gentlelady from Hawaii, Congresswoman MINK, which would strike the provision of this bill prohibiting enforcement of title IX requirements with respect to gender equity in intercollegiate athletic programs.

Enforcement of title IX—with respect to athletics—ensures that our sons and daughters have an equal chance to take part in sports while they are in school. It is that simple. This enforcement takes into consideration the fact that different sports have unique differences that are justifiable—that some aspects of athletics programs do not have to be the same for men and women. The key is that the needs of male and female athletes are being met equally.

But the language in this bill would halt title IX enforcement. The net effect would be that intercollegiate athletic opportunities for female students—hampered as they already are—would be limited even more.

I know that today, nearly three decades after my own college athletic experiences, all of my daughters—each one of them a better athlete than her father—have been denied the access that I had to college sports. Women in college today still do not have the access and opportunity that men do. But title IX enforcement ensures that young women like my daughters would not be denied the same opportunity as their male counterparts to compete in college athletics.

All of our children should have an equal opportunity to participate in intercollegiate sports. I therefore urge my colleagues to support Congresswoman MINK's amendment, which would ensure that we continue to work toward guaranteeing that our sons and our daughters have their athletic interests and abilities encouraged and supported.

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

SPEECH OF

HON. FRANK PALLONE, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1995

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union 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:

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Bateman Saxton Edwards amendment to restore $22 million to the Impact Aid Program. This program, which suffered a 15 percent cut in funding in fiscal year 1995 is scheduled for another $83 million in cuts this year. Together these figures translate to a drastic 2-year reduction of 26 percent for Federal impact aid.

The reason why this reduction is particularly drastic is quite simple. Impact aid is a program that provides for the education of the children of our military personnel and children on Indian reserves. Education programs run on federally owned property are, due to a lack of funds caused by an inability to collect State or local taxes, highly dependent on Federal funding. Without that assistance, the quality of education available for these children is certain to deteriorate.

I ask you, Mr. Chairman, do you think it is fair some children in our country should be offered a lower standard of educational training just because they happen to live on federal land? It seems clear to me that as it is the Federal Government who owns the land on which these children live, the Federal Government should be obligated, just as State and local municipalities are, to provide adequate educational services for children.

Mr. Chairman, what would you suggest I tell the military children of the Earle Naval Weapons Station in Tinton Falls and Fort Monmouth in Eatontown when I go back to New Jersey and they wonder why the resources for their education have been reduced? Indeed, how do I explain to their parents that their child's school day may have to be reduced because the government, though able to pay them to fight for their country, does not have enough money to educate their children? These are questions, Mr. Chairman, that they should not have to ask and I should not have to answer.

While I support efforts to balance the Federal budget, I believe attempting to do so by gutting valuable education programs like impact aid is unequivocally a step in the wrong direction. With the Department of Education projecting that 89 percent of the jobs being created in the United States will require post-secondary training, it is clear that cutting education programs jeopardize the well-being of our children and, ultimately, the economic growth of our Nation.

We must not allow the Federal Government to shirk its responsibilities to itself, and to our children. I urge my colleagues to act responsibly and vote ''yes'' on this amendment.

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

SPEECH OF

HON. JOSÉ E. SERRANO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1995

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union 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:

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, the committee's draconian cuts to education programs represent a fundamental shift in our Nation's priorities. Less than 1 year after the passage of Goals 2000, President Clinton's ambitious plan to prepare our children for the 21st century, the Republican majority stands poised to initiate a massive rollback in funds for programs which benefit our most precious resource—our children. There can be no higher priority than their education and training for the future.

The more than $1 billion cut in title I, the program which serves our poorest children, the 59 percent cut to safe and drug-free schools, and the 75 percent cut to bilingual education, when combined with cuts at the State and local levels, will have disastrous consequences for our Nation's already overburdened and understaffed school systems.

In New York City, these cuts will result in nearly 42,000 fewer children receiving title I services, 9,000 fewer students in bilingual education programs, and the loss of nearly 3,000 teachers.

Other Members have spoken eloquently about the cuts to education programs. I would like to speak for a moment about the cuts to bilingual education programs. I find these cuts particularly troubling because the need for the services those programs provide is ever-increasing. The number of limited English proficient children is expected to increase to nearly 3.5 million by the year 2000. Studies have shown that language-minority students take several years to fully master academic English. Bilingual education allows these children to keep up with their peers in math and science courses, while simultaneously mastering the English language. These programs have been proven effective at reducing dropout rates, which for Hispanic children are more than 50 percent.

This bill eliminates funds for nearly 200 programs, including literacy training, student aid, and graduate fellowships. We cannot hope to remain competitive in the global marketplace if we do not provide for the education and training of all of our citizens, not just those who can pay their own way.

This shift in our priorities is unacceptable. I do not believe that the way to solve our fiscal problems is to shortchange our citizens and mortgage our children's future. I strongly urge the defeat of this bill.

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

SPEECH OF

HON. CORRINE BROWN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1995

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union 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:

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I stand in strong support of Ms. Lowey's amendment. Medicaid funds must pay for abortion in the case of rape or incest. Surely, our society is not so mean and brutal that it would force poor women to give birth against their will—especially in the case of rape or incest. Abortion is not a crime in this country. The law is clear on this matter. But you would not know this by the extremist, radical, right-wing proposals being attached to appropriations bills. Unfortunately, the radical religious right has driven terror in the hearts of this country over the issue of abortion.