers have to move so much slower. What happens when you increase the cost of this work? What do homeowners do? They turn to fly-by-night contractors, to handymen, to people who do not know and understand safety on roof tops, or maybe they do the jobs themselves.

What happens if you get a bunch of people working on roof tops who do not know what they are doing?

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the remainder of my time.

Mr. Chairman, the issue is not whether you like the language on paper balers. The issue is not whether you like the language on ergonomics or whether you like the language on any other OSHA action. The issue is whether or not this language ought to be considered as a slipped-in provision in this bill with no chance for hearings, no chance for examination, or whether we ought to do it in a more orderly way.

One of the previous speakers said that I was trying to prevent jobs because we are taking out the language on paper balers. We are not trying to prevent jobs. We are trying to prevent the killing of kids. The fact is that it is true that some balers meet the new industry standards. But only one in five current machines meets all of the requirements, and 15- and 16-year-olds are sometimes not the most cautious of people. There have been six deaths because of paper baler machines, deaths of children.

The ergonomics standards, I do not, frankly, know what the standards ought to be, but I do not believe that the agency ought to be precluded from even developing data on the injuries associated with this problem, and that is what this language does.

Let me simply state, in response to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ISTOOK], about other labor-health bills providing legislative language. The difference is that every single one of those provisions was brought to this floor under an open rule, and if a single Member of Congress objected, they could strike it on a point of order. That meant the only provisions in the bill were noncontroversial, and they were not special interest sweet dreams, as these are.

Let me simply say that when you take, as you have done, 17 different legislative provisions and jam them into an appropriations bill, do not try to kid us. You know what you are doing. What you do is you circumvent the process. When you put it into an appropriation bill, what you do is you circumvent the normal congressional hearing process and the authorizing committees. You circumvent the process which is designed to make certain all of the parties who were impacted by a decision have an opportunity to comment on it before we, as the public's Representatives, make a final decision and a final choice. What you are doing now when you slip it into an appropriation bill, you make sure that only certain special pleaders get taken care of. And the other folks who are affected by it? "Sorry buddy, but you are not involved. We got it in before you even knew we were doing it. Your comments do not even get heard." That is not the way to do business when you are dealing with people's lives, when you are dealing with people's rights to have a safe and healthy workplace, when you are dealing with the ability of families to save some money on student loans. That is not the way to do business. This is simply, pure and simple, a special interest end run of the normal legislative process. If you truly believe that some of this legislative language is correct, and some of it may very well be, then the way to deal with it is to have the proper committee bring it out under conditions which allow us to amend that language and change it. You cannot legislate, supposedly, on an appropriations bill, so we cannot do that here. Except you have slipped in these items so we cannot get at them through the normal point of order process. You know that these are special interest proposals. You know, if, for instance, you are going to subject a woman to fewer choices because she is a victim of rape or incest, it would be nice if she at least had a chance to comment on it. They have not, not the way you have brought this here.

Strip out all of this language. Bring it here before us in the correct process. Some of it may pass. Some of it may

fail. But at least you will give everybody in the process a square deal.

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of my time, 2 minutes, to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MCINTOSH], a great champion of free enterprise and small business.

Mr. MCINTOSH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I think the American people have sent us here to get our work done. They are tired of us saying we cannot do it on this bill, we cannot do it on this vehicle. We have to go through this hearing. They sent us here last fall to change the very nature of this city and of this Government.

This bill takes a giant step in the right direction to accomplish that. It says to the agencies we are not going to continue giving you money to spend on regulations that do not make sense. It says to the President, "We think you have politicized the Surgeon General's office, and we are not going to give you more money to finance that operation." It says to the lobbyists here in Washington, "We are going to cut off your taxpayer funding, no more welfare for lobbyists under this Congress."

The time to act is now, Mr. Chairman. The American people want these measures. They sent us here to do this work.

The committees and the Committee on Appropriations and subcommittees have worked hard to fashion this bill and to craft these provisions in a way that reflects the will and the interests of all of the committees here in Congress. This is an effort to stop us from doing what the American voters sent us here to do, to change America, to cut back on regulations, to end welfare for lobbyists, to send a signal that it is no longer business as usual.

We are going to do what the people sent us here to do and fundamentally change the nature of this Government. I rise in strong opposition to this amendment. Support the committee bill as it is written, because it does move in the direction of changing this Government for the better and for the American people.

Mr. EWING. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment, which would strike section 107 of the bill, which prohibits funding for the enforcement of Hazardous Occupation Order 12, relating to paper balers.

The language in section 107 is based on H.R. 1114, legislation which has 119 bipartisan cosponsors. It would reform a Labor Department regulation which has been on the books since the 1950's and is very outdated. The regulation prohibits teenagers from working around paper balers in grocery stores, despite the fact that modern paper balers cannot cause injury while they are being loaded. The Department has been passing out fines up to \$10,000 to small grocery stores for allowing teenage employees to simply toss an empty box into a nonoperating baler, even though they are safe. As a result, many grocers have stopped hiring teenagers.

Our language would simply allow teenagers to load paper balers and compactors, but would not allow them to operate or unload the

machines. Additionally, they could only load the modern machines which have the strict safety standards established by the American National Standards Institute.

This is a jobs issue as well as a safety issue. This small change will encourage supermarkets to start hiring teenagers again without the fear of huge fines. It will also make the workplace safer for all grocery store workers by providing an incentive for grocers to get rid of any old machines which are still in use and replace them with the modern, safe machines.

Congressman LARRY COMBEST and I have been working for well over 2 years to get the Labor Department to modify this regulation, and they have resisted our requests. Last year the Democratic Congress included language in this appropriations bill directing the Labor Department to review H.O. 12. In response, the Department told Congress that it would issue a "Notice of Proposed Rulemaking" on H.O. 12 by May of this year. As of today that Notice has still not been issued. That is why we strongly support the language contained in this bill.

The language in the bill is strongly supported by the Food Marketing Institute, which represents grocery stores in every congressional district.

Mr. Chairman, I include for the RECORD a letter from the Food Marketing Institute concerning this amendment.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support the committee bill.

FOOD MARKETING INSTITUTE,  
Washington, DC, August 3, 1995.

Hon. TOM EWING,  
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN EWING: The Food Marketing Institute (FMI) on behalf of the nation's supermarket industry, wishes to express our strong opposition to the amendment that will be offered by Representative Nancy Pelosi to the FY 1996 Labor/HHS Appropriations bill (H.R. 2127).

Among other things, this amendment will allow the Department of Labor (DOL) to continue issuing huge fines against grocery stores for situations when there is clearly no risk of injury to 16 and 17 year old employees. As you well know, the amendment seeks to preserve as is, Hazardous Occupation Order Number 12 (HO 12), a relic of a regulation that has remained unchanged since its adoption in 1954.

Similar to the important principles embodied in H.R. 1114 that you and Congressman Larry Combest are sponsoring, the language in the FY 1996 Labor/HHS Appropriations bill calls for common-sense reform to HO 12. This important language rejects the status quo and embraces safety standards that have been issued by the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) for cardboard balers and compactors. As provided for in H.R. 1114 and in the FY 1996 Labor/HHS Appropriation bill, employees who are 16 or 17 years of age would be permitted to place materials into a baler or compactor that cannot be operated during the loading phase because the equipment complies with current ANSI standards.

FMI strongly endorses H.R. 1114 and the common-sense reform relating to HO 12 as specified in H.R. 2127. A vote against the striking amendment achieves the following: Fairness to employers because fines will not be assessed for situations in which there is no risk of injury to workers; enhanced safety in the workplace as supermarkets upgrade or purchase new equipment that meets the ANSI standards; and finally, job opportuni-

ties for young people, as grocery stores will once again be encouraged to hire teenagers. Sincerely,

HARRY SULLIVAN,

Senior Vice President and General Counsel.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, I agree with Mr. OBEY. If he's said it once, he's said it a thousand times: This legislative language has no place in an appropriations bill.

The issues that this bill touches—from abortion to workers' rights—are complicated and controversial. They should be considered out in the open in the committee with primary jurisdiction. If the Majority is proud of this legislation, its members should have the opportunity to hold public hearings to discuss these matters with the public. If this legislation—and that's just what it is—is so important, it should stand on its own, and not hide behind the cover of an appropriations bill.

That said, I rise in support of Mr. OBEY's amendment to strike the pages and pages of legislative language in this bill.

This inclusion is more than unnecessary and a waste of our time. It is malicious. It targets the most vulnerable in our communities, women who have been assaulted by rapists, and children who have been victims of incest. In some cases, this bill rescinds years of legal precedent. In this bill, court decisions in labor cases are overruled.

The demolition does not end here. The supporters are attempting to give political pay back to their conservative supporters. Let me give you two examples.

The language in this bill about gender equity in college sports is unfair to our daughters. Title IX enforcement ensures that our sons and daughters have an equal chance to take part in sports while they are in school. The language in this bill would halt Title IX enforcement. Intercollegiate athletic opportunities for female students—hampered as they already are—would be limited even more. My daughters—each one a better athlete than her father—have been denied the access that I had to college sports. Halting enforcement of Title IX when there is still so much work to do is simply wrong.

The other example that I find intolerable as well as ironic addresses the training of obstetricians and gynecologists. Supporters of this language will say that it protects those who have moral and religious reservations about abortion from discrimination. But the Accreditation Council for Graduate Medical Education—the independent, organization of medical professionals who set the standards for medical education—does not mandate abortion training. Anyone, either an individual or an institution, with a legal, moral, or religious objection to such training is not required to participate.

I would argue that the language in this bill serves a different purpose. It serves to restrict academic freedom. It serves to restrict knowledge about a legal medical procedure its supporters find personally unacceptable. In an ironic twist, in order to satisfy the personal priorities of many proponents of small government, they have inserted this language which represents an unprecedented intrusion into the actions of a private organization.

To repeat, this language has no place in an appropriations bill. Vote with Mr. OBEY to strike all of these unnecessary and outrageous provisions.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of Mr. OBEY's amendment to strike the

pages and pages of legislative language in this bill. Legislative language has no place in an appropriations bill.

This bill addresses complex and controversial issues—from abortion to workers' rights. The American people demand and expect that these issues be subject to full Congressional scrutiny—out in the open—in the committee of jurisdiction.

Yet, the Republican back-door strategy is designed to circumvent this process.

This is wrong. Their legislative language deserves to stand on its own. These provisions deserves to rise or fall on their own merits, not on the basis of some legislative shenanigans.

My Republican colleagues speak highly of this bill. They are clearly proud of their efforts.

Yet, one could reasonably conclude—based upon the Republican decision to insert legislative language in this bill—that they seek to avoid a direct confrontation over this language.

Their motivation is clear. Many of these provisions reflect the most radical and extreme elements of Republican agenda.

This language targets the most vulnerable members of our society: rape victims and the victims of incest. In some cases, this bill rescinds years of legal precedent. It over-rules a number of significant court decisions in the area of labor relations.

This is a simple instance of political pay-back. My colleagues are advancing the interests of narrow, special-interests and right-wing conservative supporters.

Here are just two examples:

Language in this bill addressing gender equity in college sports is outrageously unfair. Currently, title IX enforcement ensures that our sons and daughters have an equal opportunity to participate in sports while at school.

Language in this bill would halt title IX enforcement, and intercollegiate athletic opportunities for female students—already limited—would be further scaled-back.

My own daughters—each one a better athlete than their father—have been denied the same access that I had to college athletics—support, facilities, scholarships, \* \* \* the list is long. Undermining title IX—while so much inequity remains—is simply wrong.

Let me present another, more pernicious example of legislative meddling:

Language in this bill interferes with the training of obstetricians and gynecologists. While seeking to protect from discrimination, those with moral and religious reservations about abortion, this language actually serves to restrict academic and personal freedom. This language ignores the facts.

The Accreditation Council for Graduate Medical Education—the independent, organization of medical professionals that sets the standards for medical education—does not mandate abortion training.

Anyone, either an individual or an institution, with a legal, moral, or religious objection to such training is not required to participate.

This language has the intended consequence of restricting knowledge about a

legal medical procedure that some find personally unacceptable.

In an ironic twist, in order to satisfy the personal priorities of many proponents of small government, they have inserted this language which represents an unprecedented intrusion into the actions of a private organization.

In closing, let me repeat what Mr. Obey has stated so forcefully: This language has no place in an appropriations bill.

Vote with Mr. Obey to strike all of these unnecessary and outrageous provisions.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] will be postponed.

Are there further amendments to title I?

#### AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MS. PELOSI

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I offer three amendments en bloc.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendments en bloc.

The text of the amendments en bloc are as follows:

Amendments en bloc offered by Ms. PELOSI:

Amendment No. 60: Page 20, strike lines 15 through 22 (relating to OSHA ergonomic protection standards).

Amendment No. 61: Page 58, line 20, strike the colon and all that follows through "Act" on page 59, line 8 (relating to NLRB and salting).

Amendment No. 62: Page 59, line 8, strike the colon and all that follows through "evidence" on page 60, line 8 (relating to NLRB section 10(j) authority).

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House, the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI] will be recognized for 10 minutes, and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY] will be recognized for 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI].

#### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman will state her parliamentary inquiry.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I thought we were 20-20.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California is 20 minutes total, 20 minutes on each side.

Ms. PELOSI. That is for all three, the en bloc?

The CHAIRMAN. The en bloc amendments specified under the unanimous-consent request was for 20 minutes, 30 minutes on each side.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI].

Mr. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, in light of the fact that I only have 10 minutes and I

though I had 20, I will take less time, obviously.

My en bloc amendment addresses three shortsighted riders to the Labor-HHS bill regarding worker protection. It deletes the ergonomics rider and can save American corporations \$20 billion a year in workers' compensation costs. It eliminates one of the chief causes of a debilitating work-related disorder.

My amendment reverses the effects of this misguided rider which falls under OSHA. In addition to that, I have two amendments which address the NLRB.

As we know, earlier today we discussed some of the cuts in NLRB, a 30-percent cut.

The rules prevent me from introducing an amendment which would restore these cuts. Instead, I am addressing some of the legislative language in the bill that addresses the NLRB, two provisions in particular, the 10(j) provision and salting.

Section 10(j) of the National Labor Relations Act gives the NLRB the power to go into Federal court against an employer or a union to get the court to issue an order for interim relief. This is a very preliminary step. Such orders, for example, can require an employer or union to stop committing additional violations and to reinstate employees fired to chill organizing or withdraw illegal bargaining demands.

Mr. Chairman, what is important to note about this is when these 10(j)'s are issued, most of the time the overwhelming percentage of the time, the issue is dealt with expeditiously and in only a small minority of cases does it go to the next step.

This legislation in this bill would say that in order for the NLRB to go to Federal court against an employer or union, it would require a four-fifths vote of the NLRB, 80 percent. You talk about minority rule, 20-percent rules, a veto power of one person on the NLRB, so I think that in a sense of fairness, our colleagues would recognize that this is silly legislative language.

In fact, had this legislation been in effect at the time of the baseball strike, on which the NLRB voted 3 to 2, we would never have been able to proceed to the resolution of that strike. I think that the figures there speak for themselves.

Mr. Chairman, I have so much more to say on these issues, but will not, in the interest of time,

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

#### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Chairman, could I, under the rules, transfer the management of the opposition to another Member by unanimous consent?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman, by unanimous consent, could do that.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to allow the gen-

tleman from North Carolina [Mr. BALLENGER] to control the time in opposition.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina will be recognized to control the time in opposition to the Pelosi en bloc amendments.

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FAWELL], a member of the committee.

Mr. FAWELL. Mr. Chairman, I am going to try to, in the 5 minutes I have, make reference to the National Labor Relations Act provisions which are involved in this particular amendment.

First of all, in regard to the 10(j) injunction, I think that is oftentimes misunderstood, but basically all that this bill is doing is to, in effect, require uniform standards in regard to the issuance of a preliminary injunction. Nobody, obviously, should be against something like that.

We are also setting forth that the basic equity principles that always apply in all other areas of our civil law in regard to the issuance of a preliminary injunction would apply here.

Here again, when we talk about a preliminary injunction, we are talking about a very extraordinary remedy, and you must understand that where ordinarily speaking—and any of my lawyer colleagues listening in on this would agree—that you do not get a preliminary injunction just as a matter of course, which is what the NLRB has been doing for the last 2 years. You have got to show a likelihood of success, you have got to show irreparable damage that would be done if the preliminary injunction were not granted. You would have to show a balance of hardships between the complainant and the respondent, and you have to show the public interest is something that demands it. That is what is being requested here.

In the last few years, we have had a great increase in the use of the 10(j) injunction, and both the new chairman, Mr. Gould, and the general counsel, Mr. Feinstein, have made a number of speeches where they have said that they are going to increase the use greatly and, indeed, they have.

Since 1947, when the Taft-Hartley law first authorized this kind of an injunction, it was used on average over the years no more than 30 or 50 times per year.

□ 1900

Now we are getting it at something like 160 over a 16-month period or roughly 10 times for each of the 16 months, and all of this means that what we have, as far as the small business person is concerned, a very costly and a very intimidating result because he is dragged into Federal court to try to defend himself, and then all too often we have, without these provisions

applying as would ordinarily apply, we have an injunction that is issued against the respondent. The small business person especially cannot stand that cost, and it is an intimidating procedure to go through, and oftentimes we get what is called a settlement, but it is not really a settlement. There is nothing to worry about here if my colleagues understand that these kinds of preliminary injunctions should never be issued anyway unless there are these extraordinary circumstances.

In regard to the so-called salting issue, this involves unions that are sending paid or professional union agents and union members into non-union workplaces under the guise of seeking employment, and the question raised in a number of appellate court cases is whether the union paid and employed applicants for a job can be classified as an employee who would meet the definition of employee under the National Labor Relations Act.

So the issue basically is simply this: Should the NLRB's general counsel proceed to investigate and prosecute unfair labor practice charges against employers who refuse to hire an applicant who is employed by a union full-time and under the control and the supervision of the union and there basically to organize?

In the most recent case, which is now before the Supreme Court, the Supreme Court stated, and I quote, "union members who apply for jobs so that they can organize workers are not employees under the protection of the National Labor Relations Act," so what is being suggested here is that they should not spend all that money that is necessary to prosecute and to investigate business people. We should not be spending all this money when we have a Supreme Court case which will very soon make a decision. As soon as that decision is made, then this particular ban in regard to spending would be lifted.

So I think in both of these areas we have some very commonsense suggestions.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS].

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

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, 10(j) injunction processes allow the NLRB, the National Labor Relations Board, to do the job they set up to do. They operated for the last 60 years, done a great job for labor relations in America, but in their zeal to destroy organized labor and their zeal to destroy the workers of this Nation, the Republicans, the majority, has moved in this appropriations bill in a way which is abusive, abuses their power and makes a mockery of the democratic process. It trivializes the institutions that we have built for the last 60 years.

The 10(j) process, when it was not in existence, caused the National Labor Relations Board to be impotent in

cases which were life-and-death matters. I am going to give my colleagues one extreme example.

In August 1989 the company fired employee Jerry Whitaker for having previously filed an unfair labor practice charge with the Board. The Board ordered the company to reinstate Whitaker, and the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals enforced the Board's order in 1992. The company ignored both the Board and the court. This is Gary Enterprises ignored the court and the Board, and the Board was forced to bring a contempt case and forced the company to comply. After being discharged, Mr. Whitaker, while he is waiting for this process to take place, had to find work. He could not find work. He finally found work hauling logs. He had to sleep in his car. He had a heart condition, and one morning while a contempt case was still pending before the court, Mr. Whitaker was found dead in his truck from a heart attack at age 55. The Board is still trying to collect the back pay owed to Mr. Whitaker's estate by the company. This is the kind of case that today would be considered for a 10(j) injunction. It could not happen today. The use of the 10(j) injunction today successfully could have put Mr. Whitaker back to work promptly, reduced the back pay owed by the company, and possibly saved and prolonged Jerry Whitaker's life.

This is a life-or-death matter, and we are using a shortcut process in the appropriations process to deal with it.

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. NORWOOD], a member of the committee.

Mr. NORWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BALLENGER] yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose this amendment on the same grounds that I opposed the Obey amendment 10 minutes ago. We must not allow OSHA to write an ergonomic standard about a medical condition they know nothing about. We do not even know for sure how many repetitive-strain injuries occur in this country. How can we say that it costs \$20 billion when we are not sure exactly who has a repetitive-strain injury? How is it two employees can do the exact same thing, and one of them has a strain injury, and one does not?

Mr. Chairman, OSHA cannot write this standard yet. They do not have the ability, medical science does not have the ability, to determine when a person has a repetitive-strain injury.

I ask, "Is your sore elbow sore from tennis, or is it sore from work? Is your sore ankle from skiing, or is it sore from work?"

Mr. Chairman, we do not have the ability yet to understand this. Vote against this amendment.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, responding to the previous speaker, it is interesting to hear

our colleagues talk about needing a scientific basis for OSHA before proceeding with further ergonomic regulations. We do have that scientific basis with NIOSH, and these same colleagues want to cut \$32.9 million of our safety and health research [NIOSH] which is the foundation for the OSHA work.

Mr. Chairman, I also would like to point out to our colleagues who are railing against the ergonomics regulation that a letter received in our offices that came from the Office of Inspector General, the House of Representatives. The letter says that among the provisions we recommend the Chief Administrative Officer develop proposals for the approval of the Committee on House Oversight to phase out nonfunctioning furnishings with ergonomic modern furnishings over the next 9 years.

Let us take the advice of the administration of this House and have ergonomics considerations for people outside as well as in the Congress.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. BECERRA].

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI] for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, my father has never skied in his life, my father has never played tennis in his life. I doubt he even wore a pair of skis or touched a tennis racquet in his life. But for more than 50 years he did work with a pick and shovel, and now my father has tendons in his hands which are contracted and tendons in his hands which are hardened.

Pick and shovel and constantly stooping down, that is what my father did in building the great Nation that we have in America.

Now was it repetitive action that caused those tendons to contract and harden? I do not know, but we should have information to determine if in fact that is what caused my father's tendons to contract and harden. But this legislation does not even allow OSHA to collect the information to make that determination.

Whether or not we should have standards now, I will not make that judgment, but we should at least be allowed to collect the information needed to make that judgment. This bill under the Republican leadership would not allow it to happen.

I will go back and tell my father what the Republican Congress wishes to do on this particular issue.

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOEKSTRA].

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BALLENGER] for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Pelosi amendment to strike the OSHA ergonomic provision, the provision on the 10(j) injunctions, and the provision regarding the processing of

salting charges by the NLRB. We have talked about these issues in our Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities. We concur with the work that has gone on here in the Committee on Appropriations. These provisions included in the bill simply are statements by the Committee on Appropriations that these are areas which are not a priority for the expenditure of resources.

Mr. Chairman, we are in a time of making difficult choices. The ergonomic provision would prevent OSHA from issuing an overly expensive regulation as indicated by the draft proposal already issued. When there are other demands on OSHA, we should focus OSHA's limited resources on reducing fatalities and workplace accidents rather than on developing regulations to protect workers from repetitive injuries and other ergonomic hazards, regulations which will cost jobs, create paperwork, and will not work.

What we need to do in the area of repetitive-motion injuries is use common sense and not look for a bureaucratic paperwork maze to solve our problems.

The provision on 10(j) injunctions requires the Board to pursue injunctive relief to be guided by uniform standard in determining when injunctive relief would be appropriate. It would also allow parties impacted by injunctive relief a opportunity, an opportunity to present their cases to the Board to open up the process. These seem to me to be matters of simple fairness and due process.

The provision on salting merely requires the NLRB to suspend processing of charges until the Supreme Court has made a determination of whether or not these employees are covered under the National Labor Relations Act. It does not make sense for the NLRB to expend resources in an area where it might ultimately be determined that the NLRB has no jurisdiction.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. OLVER].

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, the labor title of this legislation really is not about money. It is all about legislating a return to the labor philosophy of the 19th century just as we are entering the 21st century. The amendment by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] corrects some of the worst of those features, but, pending that, the amendment that the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI] has offered removes some of the limitations on the NLRB's actions, but it also allows OSHA to set standards protecting workers from repetitive-motion injuries, and that is clearly going to be one of the largest of the issues of the communication and information revolution that we are going to be having in the 21st century.

So, this is an extremely important amendment that we adopt and make certain that we go ahead with the ability to deal with ergonomic standards now and on into the future that is part

of the communications information revolution of the 21st century.

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, this Congress passed a number of regulatory reforms which have benefited America's employee community as much as its employer community. We have said that we cannot protect the safety of the employees without destroying their jobs. We can reduce the risk without reducing employment. This is why we passed risk assessment, cost-benefit, and a regulatory moratorium.

OSHA has said that in developing ergonomic standards it wants to do business as usual, no matter what Congress says. Cumulative trauma disorders represent less than 4 percent of the workplace illnesses, but to drive this 4 percent higher, OSHA arbitrarily decided to include back pain, which would increase the figure to 28 percent. But there is a great controversy in the scientific community over whether such back pain can be attributed to workplace causes.

In Australia, when an ergonomic standard was adopted in the 1980's, injury rates increased. Workers' compensation costs increased as much as 40 percent in some industries, and a single company lost more than \$15 million in 5 years due to increased production costs.

As Tom Leamon, vice president and research director for Liberty Mutual Insurance, a company which has worked with OSHA to try to develop a standard, has concluded:

I've spent a long time trying to make jobs better and lighter, but there is amazingly little evidence to support a mandatory standard.

□ 1915

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, how much time is remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from California has 2½ minutes remaining.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

In that time I want to urge our colleagues to support this amendment which supports American workers, and to give to the people in America concerned about ergonomics the same opportunity that the leadership of this House of Representatives wants to give to the workers in the Congress of the United States.

I believe that the calling for a four-fifths majority for 10(j) injunction is really antidemocratic. I urge our colleagues to vote for fairness and against that proposal in the appropriations bill. Please vote for the Pelosi amendment to support American workers and to treat them with the same fairness in regard to ergonomics we wish to have in this Congress.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], the ranking member of the committee.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, how much time remains?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from California has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, there are a lot of people here that seem to laugh at OSHA as a pointy-headed agency. I want to tell you a story. The first day I ever served on this subcommittee, I walked into the hearing and I heard a witness saying that 40 percent of the workers, shipyard workers, who had worked with asbestos in World War II, had died of cancer. That got my attention because I used to work with asbestos.

What I found out, after I started to dig into it is, that Manville Corp. knew since 1939 that their product killed people. They knew that workers like me were at risk. They did not bother to tell anybody. It is only the protection you get from an agency like OSHA that assures that people eventually find out what threatens their health in the workplace.

Mr. Chairman, the issue is not whether you like individual OSHA standards or not. Frankly, none of us are qualified to determine exactly what those standards should be because those should be scientific not political judgments. All I am saying with this amendment tonight, on these labor issues, on these worker health related and worker rights related issues, all we are saying is leave the choice to the people who are supposed to be objective about it. Do not turn each and every one of these choices into political decisions.

The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BALLENGER] smiles. With all due respect, he is not objective on this issue and neither can I. We have both had our personal experiences. That is why we established these agencies, so they can make neutral judgments based on the best possible scientific information and based on the best possible legal evidence.

If we want to toss this into the political arena and have worker health decided by a bunch of politicians based on which special interest got to them last, vote against the Pelosi amendment. If we think workers deserve better, vote for it.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment submitted by my colleague from California, Congresswoman PELOSI—an amendment which will restore some equilibrium to the relationship between American workers and employers.

By reducing funding for and restricting the operations of the National Labor Relations Board [NLRB], this bill damages one of the most important tools that we have in this country for ensuring that fairness and balance remain in the collective-bargaining process.

The NLRB ensures that American workers do not lose their legal right to choose whether or not they will be represented by a union, and it keeps both unions and employers from interfering with the organizing and collective-bargaining process. The NLRB is an independent agency and acts only in response to charges—charges that can be initiated by either employers or employees.

Impeding the work of the NLRB just makes it harder for middle-income workers and their families. By striking at the very heart of labor-management cooperation and teamwork, erosion of the NLRB lays the groundwork for making millions of American workers more vulnerable to the whims of employers who want to avoid the rules of fair labor practice. By undermining the collective-bargaining system, we pave the way for unfair labor practices, and contribute to the disintegration of the American middle class. Without the protection of the NLRB—safeguards that ensure that both workers and managers engage fully in the collective-bargaining process—we are on the road back to the days when workers had no security. We cannot backslide to the days when the relationship between employers and employees was ruled solely by management. I urge my colleagues to support fairness and balance for American workers, families, and companies by supporting Congresswoman PELOSI's amendment.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to express my support for this amendment and my strongest opposition to the provisions in this bill which seek to limit the responsibilities and enforcement authority of the National Labor Relations Board.

The NLRB measures in this bill chip away at the basic organizing rights of American workers.

This attack on the NLRB could mean the closing of half of the NLRB field offices—an obvious attempt to dismantle the ability of the NLRB to halt flagrantly unfair labor practices by employers and to provide necessary worker protections.

The NLRB now takes over a year to resolve unfair labor practice cases. Ten percent of the cases are not resolved for 3 to 7 years. In the meantime, workers who have been improperly fired for union organizing activities remain out of work. Is it any wonder many workers are intimidated from being involved in organizing? The Republican leadership, by cutting NLRB funds by 30 percent, even in the face of this backlog, shows its true intent to make the rights of American workers, enshrined in the National Labor Relations Act of 1935, to choose freely whether to join a union, a fiction.

This provision is a direct attack on the democratic rights of workers. It is an attack on their right to organize, and on their basic right to a fair, safe and healthy workplace. It is an attack on every working American.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to ensure the basic rights of America's working men and women and support this very important amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment by the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House today, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI] will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CRAPO

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment made in order by the rule.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Part 2, amendment number 2-3, offered by Mr. CRAPO: Page 88, after line 7, add the following new title:

TITLE VII—DEFICIT REDUCTION LOCK-BOX

SEC. 701. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the "Deficit Reduction Lock-box Act of 1995".

SEC. 702. DEFICIT REDUCTION LOCK-BOX ACCOUNT.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF ACCOUNT.—Title III of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"DEFICIT REDUCTION LOCK-BOX ACCOUNT

"SEC. 314. (a) ESTABLISHMENT OF ACCOUNT.—There is established in the Congressional Budget Office an account to be known as the 'Deficit Reduction Lock-box Account'. The Account shall be divided into subaccounts corresponding to the subcommittees of the Committees on Appropriations. Each subaccount shall consist of three entries: the 'House Lock-box Balance'; the 'Senate Lock-box Balance'; and the 'Joint House-Senate Lock-box Balance'.

"(b) CONTENTS OF ACCOUNT.—Each entry in a subaccount shall consist only of amounts credited to it under subsection (c). No entry of a negative amount shall be made.

"(c) CREDIT OF AMOUNTS TO ACCOUNT.—(1) The Director of the Congressional Budget Office (hereinafter in this section referred to as the 'Director') shall, upon the engrossment of any appropriation bill by the House of Representatives and upon the engrossment of that bill by the Senate, credit to the applicable subaccount balance of that House amounts of new budget authority and outlays equal to the net amounts of reductions in new budget authority and in outlays resulting from amendments agreed to by that House to that bill.

"(2) The Director shall, upon the engrossment of Senate amendments to any appropriation bill, credit to the applicable Joint House-Senate Lock-box Balance the amounts of new budget authority and outlays equal to—

"(A) an amount equal to one-half of the sum of (i) the amount of new budget authority in the House Lock-box Balance plus (ii) the amount of new budget authority in the Senate Lock-box Balance for that bill; and

"(B) an amount equal to one-half of the sum of (i) the amount of outlays in the House Lock-box Balance plus (ii) the amount of outlays in the Senate Lock-box Balance for that bill, under section 314(c), as calculated by the Director of the Congressional Budget Office.

"(d) CALCULATION OF LOCK-BOX SAVINGS IN SENATE.—For purposes of calculating under this section the net amounts of reductions in new budget authority and in outlays resulting from amendments agreed to by the Senate on an appropriation bill, the amendments reported to the Senate by its Committee on Appropriations shall be considered to be part of the original text of the bill.

"(e) DEFINITION.—As used in this section, the term 'appropriation bill' means any general or special appropriation bill, and any bill or joint resolution making supplemental, deficiency, or continuing appropriations through the end of a fiscal year."

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of contents set forth in section 1(b) of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 313 the following new item:

"Sec. 314. Deficit reduction lock-box account."

SEC. 703. TALLY DURING HOUSE CONSIDERATION.

There shall be available to Members in the House of Representatives during consideration of any appropriations bill by the House a running tally of the amendments adopted reflecting increases and decreases of budget authority in the bill as reported.

SEC. 704. DOWNWARD ADJUSTMENT OF 602(a) ALLOCATIONS AND SECTION 602(b) SUBALLOCATIONS.

(a) ALLOCATIONS.—Section 602(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 is amended by adding at the end of the following new paragraph:

"(5) Upon the engrossment of Senate amendments to any appropriation bill (as defined in section 314(d)) for a fiscal year, the amounts allocated under paragraph (1) or (2) to the Committee on Appropriations of each House upon the adoption of the most recent concurrent resolution on the budget for that fiscal year shall be adjusted downward by the amounts credited to the applicable Joint House-Senate Lock-box Balance under section 314(c)(2), as calculated by the Director of the Congressional Budget Office, and the revised levels of budget authority and outlays shall be submitted to each House by the chairman of the Committee on the Budget of that House and shall be printed in the Congressional Record."

(b) SUBALLOCATIONS.—Section 602(b)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 is amended by adding at the end of the following new sentence: "Whenever an adjustment is made under subsection (a)(5) to an allocation under that subsection, the Director of the Congressional Budget Office shall make downward adjustments in the most recent suballocations of new budget authority and outlays under subparagraph (A) to the appropriate subcommittees of that committee in the total amounts of those adjustments under section 314(c)(2). The revised suballocations shall be submitted to each House by the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of that House and shall be printed in the Congressional Record."

SEC. 705. PERIODIC REPORTING OF ACCOUNT STATEMENTS.

Section 308(b)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 is amended by adding at the end the following new sentence: "Such reports shall also include an up-to-date tabulation of the amounts contained in the account and each subaccount established by section 314(a)."

SEC. 706. DOWNWARD ADJUSTMENT OF DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS.

The discretionary spending limit for new budget authority for any fiscal year set forth in section 601(a)(2) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as adjusted in strict conformance with section 251 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, shall be reduced by the amount of the adjustment to the section 602(a) allocations made under section 602(a)(5) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as calculated by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget. The adjusted discretionary spending limit for outlays for that fiscal year, as set forth in such section 601(a)(2), shall be reduced as a result of the reduction of such budget authority, as calculated by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget based upon programmatic and other assumptions set forth in the joint explanatory statement of managers accompanying the conference report on that bill. Reductions (if any) shall occur upon the enactment of all regular appropriation bills for

a fiscal year or a resolution making continuing appropriations through the end of that fiscal year. This adjustment shall be reflected in reports under sections 254(g) and 254(h) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

**SEC. 707. EFFECTIVE DATE.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—This title shall apply to all appropriation bills making appropriations for fiscal year 1996 or any subsequent fiscal year.

(b) FY96 APPLICATION.—In the case of any appropriation bill for fiscal year 1996 engrossed by the House of Representatives on or after the date this bill was engrossed by the House of Representatives and before the date of enactment of this bill, the Director of the Congressional Budget Office, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, and the Committees on Appropriations and the Committees on the Budget of the House of Representatives and of the Senate shall, within 10 calendar days after that date of enactment of this Act, carry out the duties required by this title and amendments made by it that occur after the date this Act was engrossed by the House of Representatives.

(c) FY96 ALLOCATIONS.—The duties of the Director of the Congressional Budget Office and of the Committees on Budget and on Appropriations of the House of Representatives pursuant to this title and the amendments made by it regarding appropriation bills for fiscal year 1996 shall be based upon the revised section 602(a) allocations in effect on the date this Act was engrossed by the House of Representatives.

(d) DEFINITION.—As used in this section, the term "appropriation bill" means any general or special appropriation bill, and any bill or joint resolution making supplemental, deficiency, or continuing appropriations through the end of a fiscal year.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. CRAPO] will be recognized for 20 minutes and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] will be recognized in opposition for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. CRAPO].

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

Mr. Chairman, we have finally made it to where the lock-box amendment is now getting an opportunity to be debated and voted on the floor. It has been nearly 2 years since a bipartisan group has been working to try to get this critical budget reform brought forward, and I want to thank the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BREWSTER], and the gentlewoman from California [Ms. HARMAN], from the Democratic side, for their support and continued effort to try to bring this issue forward.

Mr. Chairman, I also want to thank the gentleman from California, Mr. ROYCE, the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. ZIMMER, the gentlemen from Florida, Mr. FOLEY and Mr. GOSS, the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. UPTON, the gentleman from Oklahoma, Mr. LARGENT, the gentleman from Wisconsin, Mr. NEUMANN, the gentleman from New York, Mr. SOLOMON, for their strong effort on the Republican side to be sure that this important reform comes forward.

In a nutshell, Mr. Chairman, what does this amendment do? It corrects

one of the basic problems in our budget process. Right now, as we vote to reduce spending, to try to balance our budget, and we reduce spending in a particular program, project or line item of our budget, all that happens is that particular program or project is eliminated. The money allocated to that project is not eliminated. It simply goes into the conference committee so that those in the conference committee can reallocate it to their special projects.

Mr. Chairman, it is important for us to have a system where when we make a cut that counts, and that when we talk about deficit reduction on this floor, our cuts reduce the deficit. This bill does just that. It takes those cuts and puts them into a lock box and makes certain when this bill is conferenced, those lock-box items are used to reduce the statutory as well as the budgetary limits on our spending.

I encourage the support of the Members of this body for this critical reform and think that we are now going to take one of the major steps in this Congress for budgetary reform.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the idea behind the lockbox is that, supposedly, when savings are made on the floor in bills that are brought out of the Appropriations Committee, that that money, instead of being used for another purpose, is locked up in a box and used for deficit reduction. Sounds great.

I think we ought to go through the history of the lockbox in this Congress. The first time that it was raised as a major issue was on the rescissions bill, when major reductions in the existing fiscal year's budget were being considered by this House. In that bill, in committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA] tried to offer an amendment assuring that every dollar that was cut in that bill be used for deficit reduction, not for tax cuts. That amendment was defeated.

We then came to the floor, and our Republican friends in the majority had a change of heart. Essentially, they were looking for votes. What they said was, "All right, I tell you what. We will support the Murtha amendment." They supported the Murtha amendment and they also supported the Brewster amendment, which said "No money for tax cuts, just use it for deficit reduction."

One day after it was adopted, Mr. Chairman, the Republican chairman of the Committee on the Budget said, "Oh, that was just a game to get the votes to pass the rescissions bill." They dumped it in Congress and came back with a hugely modified provision which allowed only the first year's savings to go for deficit reduction, and they allowed all of the out-year savings, billions and billions of dollars, over 90 percent of the savings in the bill, to be used for their tax cut.

Guess who gets most of that tax cut, Mr. Chairman? The folks at the top of the heap. Folks making \$100,000 a year or more.

We then tried to help the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ORTON] and others, the gentlewoman from California [Ms. HARMAN] another, who wanted to have the lockbox attached to other appropriation bills as they moved through here. Bill after bill, "Sorry, kiddo, no way." It was not done.

Mr. Chairman, now, when we have the last of the major appropriation bills before us, or almost the last, all of a sudden the lockbox is attached to this bill. Why? Because our Republican friends are desperately looking for some Democratic votes for this turkey of a bill on final passage. I want to assure our friends on the Republican side of the aisle, I do not think that there are very many people on our side of the aisle naive enough to think that this lockbox provision is going to be sweet enough to make them vote for this labor, health appropriation bill.

Let us not be fooled, Mr. Chairman. There are \$9 billion or more in cuts in this bill from last year, but none of those dollars are going to go in a box for deficit reduction. Those babies are all going to be used to help finance that nice fat \$20,000 tax cut for somebody making \$300,000 a year and all of the other tax cuts associated with it.

I would simply suggest, Mr. Chairman, lockbox has been spectacularly manipulated politically for the past 7 months. I find it ironic that the only bill that you wind up debating this on is this bill which contains funding for the poorest people in this country and for middle class working people.

It did not apply when the Klug-Obey amendment passed to eliminate a fat subsidy for the nuclear power industry. Oh, no. You would not apply the lockbox to that. You would not apply the lockbox to pork projects when we had the public works bill before us. Oh, no. You would not apply it to the transportation bill when we had transportation pork out here. Oh, no. Now that it affects education, health, labor, however, now you are going to say, well, let us save the money.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think there will be any amendments adopted which cut this bill anyway. What that means is that this is an empty gesture from the majority party. It is a desperate effort to pick up a few votes on our side. Frankly, I do not care how people vote on this amendment, because it is so meaningless, but I hope it does not divert Members from the fact that if anyone really cares about a fair balancing of budget priorities in this country, they will vote against the underlying bill when the opportunity presents itself.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH].

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I want to say to those who have been following the progress of the Republican revolution, this amendment today on the

lockbox is critically important. There are a lot of people all over this country, we call them C-SPAN junkies, and many of them are as informed as any group of people you can find within this country, but they did not know, many of them, that if you actually cut spending on an appropriations bill, the money does not go to reduce the deficit; that the money, instead, will go for another spending program. This has been the practice now for about 40-plus years.

The Republicans have now been in the majority since January. This is now August. We have essentially been in charge a very limited period of time. Within this very short period of time, however, we are actually, today, going to pass the first official lockbox bill on the House floor, so that as we cut spending, instead of using Washington rules and using it to spend on something else, this actually is going to reduce spending and we will use it to reduce the deficit.

You know what that is, Mr. Chairman? That is Main-Street-USA common sense. People on the other side criticize us for the way in which we have got lockbox to the floor. I say wait a minute. The minority had 40 years to do it, why did they not do it? They response is, "Well, if we would have just had one more week to be in control, we would have got it done." That is kind of a joke around here. We could give them another 40 years and it probably would not have been done because this means real spending cuts, real reductions in the deficit, and it means common sense, USA, a Main-Street-America idea.

The beauty of this, Mr. Chairman, is it is on this bill and we are going to permanently extend the lockbox for as long as the Republicans, joined by some Democrats who have stuck their necks out, in order to get a lockbox and save this country's fiscal future.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. HARMAN].

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time, and I commend him for his effective leadership on this issue.

First of all, I agree that Mr. OBEY that the lockbox should have been passed a lot sooner. Had we had a lockbox at the beginning of this Congress, \$479 million in cuts from 11 appropriations bills would have been in it. Instead, today, the lockbox, sadly, is still empty. It will be empty at the end of this bill, because, as has been pointed out, we do not expect to cut money from this bill.

Nonetheless, Mr. Chairman, we start today on a very good footing with a bipartisan lockbox amendment that many of us have worked on for years. Had it been adopted in the last Congress it could have included more than \$600 million in cuts adopted to appropriations bills.

I would like to commend the many freshmen on the other side whose in-

volvement was critical in moving the amendment as quickly as it did move. Let me not forget my colleague, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BREWSTER], sitting to right whose formidable presence and leadership on this issue made a big contribution. I also thank Rules Committee Chairman TERRY SOLOMON and PORTER GOSS for their concerted efforts to report H.R. 1162.

Let me say, Mr. Chairman, that a reasonable person would believe a cut in a cut, but not here in Congress. Money cut from one appropriation bill is simply shifted to another.

□ 1930

Lockbox will stop this practice and make a cut in spending a cut in the deficit. The lockbox, as I have said, has many fathers, but I am its mother, and as a mother, I would like to say how proud I am that after a very long gestation the baby will be born.

Congratulations again to all the bipartisan group that worked on this. I offer my strong support for the Crapo amendment.

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

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bipartisan effort to make our cuts, the cuts that we make on this House floor, count. What this bill would do would be to ensure that spending cuts to appropriations bills will be designated directly to deficit reduction. They will not disappear in conference to be respent later.

This reform, I should share with Members, is supported by such bipartisan groups as the Concord Coalition. It is supported by Citizens Against Government Waste, Citizens for a Sound Economy, and the National Taxpayers Union. The amendment makes a statutory change to the Budget Act of 1974, and would require that all net savings below the budgeted 602(b) allocation, whether from amendments on the floor or in committee, will go toward debt reduction and not for other spending projects.

In the case of this bill, the committee is already \$320 million under its 602(b) budget authority allocation, and the net amount of savings and any more savings adopted on the floor of this House will be credited to the deficit reduction lockbox. The lockbox provision applies to this bill and to any other general or special appropriations bill or measure which follows, including supplemental appropriations, deficiency appropriations, and continuing resolutions upon their engrossment by either house.

I want to share with Members that had this passed last year, we would have saved \$659 million that we cut on this floor, but was later respent rather than go to deficit reduction.

Mr. Chairman, this provision is supported by the American people. They desperately want and need deficit reduction. Interest on the national debt

is now the third highest item in the federal budget, and a child born today will have to pay, on average, taxes of \$187,000 over his or her lifetime just to cover their share of interest on the national debt. That does not include the off-budget impact of the national debt itself, which causes higher interest rates on everything from homes to cars.

Please support the amendment.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS].

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, as somewhat of a technician in the effort to devise a lockbox mechanism that could work and still meet the legitimate need of flexibility for those who must write our spending bills, I am pleased to rise in strong support of this lockbox proposal. Our Rules Committee—members and staff—worked long hours to ensure that lockbox would be more than just a catchy phrase—that it would be a powerful and workable budgetary tool to help us meet and maintain our commitment to a balanced budget. And I believe we have succeeded in that effort.

When the House and the Senate vote to save money in spending bills, those savings should not be spent elsewhere, they should be credited toward deficit reduction.

On its face, this appears to be a simple matter—and the principle, that a cut should be a cut, truly is simple. But given the complexities of our current budget process, this simple principle becomes complicated in its application and one can get hopelessly mired in arcane commentary on such things as 602(a) allocations, 602(b) suballocations, statutory spending limits, and the like. These are beltway terms but they are important to understanding the minutia of how this thing will work.

As chairman of the Rules Committee's Subcommittee on Legislative and Budget Process, I am deeply committed to reforming our entire budget process—it is complicated, it is cumbersome, it is confusing, it is often redundant, and it is generally geared toward spending and preserving the status quo.

While we proceed on the larger reform effort, there is no reason not to move forward now on this one important piece of the budget process reform puzzle. I urge strong support for this lockbox proposal.

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

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think there is anyone in this House that is not pleased to see us with a lockbox amendment finally before us so that when we do see cuts being made, we

know they are not just going to be for naught, because the money that will have been saved will go on to other programs within that particular agency.

If I may, I would like to propound a question to the sponsor of the amendment and tell the gentleman that I noticed something. This is an amendment that was made in order by the Committee on Rules. It was printed up. Unlike many amendments that were not included within the Committee on Rules report, this one was. As I understand it, this amendment applies to all the cuts and savings that will be made henceforth.

But as the gentlewoman from California mentioned, there were \$400 million worth of cuts that have been made in the previously passed appropriations bills over the last couple of weeks, but those \$400 million will not be put into this lockbox. They will be used for other purposes, which I imagine include a tax cut for the very wealthy.

So I would ask the gentleman, when he went to the Committee on Rules, if he had asked the Committee on Rules to make this lockbox amendment applicable retroactively to the appropriations bills which we have passed over the last 2 weeks?

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

Mr. BECERRA. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

I agree that we have been trying to get this lockbox amendment put into the process much earlier, and it should have been, so we could have caught some of the savings we already voted on. We did ask for retroactivity. We found there were some significant technical problems with that. The amendment has been written to give as much retroactivity as we can within the process that we are working in. I have to say it is not going to catch all of that which has now gone under the bridge.

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman for this response, because that worries me, because I know this committee can do quite a bit, technical or not, to make sure we save the money. It is unfortunate we did not take the opportunity to do so.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to my good friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], the chairman of the Committee on Rules, who has been of great assistance in this bill.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, I took the well on this side of the aisle to look straight at two people sitting over here, because this truly is a bipartisan effort, and it is so badly needed. You know, there is nothing more disheartening for any Member of Congress than to stand up here and have the guts and the courage to vote for cuts of programs, some good program, but you have to do it. You have to get this defi-

cit under control. And then, after you have cast that tough vote, to see the moneys not go toward lowering the deficit. That is so discouraging. The American people are just so disturbed with that.

Finally we have a lockbox that is going to correct that. That means when the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BREWSTER] or the gentlewoman from California [Ms. HARMAN] or the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. CRAPO] or all of the rest of us, when we have the courage to come out here and vote for those cuts, it means now they are going to lower the deficit, and we are going to get this deficit under control.

I think this is a great day. I am just so excited I can hardly stand it. I want to jump up and down. Come over here and vote for this. I want to give the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. CRAPO] great credit, because for 2 years the gentleman has pursued this. Now we are going to get it. Pass it overwhelmingly. I thank the gentleman for the American people.

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

Mr. Chairman, I tried to listen to the previous speech with a straight face. I just want to say that it was my impression that just last night the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST] tried to, in the Committee on Rules, amend this proposal so that the lockbox could be applied to all of the appropriations bills which had passed the House in this section, and that in fact he was turned down. It seems to me that that fact indicates the basic disingenuousness of the situation in which we find ourselves.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, will my good friend yield?

Mr. OBEY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, I would just say that there is nothing we would rather do than make this retroactive, to make it affect everything. But the gentleman knows after you pass these bills, and the gentleman from Wisconsin, DAVID OBEY, is one of the smartest Members of this body, once we had made those cuts and then the 602(b) allocations has been redistributed, where had they been redistributed to? Mostly to NASA, which people felt we had to reinstate some of the cuts, and mostly to veterans affairs. We could not do that.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I would simply say that I did not see that side of the aisle getting any double hernias trying to do heavy lifting in order to get the lockbox adopted on the rescissions bill. In fact, I saw them after they accepted the Brewster amendment, the rescission bill in this House, applying the lockbox principle to all of the savings, both near year and outyear in the rescissions bill. I did then see them swallow a process in which all of the outyear dollars were diverted for the tax cut, rather than for deficit reduction.

I find it interesting that the lockbox will be used to provide tax cuts for

somebody making \$200,000 a year, but we will also pretend we are going to make additional savings in this bill for people at the lower end of the economic scale, when in fact we know that all of the savings you are going to have in this bill have already been made, they have already been cut, and, again, they are being used to justify a tax cut.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. LARGENT].

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to say if the only argument that we have to overcome in order to pass this lockbox is simply that it is not good timing, that I look forward to an overwhelming vote on the lockbox, because that is no argument against voting for the lockbox. I am encouraged by that. It is fun to take the field with so little opposition.

For the last month, we have been going at the annual ritual of offering amendments to reduce spending in the Federal budget. As a freshman and a freshman of the Committee on the Budget, to find out only hours later that we really did not reduce spending, we merely reallocated it, was really frustrating. I can tell you that in all sincerity we have been working morning, noon and night to try to get this lockbox retroactive, to get it passed as quickly as possible, and get it passed as a freestanding bill, which we are still committed to do, in order to make this lockbox truly effective right now. We want to make it effective yesterday and last month.

This is the best we can do, and I am glad to see that we should expect overwhelming bipartisan support.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ZIMMER].

Mr. ZIMMER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I do agree it would have been an excellent idea to have enacted the lockbox earlier. In fact, it would have been an excellent idea to have enacted the lockbox shortly after the gentleman from Idaho introduced the legislation along with the gentlewoman from California in the 103d Congress. Think of all the money we could have saved if it had been passed under the previous majority.

But, fortunately, we have today for the first time a meaningful lockbox amendment before us, and it will establish that the budget allocations that we so solemnly adopt each year will be not floors, but ceilings. It will make it clear that we can reduce spending below those allocations and have those spending cuts stick. Budget cuts can go straight to deficit reduction, so we can reduce the amount we add to the national debt every single day until that blessed day when we finally reach a balanced budget.

Those of us who have been fighting to cut the budget over the years have felt

sometimes like Sisyphus, the mythical character who would roll a rock up a hill only to see it roll back down again. Every cut would be reallocated and respent.

□ 1945

And more than that, the effort to make the spending reductions in the first place would be undermined because everybody here knew that the reductions were not real cuts in spending, so why bother to make enemies by voting not to find programs.

What we are doing is truth in packaging. What we are doing is authenticity in Government. We are making good on our promise to be fiscally responsible. Vote for the amendment.

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

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

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Crapo amendment. I commend the gentleman, and also the gentlewoman from California [Ms. HARMAN] and the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BREWSTER] for the bulldogged work that they have provided this year to see that we have a chance to vote on this tonight.

I have had an interest in the lockbox idea for several years myself. In fact, Tim Penny, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH], and I included in our commonsense budget reform bill last year, but this provision was one of only four of our provisions that the House did not approve.

This amendment would simply guarantee that spending cuts we approve as part of any appropriation bills could be designated for deficit reduction, a novel idea.

Having watched year after year after year spending cuts voted in the House never ever, ever becoming true spending cuts, to say that we are a little bit excited about the possibility this time in spite of the fact that this is the second time this year we have done this, perhaps this time we are going serious and that this will not only pass tonight but that it will receive the full and complete support which it deserves and see that it in fact becomes the law of this House. This is a commonsense legislative effort.

When Congress votes for cuts, we should not deceive the American public or ourselves about what those cuts mean. Citizens assume a cut means a reduction in the deficit, not just a reshuffling of funds as has always been the case. With this change, budget savings will be placed in the lockbox, locked in for deficit reduction, without loopholes. These spending cuts should be initiated automatically unless otherwise specifically designated or transferred, which can be done.

I commend the gentlewoman from California [Ms. HARMAN], the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BREWSTER], and the gentleman from Idaho

[Mr. CRAPO] for the effort, the leadership that they have shown in seeing that we have an opportunity tonight to vote for this amendment.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FOLEY].

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

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I am delighted to join the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. CRAPO] in this effort. I also commend the gentlewoman from California [Ms. HARMAN] and the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BREWSTER] on their leadership on this issue.

The American public is telling us to quit spending their money, quit wasting their dollars. This is a mechanism by which we can start locking up some of those savings and putting them towards deficit reduction.

Simply put, I cut a project the other day \$25 million. I found out hours later that that money, that \$25 million, was swept off the table and spent somewhere else. It frustrated this Floridian to know that all of that effort was in vain because somebody else spent the dollars.

Let me tell my colleagues, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. LARGENT] spoke eloquently on the freshman class. I want to read you from the Fort Lauderdale Sun-Sentinel an editorial, "Applaud House Foley, for 'revolt'":

Congress has played the old shell-and-pea game with the appropriations process for years, shifting federal money from shell to shell with so much speed and dexterity that the befuddled taxpayer soon loses track of the pea.

Foley and many of his colleagues in the Class of 1994 were sent to Congress partly because they pledged to get serious about reducing the deficit. In this instance at least, they seem determined to make good on their pledge. Foley's prominent role on this important issue may not endear him to the House leadership, but it should earn him some deserved points with the people he was elected to serve.

My colleagues, we were sent here from districts across America to serve the taxpayers, not the leadership of this Congress.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BREWSTER].

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

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. Chairman, today first I want to thank my good friend from Idaho, Mr. CRAPO. We have worked on this project for 3 years, were joined by the gentlewoman from California [Ms. HARMAN] last year, and it has been a long road. But we finally reached the point of getting a vote.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the lockbox amendment to H.R. 2127. Many Members on both sides of the aisle have worked tirelessly to get to this point. We have many times seen amendments come up on the floor. We have made difficult votes to make cuts in those bills out there and then seen

that money spent later by the Committee on Appropriations on other programs. That is just not right. Since I came here in 1991, I have been astounded that those kinds of things continued to happen.

I committed myself to make sure this practice would not continue. Today we have a vote on the lockbox amendment. This lockbox represents the most substantive change in the way this place does business that has occurred in many decades.

The gentlewoman from California [Ms. HARMAN] and I have appeared before the Committee on Rules on every appropriations bill this year. I am sure the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] is tired of seeing us there.

As we testified for the Brewster-Harman lockbox to be made in order, savings were slipping away and being used by the Committee on Appropriations elsewhere. Although a lockbox amendment does not capture the \$480 million in cuts the House has already made this year, it symbolizes our commitment toward deficit reduction.

I thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] for bringing this issue before the House today and agreeing to also debate H.R. 1162 as a stand-alone bill after the August recess. I think this twofold process is important for the House to work its will on the lockbox issue and to better ensure that the lockbox becomes law as soon as possible.

Our constituents sent a message to Congress last November to reduce the deficit. Let us be honest to our constituents. Let us make sure a cut is really a cut, not additional spending for someone else. I urge my colleagues to vote for the lockbox amendment.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS].

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, let me ask this question: If you asked the American people, do we need to change the way Congress works, I think you would get a large percentage that would say yes.

There is another question. Shortly we are going to see on this voting board around here the votes on this amendment. The American people are going to look to see who votes against this very simple amendment for a lockbox. That is the other question. Let us show the American taxpayers that we are serious, very serious about reducing the deficit. Supporting this amendment should make it clear that we are going to put our money where our mouths are. In other words, we will ensure that any savings realized in the appropriations bill will automatically go into a lockbox and not be spent in another way.

Such a trust fund is long overdue, my colleagues. If we show the folks back home that we are truly committed to

reducing the deficit, it will be easier for our citizens to accept some of the other tough choices we are asking them to accept.

Again, I want to compliment my colleagues for offering this amendment. I am proud to be an original cosponsor. I support the amendment.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MINGE].

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Chairman, first, I will start by complimenting my Republican colleagues for what I think is an excellent proposal and also those Members on the Democratic side who have been so active in proposing and advocating and bringing this to the floor for a vote.

The lockbox principle is important; it is very important. One can simply say, a cut is not a cut unless we have the lockbox principle in place, because as others have explained, it is altogether too easy to take the cut, reallocate it among other programs, and undermine or defeat the entire effort that took place to save money and to reduce the deficit and ultimately to balance this budget.

There are aspects of this which remain troubling, and I trust that we will deal with these aspects in the weeks to come.

One that is most significant, in my opinion, is the unfortunate tension that exists in our Federal Government, the tension between the House and the Senate and between the White House and Congress. And what we find is that some of these bills and provisions are lost in that process. As a consequence, our efforts here to insert the lockbox principle in this appropriations bill may not survive the entire conference process and the possibility of a veto and work with the White House subsequently.

I urge the Committee on Rules and the Members of this body to work aggressively to not just pass this but to also make sure that if this does not pass and is not ultimately signed by the President that we, in fact, have a lockbox that this body will observe as its own internal operating procedure so that we, in fact, as the U.S. House of Representatives, are committed to deficit reduction and we do not abuse the cuts that are made and reallocate these funds for other programs.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. UPTON].

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Chairman, I ran for Congress to fight spending and to reduce the deficit. What has been more frustrating than ever has been when we have been able to get amendments on this House floor to cut spending, more times than not we have lost those battles. But in the times that we have actually been successful in cutting spending, something happens. The folks in the gallery, the folks at home may cheer watching C-SPAN, but ultimately when the bill goes to the Senate and those bills come back from

conference, the spending level is at the same if not even higher.

This lockbox changes things. Thanks to a bipartisan approach from the very beginning, we have been able, I think, to change history with that we are going to be doing tonight. Because in the future when we cut spending for whatever project it might be, defense, nondefense, foreign aid, I do not care, the spending is going to come down and we are going to win and the taxpayers are going to win big time.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BARRETT].

Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Crapo-Harman-Brewster lockbox amendment. It is an amendment that I think is long overdue.

I have to admit that I was sitting in my office listening to the debate and hearing many of my colleagues from the other side of the aisle get up and talk about their shock, their shock and amazement that the cuts that they thought that they had voted for were not going to deficit reduction but were going back into be spent again by the appropriators. This shock was unbelievable to them.

What I find ironic is that we have had this debate for 7 months this year, and over and over again we have said, If we are going to truly address the deficit reduction problem, we have to have cuts made on this floor apply to deficit reduction. And time and time and time again we have been shot down. We have been unable to have those cuts go to deficit reduction.

I think it is wonderful that we have it in this bill. Of course, there are not going to be many cuts in this bill. It is ironic that we did not have this provision in the bill that dealt with transportation spending, that dealt with highway projects, that dealt with true pork, because that is the place where we should have been making cuts and having those cuts go to deficit reduction.

I am happy it is here now, but when I hear my colleagues talk about their shock, it makes me think, maybe it is not as shocking as they pretend that it is.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOKE].

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Chairman, we have done a lot, we have gone a long way to reform this Congress. But one of the things that we have not done is, we have not really tackled a systemic problem that needs systemic and systematic reform.

One of the problems we have got in the Congress is that we really have three parties. We have got Republicans; we have Democrats; and then we have appropriators. And sometimes the appropriators forget which party they originally came from.

The reason that it creates such a problem is that the appropriators run this place in a different way, knowing

that if we do in fact get to the floor and make a cut, that when we make that cut, it will not matter. They can reprogram it however they want anyhow afterward, because it will not actually cut the budget in a way that goes to the deficit but it will simply be available to be used in another program in that particular appropriations bill.

That is wrong. It is part of what gives a certain kind of arrogance to the appropriations process that, frankly, becomes problematic to the rest of the Members.

□ 2000

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity that we have had to have this critical debate. As the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BREWSTER] said, we have been fighting for a long time to get this issue to the floor, and I again want to say thank you to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BREWSTER] and the gentlewoman from California [Ms. HARMAN] for their strong help in getting this moved forward. This has been a bipartisan effort.

For those on the Republican side whom I mentioned earlier, we have fought long and hard to bring this critical reform forward, and now, tonight, we are going to have a vote on one of the most important reforms of our budget process that we have seen in years.

Mr. Chairman, as the previous speakers have said, we now have an opportunity to make our budget process real, so that when we vote, when those C-SPAN viewers see across the bottom of the screen that the debate is on whether to cut spending or to spend money on a certain project, then it is true that we are truly talking about making our cuts count. We now have the opportunity to create the lockbox; to create a true system in which when we vote on this floor to cut spending, spending is cut.

Mr. Chairman, I again want to say that this vote, this bill, has support of the Concord Coalition, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the Citizens Against Government Waste, the Citizens For a Sound Economy, and the National Taxpayers Union. Those who are interested in our budget process, in protecting the fiscal stability of our budget system, in protecting against the increasing taxes that we have seen across the country, are all standing up tonight, watching the vote here on this floor.

Mr. Chairman, one final point. I think it is very important that we have a strong vote tonight, so that we can send a signal to the other body that we are serious, that this reform was put into this appropriations bill because we expect to see it back, we expect it to come out of conference, and we expect it to be delivered to the President for

his signature. That kind of a vote is what we need to see tonight to send a strong signal. I think that the debate today has shown that there is that kind of support, and I am encouraged that we pass the lockbox.

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the gentleman's amendment and would like to commend him for his tireless work in bringing the lockbox amendment before the House.

The concept of this proposal is so simple, so basic, and so common sense, that only in Washington could we have missed it for so many years.

In essence, the term "lockbox" simply means that a dollar saved is a dollar saved—that when Congress votes to cut funding for a program, the money won't be spent.

Most taxpayers—and maybe even most Members of Congress—believe that when Congress agrees to eliminate \$5 billion in funding for the space station or \$7 billion for the super collider, that the money remains in the Treasury. But, in fact, under current law, those tax dollars go back to the pot and can be reallocated, or spent, later that same year.

A ludicrous concept at any time, the practice is simply unsupportable in this era of \$200 billion deficits and ongoing struggles to balance the budget by the year 2002.

When the American people voted last November 8, they sent us a message. The message was one of smaller Government, less costly Federal programs, and overall fiscal responsibility. Our ability to meet these demands hinges upon two factors.

First, we must engage in plain old-fashioned tough decisionmaking. We must determine which programs merit continuing, which can be privatized, and which should be eliminated altogether. My committee, the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, is serving as overall House coordinator of this government-wide downsizing effort and is a strong champion of substantial Federal reform.

But even as we go about our business and make the hard choices on departmental restructuring and program eliminations, we recognize the need for a second type of fundamental reform. That is reform of the legislative process itself—reform which compels fiscal responsibility by promoting saving and making spending harder.

The Crapo lockbox amendment offers just such a change. It permits lawmakers to choose saving over spending, and allows us, for the very first time to honestly tell our constituents that a dollar saved is a dollar saved.

The amendment is long overdue, and should be supported. I urge my colleagues to vote "aye."

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Crapo amendment which establishes a deficit reduction lockbox and finally makes our cuts count.

When I was first elected to Congress, one of my first priorities was to reduce and eliminate the deficit. I became a cosponsor of the Deficit Reduction Lockbox Act then and have again cosponsored the bill in the 104th Congress.

Why is this bill necessary? Every time we vote to cut spending in appropriations bills, these funds can be reallocated to other programs rather than being used for deficit reduction.

Mr. Chairman, we must get our House in order before we reorder anything else.

I worked hard to keep my own congressional office budget as low as possible both to save money and set an example of accountability to my constituents.

I was one of the rock-bottom, low spenders in my class, returning the unspent dollars of my office account back to the Federal Treasury for deficit reduction.

It's an outrage that we cannot do the same with our annual appropriations. This amendment will bring some accountability and common sense into our appropriations process, rebuild the confidence of the American people in what we do, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. CRAPO].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House today, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. CRAPO] will be postponed.

Are there additional amendments to title I, or are there amendments made in order under the rule?

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON].

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Chairman, the Labor, HHS, Education Committee report contains language that highlights the need for a Comprehensive Scientific Research Program addressing characteristics of extra-societal groups. Many Americans are concerned and puzzled by the conduct of individuals involved in events such as the bombing of the Murrah Federal Building in Oklahoma City, the Sarin attack in the Tokyo subway and the extreme hold that David Koresh had on his followers. The National Institute of Mental Health is particularly suited to examine such concerns in a scientific manner.

The current state of understanding of such groups is extremely limited. Through efforts by the National Institute of Mental Health, we hope to increase our understanding of characteristics of such groups which are associated with increased potential for terrorism, violence or other criminal behavior; the manner in which such groups recruit individuals and influence their behavior sufficiently to move them toward terrorism, violence, and other criminality; the causes behind members leaving such groups; and mental health effects of membership in such groups.

I want to clarify the committee report language. The committee language discusses the need for increased understanding of such extra-societal groups, but does not specifically request information on the above mentioned causes and characteristics to the extent the National Institute of

Mental Health concludes that these concerns can be addressed scientifically, based on present knowledge and additional research.

I ask the subcommittee chairman if the intent of the committee language includes addressing the concerns I just mentioned?

Mr. PORTER. Reclaiming my time, it is important to note that one of the major goals of this bill is to provide for maximum flexibility within the National Institutes of Health as a whole and, in this particular case, within the National Institute of Mental Health.

With that in mind, yes, the committee recognizes that the intent of this request to the National Institute of Mental Health includes addressing the specific concerns that you mentioned in their research.

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the willingness of the chairman of the subcommittee to include this language in the report. This program of research is vital to effective and strategic planning of dealings with terrorism, violence and other criminality associated with certain organizations.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman of Ohio [Mr. SAWYER].

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Chairman I have sought this time to enter into a brief colloquy with the distinguished subcommittee chairman, Mr. PORTER, concerning title III of H.R. 2127.

Mr. Chairman, last year, after many months of bipartisan discussions and negotiations, Congress reauthorized the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, including the title I program for educational disadvantaged children.

One fundamental element in determining how to allocate title I dollars was the accuracy of the data itself. Because reliable poverty numbers for areas below the national level were only available every 10 years from the census, title I funds were being distributed on the basis of data that was as much as 13 years out of date.

Therefore, Congress decided that these critical program dollars should be allocated using poverty estimates that were updated every 2 years. Equally important, the funds would be allocated based on school district-level numbers, to ensure maximum targeting of shrinking dollars to those students most in need.

Congress recognized that producing poverty data for small geographic areas between censuses was a complex scientific task. That is why, as part of the reauthorization bill, it directed the National Academy of Sciences to conduct a 4-year review of the Census Bureau's efforts to produce updated poverty numbers for States, counties, cities, and eventually school districts.

The Academy study would have two important purposes. First, it would provide an objective, scientific review of the Census Bureau's methodology, and be able to recommend alternative approaches as the project moved forward.

Second, it would help the Congress determine the reliability of the updated poverty numbers at various geographic levels, and for various purposes. Without the Academy's review, I am not at all sure that Congress will have confidence in the numbers that the Census Bureau publishes.

Unfortunately, the Department of Education has not yet been able to fund the National Academy's study, due to a substantial rescission in the Department's evaluation funds.

Mr. Chairman, I am enormously pleased and grateful that the committee has included specific funding in this appropriations measure for the Department to obtain updated, school district-level poverty data from the Census Bureau. Those funds should allow the Bureau to proceed with its program as planned.

But I am afraid that failure to proceed with the National Academy study at the same time may render the Bureau's hard work irrelevant in the end, if Congress does not have confidence in the accuracy and soundness of the resulting numbers for purposes of the title I program.

Therefore, I would ask if you agree that the Department of Education should be able to use a portion of the \$3.5 million set aside in this bill for updated, small area poverty data, for the National Academy study that Congress directed under the Improving America's Schools Act?

Mr. PORTER. I thank the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SAWYER] for bringing this important matter to the committee's attention.

As a member of the committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities, Mr. SAWYER was instrumental in bringing the problem of outdated poverty numbers to the attention of this body and in developing the solution that we are funding in this appropriations measure.

I agree with the gentleman from Ohio that the National Academy study is an important part of the effort to ensure that we have accurate and timely poverty data on which to base the allocation of title I funds.

Therefore, I support the gentleman's point that a portion of the \$3.5 million, as the Department deems appropriate, could be used to fund the National Academy study of the Census Bureau's poverty estimates program.

Mr. SAWYER. I thank the gentleman from Illinois for his assistance in this very important effort.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN].

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to inquire about the coordination of disease prevention and health promotion activities at the Federal level. H.R. 2127 eliminates explicit funding for the activities carried out by the Office of Disease Prevention and Health Promotion, including the aggressive implementation of the national prevention strategy, Healthy People 2000. Al-

though the activities of this office are to be continued at the Secretary's discretion, no moneys were transferred to carry out this mandate.

I would like to clarify with the chairman his intent on maintaining disease prevention and health promotion as an integral part of our national health policy and ensuring coordination of the array of Federal efforts in this domain.

I understand the budget constraints that you faced in putting together this legislation and appreciate the considerable flexibility that this bill gives the Secretary of Health. I also appreciate the increased funding for specific, categorical prevention programs supported by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, such as for breast and cervical cancer screening. However, I am concerned that we are abdicating a strong Federal leadership role in orchestrating and coordinating prevention policy.

Would the chairman agree that a strong emphasis on disease prevention and health promotion must be part of our national health strategy?

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I very definitely, do agree.

Mr. MORAN. Would the chairman further agree that it is the Office of the Secretary is best suited to coordinate all prevention activities in the various health-related agencies?

Mr. PORTER. Yes, I do.

Mr. MORAN. And so you would clarify your intent to ensure that funds are available for orchestrating disease prevention policy at the Federal level.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GREENWOOD

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GREENWOOD:

Page 22, line 13, insert "X," after "VIII,".

Page 23, line 8, insert before the period the following: "Provided further, That of the funds made available under this heading, \$193,349,000 shall be for the program under title X of the Public Health Service Act to provide for voluntary family planning projects: *Provided further*, That amounts provided to said projects under such title shall not be expended for abortions, that all pregnancy counseling shall be nondirective, and that such amounts shall not be expended for any activity (including the publication or distribution of literature) that in any way tends to promote public support or opposition to any legislative proposal or candidate for public office".

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GREENWOOD] will be recognized for 15 minutes, and a Member opposed will be recognized for 15 minutes. Does any Member rise in opposition?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] will be recognized for 15 minutes in opposition.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LIVINGSTON AS A SUBSTITUTE FOR THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GREENWOOD.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, amendment No. 2, as a substitute for the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment offered as a substitute for the amendment.

The text of the amendment offered as a substitute for the amendment is as follows:

Part 2, amendment No. 2-2 offered by Mr. LIVINGSTON as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. GREENWOOD:

On page 23, after line 8, insert the following new paragraph:

"Funding for the Title X categorical program is terminated and \$193,349,000 is transferred to the Maternal and Child Health block grant and Community and Migrant Health Centers programs. Of the \$193,349,000 amount, \$116,349,000 is transferred to the Maternal and Child Health block grant program and \$77,000,000 is transferred to the Community and Migrant Health Centers program. The additional funds transferred to these two programs are available through programs that also provide comprehensive health services to women and children."

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the amendment offered as a substitute for the amendment by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] is also a 30-minute amendment, with 15 minutes being controlled by the gentleman from Louisiana and 15 minutes by a Member in opposition.

Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GREENWOOD], take the time in opposition?

Mr. GREENWOOD. I do, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GREENWOOD] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the time will be fungible.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GREENWOOD].

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, 25 years ago legislation sponsored by then-Congressman George Bush, signed into law by then-President Richard Nixon, established an American family planning program. It has been one of the most successful programs in the history of our Nation, and its success is for simple reasons. Family planning prevents unplanned pregnancies. And when you prevent unplanned pregnancies, you prevent abortions, and we all support that, and every American supports that goal.

Preventing unplanned pregnancies prevents welfare dependency. It allows poor working women who have no health insurance to have access to contraception, to birth control, to the kind of counseling and health services they need, so that they can plan their families and stay off of the welfare rolls.

Mr. Chairman, this program has not been controversial. It is supported by 70 percent of Americans for good reason. But lately it has become controversial. The Committee on House

Appropriations chose to zero out, after 25 years, to eliminate entirely the title X family planning bill.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment is straightforward. My amendment restores the title X family planning program. It is also very simple in these regards. It makes it clear, in black and white, that not a penny of these funds can be used to provide abortion services. That would be controversial. These funds are not for that purpose. It makes it clear that all counseling must be nondirective. Counselors in these programs may not suggest that a client choose abortion, but would simply lay out the legal options under the State laws that are applied. My amendment makes clear that not a penny of these funds can be used to advocate either in favor or against pending legislation at any level, nor for or against any candidate for public office.

□ 2015

This is strictly a birth control, family planning debate.

Now we have an agreement that we have reached that makes the Livingston-Smith amendment to my amendment in order as a substitute. We have agreed to do that for the purposes of a fair debate. But let me tell my colleagues what the Livingston-Smith amendment does.

The Livingston-Smith amendment kills title X family planning. It is just that simple. The program is gone, and at least in 781 counties across the United States there would be no family planning services at all, at all.

What we have to do is we have to defeat the Livingston-Smith amendment and then vote in favor of the Greenwood amendment.

The opponents will say all they choose to do is block-grant these funds into existing programs. They are wrong; that is not what their amendment does because those programs are already written into law in ways that prohibit these funds from being available for family planning. For the most part perhaps 30 percent of the funds might be available, and in many States not a dime will be available to help women with their family planning needs.

The opponents will say that this is about abortion. It is not about abortion. This debate is not about abortion. This debate is about family planning. Ninety-eight percent of the recipients of these funds perform zero abortions, zero abortions, and of the small 2 percent that do provide abortions, half of those happen to be hospitals where abortions are performed.

I say to my colleagues if they support family planning, a 25-year-old, successful, noncontroversial, mainstream program, then I ask them tonight to stand up, vote against the Smith amendment, the Livingston-Smith amendment, and vote for the Greenwood amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GREENWOOD] for his participation in what will be a meaningful debate, however I might say that while the Livingston-Smith amendment kills title X, it certainly does not kill family planning.

The fact is that the Livingston-Smith amendment transfers the entire \$193.3 million for title X, which the Greenwood amendment would hope to restore, the same amount allocated in fiscal year 1995, and it maintains that amount and places the entire \$193.3 million into the maternal and child health care block grant and the community migrant health centers program, divided between them. About 60 percent of title X funding or \$116.3 million would be transferred to the maternal and child health block grant, and the remaining 40 percent or \$77 million will be transferred to the community and migrant health centers program.

Mr. Chairman, the most important thing is that this amendment does not, does not, eliminate or cut one single dollar in funding for family planning programs. What it does do is transfer the funding from a separate categorical family planning program centralized here in Washington into two other comprehensive health care programs for low-income women and children. Both of these programs already provide family planning services, so this amendment does not cut family planning, does not eliminate family planning, and even if I were to eliminate the funding as opposed to transferring it to other programs, family planning funds already provided by the Federal Government would still be considerable.

Family planning funds and services are already provided under Medicaid, under the maternal and child health block grant program today, and the social services block grant and the community and migrant health centers program. In fact, the total conservative estimate that the Federal Government will spend on domestic family planning services in fiscal year 1995 is over \$750 million, three-quarters of a billion dollars, and that is if we eliminate this funding, which we do not do. We transfer every single dollar of it. But, in 1994 alone approximately 2.6 million Medicaid-eligible people receive family planning services totaling over \$580 million apart from this program. This is in addition to the millions of dollars available from State and private resources.

Under the Livingston-Smith amendment the same private and public non-profit institutions, the same ones that currently receive title X family planning funds, can apply for funds for family planning under the maternal and child health block grant and the Community and Migrant Health Centers program. Under the maternal and child health care block grant program the decision as to what entities will receive funds will be left strictly to the State and local authorities. Now that

is what opponents may not like, but it localizes the decisionmaking.

Under the community and migrant health centers categorical program the decision will be left to well over 150 community and migrant health centers in every State and territory who are allowed under present law to provide family planning services or, under present law, can contract out to other public and private organizations for family planning services. These community and migrant health centers already do contract out for other services.

According to HHS' own budget justifications, over 115 centers have contracting procedures with outside groups and have contracted out for other managed health care services. The maternal and child health care block grant program serves currently 13 million low-income women and children, age 19 and under, and infants. The Federal law leaves the discretion to States and localities as to what services to spend. Forty percent of those funds can be used for various services including family planning. The Library of Congress has documented that States can and do use their funds for family planning. But the Federal law guarantees the States provide services to, quote, assure mothers and children, and particularly those low-income mothers and children, access to quality maternal and child health services, unquote, and they determine that the low-income mothers and children are those with family incomes below 100 percent of the Federal poverty guidelines.

The HHS officials have cited the maternal and child care health block grant as a model of the Federal-State partnership in that it provides the maximum flexibility to the States to achieve what they determine is best for their citizens. Under the community and migrant health centers program, comprehensive health care services, including family planning, are already provided to over 7.6 million low-income and medically underserved people. These centers are all community based, and 61 percent of the people receiving services under this program are of minority ethnicity. Sixty-six percent of the users of community and migrant health centers are below the poverty level.

I say to my colleagues, if you believe that we should continue to streamline programs, downsize and operate more comprehensive, efficient health care programs for our needy, if you want to get the dollars to those who need it most and take it away from the Beltway bandits, then I urge you to support the Livingston-Smith amendment.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY].

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Greenwood-LoweY amendment to restore funds to our Nation's family planning programs.

The amendment would restore \$193 million to the bill for the network of family planning services provided through the title X program.

Those who oppose this amendment and support the Livingston-Smith amendment say that they are not cutting family planning, they are just putting the money somewhere else. They contend that family planning services will continue as before. Well, my colleagues, this is simply untrue. Here are the facts:

By law the maternal and child health program will be able to spend only the \$34 million it would receive under this bill for family planning. That is a cut in family planning services of 72 percent. The rest of the title X funds that go to community health centers may or may not be used for family planning. We simply do not know if community health centers will use these new funds for family planning or for other very crucial health services.

Here is what we can be sure of. Without a designated source of Federal funds for family planning Congress' commitment to the prevention of unwanted pregnancies, to the prevention of out-of-wedlock births, is merely empty rhetoric. If we fail tonight to restore funds for family planning, we are renegeing on our commitment to reduce this epidemic.

My colleagues, let us be clear about why title X was eliminated in committee. Title X is on the Christian Coalition's hit list, and I quote. They call it the notorious family planning program. Despite the fact that title X funds are not and may not be used for abortions, the Christian Coalition has chosen to make this a fight over the right to choose. I frankly just do not understand it.

We may disagree in this body about the right to choose, but why can we not work together to support a program to prevent unwanted pregnancies? Can we not work together, my colleagues, to prevent abortions?

To my colleagues who do not believe that government should be in the business of family planning, failure to restore title X funds today would affect more than just family planning services. Title X clinics provide over 4 million American women with their primary health care. If we fail to restore title X family planning funds today, the health of millions of American women will be jeopardized. Eliminating title X would cut out pap smears and exams for cervical and breast cancer. It would cut prenatal and postnatal care.

Earlier this year the House passed a welfare reform bill which stated that reduction of out-of-wedlock births was an important Government interest. How can this body claim it wants to decrease out-of-wedlock births while at the same time eliminating the cornerstone of our Nation's family planning efforts? Family planning services prevent abortions, prevent teenage pregnancies, help keep women off welfare. Let us work together, my colleagues,

to maintain our Nation's commitment to family planning.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the Greenwood-Lowey amendment and "no" on the Livingston-Smith amendment. I urge my colleagues to save the Nation's family planning program.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY], the majority whip.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Chairman, the title 10 family planning program was created in the 1970's with the expressed mission to decrease teen pregnancy. Mr. Chairman, that mission has failed. I repeat, title X has been an abject failure.

Unfortunately, more money does not solve our country's social ills. The increase in funding for title 10 over the past 25 years has actually paralleled a dramatic increase in teen pregnancy, between 1970 and 1992, the teen pregnancy rate has increased 23 percent. In addition, when title 10 began, 3 in 10 teen births were out of wedlock. Today, 7 out of 10 teen births occur outside of marriage.

The increase in funding not only correlates an increase in teen pregnancy, but also in teen abortions, the transmission of sexually transmitted disease and the HIV virus.

In addition, title 10 gives a \$33 million subsidy to Planned Parenthood, the Nation's largest abortion provider, which also provides contraceptive services and abortion counseling without parental consent or knowledge.

I have to say, as a father, the idea of some other adult counseling my daughter to have an abortion, without my knowledge or consent, makes me sick to my stomach.

Mr. Chairman, title 10 has never been evaluated and has yet to show any success, and in this bill the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] directs the \$193 million back to the States, and, if my colleagues do not believe in block grants, I understand it, but they can compete for this money through the block grant system. This is in addition to the \$560 million we already spent in 1995 for family planning services through Medicaid and social services block grants.

Vote "no" on Greenwood and "yes" on Livingston.

□ 2030

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA].

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

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Greenwood/Lowey amendment to restore funding for the title X family planning program.

To eliminate this Federal program when we are trying to curtail depend-

ence on welfare; when we are trying to reduce the number of abortions and unwanted pregnancies; when we are trying to reduce the number of breast and cervical cancer deaths; when we are trying to reduce the number of sexually transmitted diseases, including HIV; when we are trying to increase access to health care for low-income individuals—flies in the face of common sense.

The elimination of title X as a categorical program could be devastating to the availability of family planning services to women, particularly low-income women. While the funding designated for title X has been divided between the maternal and child health block grant, and the community and migrant health centers, there is no requirement that these additional dollars be used for family planning services. States would be given the option of using the dollars for any purpose allowed under the block grant.

Even more damaging is the fact that the maternal and child health block grant includes a number of set-asides: The result being that the maximum amount of the \$116 million transferred to that program that could be actually used for family planning services would be \$34 million—that is a cut of \$83.6 million. Thus, this provision would not be a simple transfer of money for family planning—it would represent a drastic cut.

The title X program currently serves 4 million women—and some men—through more than 4,000 title X clinics across the country, with preference given to low-income women. In Maryland, 20 of our 23 counties have title X clinics only; there are no community health centers or MCH funded health department clinics currently providing family planning services in those 20 counties. And, 94 percent of the women served at title X clinics in Maryland were served in those same counties.

Title X clinics provide contraceptive services, including natural family planning methods and supplies, infertility services, and basic gynecologic care. The clinics also provide screening services for STD's—some test for HIV—breast and cervical cancer, hypertension and diabetes. Training is also provided for nurse practitioners and other clinic personnel.

The program is clearly prohibited from using any funds for abortion services. Title X clinics do not provide abortion services.

The Greenwood-Lowey amendment specifically includes language clearly stating that no title X funding can be used for abortions. Mr. Speaker, title X prevents abortions. How can we on the one hand talk about the need to prevent unwanted pregnancies, and then vote to eliminate funding devoted to family planning services.

It is estimated that for every dollar spent on family planning services saves an estimated \$4.40 in medical, welfare, and nutritional services provided by Federal and State governments. If title

X services were not provided, between 1.2 million and 2.1 million unintended pregnancies would occur each year, rather than the 400,000 occurring today.

The Greenwood-Lowey amendment restores funding for this critical program, and it restores common sense. Vote for the Greenwood-Lowey amendment and against the Smith amendment.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

(Mr. SMITH of New Jersey asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I thank my good friend for yielding me time. Mr. Chairman, today I rise in strong support of the Livingston-Smith compromise which makes needed reforms in the Nation's family planning effort.

This vote, Mr. Chairman, is not about ending Federal family planning assistance. It is about defunding the abortion industry, restoring State and local control, and redirecting funds to organizations which recognize that the worst problems of teenage children cannot be solved by shutting their parents out of the process.

Make no mistake about it, the Livingston-Smith compromise does not end Federal family planning assistance. Instead, it redirects to the States a little over 25 percent of what the Federal Government spends on family planning programs—that's the \$193 million we spend on title X—through block grants them and lets States decide how and where to best use these needed funds. As many of my colleagues know, the Federal Government will spend in excess of \$745 million on family planning programs this year alone. The lion's share of the Federal spending on family planning is through Medicaid—the Nation's program for the poor—which is expected to spend in excess of \$525 million on family planning for poor women in fiscal year 1995. The Livingston compromise leaves this money and this program as is—untouched. The argument that the Federal Government is abandoning family planning support for poor women is simply not true.

It's a red herring.

The truth is that under Chairman LIVINGSTON's proposal, the Federal funds now used for title X are redirected on a dollar-for-dollar basis to the Maternal and Child Health block grant, as well as the Consolidated Health Centers program. Each of these programs already provides primary health services and preventive services, including family planning, to low-income people. Under the Livingston-Smith compromise the Maternal and Child Health Block Grant program will receive an infusion of more than \$116 million which they can target to family planning programs while the Consolidated Health Center program will receive an additional \$77 million that

can be targeted for family planning initiatives across the country.

Federal family planning assistance is not eliminated. But duplication of effort and administrative costs are. Right off the bat, the Livingston-Smith amendment will free up \$3 million from overhead costs and allow that money to go to direct services. And as this Congress has searched for ways to bring the Federal budget under control, programs that are unauthorized have naturally been subject to particular scrutiny. The title X program hasn't been authorized in 10 years.

The Livingston-Smith compromise will provide greater power to the States to administer their own family planning programs. As we have seen with many other areas of Government spending, the State governments are closer to the problem and can more effectively channel funds so that the greatest number of persons—in each State—are served in the most efficient and most effective way possible. Who is more capable of delivering services to the people, the States or the Federal Government?

Part of the answer to this question includes a long, hard look at the title X program, its pet recipients and its record of controversy and failure. Most of us agree that the purpose of Federal involvement in family planning efforts is to reduce the number of children born outside of wedlock, particularly to teenagers.

Yet, since 1972, teen pregnancy has skyrocketed from about 50 pregnancies per 1,000 teenage girls to about 100 pregnancies per 1,000 girls in 1990. This is a staggering increase of 100 percent—in a time span of less than two decades.

As with many other social problems, we are slowly making the realization that throwing more money at the problem is not the answer. The problem with title X is not the amount of money, but who spends it and how.

The largest single recipient of title X funds is a private organization—the Planned Parenthood Federation of America, Inc. And its no coincidence that Planned Parenthood is the largest abortion provider in the United States today. Planned Parenthood organizations perform or refer for over 215,000 abortions each year. This is an organization that believes in giving out contraceptives to children, and performing abortions on them, without their parents being informed. Planned Parenthood proudly boasts of lobbying to overturn State laws that require informed consent before women undergo abortions, and which require parents to be notified before minors have abortions.

The ideology of Planned Parenthood is one that undermines parental authority. Unbelievably, title X regulations actually prohibit grantees from informing parents about treatment of and drugs that are given to teens, if the teenager in question requests that the parents be left in the dark. This bizarre requirement in the title X pro-

gram has actually prevented some States from receiving title X funds because they have laws on the books which require parents to be informed about medical treatment given to their children. For example, the State of Utah was denied title X funds in the past because of the State's parental notification requirements.

And here's another coincidence. The Office of Population Affairs, which oversees the title X program, is headed by an abortionist from California who performed abortions for Planned Parenthood for over 20 years. This is the Clinton administration's idea of a family planning expert.

Mr. Chairman, I hope no one will be fooled by the language on abortion that is contained in the Greenwood amendment. The intent of the amendment is to nullify the Livingston compromise and take the \$116 million in new moneys from the Community Health Centers in order to re-fund title X, Planned Parenthood, and the abortion industry.

The Greenwood amendment sounds like it has restrictions on funding of abortion, but it doesn't. It merely restates current law and policy with respect to title X recipients and abortion funding, counseling, and lobbying with Federal funds.

The Greenwood amendment provides no further protections than current law. Everyone on both sides of the abortion debate knows that the current restrictions on abortion funding do not really restrict. The proabortion side knows that they don't work and that's why the proabortion side supports the Greenwood amendment. The pro-life side knows the current restrictions don't work and that's why we oppose the Greenwood amendment. Money is fungible, and when more than \$34 million in title X funds goes to the Nation's leading provider of abortions, we are subsidizing the abortion industry. Consider this: Planned Parenthood's records show that it is an organization which favors abortion over childbirth. In 1993, for example, Planned Parenthood clinics directly provided 134,277 abortions, but only provided prenatal care to 9,943 women—a staggering 13.5 to 1 ratio of planned abortions to planned births. With this record it cannot be denied that whenever tax dollars go to Planned Parenthood they prop up the abortion industry.

Supporters of the Greenwood amendment will say it prohibits title X funds from being used to pay for abortions. But abortion funding is already prohibited under the Hyde amendment. And yet, title X funds regularly go to support organizations and clinics which perform abortions as a method of birth control.

And they will argue that the Greenwood amendment says that title X funds cannot be used for lobbying for or against candidates or legislation. But this too is already in current law. And it has never stopped title X recipients from lobbying for abortion on demand and continued title X funding.

Just this month, a pro-life Member got hold of an "Action Alert" from Planned Parenthood of Central Florida—which receives title X funding—opposing the Livingston compromise. The alert urges PP supporters to write and call the Member and "express your outrage." It also encourages people to go to town hall meetings and "to clap or boo even if you don't

want to speak." It concludes: "We need to let him know we are watching him . . ."

We should not be surprised that the Planned Parenthood Federation is opposed to the changes proposed to title X by Chairman LIVINGSTON. It is not often that a private organization can ride the gravy train and receive tens of millions of dollars in public funding each year, all from a program that is administered by one of its own.

Finally Mr. Chairman, it is important to note that under the Livingston/Smith amendment, Planned Parenthood can and presumably will apply to receive funding from the States, which would receive the title X funds that are redirected to the Maternal and Child Health block grant, and the Community and Migrant Health Centers program. But there will be no more sweetheart deals from the Federal Government. Planned Parenthood will have to compete on a level field with other service providers, many of whom are less ideological, less controversial, and more effective at providing family planning services other than abortions.

Mr. Chairman, I would ask my colleagues to consider what we would gain by restoring funding for the title X program. Billions more dollars for an unauthorized program which has a solid record of failure in reducing teen pregnancy? more funding for organizations like Planned Parenthood which undermine parental authority and perform or arrange hundreds of thousands of abortions every year? is that what the American taxpayers really want?

Our choice today is not about whether we should continue to support family planning. It is about whether we should continue supporting a failed and controversial Federal program, or give the money to the States, and let them experiment with different approaches to solve these persistent and tenacious problems.

I urge my colleagues to support the compromise worked out by our distinguished colleague, Mr. LIVINGSTON.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN].

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, in 1970, President Nixon signed into law the Title X Family Planning Program to provide disadvantaged women with the means to avoid unintended pregnancies. No one would have imagined 25 years later, tonight, what we are trying to do.

In a country where our health bills are skyrocketing, the abolition of title X will deny preventive health care to millions of American women. In a world where too many unwanted kids become the victims of neglect and abuse, abolishing title X will result in more unintended pregnancies. In a Nation where we should work to keep abortion safe, legal, and rare, abolishing title X will result in more than 500,000 more abortions each year. At a time when we should encourage women to do the responsible thing in planning the size of their families, the abolishing of title X will slam the door on over 1 million women each year who turned to title X for family planning services.

Mr. Chairman, the abolishing of title X means more misery, more abused

children, more abortions, and more American women locked in poverty.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, how much time remains on both sides?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] has 19 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GREENWOOD] has 19 minutes remaining.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I am delighted to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Nevada [Mrs. VUCANOVICH].

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by Congressman GREENWOOD, which would decrease the appropriation for the maternal and child health block grant by \$16.3 million and decrease the consolidated health centers block grant by \$77 million in order to fund the unauthorized title X program. I do strongly support the Livingston-Smith amendment and wish to speak on its behalf.

Since 1970 this program has never had an official impartial evaluation of its effectiveness, while its funding has continued to increase. However, we do know that the teenage pregnancy rate has doubled, out of wedlock births have increased, the teenage abortion rate has more than doubled, and sexually transmitted diseases among teenagers have increased to where one in four sexually active teenagers will be infected by a sexually transmitted disease every year.

In addition, Mr. Chairman, while title X prohibits the use of these funds for abortion, many of the clinics perform abortions as well as provide family planning services. This arrangement implies that abortion is just another family planning method. No one supports abortion as a method of family planning.

This program is a disaster. The Livingston-Smith amendment would terminate funding for title X and transfer all of the money to the maternal and child health block grant in community and migrant health centers programs. Services such as preventive and family planning health care for women would be better funded under a block grant. Preventive health care is also provided to pregnant women, infants, children, and adolescents. Health care and support services are also provided to families in rural and underserved areas and to children with chronic health conditions.

Mr. Chairman, it would be irresponsible of us to again fund an ineffective program that has not even been authorized since 1985. We have an obligation to the American people to fund programs that work and provide real family planning assistance. I urge my colleagues to vote yes on the Livingston-Smith amendment.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER], the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

All during the 1980s, never was title X a target. On a bipartisan basis, even though from 1985 on the program was unauthorized, people on both sides of the aisle supported funding for family planning. There was an issue on the gag rule that was debated furiously, but not for a minute was there a question about funding of title X itself.

Mr. Chairman, now, somehow, the agenda has changed. Suddenly people are jumping up who were supporters of title X and saying how terrible a program it is. I heard a minute ago one of the Members say that he would be very, very concerned that his daughter was going to be counseled to have an abortion.

No one has ever been counseled to have an abortion by a title X clinic. It is against the law to do that. Never has a dollar been spent on abortion by a title X clinic. It is against the law to do that. GAO has repeatedly, over and over again, certified that no money is spent for abortion by title X clinics, yet here we are with some kind of new agenda.

Mr. Chairman, this is a program that helps poor women avoid unwanted pregnancies through contraception. Through contraception. Abortion is not a legitimate family planning method. Nobody thinks that, but, good God, here we are about to destroy, and make no mistake, this is an attempt to destroy title X family planning, a program that has served poor women for all of these years, sponsored originally in this House by George Bush, I might say, when he was a Member of Congress. The agenda has completely changed and it is a bad, bad agenda.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PORTER. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

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

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Chairman, I want to associate myself with the gentleman's remarks. This is not about abortions, this is about education and stopping unwanted pregnancies.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the amendment offered by my friend from Pennsylvania, Mr. GREENWOOD, and would like to thank him for his hard work on this issue of family planning which is so very important to the health of women and their families throughout the country.

Mr. Chairman, let us get one thing straight about the Greenwood amendment: it provides funding for family planning services, and not abortions, as critics of this program argue. To make this a debate on abortion is to, once again, distort the truth—a misfortune that now seems to permeate every abortion debate. By attempting to link family planning funds to providing abortions, it would appear to me that many of my colleagues don't want to educate young women about the responsibilities and consequences of becoming pregnant without obtaining abortions. Let me repeat, under the

Public Health Service Act, title X funds cannot be used in programs that perform abortions.

What the Greenwood amendment would do is to help reduce the number of unintended pregnancies. Under title X, grantees such as State and local health departments, hospitals, family planning clinics, and organizations such as planned parenthood raise awareness among low-income women and adolescents about comprehensive reproductive services and the prevention of teenage pregnancy and sexually transmitted diseases.

In 1995 alone, it is estimated that over 4,000 family planning clinics will provide basic infertility and gynecological services and screenings for sexually transmitted diseases and other health problems to more than 4 million low-income women.

Mr. Chairman, critics of family planning like to cast a black eye on family planning by pointing their fingers at organizations such as planned parenthood. Well, let me tell you something Mr. Chairman. In case you didn't know, opponents of family planning don't like planned parenthood anyway because of its pro-choice position. And, as evidenced in this bill, they will do anything they can to destroy its and any other organizations or clinics ability to function if they either perform or promote abortion. And, as I have said already, even though title X funds can't be used for abortions, critics say that that's not good enough. Well, I say to them, enough is enough.

Mr. Chairman, let me conclude by saying that I find it rather ironic that many of those same Members who so strongly supported punitive welfare provisions denying benefits to mothers under the age of 18 who had more children or to mothers who had children out of wedlock, would oppose the very funding that would help prevent such births. Because, if we refuse to address issues related to family planning, then many of the other costs associated with our present welfare system that we are attempting to control in the welfare bill we recently passed will continue to rise.

Mr. Chairman, I applaud those pro-life Members who support family planning and who recognize how vital its services are. But, unfortunately, for many other abortion opponents, there is no common ground. For them, it is all or nothing. As we have already seen and as we will see again with Congressman LOWEY's amendment, even rape and incest is too much to consider. Opponents insist on taking it one step further, and that is what the Smith amendment does.

If we adopt the Smith amendment, then there is a real possibility that no family planning services will be provided at all, especially since under current law the maternal and child health block grant earmarks most of the funds for non-family planning related services. If this were to happen, then my State of New Jersey would lose the over \$5 million that it receives to provide family planning services to 106,000 low-income women. And, I refuse to accept this.

I urge my colleagues not to let this happen. Vote no on the Smith amendment. Support the Greenwood amendment.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, let me say to the gentlewoman that someone said it is not something they can quantify. I would say that this means 798,000 unintended pregnancies to unmarried women.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS].

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I would say to my colleague from Illinois that the reason we have not really looked at this program is we did not have the majority here to do anything. The funding for this program just increased exponentially under the Democrats, and the only reason we have not taken the time to look at this program carefully is because we never had the votes.

Now let us talk about what the real problem is. This all comes down to a debate on, and I think it basically could be thought of this way, do you want young women to be counseled for abortions without parental consent, without informed consent? Do you want your Federal Government to spend your money to do that? Do you want this same agency that is getting your taxpayer dollars to go out and lobby, lobby through the Supreme Court, using your tax dollars, to fight for more abortions? That is what it all comes down to.

Obviously, Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Greenwood amendment to appropriate \$193 million for title X.

The Federal family planning program, title X, was enacted in 1970. Before 1970, people will say, what happened? As the whip has said, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY] has mentioned that since title X, we have had no studies to show that it has worked, that it has done any of the things they have talked about. At this point it has ballooned into such a program that well-to-do families are using it.

Mr. Chairman, I ask the Members to support the Smith amendment.

□ 2045

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield one minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. MINETA].

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

Mr. MINETA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in very strong support of the Greenwood-Lowey amendment to restore title X funds to provide for voluntary family planning projects. Title X funds support clinics that provide 5 million low-income women with access to affordable, basic health care services, including access to all major methods of family planning. In my State of California, the working poor are caught without health insurance. Consequently, one out of five women of reproductive age are uninsured. For any of these women, title X services are essential to allow them to make informed personal decisions regarding their own health and well-being.

Furthermore, family planning is essential to preventing unintended preg-

nancies. The title X program is estimated to avert 1.2 unintended pregnancies every year. No title X funds are spent on abortions. Rather than supporting abortions, title X family planning prevents abortion.

Mr. Chairman, I therefore strongly support the Greenwood-Lowey amendment and urge my colleagues to vote for it.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. BUNN], a distinguished member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. BUNN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Greenwood amendment and support for the Livingston-Smith amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I listened as an earlier speaker said that he could not imagine that 25 years ago we would picture this happening. I cannot imagine that it takes 25 years of failure before we decide to fix the problem.

We all know the abortion rate and the illegitimacy rate have increased. Do we need to go another 5 years of failure before we fix it or 10 or 20 years? We also had an earlier speaker say that title X provides basic medical services. It provides some services. It does not provide the kind of services that the maternal and child health block grants will. It does not provide the kind of programs that the community and migrant health centers are all about.

I think it is important to note this does not make family planning go away. Family planning is covered under the maternal and child health block grant, Medicaid, social services block grants and State moneys. I wanted to emphasize that this change does set a priority. It sets a priority, for example, with the community and migrant health centers to provide physician care, dental care, hearing care, prenatal care, and, yes, family planning services.

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

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank him for his initiative in this area.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the gentleman's amendment and in opposition to the amendment by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], whom I have the deepest respect for.

However, this issue is not really about abortion politics. At least it should not be. It is whether the Federal Government ought to be involved in family planning and pregnancy prevention efforts. It seems to me the proponents of the Smith amendment are really driving a wedge in an area where we ought to be able to find middle ground and build some form of bipartisan consensus, and that is the overall goal in this Chamber ought to be preventing unwanted abortions by preventing unwanted pregnancies.

I will admit there are elements of the title X program that I would like to see

reviewed and revised through the reauthorization process. I am certainly willing to consider means testing the program. However, I strongly submit that you can be both pro-choice and pro-life and support the title X family planning area. Let us tonight indicate to our fellow Americans that we are capable of reaching bipartisan consensus. Let us preserve the title X family program. Support the Greenwood amendment and, unfortunately, reject the language included in the appropriations bill.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN], the distinguished candidate for President.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Chairman, no commercials. I did not ask for that. No commercials.

Mr. Chairman, Planned Parenthood is what we are debating here tonight. Money is fungible, and title X funding must be abolished. It has been nothing but an annual subsidy for the largest abortion provider on the planet Earth with the sole exception of the Chinese oppressive communist government. They promote abortion, they lobby for abortion, and they litigate about abortion.

How many Members saw the movie, TV movie, this last few months glorifying Margaret Sanger, the very first president of Planned Parenthood, still praised by its rank and file members? A young talented actress, Dana Delaney, Irish, one time I guess practicing Catholic, played her in this glorification piece.

Here is a few Sanger quotes, and I will fade out. She believed that Negroes, as she used the term, and Southern Europeans were mentally inferior to native born Americans. She said the Jewish were feeble minded, human weeds, and a menace to society. The poor were sinister forces of the hordes of irresponsibility and imbecility. She argued that organized attempts to help the poor were the surest sign that our civilization has bred, is breeding, and is perpetuating constantly increasing numbers of defectives, delinquents, and dependents.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN], with the comment that 85 percent of these funds never go to Planned Parenthood.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, let us be clear what the Smith-Livingston amendment is all about. It is not to improve family planning around this country. It is not for women to get better access to primary care, which they now get under the existing title X program, which, for the most part, is distributed through State funds for the States to operate.

What this is is ideological; it is a payback to the religious right, who hate the idea that some people feel free to engage in sex outside of marriage because of contraception.

Well, let us understand something: Many of the women who go to clinics

are married and they do not want to have a child, and they want contraception for that reason. Let us understand something else: That many of the people who are going to be denied family planning services are still going to have sex. But what they are also going to have is unintended pregnancies.

What is the answer we get from those who oppose this program? Well, what they suggest, those who claim they are against abortion, is end this program, which will lead to more abortion.

Mr. Chairman, I urge a defeat of the Smith-Livingston amendment.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. SMITH].

Mrs. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I want to first stand and commend the genius of the chairman of the committee. It looked to me like it was a no-win when I heard both sides of this issue, and then the committee came out with a compromise, which is the genius of the committee chair.

It did not make me so happy, because I have, after 30-some years of being pro-abortion, I decided that I could not stay in that position and became pro-life. And it did not make the other side so happy, but it really probably did what the American people would like. And what it did is it left most of the family planning money, in fact, all of it for welfare women, poor women, all the access points still there. It just said a little tiny part called title X was going to be block granted back to the States where we could mix it with programs I helped start in our State, called the prenatal health program, and we could mix it with that and have some more money for those type of things and let the states make choices.

It sounded like a great genius. Then I found out there was all this controversy. Still could have abortion? Decide they did not like it, still does not like it. But what was happening, then I started getting letters and figured out what it was all about.

Planned Parenthood gets 21 percent of the money in title X. And Planned Parenthood is a political lobby that is very big in campaigns, both sides. So it became an issue of they would have to go to the States and compete for this money, where States values and people's values would have to be reflected.

I am not so sure I would want to compete for it. I would just as soon get rid of title X. I think it failed. I think we need to figure out how to prevent pregnancies and do family planning a different way. Title X has not worked real well. I did not get my way, but I am willing to take this compromise and say okay, this place is a place of compromise.

So I urge Members to vote for the Smith amendment and against the Greenwood amendment.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. KENNELLY].

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Chairman, wonders never cease. Only a few

months ago, this body voted to deny assistance to unwed teenage mothers and their children. Tonight we are voting on an amendment that would eliminate a program that actually prevents teenage pregnancies, family planning.

I agree with a letter sent by 35 Republicans to our Speaker, Mr. GINGRICH. This debate does not need to be divisive, it should not be politicized. Family planning is an important national health issue. Without family planning, thousands of additional low income women will go on the welfare rolls. Title X focuses on preventing unplanned pregnancy in the first place.

In fact, publicly funding public planning services such as Planned Parenthood has prevented 1.2 million pregnancies in a year. Let us not turn our back on common sense. Family planning is important so every child is a wanted child.

Please support the Greenwood-Lowey amendment.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CHRISTENSEN].

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

Mr. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Louisiana for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is the camel's nose under the tent.

It purports to refund title X but exclude abortion from the services title X and its clinics provide.

Well Mr. Chairman, we've been there, seen this and done that before.

During the Reagan and Bush administrations Title X clinics were prohibited from providing abortion counseling, but Planned Parenthood clinics continued to provide abortion counseling anyway as well as abortion on demand, even though they were receiving title X funds.

With the stroke of a pen, President Clinton made title X funds taken from the pockets of hard-working Americans available to provide abortions and abortion counseling.

Mr. Chairman, when it comes to title X it's not enough to say "you can't". The time has come to say—"you will never again."

I urge my colleagues to vote no on the Greenwood amendment.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER].

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, I must say I cannot believe what Richard Nixon would think if he were here tonight to watch this program that he really tried to utilize to build a bridge, to build a bridge over an issue that people hate. We all hate the abortion issue. But people constantly say the solution is family planning, and title X is family planning, and states are allowed to get title X funds. But if you flip it the way they are trying to go, what you are really

going to say is states are going to be able to take the funds and decide not to spend them for family planning if they opt to do that.

That is wrong. The recipients of this planning, family planning in title X, are women, tax paying American Women. We have heard all sorts of outrageous charges on this floor that title X has caused teen pregnancy. Please, no. Title 10 funds are given under state funds and they are not given without family permission and whatever the state law says.

Mr. Chairman, let us be sensible. Let us vote for the Greenwood-Lowey amendment.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. SEASTRAND].

Mrs. SEASTRAND. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Greenwood amendment and in support of the Smith amendment on title X.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say right off the bat that elimination of title X as a government program does not mean the elimination of family planning services for the poor. What title X supporters fail to tell the American people is that its funding level is maintained in this bill. \$193 million in family planning assistance—the same level as fiscal year 1995—remains available through block grants. All current recipients of title X funding will still be able to apply for funds from their States.

What we are doing in this bill is recognizing the inefficiencies of title X as a federal program. Title X was established in 1970 as a way to reduce unintended pregnancies by providing services to low-income, poor women. In fact the program was originally designed to help poor couples—not individuals—plan their families.

Over its 25 years title X has mushroomed into a model of government inefficiency and been a contributing factor to the steady increases in areas where we were supposed to see dramatic reductions: single-parent families; illegitimacy; sexually transmitted diseases; and despite the assertions of its supporters, abortions. The program is another example of where the hand of Federal Government—well intended as it may have been—has compounded a problem.

Block granting these funds allow us to do away with a costly and inefficient government bureaucracy that has failed to direct services exclusively to those in need. We are giving States the flexibility they need to ensure that services are going directly to those who need them.

This Smith amendment is perfectly consistent with Republican efforts in this Congress to move power and money away from Washington, DC and into the hands of States and communities where it belongs.

I urge my colleagues to support the Smith amendment.

□ 2100

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. MALONEY].

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Greenwood-Lowey amendment. Many referred to 1992 as the year of the woman. Today, Mr. Chairman, we face a Congress far more hostile to women's rights and health than any I remember.

It is hard to understand why anyone would want to cut the Nation's principal family planning program, one that through preventive medicine saves \$5 for every dollar spent. If family planning is cut, 4 million women, most of whom are young and low-income, will lose their only health care.

How can anyone oppose such an essential program? Whose better interests are being served? Certainly not those of American women. Once again, the radical right's agenda is put ahead of a good government. Protect American women. Vote to keep funding for title X. Save the Nation's family planning program.

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

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, prior to coming to this body, I was a practicing physician. So I used to see a lot of this stuff on a daily basis. I have to say this program was initiated with the intent of helping to deal with the terrible problem of unwanted pregnancies. The unwanted pregnancy rate has skyrocketed. The abortion rate has skyrocketed. Teenage pregnancy has skyrocketed. This is a dismal failure.

I saw an amazing statistic yesterday: The U.S. people get more upset about wasteful government spending than they get upset about violent criminals being let out of jail prematurely. That is the thing that gets them more upset than anything else. Here we are today arguing about whether or not we should continue to fund a program that has been a dismal failure.

The abortion rate is up. The teen pregnancy rate is up. The venereal disease rate is up. That is why this program was initiated, and it has not worked. Now we are asked today to continue its funding. I support the Smith-Livingston amendment. Oppose Greenwood.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GANSKE], a new Member, our physician.

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

Mr. GANSKE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Greenwood amendment.

Let me make myself perfectly clear. I have been strongly and consistently anti-abortion. I will base my vote on this amendment on my view of the best way to decrease the incidence of abortion.

I do feel there are too many abortions and do not believe abortion is an acceptable method of birth control or should be used to select the sex of a baby. And I firmly believe that abstinence is the best choice for unwed couples.

But I recognize that abstinence is not always practiced, and, in its place, contraception is far preferable to abortion.

Let me give some facts. We can never know how many abortions have been prevented in Iowa and around the country because young couples have had access to family planning services. But I do know that title X funds support 67 clinics in Iowa, provided family planning services to nearly 75,000 women in 1994. In my district alone, two-thirds of the 18,000 women receiving these services were at or below 150 percent of the poverty line. Without the assistance of title X services, they may be unable to obtain the family planning necessary to prevent unwanted pregnancies which may end in abortion. Title X funds provide support for 10 family planning clinics in my District four in Polk County, one in Pottawattamie County, one in Montgomery County, one in Harrison County, one in Shelby County, one in Audubon County, and one in Dallas County. Only one of the four sites in Polk County performs abortion services, and they do that without any title X funds.

If the Greenwood amendment fails, the funds transferred to the Maternal and Child Health Block Grant will not provide any family planning in Iowa. That is because the State has determined that none of the MCH funds should be used for that purpose.

The loss of title X funds in Iowa would leave a Community Health Center in my district of 1,800 sq miles, to provide family planning to the nearly 13,000 women at or below 150 percent of the poverty line. This clinic had 1,500 visits for family planning last year. The program's director, Dr. Bery Engebretsen told me today it would be impossible for the clinic to handle the approximately 36,000 visits needed to make up for the closure of the title X sites.

Dr. Engebretsen also said, "without adequate access to birth control, I expect the rate of abortion will increase in the Fourth District."

The Greenwood amendment recognizes the importance of separating family planning from abortion. It makes clear that none of these funds may be used to perform or counsel on abortion. These safeguards are important to ensure that the title X funds are used for family planning, not the termination of a pregnancy.

Mr. Chairman, I am strongly anti-abortion. And I believe that a vote against the Greenwood amendment would betray my goal of reducing the incidence of abortion in America. We

cannot eliminate effective family planning without inviting a dangerous increase in the number of unwanted pregnancies, too many of which end in an abortion.

Mr. Chairman, I know that every one of us, whether we are pro-life or pro-choice, is anti-abortion. Ask yourself this simple question before voting. "Will the elimination of title X funding increase the incidence of abortion in your district?" I think the answer is yes. And that is why I support the Greenwood amendment. I urge all of my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. EMERSON].

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

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Greenwood amendment and in support of the Livingston-Smith language.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to Mr. GREENWOOD's amendment.

Each year as we review funding for title X, abortion supporters manage to cloud the debate, claiming that women will not receive complete medical care if title X is defunded. Let me remind you that title X is not the only source of family planning assistance available to women who are economically disadvantaged. Each year hundreds of millions of dollars from private and State resources and the Federal Government through Medicaid, the Social Services Block Grant, the Maternal and Child Health Block Grant and several other smaller programs are allocated for this type of health services.

I cannot support Mr. GREENWOOD's amendment which would essentially reinstate the hypocritical title X program. By hypocritical I am referring to the clause in title X that states, "none of the funds appropriated under this title shall be used in programs where abortion is a method of family planning," however, last year title X allocated \$33 million of its \$193 million to Planned Parenthood, the single largest abortion provider and advocate for legal abortion on demand in the United States.

Plainly and simply, if Mr. GREENWOOD's amendment is passed title X funds will be retained at present levels. Under these levels millions of taxpayer dollars will be funneled to abortion providers and advocates. Abortion is not family planning. It is family cancellation. As we all know planning is something you do before the fact. Abortion happens after the fact. I cannot support spending my fellow citizens tax dollars on a program that promotes abortion and I urge my colleagues to oppose Mr. GREENWOOD's amendment.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ISTOOK].

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

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Livingston and Smith language and in opposition to the Greenwood language.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose the Greenwood amendment, and support the proposals of Mr. LIVINGSTON and Mr. SMITH.

The current title X programs hurt America's families; they undercut America's families and our values.

How?

Because current title X programs promote teenage promiscuity and other sex outside of

marriage. American history since title X was adopted shows that abortions are up, and out-of-wedlock births are also up dramatically. Why? Because the Federal Government, with taxpayers' money, is subsidizing sex outside of marriage.

Let's look just at the teenagers who are subsidized by title X: One-third of those who use title X are juveniles. Minors. Children. Teenagers. Over 1 million young people each year, who the law says are too young to vote, too young to enter a contract, often too young to have their ears pierced without a parent's permission, can go to a government family planning clinic, without knowledge of parents or family. There they don't get instruction in the moral and other consequences of sex outside marriage. Instead, they get free birth control pills, condoms, and other contraception, and treatment for sexually-transmitted diseases: AIDS, syphilis, gonorrhea, and other forms of venereal diseases. And their parents are never told.

No wonder America's families find it hard to guide their children, when the government offers their children an end-run around the family on this, the most intimate of family issues. As a father of five, I don't want government using my tax dollars to undercut what I teach my children about morality.

And these teens are not all poor, not by a long shot. That's because title X ignores the family's income, and looks only at the teenagers'. Thus, even children from wealthy families qualify for private government help in maintaining their sexual conduct. Our tax dollars are used to by-pass Mom, and by-pass Dad, and by-pass the entire family. In their place, a federally-paid worker tells our youth it's OK, you can sleep around all you want with your boyfriend or girlfriend, regardless of what your family has taught you. The Federal worker won't focus on the fact that it's wrong. They don't give you love and moral guidance. They just give this young person more birth control, and treatment for V-D if they catch something.

Title X in this insidious fashion undercuts America's families and promotes teenage promiscuity. Is this what we want to do with \$193-million a year of our tax dollars?? I do not believe this is what America wants, or what our families want. I urge defeat of the Greenwood amendment, and adoption of the Livingston and Smith language.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WICKER] a distinguished member of the Committee on Appropriations.

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

Mr. WICKER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for the time.

The question before us tonight is clear. Should we let the title X program, which has been a failure by any objective measure, simply continue to exist? Or should we attempt to reprogram these scarce Federal tax dollars where they might provide a better service and value to our Nation?

The title X program was created with the best of intentions, but it has prov-

en to be a dismal failure. It was supposed to reduce unplanned pregnancies among teenagers, but teenage pregnancy has risen dramatically. It was supposed to educate teenagers to prevent the number of abortions, but teenage abortion has doubled since the inception of the title X program.

Now, it is hard for some Members to admit that one of their social engineering schemes may be a failure, but title X is a failure. It is time we admitted that fact.

It is also important for us to stress that title X funds will be transferred under the Livingston amendment to block grants for the States. They will be used by individual States who will be able to set priorities for the use of these funds to benefit their citizens. No longer will these funds be a Washington setaside for Planned Parenthood and like-minded groups.

Planned Parenthood itself received approximately \$35 million in 1995, approximately 19 percent of the entire program services budget for title X programs.

All the ills designed to be addressed by the title X program have increased. We have a national epidemic of out-of-wedlock births, teenage pregnancy, sexually transmitted diseases and abortion. It is time to let the States attempt to devise their own solutions. For all of these reasons, I urge a yes vote on the Livingston substitute and a no vote on the Greenwood amendment.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Kansas [Mrs. MEYERS].

(Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Greenwood amendment.

I rise in support of Mr. Greenwood's amendment to restore title X family planning grants to the Department of Health and Human Services. After consulting with Kansas health officials, I am gravely concerned that ending title X and rolling the money into the Maternal and Child Health Block Grant and Migrant and Community Health Care Centers will seriously reduce family planning access for working low-income women across this Nation.

The Maternal and Child Health Block Grant has a four-part mission, none of which has to do with providing basic routine gynecological care or birth control to women. The Maternal and Child Health block grant's mission is a

laudable one: (A) to ensure mothers and children access to maternal and child health services; (B) to reduce infant mortality; (C) to rehabilitate blind and disabled children; (D) to promote community-based care for disabled children.

But because of these four specific earmarks there are very few dollars left for family planning. This is not block granting—the Smith amendment simply destroys a successful and tremendously important program which allows women control over their reproductive lives.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TORKILDSEN].

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

Mr. TORKILDSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Greenwood amendment and in opposition to the Smith amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I support title 10 funding and the Greenwood amendment. I commend my colleague from Pennsylvania for his leadership and patience in bringing his amendment to the floor.

This issue is about family planning—not abortion. Title 10 is the only program that exclusively addresses the health of women in this country. It helps keep women off of welfare, and helps prevent abortions.

A facility in my district, HealthQuarters, is the only source of health care for thousands of women. Seventy percent of these women are well below the Federal poverty level. They have no health insurance—public or private.

The number of middle-aged women using family planning facilities is growing because these women are in desperate need of cancer screening, and they can't afford to pay a doctor for preventative care. The block grant approach proposed in this bill simply won't meet these needs because it is impossible to replace the nationwide network of 4,200 family planning facilities already in place. Community health centers simply don't exist in many parts of this country.

Even more onerous is the fact that these block grants provide no language explicitly directing States to use the funding for family planning services. Transferring funds to the Maternal Child Health Block Grant will mean an over 80-percent cut for family planning. This bill is a black hole for women searching for effective family planning and accessible, affordable care.

Eliminating title 10 is not the message this Congress and this majority should be sending to American women or American men. Family planning is clearly an integral part of healthy, successful families. Moreover, it allows poor women to take responsible control over their lives.

My colleagues, it is here that we must draw the line. It is here that we must rise above the rancorous political debate surrounding abortion, because this is not abortion. Let's not lose sight of the fact that title 10 is originally Republican legislation. I urge my colleagues to remember the tradition of a young Congressman from Texas named George Bush, who helped to pass the founding legislation, and the Republican President, Richard Nixon, who signed it into law.

Vote for responsible, healthy families. Support title 10. Vote for the Greenwood amendment.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FAWELL].

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

Mr. FAWELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Greenwood amendment.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN].

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Greenwood amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that the title X family planning program is a national priority. We have done a disservice by transferring these monies to other areas with no guarantee that these vital services will continue.

Title X provides basic health care services for millions of low-income women.

Without title X, my state of New Jersey will lose \$5.3 million in designated family planning funding and over 106,000 New Jersey women will lose access to contraception, pre-natal care, and other basic health services like cervical and breast cancer screenings.

This debate is about whether or not we believe it is a national priority to provide low-income women with family planning information, education and services.

Mr. Chairman, I respectfully submit that it is a national priority.

The most recent data estimates each year in the United States, there are 3.1 million unintended pregnancies, 1.5 million abortions, and 1 million teenage pregnancies.

This is a national crisis.

Congressman GREENWOOD's amendment simply restores direct funding for title X family planning programs and I urge its passage.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. BASS].

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

Mr. BASS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Greenwood amendment.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT].

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

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Greenwood amendment.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. HARMAN].

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

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Greenwood amendment, salute the distinguished record of Planned Parenthood in preventing unwanted pregnancies.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of restoring funds to the title X Family Planning Program. I commend my colleague Mr. GREENWOOD for offering this important amendment, and am pleased that this amendment has bipartisan support.

The Title X Family Planning Program has a history of bipartisan support. It was enacted with broad bipartisan support in 1970, enjoying support from cosponsor former President George Bush. President Richard Nixon signed it into law. It has been reauthorized six times since 1970, always receiving bipartisan congressional support.

Unfortunately, choice opponents who don't understand the important role that title X serves seek to eliminate title X. Instead, they have launched an ideological war against Planned Parenthood and in their zeal they may succeed in ending an invaluable program. In fact, title X does something that many on both sides of the choice debate would agree is an important goal: it reduces unwanted pregnancy and makes abortion rare.

Like so many other provisions that we have seen during this year's appropriations process, this provision to eliminate title X is part of an anti-choice agenda designed to roll back a woman's right to choose. But this vote isn't even about choice—it's about ensuring quality health care for women.

No title X funds go toward abortion; clinics have always been prohibited from using title X funds for abortions. What title X does do is provide quality health care for low-income women, many of whom would not receive health care otherwise. In addition to providing a full range of reproductive health services for low income women, title X clinics screen women for breast and cervical cancer, sexually transmitted infections and hypertension. Title X's family planning services have reduced unwanted pregnancies by an estimated 1.2 million.

It is terribly ironic that anti-choice Members seek to eliminate a program that provides quality health care and is a proven success at preventing abortion. Support this bipartisan effort to restore funding to title X, a critically important program to American women that encourages responsible family planning choices.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS].

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

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Greenwood amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the Greenwood amendment to restore funding for the title X program and in opposition to the Smith amendment to restore the bill's language which would block grant these funds.

It is unfortunate that some Members of Congress insist on continuing their assault on a woman's right to choose to have an abortion and her right to comprehensive family planning services at the same time. Certainly these two agendas seem at odds with one another.

While I support a woman's right to choose to have an abortion, like many of my colleagues, I am very troubled by the number of abortions taking place in our country. I feel it is important to concentrate more resources toward educating our young people about the

consequences of sexual activity. I have consistently supported the reauthorization of the title X program, which funds family planning clinics, because I feel it offers women necessary family planning information, including methods of avoiding unwanted pregnancy.

I believe withholding or reducing funding for title X programs denies poor women in particular information about the full range of available medical options. This could cause them to make uninformed decisions and deprive them of needed medical services.

Current provisions in the bill that would block grant title X funds with other health programs will, in fact, reduce the amount of money that will be devoted to the vital purpose of family planning.

Our party talks about the need for encouraging responsibility and taking control of one's life and that is exactly what this program aims to teach young women. We cannot abandon these women by eliminating this program at a time when this Congress has repeatedly sent the message that abortion is not an available option.

If we are truly serious about eliminating the need for abortion in our country, as well as many of the related social problems caused by unintended pregnancy, we must reaffirm our commitment to the title X program and support the Greenwood amendment.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. WYDEN].

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

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. Chairman, the authors of this appropriations bill should call their legislation the Barefoot and Pregnant Act of 1995. I must say that I find this appropriations bill particularly odd because so many of our colleagues have talked about citizen empowerment throughout this Congress. Well, cutting family planning takes power from women because it strips them of their most personal choice, the right to plan their own family.

Cut family planning and it will be harder to achieve our national goals of reducing the number of abortions and encouraging more personal responsibility. Cut family planning, and our Nation takes another step towards two-tiered medicine, where the wealthy can get access to the services they need and the poor go without.

Support the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GREENWOOD].

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, who has the right to close?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], a member of the committee, will have the right to close.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE].

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Greenwood amendment, offering great support for not going back but going forward with family planning.

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

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

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Greenwood amendment.

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Chairman, George Orwell is alive and well in the Halls of Congress. This may be 1995, but it sure feels like 1984, when big brother can dictate what health services women have access to and then use double-speak to hide the impact of what is being done.

The termination of title X family planning programs is just plain wrong. We must fix this wrong by approving the Greenwood amendment. This amendment would provide \$193 million for title X programs to ensure that women have access to health care services, including reproductive health care. Women should have the ability, no matter what their income is, to receive appropriate health care services.

Family planning works and should be continued. In Houston, many women regularly visit title X clinics to see doctors. This may be the only place that low-income women get health care. For many women, health care is not affordable and not a priority when they are struggling to pay for food and shelter. Title X is the safety net for these low-income women and should not be eliminated.

Family planning is not about abortion. This debate is about giving women access to health care services. The Republicans want to eliminate these services in order to pay for tax cuts for the wealthy. Family planning is cost-effective and necessary. We must not permit the Republican majority to eliminate these vital reproductive health services.

The women of America should have access to family planning services so that they, not the Government, can make the decisions about their health care. The Greenwood amendment ensures that low-income women have the same access as other women, which is fair and responsible. I strongly urge my colleagues to support the Greenwood amendment and oppose the Smith amendment.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. BILBRAY].

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Chairman, for the last 10 years, I have had the privilege of administering many Federal programs for and to the people, 2½ million, in San Diego County. I am sure my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are sick and tired of hearing me point out all the terrible bad regulations that do not work. I will continue to do so. They will continue to be sick of it. But I think there is a responsibility here to point out the ones that do work.

I have to regretfully oppose the amendment of my dear friend, the gentleman from Louisiana, because if there is any program that I really be-

lieve did work, especially as somebody who desperately wanted to see abortions become a thing of the past, title X was the one thing as a local administrator that I was able to do, to avoid something that I felt very strongly about and that is trying to keep abortion out of the formula, as options for birth control.

I have to join with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GREENWOOD] and support him because a dose of reality that I came here to try to bring to the Democratic Party also must be brought to both sides.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. TAYLOR].

(Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Livingston-Smith amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this bill's provision to transfer funds from title X to State health programs, and in support of the Livingston-Smith amendment.

We have heard some Members argue that we need to fund title X to ensure that money is available for family planning. Mr. Chairman this simply is not the case.

As we all know, the title X funds are being redirected to the maternal and child health block grant and community and migrant health centers. The fact is, these State health programs have always been able to use money for family planning, and will still be able to do so.

Under this bill, family planning will simply have to compete with other health needs when States set their funding priorities. Competition on a fair basis is a very reasonable approach. Funds can be used for the most serious health needs in each State, and family planning can be a part of that.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is also important to point out that this bill ensures that money for health needs will go to those who are truly poor. Instead of going to affluent or middle-class teens as it does in title X, the funds in the State programs will be used for the poor, and that group is the one that we are really trying to help here.

And let's talk a little bit about what title X was intended to do when it was brought about, as opposed to what it has actually accomplished. Since we introduced title X in 1970:

The teenage out-of-wedlock birth rate has doubled.

Sexually transmitted diseases among teens is at an all-time high.

The teen-age abortion rate has more than doubled.

These figures indicate many things, but success is not one of them.

Mr. Chairman, let's be honest with ourselves. Title X has not achieved its goals. The States are in a better position to understand the particular needs of their areas, so let us give them the opportunity and the money to do so.

The maternal and child health block grant and community and migrant health centers are a proven success—let these organizations determine the greatest health needs within their State.

Mr. Chairman, this Congress has demonstrated a remarkable commitment to put an end to failed or low priority Government programs. Title X is one of these failed programs, which is why I strongly urge my fellow members to vote for the Livingston-Smith amendment.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Utah [Mrs. WALDHOLTZ], one of our most stalwart Members, a pregnant lady with shoes on.

Mrs. WALDHOLTZ. Mr. Chairman, this pregnant Member's shoes are firmly on. While my shoes are firmly on, I am proud to rise in strong support of the Livingston amendment and oppose the Greenwood amendment.

I was reluctant to come and speak on this issue because I have been careful not to politicize my pregnancy. But I came to share with you a phone call from a mother in my home district of Salt Lake City yesterday who wanted me to tell the story of her 16-year-old daughter who went to Planned Parenthood when she suspected she was pregnant and when the clinic personnel told her she was pregnant, the only option this 16 year old was offered was an abortion. Four times this young girl said no, that is not what I want to do. She finally left the clinic with no more help than when she had entered it, to go home and talk to her mother.

□ 2115

Her mother called me yesterday and said please, support the Smith amendment, let us get this money into a block grant where our States and communities can have a hand in helping with family planning. I do not want any more 16 year olds to go through what my 16 year old did.

Mr. Chairman, I am asking Members to listen to that mother from Salt Lake City and support the Smith amendment.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Chairman, this proud father of two fine young men and two beautiful little girls yields 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WATERS].

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Greenwood-Lowe amendment to restore funds to title X. I rise in support of this amendment because I want Members to understand most of us, all of us, want to prevent pregnancies. We do not like the fact that younger and younger people are bringing babies into the world and we want to do something about it. Some people like to throw these statistics at us day in and day out and say, "Why don't you stop it?" If we had a magic wand, perhaps we could wave it and stop it.

Mr. Chairman, these young people are sexually active. They are not just kids from one community. All communities. Your children. Children from the Christian Coalition, children all over America. We have to do something about preventing pregnancies.

You cannot wipe out title X. You go too far. This is extreme. I want Mem-

bers to know, most of their constituents do not support wiping out family planning. If we are ever to get a handle on this, Government must be involved.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLILEY], chairman of the Committee on Commerce.

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

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Greenwood amendment and in support of the Livingston-Smith substitute.

Supporters of the Greenwood amendment would like for everyone to believe that by transferring funds from the Family Planning Program to the maternal and child health block and the community health centers we are eliminating family planning services for poor women. Nothing could be further from the truth. Both of these programs, in addition to the Medicaid program provide family planning services to women. But what these programs provide that family planning does not is comprehensive health care services.

I am convinced that transferring these funds will result in better health care for women.

The maternal and child health block is provided to States to improve the health status of mothers and children. States are required to use at least 30 percent for preventive and primary care services for children, 30 percent for services for children with special needs and 40 percent for other appropriate maternal and child health services. These services include prenatal care, well-child care, dental care, immunization, family planning, and vision and hearing screening services.

Community health centers are located throughout the country in areas where there are significant barriers to primary health care. In addition to providing primary care, health centers also link with services such as WIC, welfare, Medicaid eligibility, substance abuse, and other social services.

The health centers program provides comprehensive, perinatal care for women and their infants. The program also has provided perinatal care services to pregnant adolescents who comprise approximately 21 percent of pregnant women served in the program. According to the administration's own statistics the program in fiscal year 1993: provided perinatal care to 185,530 women; arranged or provided for the delivery of 104,344 babies to women receiving these services; enrolled 79,572 women in prenatal care in the first trimester of pregnancy; and served 38,898 pregnant teens.

The Family Planning Program on the other hand only provides family planning services including contraception, infertility services, basic gynecological care, and referral for other services. In fact, in March 1992 the administration released a guidance on a title 10 regulation. The guidance clarified that the purpose of the title 10 program is to provide pre-pregnancy family planning services, not services to pregnant women.

We can only guess how many women, especially adolescents never make it to a health

care center for prenatal care after being told by the family planning clinic that they are pregnant.

In terms of health care for both mother and child, it makes more sense for a woman to go to one location for all her health care services, both family planning and prenatal care. Such an arrangement would be much more likely if these funds are transferred to the MCH block and the CHC program.

Do not be misled by the rhetoric my fellow colleagues. Family planning services will remain available to women with the Livingston-Smith amendment. In fact, better health care will be available to women. I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing the Greenwood amendment and in strong support of the Livingston-Smith amendment.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Chairman, woefully, only \$34 million of the \$116 million will ever find its way to family planning.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO].

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Greenwood amendment and opposition to the Smith substitute. The Greenwood amendment would protect access to safe and affordable health care for women by restoring vital family planning funding.

Low-income and uninsured working women of all ages depend on the basic health care and family planning services provided by community clinics. These clinics rely on Federal funds. Without community clinics, millions of women would be denied access to potentially life-saving services such as screening for breast cancer, cervical cancer, hypertension, pap smears, and routine clinical exams. For many women, especially young women, community clinics are their only source for basic health care.

This debate is not about choice. Current law clearly states that no title X funds may be used for abortions. It is about women's health.

Combat the Republican attack on women's health; support the Greenwood amendment to help women in need.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished doctor from Oklahoma [Mr. COBURN].

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the Greenwood amendment. I think what we need to ask ourselves is, everybody has made a lot of claims about what title X has and has not done. There is not a scientific study that will evaluate it. But there is a retrospective study based on economics.

Mr. Chairman, what we do know is since 1970, we have had a rise in teenage pregnancies, a rise in abortion. We now have a sexually transmitted disease epidemic that is out of control and unheard of anywhere in the western world. What we also are told is that there has not been a study of effectiveness.

We have one study that we can look at that will tell us what is going on, and it is a study that will be published

next month out of the University of California by a Ph.D. economist. It says the following things: That those States which spend less money on family planning have less of those three things. They have less teenage pregnancy, less abortion, less sexually transmitted disease. It also says that the States with the highest amount of money will have the most abortion, will have the most teenage pregnancy, and the most sexually transmitted disease.

Mr. Chairman, I urge Members' support for the Livingston-Smith amendment.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman will state it.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I keep hearing that title X has caused pregnancies.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman is not stating a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. SLAUGHTER].

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bipartisan amendment to restore funding for title X Family Planning, a program that last year served more than 4 million women in 4,000 clinics.

Let me make clear that title X does not fund abortions; the law will not allow it. What title X does fund, in addition to family planning services, is gynecological exams and Pap smear tests; mammograms, clinical breast exams and education in breast self-exam; screening for high blood pressure; and screening for sexually transmitted diseases, as well as education and counseling on how to avoid and prevent such diseases.

Title X clinics provide critical health and family planning services for millions of women who can't afford private insurance, but don't qualify for Medicaid. These are women working in low-paying service-sector jobs that don't provide health coverage. What does eliminating title X say to these working women? It says, "Too bad if you can't afford a mammogram or pelvic exam. We hope you don't get breast or cervical cancer, but we're not going to do anything to help you detect or prevent it." I cannot conceive of a crueler message that this Congress could send to American women.

With an allocation that works out to just 75 cents per person each year, title X is one of the best bargains around. I urge colleagues to vote in support of protecting this critical program.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. KINGSTON], a distinguished member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I think we have to put this in perspective. What we are arguing here is not

ending family planning, it is saying who is going to run it, the Federal Government or the State government, and who has done a good job.

Let us look at the Federal plan. 1970 when title X began, teen pregnancy rate, 22 percent. 1992, up to 44 percent. Teenage births out of marriage, 1970, 30 percent. In 1991, 70 percent. The abortion rate in 1970, 19 percent; in 1990, 40 percent. Sexually transmitted disease. Now it is up to one out of four sexually active teenagers. Three million teenagers a year get sexually transmitted disease.

Mr. Chairman, it is not working on the Federal level. Let us let the locals take over. If this group was in charge of gun control, they would give all the 15-year olds in America loaded pistols and say, only shoot to graze. Let us be honest. It is not working. Support the Livingston-Smith alternative; let the local people run the family planning.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOGGETT].

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Chairman, this is a debate about Elizabeth. Elizabeth, a young woman in Austin, TX, who makes use of the services of Planned Parenthood of Austin. It is a debate about Elizabeth and about thousands of other women across this country who should have the right to turn to agencies like Planned Parenthood. What type of birth control they use or whether they choose to use any birth control at all is none of my business, and it is none of the business of this Committee on Appropriations. She ought to be able to make the decision for herself.

Mr. Chairman, what this is all about is the agenda of an extremist coalition that thinks they can put an end to planned parenthood and to deny choice to people like Elizabeth to choose the type of family planning that they think they ought to have.

Mr. Chairman, I want to preserve her choice. I want to preserve her choice not to have an abortion because she has effective family planning through an agency that is providing quality health care services. This is a chance to speak up for Elizabeth and for women across this Nation to have the choice of effective family planning that they choose, and not this Congress.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. MOLINARI].

Ms. MOLINARI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, title X and family planning works. In 1995, over 5 million low-income and uninsured women were served in clinics. In addition to family planning services, they provided screening for breast and cervical cancer. Where are these women going to go? It works. Eighty-three percent of women receiving Federal family planning services rely on clinics funded by title X. And where are these women now going to go? Every public dollar

spent on family planning saves \$4.40 that would otherwise be spent on medical and welfare costs, saving taxpayers \$2 billion annually. Family planning works to save lives and to save money.

Let us be honest. If we are against abortion, if we are against escalating welfare costs, we must be a society that stands for family planning. We must give women a place to go.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. JOHNSON].

(Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Greenwood amendment and in strong opposition to the Smith amendment.

Mr. Chairman, do not be deceived. The Smith amendment is not an innocent block grant proposal. It cuts Federal support for women's health services and pregnancy prevention by two-thirds. In just the maternal and child health block grant section, it cuts funding from \$116 million to \$34 million as a result of the mandatory set-asides in that program.

The Smith amendment cuts the money and cuts access to health care services for uninsured low-income women. It eliminates services in 25 counties nationwide.

In my district I have not one community health center and all that maternal child health money goes to the five big cities. In Connecticut 30 percent of all women now receiving pap smears, routine health services, and yes, pregnancy prevention services, will no longer have access to them.

Mr. Chairman, I urge opposition to the Smith amendment and support for the Greenwood amendment.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the House, those who agree with me, those who oppose us, for what I think has been a high-toned, important debate for this country. Let me close with this, Mr. Chairman. This is not now, never has been, never will be, a debate about abortion. It is a debate about family planning. It is a debate about public health. It is a debate about the right of women in this country, poor women, to plan their families, and we should all stand up for that.

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

□ 2130

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the very distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE].

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

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, I am filling in for the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH], who was supposed to close, but he is tied up somewhere, so here I am.

This debate is not about family planning. This debate is about who will deliver the family planning.

On welfare, on grants to fight crime, the Republicans have taken the position that Washington can not do it as well as the localities can, that States ought not to be administrative districts of the Federal Government, and so we have sought to return to local government, to local agencies, the funds that heretofore have been disbursed by the all powerful Washington bureaucracy.

Now I tell my colleagues what this debate is about. It is about a \$33 million Federal earmark to the largest purveyor of abortions in the world, Planned Parenthood, and they are fighting because that is big money, but under our proposal they can still line up with other agencies out in the States and compete for those dollars. After all, Medicare today spends well over one-half billion dollars on family planning.

Who is sounding the death knell of family planning? Community health centers, social services block grants, maternal and child health block grants, and Medicare. They serve 13 million women, and children, and adolescents who need medical care, as well.

Mr. Chairman, let me in the time left simply say family planning is a good thing. I am for family planning, always have been. I am against a big Federal earmark. I am for letting the States handle it as we are doing in welfare reform and in crime grants.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Chairman, if 1992 was the year of the woman, then 1995 must be the year of the assault on women.

A good example of the continuing offensive against women in this country is the elimination of title X family planning money in this bill.

Title X was enacted with broad bipartisan support in 1970. This program provides critical services to low-income women and uninsured working women. In addition to family planning services, title X clinics provide screening for breast and cervical cancer, sexually transmitted diseases, and hypertension. For many women, it provides the only basic health care they receive.

While some in this body are pro-choice and others are anti-choice, none of us are pro-abortion. Yet this bill eliminates the one program which effectively prevents unwanted pregnancies and abortions.

In fact, for less than 1/2 of 1 percent of the entire Federal budget, this program averts 1.2 million unintended pregnancies, 516,000 abortions and 344,000 out-of-wedlock births each year.

I find it interesting that this prevention program has come under attack only after its termination was urged by the Christian coalition in its "Contract with the American Family."

Mr. Chairman, we can't allow special interests to run this Congress. I urge my colleagues to vote against this

mean-spirited attack on American women. We have come too far to let demagogic extremists reverse our gains.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GREENWOOD]. This amendment would restore separate, discrete funding for the Federal family planning—or "Title X"—program.

What many of Title X's opponents fail—or refuse—to recognize is that the scope of this program goes far beyond family planning. The Title X program also provides other preventive health care services to approximately 4 million low-income women and teenagers at 4,000 clinics across America. It provides infertility services, as well as counseling, screening, and referral for basic gynecologic care, breast and cervical cancer, hypertension, diabetes, anemia, kidney dysfunction, sexually transmitted diseases, and HIV. Without Title X, millions of American women would have no other accessible, affordable source for quality, comprehensive health care services. It is the only source of health care for 83 percent of its clients and for many of them it is the single entry point into the entire health care system.

California has received Title X funds since the Public Health Services Act was passed in 1970. Last year, more than 350,000 low-income women received health care services at California's Title X clinics. Yet, because of inadequate funding, the program serves fewer than half of those currently eligible for services. Although funding for Title X has declined by over 70 percent since 1980, health care costs have soared, and the number of women of reproductive age who are in need of these services has increased.

Title X services prevent 1.2 million pregnancies in the United States each year. When we support contraceptive services—Both care and supplies—we thwart unwanted pregnancies and, ultimately, the need for abortion. By reducing unintended births, we also decrease welfare dependency. Each public dollar spent to provide family planning services saves more than four dollars that would otherwise be spent on medical care, welfare benefits and other social services.

Mr. GREENWOOD's amendment restores accessible, high-quality, affordable health care to women who could not otherwise afford to have it. I encourage my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support passage of this pro-life, pro-health amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] as a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GREENWOOD].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] as a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GREENWOOD] will be postponed.

SEQUENTIAL VOTES POSTPONED IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order: amendment No. 36 offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY]; amendments Nos. 60, 61, and 62 en bloc offered by the gentleman from California [Ms. PELOSI]; amendment No. 2-3 offered by the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. CRAPO]; substitute amendment No. 2-2 offered by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON]; and then possibly on the underlying amendment No. 2-1 offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GREENWOOD].

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 36 OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 155, noes 270, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 611]

AYES—155

Abercrombie	Fattah	Maloney
Ackerman	Fazio	Markey
Baesler	Fields (LA)	Martinez
Baldacci	Filner	Matsui
Barrett (WI)	Flake	McCarthy
Becerra	Foglietta	McDermott
Beilenson	Ford	McHale
Bentsen	Frank (MA)	McKinney
Berman	Frost	Meehan
Bishop	Furse	Meek
Bonior	Gejdenson	Menendez
Borski	Gephardt	Mfume
Boucher	Gibbons	Miller (CA)
Brown (CA)	Gilman	Mineta
Brown (FL)	Gonzalez	Minge
Brown (OH)	Green	Mink
Bryant (TX)	Gutierrez	Moran
Cardin	Harman	Nadler
Chapman	Hastings (FL)	Neal
Clay	Hefner	Obey
Clayton	Hilliard	Olver
Clyburn	Hinchee	Owens
Coleman	Horn	Pallone
Collins (IL)	Hoyer	Pastor
Collins (MI)	Jackson-Lee	Payne (NJ)
Conyers	Jacobs	Payne (VA)
Coyne	Jefferson	Pelosi
Danner	Johnson (CT)	Peterson (FL)
DeFazio	Johnson (SD)	Peterson (MN)
DeLauro	Johnson, E. B.	Pomeroy
Dellums	Johnston	Rangel
Deutsch	Kaptur	Reed
Dicks	Kennedy (MA)	Richardson
Dingell	Kennedy (RI)	Rivers
Dixon	Kennelly	Rose
Doggett	Klecza	Roybal-Allard
Dooley	Lantos	Rush
Durbin	Lazio	Sabo
Edwards	Levin	Sanders
Engel	Lewis (GA)	Sawyer
Eshoo	Lofgren	Schroeder
Evans	Lowey	Schumer
Farr	Luther	Scott

Serrano  
Skaggs  
Slaughter  
Spratt  
Stark  
Stokes  
Studds  
Thompson  
Torres

Torricelli  
Towns  
Traficant  
Tucker  
Velazquez  
Vento  
Visclosky  
Ward  
Waters

NOES—270

Allard  
Archer  
Armey  
Bachus  
Baker (CA)  
Baker (LA)  
Ballenger  
Barcia  
Barr  
Barrett (NE)  
Bartlett  
Barton  
Bass  
Bereuter  
Bevill  
Bilbray  
Bilirakis  
Bliley  
Blute  
Boehlert  
Boehner  
Bonilla  
Bono  
Brewster  
Browder  
Brownback  
Bryant (TN)  
Bunn  
Bunning  
Burr  
Burton  
Buyer  
Callahan  
Calvert  
Camp  
Canady  
Castle  
Chabot  
Chambliss  
Chenoweth  
Christensen  
Clement  
Clinger  
Coble  
Coburn  
Collins (GA)  
Combest  
Condit  
Cooley  
Costello  
Cox  
Cramer  
Crane  
Crapo  
Creameans  
Cubin  
Cunningham  
Davis  
de la Garza  
Deal  
DeLay  
Diaz-Balart  
Dickey  
Doolittle  
Dornan  
Doyle  
Dreier  
Duncan  
Dunn  
Ehlers  
Ehrlich  
Emerson  
English  
Ensign  
Everett  
Ewing  
Fawell  
Fields (TX)  
Flanagan  
Foley  
Forbes  
Fowler  
Fox  
Franks (CT)  
Franks (NJ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Frisa  
Funderburk

Murtha  
Myers  
Myrick  
Nethercutt  
Neumann  
Ney  
Norwood  
Nussle  
Oberstar  
Ortiz  
Orton  
Oxley  
Packard  
Parker  
Paxon  
Petri  
Pickett  
Pombo  
Porter  
Portman  
Poshard  
Pryce  
Quillen  
Quinn  
Radanovich  
Rahall  
Ramstad  
Regula  
Riggs  
Roberts  
Roemer  
Rogers  
Rohrabacher  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roth  
Roukema  
Royce  
Salmon  
Sanford  
Saxton  
Scarborough  
Schaefer  
Schiff  
Seastrand  
Sensenbrenner  
Shadegg  
Shaw  
Shays  
Shuster  
Sisisky  
Skeen  
Skelton  
Smith (MI)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Smith (WA)  
Souder  
Spence  
Stearns  
Stenholm  
Stockman  
Stump  
Stupak  
Talent  
Tanner  
Tate  
Tauzin  
Taylor (MS)  
Taylor (NC)  
Tejeda  
Thomas  
Thornberry  
Thornton  
Tiahrt  
Torkildsen  
Upton  
Volkmer  
Vucanovich  
Waldholtz  
Walker  
Walsh  
Wamp  
Watts (OK)  
Weldon (FL)  
Weldon (PA)  
Weller  
White  
Whitfield

Watt (NC)  
Waxman  
Williams  
Wise  
Woolsey  
Wyden  
Wynn  
Yates

Wicker  
Wilson

Wolf  
Young (FL)

Zeliff  
Zimmer

McNulty  
Meehan  
Meek  
Menendez  
Mfume  
Miller (CA)  
Mineta  
Minge  
Mink  
Mollohan  
Moran  
Murtha  
Nadler  
Neal  
Oberstar  
Obey  
Olver  
Orton  
Owens  
Pallone  
Pastor  
Payne (NJ)  
Payne (VA)  
Pelosi  
Peterson (FL)  
Peterson (MN)  
Petri

NOT VOTING—9

□ 2153

Messrs. BARCIA, HOEKSTRA, KIL-DEE, RAHALL, and LAFALCE changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Mr. MFUME changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House today, the Chair announces he will reduce to a minimum of five minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device will be taken on each amendment on which the Chair has postponed further proceedings.

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC OFFERED BY MS. PELOSI

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendments en bloc offered by the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI] on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendments en bloc.

The Clerk redesignated the amendments en bloc.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 197, noes 229, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 612]

AYES—197

Abercrombie  
Ackerman  
Baldacci  
Barcia  
Barrett (WI)  
Becerra  
Beilenson  
Bentsen  
Berman  
Bevill  
Bishop  
Boehlert  
Bonior  
Borski  
Boucher  
Browder  
Brown (CA)  
Brown (FL)  
Brown (OH)  
Bryant (TX)  
Cardin  
Chapman  
Clay  
Clayton  
Clement  
Clyburn  
Coleman  
Collins (IL)  
Collins (MI)  
Condit  
Conyers  
Costello  
Coyne  
Cramer  
Danner  
DeFazio  
DeLauro  
Dellums  
Deutsch

Diaz-Balart  
Dicks  
Dingell  
Dixon  
Doggett  
Doyle  
Durbine  
Edwards  
Engel  
English  
Eshoo  
Evans  
Farr  
Fattah  
Fazio  
Fields (LA)  
Filner  
Flake  
Foglietta  
Ford  
Frank (MA)  
Frost  
Furse  
Gejdenson  
Gephardt  
Gibbons  
Gilman  
Gonzalez  
Gordon  
Green  
Gutierrez  
Hall (OH)  
Hamilton  
Harman  
Hastings (FL)  
Hefner  
Hilliard  
Hinchev  
Holden

Horn  
Hoyer  
Jackson-Lee  
Jacobs  
Jefferson  
Johnson (SD)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Johnston  
Kanjorski  
Kaptur  
Kennedy (MA)  
Kennedy (RI)  
Kennelly  
Kildee  
King  
Kleczka  
Klink  
LaFalce  
Lantos  
Lazio  
Levin  
Lewis (GA)  
Lincoln  
Lipinski  
Lofgren  
Lowey  
Luther  
Maloney  
Manton  
Markey  
Martinez  
Mascara  
Matsui  
McCarthy  
McDade  
McDermott  
McHale  
McHugh  
McKinney

Pomeroy  
Poshard  
Quinn  
Rahall  
Rangel  
Reed  
Richardson  
Rivers  
Rose  
Roybal-Allard  
Rush  
Sabo  
Sanders  
Sawyer  
Schroeder  
Schumer  
Scott  
Serrano  
Sisisky  
Skaggs  
Skelton  
Slaughter  
Smith (NJ)  
Spratt  
Stark  
Stokes  
Studds

Stupak  
Thompson  
Thornton  
Torkildsen  
Torres  
Torricelli  
Towns  
Traficant  
Tucker  
Velazquez  
Vento  
Visclosky  
Volkmer  
Walsh  
Ward  
Waters  
Watt (NC)  
Waxman  
Weldon (PA)  
Williams  
Wilson  
Wise  
Woolsey  
Wyden  
Wynn  
Yates

NOES—229

Allard  
Archer  
Armey  
Bachus  
Baesler  
Baker (CA)  
Baker (LA)  
Ballenger  
Barr  
Barrett (NE)  
Bartlett  
Barton  
Bass  
Bereuter  
Bilbray  
Bilirakis  
Bliley  
Blute  
Boehner  
Bonilla  
Bono  
Brewster  
Brownback  
Bryant (TN)  
Bunn  
Bunning  
Burton  
Buyer  
Callahan  
Calvert  
Camp  
Canady  
Castle  
Chabot  
Chambliss  
Chenoweth  
Christensen  
Clinger  
Coble  
Coburn  
Collins (GA)  
Combest  
Cooley  
Cox  
Crane  
Crapo  
Creameans  
Cubin  
Cunningham  
Davis  
de la Garza  
Deal  
DeLay  
Dickey  
Dooley  
Doolittle  
Dornan  
Dreier  
Duncan  
Dunn  
Ehlers  
Ehrlich  
Emerson  
Ensign  
Everett  
Ewing  
Fawell  
Fields (TX)  
Flanagan

Foley  
Forbes  
Fowler  
Fox  
Franks (CT)  
Franks (NJ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Frisa  
Funderburk  
Gallegly  
Ganske  
Gekas  
Geren  
Gilchrist  
Gillmor  
Goodlatte  
Gooding  
Goss  
Graham  
Greenwood  
Gunderson  
Gutknecht  
Hall (TX)  
Hancock  
Hansen  
Hastert  
Hastings (WA)  
Hayes  
Hayworth  
Hefley  
Heineman  
Herger  
Hilleary  
Hobson  
Hoekstra  
Hoke  
Hostettler  
Houghton  
Hunter  
Hutchinson  
Hyde  
Inglis  
Istook  
Johnson (CT)  
Johnson, Sam  
Jones  
Kasich  
Kelly  
Kildee  
Kim  
King  
Kingston  
Klink  
Klug  
Knollenberg  
Kolbe  
LaFalce  
LaHood  
Largent  
Latham  
LaTourette  
Laughlin  
Leach  
Lewis (CA)  
Lewis (KY)  
Lightfoot  
Lincoln  
Linder  
Lipinski  
Livingston  
LoBiondo  
Longley  
Lucas  
Manton  
Manzullo  
Martini  
Mascara  
McCollum  
McCrery  
McDade  
McHugh  
McInnis  
McIntosh  
McKeon  
McNulty  
Metcalf  
Meyers  
Mica  
Miller (FL)  
Molinari  
Mollohan  
Montgomery  
Moorhead  
Morella

McCrery  
McInnis  
McIntosh  
McKeon  
Metcalf  
Meyers  
Mica  
Miller (FL)  
Molinari  
Montgomery  
Moorhead  
Morella  
Myrick  
Nethercutt  
Neumann  
Ney  
Norwood  
Nussle  
Ortiz  
Oxley  
Packard  
Parker  
Paxon  
Pickett  
Pombo  
Porter  
Portman  
Pryce  
Quillen  
Radanovich  
Ramstad  
Regula  
Riggs  
Roberts  
Roemer  
Rogers  
Rohrabacher  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roth  
Roukema  
Royce  
Salmon  
Sanford  
Saxton  
Scarborough  
Schaefer  
Schiff  
Seastrand  
Sensenbrenner  
Shadegg  
Shaw  
Shays  
Shuster  
Skeen  
Smith (MI)  
Smith (TX)  
Smith (WA)  
Souder  
Spence  
Stearns  
Stenholm  
Stockman  
Talent  
Tanner  
Tate  
Tauzin  
Taylor (MS)  
Taylor (NC)

Tejeda Walker  
Thomas Wamp  
Thornberry Watts (OK)  
Tiahrt Weldon (FL)  
Upton Weller  
Vucanovich White  
Waldholtz Whitfield

NOT VOTING—8

Andrews Moakley  
Bateman Reynolds  
Chrysler Solomon

□ 2203

So the amendments en bloc were re-  
jected.

The result of the vote was announced  
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CRAPO

The CHAIRMAN. The pending busi-  
ness is the demand for a recorded vote  
on the amendment offered by the gen-  
tleman from Idaho [Mr. CRAPO], on  
which further proceedings were post-  
poned and on which the ayes prevailed  
by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate this  
amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-  
ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has  
been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic de-  
vice, and there were—ayes 373, noes 52,  
not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 613]

AYES—373

Ackerman Christensen  
Allard Clement  
Archer Clinger  
Army Clyburn  
Bachus Coble  
Baesler Coburn  
Baker (LA) Coleman  
Baldacci Collins (GA)  
Ballenger Combest  
Barcia Condit  
Barr Cooley  
Barrett (WI) Costello  
Bartlett Cox  
Barton Cramer  
Bass Crane  
Becerra Crapo  
Bentsen Creameans  
Bereuter Cubin  
Bevill Cunningham  
Bilbray Danner  
Bilirakis Davis  
Bishop de la Garza  
Blute Deal  
Boehlert DeFazio  
Boehner DeLauro  
Bonilla DeLay  
Bono Deutsch  
Borski Diaz-Balart  
Boucher Dickey  
Brewster Dicks  
Browder Dingell  
Brown (CA) Doggett  
Brown (OH) Dooley  
Brownback Doolittle  
Bryant (TN) Dornan  
Bryant (TX) Doyle  
Bunn Dreier  
Bunning Duncan  
Burr Dunn  
Burton Durbin  
Buyer Edwards  
Callahan Ehlers  
Calvert Ehrlich  
Camp Emerson  
Canady Engel  
Cardin English  
Castle Ensign  
Chabot Eshoo  
Chambliss Everett  
Chapman Ewing  
Chenoweth Farr

Hefley  
Hefner  
Heineman  
Herger  
Hilleary  
Hobson  
Hoekstra  
Hoke  
Holden  
Horn  
Hostettler  
Houghton  
Hoyer  
Hunter  
Hutchinson  
Hyde  
Inglis  
Istook  
Jackson-Lee  
Jacobs  
Jefferson  
Johnson (CT)  
Johnson (SD)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Johnson, Sam  
Johnston  
Jones  
Kanjorski  
Kaptur  
Kasich  
Kelly  
Kennedy (MA)  
Kennedy (RI)  
Kennelly  
Kildee  
Kim  
King  
Kingston  
Klecicka  
Klink  
Klug  
Kolbe  
LaFalce  
LaHood  
Lantos  
Largent  
Latham  
LaTourette  
Laughlin  
Lazio  
Leach  
Levin  
Lewis (KY)  
Lightfoot  
Lincoln  
Linder  
Lipinski  
LoBiondo  
Lofgren  
Longley  
Lowey  
Lucas  
Luther  
Maloney  
Manton  
Manzullo  
Markey  
Martini  
Mascara  
Matsui  
McCarthy  
McCollum  
McCrery  
McHale

NOES—52

Abercrombie  
Baker (CA)  
Beilenson  
Berman  
Bonior  
Brown (FL)  
Clay  
Clayton  
Collins (IL)  
Collins (MI)  
Conyers  
Coyne  
Dellums  
Dixon  
Evans  
Fazio  
Foglietta  
Hastings (FL)

McHugh  
McInnis  
McIntosh  
McKeon  
McKinney  
McNulty  
Meehan  
Menendez  
Metcalf  
Meyers  
Mfume  
Mica  
Miller (CA)  
Miller (FL)  
Mineta  
Minge  
Molinari  
Montgomery  
Moorhead  
Moran  
Morella  
Murtha  
Myrick  
Neal  
Nethercutt  
Neumann  
Ney  
Norwood  
Nussle  
Oberstar  
Obey  
Olver  
Ortiz  
Orton  
Oxley  
Packard  
Pallone  
Parker  
Pastor  
Paxon  
Payne (VA)  
Pelosi  
Peterson (FL)  
Peterson (MN)  
Petri  
Pickett  
Pombo  
Pomeroy  
Porter  
Portman  
Poshard  
Pryce  
Quillen  
Quinn  
Radanovich  
Ramstad  
Rangel  
Reed  
Regula  
Richardson  
Riggs  
Rivers  
Roberts  
Roemer  
Rohrabacher  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Rose  
Roth  
Roukema  
Royce  
Salmon  
Sanders  
Sanford  
Sawyer

Hilliard  
Hinchev  
Knollenberg  
Lewis (CA)  
Lewis (GA)  
Livingston  
Martinez  
McDade  
McDermott  
Meeke  
Mink  
Mollohan  
Myers  
Nadler  
Owens  
Payne (NJ)  
Rahall  
Rogers

NOT VOTING—9

Andrews  
Barrett (NE)  
Bateman

Bliley  
Chrysler  
Moakley

Saxton  
Scarborough  
Schaefer  
Schiff  
Schroeder  
Schumer  
Scott  
Seastrand  
Sensenbrenner  
Shadegg  
Shaw  
Shays  
Shuster  
Sisisky  
Skaggs  
Skeen  
Skelton  
Slaughter  
Smith (MI)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Smith (WA)  
Solomon  
Souder  
Spence  
Spratt  
Stearns  
Stenholm  
Stockman  
Stokes  
Stump  
Stupak  
Talent  
Tanner  
Tate  
Tauzin  
Taylor (MS)  
Taylor (NC)  
Tejeda  
Thomas  
Thompson  
Thornberry  
Thornton  
Tiahrt  
Torkildsen  
Torrice  
Traficant  
Tucker  
Upton  
Visclosky  
Volkmer  
Walder  
Walker  
Walsh  
Wamp  
Ward  
Watt (NC)  
Watts (OK)  
Weldon (FL)  
Weldon (PA)  
Weller  
White  
Whitfield  
Wicker  
Wilson  
Wise  
Wolf  
Wyden  
Wynn  
Young (FL)  
Zeliff  
Zimmer

Roybal-Allard  
Rush  
Sabo  
Serrano  
Stark  
Studds  
Torres  
Towns  
Velazquez  
Vento  
Vucanovich  
Waters  
Waxman  
Williams  
Woolsey  
Yates

□ 2210

Mr. OLVER changed his vote from  
“no” to “aye.”

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LIVINGSTON AS A  
SUBSTITUTE FOR THE AMENDMENT OFFERED  
BY MR. GREENWOOD

The CHAIRMAN. The pending busi-  
ness is the demand for a recorded vote  
on the amendment offered by the gen-  
tleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVING-  
STON] as a substitute for the amend-  
ment offered by the gentleman from  
Pennsylvania [Mr. GREENWOOD], on  
which further proceedings were post-  
poned and which the noes prevailed by  
a voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the  
amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-  
ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has  
been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic de-  
vice, and there were—ayes 207, noes 221,  
not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 614]

AYES—207

Allard	Ensign	LoBiondo
Archer	Everett	Lucas
Armey	Ewing	Manton
Bachus	Fields (TX)	Manzullo
Baker (CA)	Flanagan	Mascara
Baker (LA)	Forbes	McCollum
Ballenger	Fox	McCrery
Barcia	Frisa	McDade
Barr	Funderburk	McHugh
Barrett (NE)	Gallegly	McIntosh
Bartlett	Gillmor	McKeon
Barton	Gingrich	Metcalf
Bevill	Goodlatte	Mica
Bilirakis	Goodling	Miller (FL)
Bliley	Goss	Mollohan
Boehner	Graham	Montgomery
Bonilla	Gutknecht	Moorhead
Bono	Hall (OH)	Murtha
Brewster	Hall (TX)	Myers
Brownback	Hancock	Myrick
Bryant (TN)	Hansen	Nethercutt
Bunn	Hastert	Neumann
Bunning	Hastings (WA)	Ney
Burr	Hayes	Norwood
Burton	Hayworth	Nussle
Buyer	Hefley	Oberstar
Callahan	Heineman	Ortiz
Calvert	Herger	Orton
Camp	Hilleary	Oxley
Canady	Hoekstra	Packard
Chabot	Hoke	Parker
Chambliss	Holden	Paxon
Chenoweth	Hostettler	Peterson (MN)
	Hunter	Petri
	Hutchinson	Pombo
	Hyde	Portman
	Inglis	Poshard
	Istook	Quillen
	Johnson, Sam	Quinn
	Jones	Radanovich
	Kasich	Rahall
	Kildee	Roberts
	Crapo	Kim
	Creameans	King
	Cubin	Kingston
	Cunningham	Knollenberg
	Deal	LaFalce
	DeLay	LaHood
	Diaz-Balart	Largent
	Dickey	Latham
	Doolittle	LaTourette
	Dornan	Laughlin
	Dreier	Lewis (KY)
	Duncan	Lightfoot
	Ehlers	Linder
	Emerson	Lipinski
	English	Livingston
		Skeen

Skelton  
Smith (MI)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Smith (WA)  
Solomon  
Souder  
Spence  
Stearns  
Stenholm  
Stockman  
Stump

NOES—221

Abercrombie  
Ackerman  
Baesler  
Baldacci  
Barrett (WI)  
Bass  
Becerra  
Beilenson  
Bentsen  
Bereuter  
Berman  
Bilbray  
Bishop  
Blute  
Boehlert  
Bonior  
Borski  
Boucher  
Browder  
Brown (CA)  
Brown (FL)  
Brown (OH)  
Bryant (TX)  
Cardin  
Castle  
Chapman  
Clay  
Clayton  
Clement  
Clinger  
Clyburn  
Coleman  
Collins (IL)  
Collins (MI)  
Condit  
Conyers  
Coyne  
Cramer  
Danner  
Davis  
de la Garza  
DeFazio  
DeLauro  
Dellums  
Deutsch  
Dicks  
Dingell  
Dixon  
Doggett  
Dooley  
Doyle  
Dunn  
Durbin  
Edwards  
Ehrlich  
Engel  
Eshoo  
Evans  
Farr  
Fattah  
Fawell  
Fazio  
Fields (LA)  
Filner  
Flake  
Foglietta  
Foley  
Ford  
Fowler  
Frank (MA)  
Franks (CT)  
Franks (NJ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Frost

NOT VOTING—7

Andrews  
Bateman  
Chrysler

□ 2217

So the amendment offered as a substitute for the amendment was rejected.

Waldholtz  
Walker  
Walsh  
Wamp  
Watts (OK)  
Weldon (FL)  
Weldon (PA)  
Weller  
Whitfield  
Wicker  
Wolf  
Young (FL)

Moran  
Morella  
Nadler  
Neal  
Obey  
Olver  
Owens  
Pallone  
Pastor  
Payne (NJ)  
Payne (VA)  
Pelosi  
Peterson (FL)  
Pickett  
Pomeroy  
Porter  
Pryce  
Ramstad  
Rangel  
Reed  
Regula  
Richardson  
Riggs  
Rivers  
Roemer  
Rose  
Roukema  
Roybal-Allard  
Rush  
Sabo  
Sanders  
Sawyer  
Schiff  
Schroeder  
Schumer  
Scott  
Serrano  
Shaw  
Shays  
Sisisky  
Skaggs  
Slaughter  
Spratt  
Stark  
Stokes  
Studds  
Tanner  
Thomas  
Thompson  
Thornton  
Torkildsen  
Torres  
Torricelli  
Towns  
Traficant  
Upton  
Velazquez  
Vento  
Visclosky  
Ward  
Waters  
Watt (NC)  
Waxman  
White  
Williams  
Wilson  
Wise  
Woolsey  
Wyden  
Wynn  
Yates  
Zeliff  
Zimmer

Young (AK)

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GREENWOOD].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 224, noes 204, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 615]

AYES—224

Abercrombie  
Ackerman  
Baesler  
Baldacci  
Barrett (WI)  
Bass  
Beilenson  
Bentsen  
Bereuter  
Berman  
Bilbray  
Bishop  
Blute  
Boehlert  
Bonior  
Borski  
Boucher  
Browder  
Brown (CA)  
Brown (FL)  
Brown (OH)  
Bryant (TX)  
Cardin  
Castle  
Chapman  
Clay  
Clayton  
Clement  
Clinger  
Clyburn  
Coleman  
Collins (IL)  
Collins (MI)  
Condit  
Conyers  
Coyne  
Cramer  
Danner  
Davis  
de la Garza  
DeFazio  
DeLauro  
Dellums  
Deutsch  
Dicks  
Dingell  
Dixon  
Doggett  
Dooley  
Doyle  
Dunn  
Durbin  
Edwards  
Ehrlich  
Engel  
Eshoo  
Evans  
Farr  
Fattah  
Fawell  
Fazio  
Fields (LA)  
Filner  
Flake  
Foglietta  
Foley  
Ford  
Fowler  
Fox  
Frank (MA)  
Franks (CT)  
Franks (NJ)

Wise  
Woolsey

Allard  
Archer  
Army  
Bachus  
Baker (CA)  
Baker (LA)  
Ballenger  
Barcia  
Barr  
Barrett (NE)  
Bartlett  
Barton  
Becerra  
Bevill  
Bilirakis  
Bliley  
Boehner  
Bonilla  
Bono  
Brewster  
Brownback  
Bryant (TN)  
Bunn  
Bunning  
Burr  
Burton  
Buyer  
Callahan  
Calvert  
Camp  
Canady  
Chabot  
Chambliss  
Chenoweth  
Christensen  
Coble  
Coburn  
Collins (GA)  
Combest  
Cooley  
Costello  
Cox  
Crane  
Crapo  
Cremeans  
Cubin  
Cunningham  
Deal  
DeLay  
Diaz-Balart  
Doyer  
Doolittle  
Dornan  
Dreier  
Duncan  
Emerson  
English  
Ensign  
Everett  
Ewing  
Fields (TX)  
Flanagan  
Forbes  
Frisa  
Funderburk  
Gallely  
Gillmor  
Gingrich

Andrews  
Bateman  
Chrysler

Wyden  
Wynn

NOES—204

Goodlatte  
Goss  
Graham  
Gutknecht  
Hall (OH)  
Hall (TX)  
Hancock  
Hansen  
Hastert  
Hastings (WA)  
Hayes  
Hayworth  
Hefley  
Heineman  
Herger  
Hilleary  
Hoekstra  
Hoke  
Holden  
Hostettler  
Hunter  
Hutchinson  
Bunn  
Inglis  
Istook  
Johnson, Sam  
Jones  
Kasich  
Kildee  
Kim  
King  
Kingston  
Knollenberg  
LaFalce  
LaHood  
Largent  
Latham  
LaTourette  
Laughlin  
Lewis (KY)  
Lightfoot  
Linder  
Lipinski  
Livingston  
LoBiondo  
Lucas  
Manton  
Manzullo  
Mascara  
McCollum  
McCrery  
McDade  
McHugh  
McIntosh  
McKeon  
Metcalf  
Mica  
Miller (FL)  
Mollohan  
Montgomery  
Moorhead  
Murtha  
Myers  
Myrick  
Nethercutt  
Neumann  
Ney  
Norwood

NOT VOTING—7

Moakley  
Reynolds  
Thurman

□ 2224

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

The CHAIRMAN. Are there additional amendments to title I?

If not, the Clerk will designate title II.

The text of title II is as follows:  
TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

HEALTH RESOURCES AND SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

HEALTH RESOURCES AND SERVICES

For carrying out titles II, III, VII, VIII, XIX, and XXVI of the Public Health Service Act, title V of the Social Security Act, and

the Health Care Quality Improvement Act of 1986, as amended, \$2,927,122,000, of which \$411,000 shall remain available until expended for interest subsidies on loan guarantees made prior to fiscal year 1981 under part B of title VII of the Public Health Service Act: *Provided*, That the Division of Federal Occupational Health may utilize personal services contracting to employ professional management/administrative, and occupational health professionals: *Provided further*, That of the funds made available under this heading, \$933,000 shall be available until expended for facilities renovations at the Gillis W. Long Hansen's Disease Center: *Provided further*, That in addition to fees authorized by section 427(b) of the Health Care Quality Improvement Act of 1986, fees shall be collected for the full disclosure of information under the Act sufficient to recover the full costs of operating the National Practitioner Data Bank, and shall remain available until expended to carry out that Act.

MEDICAL FACILITIES GUARANTEE AND LOAN FUND

FEDERAL INTEREST SUBSIDIES FOR MEDICAL FACILITIES

For carrying out subsections (d) and (e) of section 1602 of the Public Health Service Act, \$8,000,000, together with any amounts received by the Secretary in connection with loans and loan guarantees under title VI of the Public Health Service Act, to be available without fiscal year limitation for the payment of interest subsidies. During the fiscal year, no commitments for direct loans or loan guarantees shall be made.

HEALTH EDUCATION ASSISTANCE LOANS PROGRAM

For the cost of guaranteed loans, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purpose of the program, as authorized by title VII of the Public Health Service Act, as amended: *Provided*, That such costs, including the cost of modifying such loans, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974: *Provided further*, That these funds are available to subsidize gross obligations for the total loan principal any part of which is to be guaranteed at not to exceed \$210,000,000. In addition, for administrative expenses to carry out the guaranteed loan program, \$2,703,000.

VACCINE INJURY COMPENSATION PROGRAM TRUST FUND

For payments from the Vaccine Injury Compensation Program Trust Fund, such sums as may be necessary for claims associated with vaccine-related injury or death with respect to vaccines administered after September 30, 1988, pursuant to subtitle 2 of title XXI of the Public Health Service Act, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That for necessary administrative expenses, not to exceed \$3,000,000 shall be available from the Trust Fund to the Secretary of Health and Human Services.

VACCINE INJURY COMPENSATION

For payment of claims resolved by the United States Court of Federal Claims related to the administration of vaccines before October 1, 1988, \$110,000,000, to remain available until expended.

CENTERS FOR DISEASE CONTROL AND PREVENTION

DISEASE CONTROL, RESEARCH, AND TRAINING

To carry out titles II, III, VII, XI, XV, XVII, and XIX of the Public Health Service Act, sections 101, 102, 103, 201, 202, and 203 of the Federal Mine Safety and Health Act of 1977, and sections 20 and 22 of the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970; including insurance of official motor vehicles in foreign countries; and hire, maintenance, and operation of aircraft, \$2,085,831,000, of

which \$4,353,000 shall remain available until expended for equipment and construction and renovation of facilities, and in addition, such sums as may be derived from authorized user fees, which shall be credited to this account: *Provided*, That in addition to amounts provided herein, up to \$27,862,000 shall be available from amounts available under section 241 of the Public Health Service Act, to carry out the National Center for Health Statistics surveys.

In addition, \$39,100,000, to be derived from the Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund, for carrying out sections 40151, 40261, and 40293 of Public Law 103-322.

NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH

NATIONAL CANCER INSTITUTE

For carrying out section 301 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act with respect to cancer, \$2,251,084,000.

NATIONAL HEART, LUNG, AND BLOOD INSTITUTE

For carrying out section 301 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act with respect to cardiovascular, lung, and blood diseases, and blood and blood products, \$1,355,866,000.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF DENTAL RESEARCH

For carrying out section 301 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act with respect to dental disease, \$183,196,000.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF DIABETES AND DIGESTIVE AND KIDNEY DISEASES

For carrying out section 301 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act with respect to diabetes and digestive and kidney diseases, \$771,252,000.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF NEUROLOGICAL DISORDERS AND STROKE

For carrying out section 301 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act with respect to neurological disorders and stroke, \$681,534,000.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF ALLERGY AND INFECTIOUS DISEASES

For carrying out section 301 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act with respect to allergy and infectious diseases, \$1,169,628,000.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF GENERAL MEDICAL SCIENCES

For carrying out section 301 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act with respect to general medical sciences, \$946,971,000.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF CHILD HEALTH AND HUMAN DEVELOPMENT

For carrying out section 301 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act with respect to child health and human development, \$595,162,000.

NATIONAL EYE INSTITUTE

For carrying out section 301 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act with respect to eye diseases and visual disorders, \$314,185,000.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH SCIENCES

For carrying out sections 301 and 311 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act with respect to environmental health sciences, \$288,898,000.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE ON AGING

For carrying out section 301 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act with respect to aging, \$453,917,000.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF ARTHRITIS AND MUSCULOSKELETAL AND SKIN DISEASES

For carrying out section 301 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act with respect to arthritis, and musculoskeletal and skin diseases, \$241,828,000.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE ON DEAFNESS AND OTHER COMMUNICATION DISORDERS

For carrying out section 301 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act with respect

to deafness and other communication disorders, \$176,502,000.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF NURSING RESEARCH

For carrying out section 301 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act with respect to nursing research, \$55,831,000.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE ON ALCOHOL ABUSE AND ALCOHOLISM

For carrying out section 301 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act with respect to alcohol abuse and alcoholism, \$198,607,000.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE ON DRUG ABUSE

For carrying out section 301 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act with respect to drug abuse, \$458,441,000.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF MENTAL HEALTH

For carrying out section 301 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act with respect to mental health, \$661,328,000.

NATIONAL CENTER FOR RESEARCH RESOURCES

For carrying out section 301 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act with respect to research resources and general research support grants, \$390,339,000: *Provided*, That none of these funds shall be used to pay recipients of the general research support grants program any amount for indirect expenses in connection with such grants.

NATIONAL CENTER FOR HUMAN GENOME RESEARCH

For carrying out section 301 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act with respect to human genome research, \$170,041,000.

JOHN E. FOGARTY INTERNATIONAL CENTER

For carrying out the activities at the John E. Fogarty International Center, \$25,313,000.

NATIONAL LIBRARY OF MEDICINE

For carrying out section 301 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act with respect to health information communications, \$141,439,000, of which \$4,000,000 shall be available until expended for improvement of information systems: *Provided*, That in fiscal year 1996, the Library may enter into personal services contracts for the provision of services in facilities owned, operated, or constructed under the jurisdiction of the National Institutes of Health.

OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For carrying out the responsibilities of the Office of the Director, National Institutes of Health, \$261,488,000: *Provided*, That funding shall be available for the purchase of not to exceed five passenger motor vehicles for replacement only: *Provided further*, That the Director may direct up to 1 percent of the total amount made available in this Act to all National Institutes of Health appropriations to activities the Director may so designate: *Provided further*, That no such appropriation shall be increased or decreased by more than 1 percent by any such transfers and that the Congress is promptly notified of the transfer.

BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

For the study of, construction of, and acquisition of equipment for, facilities of or used by the National Institutes of Health, including the acquisition of real property, \$146,151,000, to remain available until expended.

SUBSTANCE ABUSE AND MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

SUBSTANCE ABUSE AND MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES

For carrying out titles V and XIX of the Public Health Service Act with respect to substance abuse and mental health services, the Protection and Advocacy for Mentally Ill Individuals Act of 1986, and section 301 of the Public Health Service Act with respect to program management, \$1,788,946,000.

## RETIREMENT PAY AND MEDICAL BENEFITS FOR COMMISSIONED OFFICERS

For retirement pay and medical benefits of Public Health Service Commissioned Officers as authorized by law, and for payments under the Retired Serviceman's Family Protection Plan and Survivor Benefit Plan and for medical care of dependents and retired personnel under the Dependents' Medical Care Act (10 U.S.C. ch. 55), and for payments pursuant to section 229(b) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 429(b)), such amounts as may be required during the current fiscal year.

## AGENCY FOR HEALTH CARE POLICY AND RESEARCH

## HEALTH CARE POLICY AND RESEARCH

For carrying out titles III and IX of the Public Health Service Act, and part A of title XI of the Social Security Act, \$85,423,000, together with not to exceed \$5,796,000 to be transferred from the Federal Hospital Insurance and the Federal Supplementary Medical Insurance Trust Funds, as authorized by sections 1142 and 201(g) of the Social Security Act; in addition, amounts received from Freedom of Information Act fees, reimbursable and interagency agreements, and the sale of data tapes shall be credited to this appropriation and shall remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the amount made available pursuant to section 926(b) of the Public Health Service Act shall not exceed \$34,284,000.

## HEALTH CARE FINANCING ADMINISTRATION GRANTS TO STATES FOR MEDICAID

For carrying out, except as otherwise provided, titles XI and XIX of the Social Security Act, \$55,094,355,000, to remain available until expended.

For making, after May 31, 1996, payments to States under title XIX of the Social Security Act for the last quarter of fiscal year 1996 for unanticipated costs, incurred for the current fiscal year, such sums as may be necessary.

For making payments to States under title XIX of the Social Security Act for the first quarter of fiscal year 1997, \$26,155,350,000, to remain available until expended.

Payment under title XIX may be made for any quarter with respect to a State plan or plan amendment in effect during such quarter, if submitted in or prior to such quarter and approved in that or any subsequent quarter.

## PAYMENTS TO HEALTH CARE TRUST FUNDS

For payment to the Federal Hospital Insurance and the Federal Supplementary Medical Insurance Trust Funds, as provided under sections 217(g) and 1844 of the Social Security Act, sections 103(c) and 111(d) of the Social Security Amendments of 1965, section 278(d) of Public Law 97-248, and for administrative expenses incurred pursuant to section 201(g) of the Social Security Act, \$63,313,000,000.

## PROGRAM MANAGEMENT

For carrying out, except as otherwise provided, titles XI, XVIII, and XIX of the Social Security Act, and title XIII of the Public Health Service Act, the Clinical Laboratory Improvement Amendments of 1988, and section 4005(e) of Public Law 100-203, not to exceed \$2,136,824,000, together with all funds collected in accordance with section 353 of the Public Health Service Act, the latter funds to remain available until expended; the \$2,136,824,000, to be transferred to this appropriation as authorized by section 201(g) of the Social Security Act, from the Federal Hospital Insurance and the Federal Supplementary Medical Insurance Trust Funds: *Provided*, That all funds derived in accordance with 31 U.S.C. 9701 from organizations

established under title XIII of the Public Health Service Act are to be credited to this appropriation.

## HEALTH MAINTENANCE ORGANIZATION LOAN AND LOAN GUARANTEE FUND

For carrying out subsections (d) and (e) of section 1308 of the Public Health Service Act, any amounts received by the Secretary in connection with loans and loan guarantees under title XIII of the Public Health Service Act, to be available without fiscal year limitation for the payment of outstanding obligations. During fiscal year 1996, no commitments for direct loans or loan guarantees shall be made.

## ADMINISTRATION FOR CHILDREN AND FAMILIES FAMILY SUPPORT PAYMENTS TO STATES

For making payments to States or other non-Federal entities, except as otherwise provided, under titles I, IV-A (other than section 402(g)(6)) and D, X, XI, XIV, and XVI of the Social Security Act, and the Act of July 5, 1960 (24 U.S.C. ch. 9), \$13,614,307,000, to remain available until expended.

For making, after May 31 of the current fiscal year, payments to States or other non-Federal entities under titles I, IV-A and D, X, XI, XIV, and XVI of the Social Security Act, for the last three months of the current year for unanticipated costs, incurred for the current fiscal year, such sums as may be necessary.

For making payments to States or other non-Federal entities under titles I, IV-A (other than section 402(g)(6)) and D, X, XI, XIV, and XVI of the Social Security Act and the Act of July 5, 1960 (24 U.S.C. ch. 9) for the first quarter of fiscal year 1997, \$4,800,000,000, to remain available until expended.

## JOB OPPORTUNITIES AND BASIC SKILLS

For carrying out aid to families with dependent children work programs, as authorized by part F of title IV of the Social Security Act, \$1,000,000,000.

## LOW INCOME HOME ENERGY ASSISTANCE (RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available beginning on October 1, 1995 under this heading in Public Law 103-333, \$1,000,000,000 are hereby rescinded.

## REFUGEE AND ENTRANT ASSISTANCE

For making payments for refugee and entrant assistance activities authorized by title IV of the Immigration and Nationality Act and section 501 of the Refugee Education Assistance Act of 1980 (Public Law 96-422), \$411,781,000: *Provided*, That funds appropriated pursuant to section 414(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act under Public Law 103-112 for fiscal year 1994 shall be available for the costs of assistance provided and other activities conducted in such year and in fiscal years 1995 and 1996.

## CHILD CARE AND DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT

For carrying out sections 658A through 658R of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981 (The Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990), \$934,642,000, which shall be available for obligation under the same statutory terms and conditions applicable in the prior fiscal year.

## SOCIAL SERVICES BLOCK GRANT

For making grants to States pursuant to section 2002 of the Social Security Act, \$2,800,000,000.

## CHILDREN AND FAMILIES SERVICES PROGRAMS

For carrying out, except as otherwise provided, the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act, the Developmental Disabilities Assistance and Bill of Rights Act, the Head Start Act, the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act, the Family Violence Prevention and Services Act, the Native American Pro-

grams Act of 1974, title II of Public Law 95-266 (adoption opportunities), the Temporary Child Care for Children with Disabilities and Crisis Nurseries Act of 1986, the Abandoned Infants Assistance Act of 1988, and part B(1) of title IV of the Social Security Act; for making payments under the Community Services Block Grant Act; and for necessary administrative expenses to carry out said Acts and titles I, IV, X, XI, XIV, XVI, and XX of the Social Security Act, the Act of July 5, 1960 (24 U.S.C. ch. 9), the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981, title IV of the Immigration and Nationality Act, section 501 of the Refugee Education Assistance Act of 1980, and section 126 and titles IV and V of Public Law 100-485, \$4,543,343,000.

In addition, \$800,000, to be derived from the Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund, for carrying out sections 40211 and 40251 of Public Law 103-322.

## FAMILY PRESERVATION AND SUPPORT

For carrying out section 430 of the Social Security Act, \$225,000,000.

## PAYMENTS TO STATES FOR FOSTER CARE AND ADOPTION ASSISTANCE

For making payments to States or other non-Federal entities, under title IV-E of the Social Security Act, \$4,307,842,000.

## ADMINISTRATION ON AGING AGING SERVICES PROGRAMS

For carrying out, to the extent not otherwise provided, the Older Americans Act of 1965, as amended, \$778,246,000.

## OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

## GENERAL DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided, for general departmental management, including hire of six medium sedans, and for carrying out titles III and XX of the Public Health Service Act, \$116,826,000, together with \$6,813,000, to be transferred and expended as authorized by section 201(g)(1) of the Social Security Act from the Hospital Insurance Trust Fund and the Supplemental Medical Insurance Trust Fund.

## OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For expenses necessary for the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, \$56,333,000, together with not to exceed \$17,623,000, to be transferred and expended as authorized by section 201(g)(1) of the Social Security Act from the Hospital Insurance Trust Fund and the Supplemental Medical Insurance Trust Fund.

## OFFICE FOR CIVIL RIGHTS

For expenses necessary for the Office for Civil Rights, \$10,249,000, together with not to exceed \$3,251,000, to be transferred and expended as authorized by section 201(g)(1) of the Social Security Act from the Hospital Insurance Trust Fund and the Supplemental Medical Insurance Trust Fund.

## POLICY RESEARCH

For carrying out, to the extent not otherwise provided, research studies under section 1110 of the Social Security Act, \$9,000,000.

## GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 201. Funds appropriated in this title shall be available for not to exceed \$37,000 for official reception and representation expenses when specifically approved by the Secretary.

SEC. 202. The Secretary shall make available through assignment not more than 60 employees of the Public Health Service to assist in child survival activities and to work in AIDS programs through and with funds provided by the Agency for International Development, the United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund or the World Health Organization.

SEC. 203. None of the funds appropriated under this Act may be used to implement section 399L(b) of the Public Health Service Act or section 1503 of the National Institutes of Health Revitalization Act of 1993, Public Law 103-43.

SEC. 204. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to withhold payment to any State under the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act by reason of a determination that the State is not in compliance with section 1340.2(d)(2)(ii) of title 45 of the Code of Federal Regulations. This provision expires upon the date of enactment of the reauthorization of the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act or upon September 30, 1996, whichever occurs first.

SEC. 205. None of the funds appropriated in this title for the National Institutes of Health and the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration shall be used to pay the salary of an individual, through a grant or other extramural mechanism, at a rate in excess of \$125,000 per year.

SEC. 206. Taps and other assessments made by any office located in the Department of Health and Human Services shall be treated as a reprogramming of funds except that this provision shall not apply to assessments required by authorizing legislation, or related to working capital funds or other fee-for-service activities.

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 207. Of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available for the Department of Health and Human Services, General Departmental Management, for fiscal year 1996, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall transfer to the Office of the Inspector General such sums as may be necessary for any expenses with respect to the provision of security protection for the Secretary of Health and Human Services.

SEC. 208. None of the funds appropriated in this Act may be obligated or expended for the Federal Council on Aging under the Older Americans Act or the Advisory Board on Child Abuse and Neglect under the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act.

SEC. 209. None of the funds appropriated in this or any other Act may be obligated or expended for the position of Surgeon General of the Public Health Service.

This title may be cited as the "Department of Health and Human Services Appropriations Act, 1996".

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. EMERSON) having assumed the chair, Mr. WALKER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2127) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill, H.R. 2127, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENDING AUTHORITIES UNDER THE MIDDLE EAST PEACE FACILITATION ACT

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to that the Committee on International Relations be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2161) to extend authorities under the Middle East Peace Facilitation Act of 1994 until October 1, 1995, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not intend to object, but I do want to state a continuing concern I have about our approach to this legislation.

□ 2230

Mr. Speaker, the existing law of the Middle East Peace Facilitation Act now expires August 15 of this year. On June 29 we took up a bill extending the law for 45 days. Now we are back doing the same thing again, extending the law only until October 1, 1995.

Mr. Speaker, I would much prefer that the House be taking up at least a 6-month extension at this time, and I regret that we are not. At this time especially, I think we should be sending a signal of very strong support to the parties in the Middle East peace process. This short-term extension I think has the opposite effect. It creates an unstable environment and makes a hard job for the Israelis and the Palestinians involved in the peace process even more difficult.

Mr. Speaker, having expressed that concern, since this bill is the only option before us right now.

My concerns have only increased about using this kind of approach on a bill critical to the Middle East peace process. If the act is allowed to expire, all funds for direct and multilateral assistance to the Palestinian authority will be cut off. Representatives of the Palestinian authority will not be able to maintain an office in the United States. Engaging in diplomatic activities relating to the peace process here in Washington would be impossible.

In short, allowing this law to expire could seriously jeopardize a fragile, but steadily progressing, Middle East peace process.

As I understand it, our reasons for extending this act for only 45 days at a time are related neither to Palestinians nor to Israelis. Instead, this act is being used in the other body as some kind of bargaining chip in negotiations on unrelated bills. I think this is a serious and potentially dangerous mistake.

On June 29 on the House floor, I expressed my hope that the next time we extended this law, we would do so for a longer period of time. Chairman GILMAN said we were taking up only a short term extension because we

would conference a more substantive Middle East Peace Facilitation Act prior to the summer recess. We have not. In fact, we have not yet even considered such a bill in committee.

Difficult negotiations between Israel and the Palestinians continue and an interim agreement is possible soon. Terrorism also continues to raise its ugly head. The Palestinian authority is moving to control violence but there is always room for more effort.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EMERSON). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I will not object, but we are now extending it a second time for another 45 days, and I guess my feeling is a little bit different than my colleague from Indiana. I believe that we cannot indefinitely have these extensions without holding Mr. Arafat's feet to the fire. I have submitted a bill along with the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON], the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER], and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY], which clearly lays out reasons and the threshold for Mr. Arafat and the PLO to comply with before there can be a continuation of funding for the PLO.

I would like to ask the Chairman if he can give me assurances that our bill will be marked up at committee, because I think there are many, many different feelings and opinions on the committee, and I think we should have the opportunity. I just want to say, I think it is especially critical because it seems pretty obvious to me that in the Senate, the State Department authorization bill is dead. So I think it is even more critical that we in the House come together and mark up my bill so that we can have a resolution of this issue, and I would like to just ask the Chairman if he would agree to mark up the bill.

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

Mr. ENGEL. Further reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, we certainly will take the gentleman's thoughts into consideration and we will be reviewing the request as we return to committee following the recess.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to just reiterate that I think it is critical that we do have a markup of the bill, that we hold hearings and have a markup of the bill. With the chairman's assurances that he will take a look at this, and I hope with the assurances that we will mark up the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows: