MESSRS. STARK, OLVER, GORDON, SERRANO, GILMAN, MS. DE LAURO, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, MS. WATERS, and Ms. MCKINNEY changed their vote from "yea" to "nay." 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 SUNDAY 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; and Committee on National Security; Committee on Small Business; Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure; and Committee on Veterans’ Affairs.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DICKEY). 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 Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 2127.

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].

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

The Clerk reads 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 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 ended earmarking of research funding and leave our 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 head poisoning and epidemic services.

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 funding.

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 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 limited Federal funds, 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 Services Block Grant to 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 strike or 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 the agency programs 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 $860 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 increased, and we provide funding for what was, as 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 funding of abortion in the operation of any hospital or health care facility that discriminates 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 to the 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 that also contributes its share of reduction and the need 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 and cut out the waste and the duplication. 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 believe that election was to tell us that the weak economy is not working and that employment is the key to it. If you look at past 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 have seen their take-home pay fall. In the last 10 years the average income of the bottom 20 percent of the population fell 10 percent. The bottom 40 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 last 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 gained, 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 national wealth by a factor of six, from 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 nation, not increased during that period. And yet our Republican friends on this side of the aisle think that is not enough disparity, that is not enough trickle-down which starts by taking care of the needs of people in the top brackets.

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 from the bottom 40 percent, or even in the middle of this society, but, oh man, someone in that top 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 $26 billion. Going to chisel chapter 1. Going to chisel “Drug-Free Schools” that helps schools teach kids to avoid drugs before they get hooked. Going to chisel vocational education. Going to lay it to the School to Work Program which is a good idea that we provided in the past, that we provide here and help 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 a poorer 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 wouldn’t 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 college, 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: part of the program, started by 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, 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 Governments 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 this 800 million is going to be chiseled from the program, this money not to be made 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 one 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 under this bill literal in the dead of night, by 9:30 in the morning, and under this bill that language out, but we will not be offering amendments to try to strip that language out, but we will not be offering amendments to fix this bill financially.

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. And what that does is wipe out all of the 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 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 yet we are going to make them 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 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. The cause of which will 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 of the B-2 bombers, and we are more than the Pentagon asked for, more than the President asked for, more than the Joint Chiefs of Staff asked for.
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 our excellent 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 better benefits through employment health benefits, pension benefits and the like that are not reflected in his chart.

Mr. Chairman, he also ignores Government transfer programs. There is nothing in the chart 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 with this in the not the right 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 being funded at $6 billion. Is that right? 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 LINEAP Program earlier. I would have supported it in 1979 because Federal policy caused the second Arab oil embargo. It did raise prices unconsciously, 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, perhaps, 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 even a fraction of those needs to help people? Of course it is. 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. There are some 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 bureaucratic 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 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 educate our 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. The very schools that 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 workers. The 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 minds 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 the 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. Hill]. 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 courtesy with all of our staff. One word, wonderful work, headed by our clerk, Tony McCann, Bob Kinsely, Sue Quintius, Mike Myers, Joanne Orndoff, and Jennifer MacKay. All have done wonderful work. Jennifer is on detailed 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 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 has been invaluable. I want him to know how much all of us appreciate it. He has done a splendid job of representing 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 condemn 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 to me?

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

Mr. Obey. As the gentleman knows, Will Rogers said once that when two politicians agree, 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 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 here, 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 been with us for the last 60 years. It has ended. Social Security 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, and that 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 fact 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 the House passed last year, total Federal spending will continue to grow by hundreds of billions of dollars.
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 $302 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 J ob 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 providing 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. How could 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 job programs, $934.6 million for community health centers, $877 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 mandatory food 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 $30,000 and $300,000, 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, you can see 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 of the cuts. It spends $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 suggested 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 50,000 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?
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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?
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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 eli-
molated. He is beating a dead horse. We have already said 15 times we support the elimi-
nation 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 train-
ing is socialistic.

I ran into one young woman in the community of Rhinelander in my dis-

trict, 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 hus-

band split because her husband had beaten the living devil out of her time after time after time. She was home-

less for 2 months last year, yet she kept going to school day after day, trying to make a living, a living, 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 don’t 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 com-

parison to the caviar given to the peo-

ple at the top of the income scale.

The gentleman says 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 sug-
gested increases. What the gentleman from Louisiana tells me any collo-

leagues 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 tak-
ers rather than taxpayers. They will not be inactive, participating citizens in our community. We see them on tele-

vision. 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 capitalist system, in the free market system knows full well if you do not in-

vest you will not get a return. Bottom line.

Now, I only have 4 minutes. The edu-
cational budget that is presented by this bill would be opposed by the ranking member of this subcommittee, the Re-

publican with whom I served for so many years, Silvio Conte. He would not countenance this bill. And Bill Natch-
er, the former chairman of this sub-

committee, I am sure, is 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 are going to have 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 atten-
tion 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 Edu-
cation, when he first came into office, saying that he wanted to have a revo-

duction in this country. Let me tell you what Secretary Bell believes of this budget, not the gentleman from Wis-
consin [Mr. Obey], not the gentleman from Maryland, [Mr. Horner], not the Demo-

cratic side of the aisle, but Terrell Bell, the Secretary of Education under Ronald Reagan.

Statement, July 13, 1995: “The dras-
tic and unwarranted education cuts made in this year’s Congres-
sional appropriations Subcommittee,” this sub-
committee, this bill, “must be restored or we will undercut community efforts to help better educate our children.” Ronald Reagan’s Secretary of Edu-
cation.

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

My colleagues, the person calling for the rejection of this bill and opposition to political extremism was Secretary Terrell Bell of the Reagan administra-

tion. Reject this bill.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chair-

man, I yield 4 minutes to the gentle-

man from Pennsylvania [Mr. Good-

ling].

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I was

like to pick up on the last couple words that were just mentioned: educational excellence. I want to stand here today to take partial responsi-

bility 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 have any new program you added. We do not want to know how much money 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. STOKES. 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. CHABOT. As the leadership of this committee has 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 O'LEARY, as well as the leadership of the distinguished ranking member, Mr. DAVID OBEY of Wisconsin.
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Nevertheless, I want to acknowledge the leadership and fairness of our distinguished subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. JOHN O'LEARY, as well as the leadership of the distinguished ranking member, Mr. DAVID OBEY of Wisconsin.
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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 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 at the Department of 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 our success in 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 cohort, excluding the chemotherapeutic program and the immune reconstitution program?

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentlewoman from Maryland will continue 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. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from California [Ms. Pelosi], a member of the subcommittee.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the 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. 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.

Before 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, our priorities, our sense of 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 on education, and, in pursuit of punishment for 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 decided to focus the dramatic 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 my 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 wealthy, which will add $90 billion to the deficit. I would also like to thank the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Young], for his assistance. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.
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 look to them to judge whether the Congress of 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 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 a 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 mistake about this bill. 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 disgraceful, 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 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 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 clear: the 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].

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, or 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 has resources to defend the American people against an aggressive world. 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 tremendous 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 amount is $138,000 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. As the baby 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, and in 10 years, there are going to be more and 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, it is the fact that we have a debt that we need to clear up and that we need to spend 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 mortgage that is $100 less than 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 challenge now is to be less than that, that we 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.

First of all, the more debt we build up, the more interest rates payments will grow. In other words, we lock in and more spending. But more importantly, starting in the year 2006, the first of the baby boom generation begins to retire, and the costs of Social Security and Medicare and 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 enormous 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 amount is $138,000 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. As the baby 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, and in 10 years, there are going to be more and 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, it is the fact that we have a debt that we need to clear up and that we need to spend 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 mortgage that is $100 less than 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 challenge now is to be less than that, that we 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.

First of all, the more debt we build up, the more interest rates payments will grow. In other words, we lock in and more spending. But more importantly, starting in the year 2006, 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, 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 and the Reverend Jerry Falwell dancing in his pulpit. These cuts 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 benefit programs. 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, 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. OBRY. 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 sacrifice, and there is nothing noble in the purpose. But folks, this is not a shared sacrifice, and there is nothing noble in asking our most vulnerable citizens to sacrifice, and there is nothing noble in the purpose. But folks, this is not a shared sacrifice, and there is nothing noble in asking our most vulnerable citizens to sacrifice, and there is nothing noble in asking our most vulnerable citizens to sacrifice.

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 my 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 to try to pass 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 by cutting retraining, and that help could be provided to them if they lose that job.

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 by cutting retraining, and that help could be provided to them if they lose that job.

This bill is so bad it is beyond repair, and I urge my colleagues to vote against it.
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 have. 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 that 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 education 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.

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 house 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 money or trying to balance the budget.

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.

What than 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 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 from the 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 $29 million from Texas for de-occupying $29 million under goals 2000. He voted to take away $29 million under Goals 2000. He voted to take away $21 million from Texas and $29 million under goals 2000. He voted to take $21 million from Texas. He voted to take away $21 million from Texas for dislocated worker training.

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

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 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. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong opposition to the Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Appropriations. 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 our country including provisions which 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.

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 merely 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.
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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 it's women athletic program or that it is meeting the needs and abilities of women students and is 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 worker rights 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, 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 not protected 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, any institution 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 exceed 15 percent of its total expenditures.

This definition of “political activity” is 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 that are what they call 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 Federal spending? 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 a socially responsible manner?

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.

Compulsory education is assured 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 last one we discussed, 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 reach the President's 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 another 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 spend $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.

Governors want 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 the 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 "hogwash." I agree with him.

Statements of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations seem to indicate that he believes that the philosophy, which he will 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.

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.

As 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 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.

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 develop reading, writing, math, 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 $2,620 in 1996. Republicans would cut $1.5 billion in 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 chance to be a part of this partnership, and we want to do this. 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 $683 million and would deny training opportunities to 28,668 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 800,000 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. If this cuts overseas 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 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? 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?" Not a one said, "Okay, we are going to cut here, we are going to cut there, we are going to cut this."

"No, we were told, 'This is where you should cut.'" Not a one 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 arch-itects of this. For 30 or 40 years the people who controlled 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.'" We have got some more money, 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 there," 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?"

"And, yes, we have got you out there. We could not have got you out there. I know we have got everybody could go and say, 'Here is more money, because we are afraid to say 'no.'" We, we have got you out there. We have got enough money, because we are afraid to say 'no.'"
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 home in the primaries. The Republican leadership tells us, "We are going to have to cut money for the American people."

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, life and education 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 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 to educate themselves.

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 cut spending, to be obedient to the will of the American people. And was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, yield 1 1/2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. BECERRA).

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 1/2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. BECERRA).

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Chairman, we hear in this debate that we are being told that some programs have to be trimmed. I have to trim the tree for 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 of 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, yield 1 1/2 minutes to the gentleman 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 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 some funding. I wonder which 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 his proposal.

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 dear in the long run.

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; 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 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.

For 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 new in the well-being, health, and safety of all Americans. 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 and America that 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 have done everything, and more, the 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 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 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 antwomen provisions—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, compared to the 38 programs that existed less than 20 years ago. The Department has forever changed the way Washington works.

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, compared to the 38 programs that existed less than 20 years ago. The Department has forever changed the way Washington works.

Mr. Chairman, the Department of Education is going to cost us dear, in the long run, dollars. 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.

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, 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 bill.
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 crisis.

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 interdepartmental 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 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 319 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 in the past, and in both circumstances we needed 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 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. 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 into the economy.

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

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 into the economy. I was just a little concerned about head start training. I know about Head Start.

Mr. Chairman, I yield a 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-based 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 spending 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 $225 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, LIVINGS- TON, and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FREELINGHUYSEN], 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
Mr. OBEY. I am awaiting my last speaker. I yield 1½ minutes to myself in the hope that the gentleman may have something more to say.

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 will go down an unending scale to 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-2s 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 in a way that profits the company instead of unifying 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].

Mrs. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 2127 with regret, because I support the 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 $37 million.

The bill cuts funding for seniors as well, including reducing the National Senior Volunteer Corps by $21 million and cutting seniors’ 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 instead of 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. 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. 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 can 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 like America in the 1890’s.

Mr. Chairman, like the days of the Robber Barons, we shall see 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 does not have the best interests of 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, I judge by that goal, however, we are already in a crisis. Wages and incomes have been flat for 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% of income earners 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 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 made it. 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 engaging in dangerous jobs and preparing 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 meager, 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 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. Chair, I yield myself the balance of the time.

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

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chair, 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 $5 billion on a base of $70 billion.

What I really take issue with is I think 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. Chair, 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. Chair, 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 the R E C O R D, "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.

Amendments offered or offered on behalf of a Member designated in the R E C O R D, 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.

An amendment by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY];

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

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

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 amendment, and 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 on bloc by the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI].

Debate on each of the following amendments—identified by their designation in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—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];

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];

Amendment by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STOKES]; and

Amendment by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] proposing to amend title VI of the bill;

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 of the Whole may accredit priority in recognition to a Member who has caused an amendment to be printed in the designated place in the report, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent of the amendment, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report.

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 amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question, if offered by the Member designated:

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

Text of the amendment is as follows:

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

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. Chair, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chair, 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?

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

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

Mr. Chair, 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 $2.1 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 permit to fund its portion of the International Labor Organization’s International Program for the Elimination of Child Labor and to carry out other human
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 a clerical error that occurred in 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 Istock 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 Istock 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 drafting errors 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 your attitude 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 concerns. I certainly 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 of the measure.

The measure designated 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 $3,126,672,000 shall be for carrying out title II, part A of such Act, and $65,000,000 shall be for carrying out section 402 of such Act, $7,300,000 shall be for carrying out section 403 of such Act, $35,000,000 shall be for carrying 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 CITIZENS

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

FEDERAL UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS AND ALLOWANCES

For payments under 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 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. 901-941; 39 U.S.C. 3001a(1)(2)(3); title III of the Social Security Act, as amended (42 U.S.C. 502-504); title II of the Social Security Act, as amended, for carrying out 5 U.S.C. 8501-8523, and sections 225, 229, 231-235, 231, 243-244, and 240(d)(1), 250(d)(3), title II of the Trade Act 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)(e)(1), (m), (n)(3), and 216(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 202(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 administrative expenses for amnesty for persons who had an independent retirement plans in their State employment service agencies prior to 1990, 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, as determined by the Employment Security Administration account in the Unemployment Trust Fund, and of which the sums available in the allocation for activities carried out by the Employment Security Administration, including financial assistance authorized by section 104(d) of the Social Security Act, as amended, and to the Black Lung Disability Trust Fund as authorized by section 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, 1998.

In addition, for making repayable advances to the Black Lung Disability Trust Fund in the current fiscal year after September 15, 1995, costs incurred in 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 303 of the Wagner-Peyser Act; section 217 of the Immigration and Nationality Act; sections 401 et seq. of the Social Security Act, as amended (42 U.S.C. 502±504); and section 105 of the Developmental Disabilities Act, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1121±1126), $83,505,000, together with not to exceed $40,574,000, 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 96-304, 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 provisions of this Act, and as provided by section 104 of Public Law 96-304, for such Corporation: Provided, That not to exceed $10,603,000 shall be available for administrative expenses of the Corporation without regard to fiscal year limitations, and to such extent that the average weekly insured unemployment (AWIU) for fiscal year 1996 is estimated 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 under 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, as amended, may be obligated by the State operated Employment Service and Unemployment Insurance automation efforts, notwithstanding cost allocation principles prescribed by 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 950(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, section 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, 1996.

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 Administration and the balance of such support of Federal Employees’ Compensation Act: Provided, That the Secretary of Labor is authorized to ac-
pcept, retain, and spend, until in the name of the Department of Labor, all sums of money ordered to be paid to the Sec-
retary of Labor, in accordance with terms and conditions of the Consent Judgment in Civil Ac-
tion No. 91-0027 of the United States District Court for the District of the Northern Mari-
aña Islands: 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 cer-
tificates 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 cer-
tificates under title I of the Migrant and Seasonal Agricultural Worker Protection Act, 29 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.

BLACK LUNG DISABILITY TRUST FUND (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For payments from the Black Lung Dis-
ability Trust Fund, $985,447,000, of which $986,474,000 shall be available until Septem-
ber 30, 1997, for payment of all benefits as au-
thorized by section 9501(d)(1), (2), (4), and (7), of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, as amended, and interest on advances as au-
thorized by section 9501(c)(2) of that Act, and of which $26,045,000 shall be available for transfer to Employment Standards Adminis-
tration, Salaries and Expenses, and $31,621,000 for transfer to Departmental Man-
gagement, Salaries and Expenses, and $287,000 for transfer to Departmental Management, Salaries and Expenses, and for operation and administration of the Black Lung Benefits program as authorized by sec-
tion 9501(d)(5)(A) of that Act: Provided, That any unexpended balance as may be nec-
essary may be charged to the subsequent year appropriation for the payment of comp-
ensation, interest, or other benefits for any period subsequent to those of the cur-
rent year: Provided further, That in addition such amounts shall be paid from this fund to-
ward miscellaneous receipts as the Secretary of Labor determines to be the admin-
istrative expenses of the Department of the Treasury for administering the fund during the cur-
tent fiscal year: Provided further, That in the case 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 104(g)(1) 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 payment of $263,965,000 including not to exceed $65,319,000 which shall be the maximum amount avail-
able for grants to States under section 23(g) of the Occupational Safety and Health Act, which grants shall be no less than fifty per-
cent of the costs of State occupational safety and health programs required to be incurred under such grants, together with such sums as may be authorized by section 18 of the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970; and, in addition, notwithstanding section 131 of the Migrant and Seasonal Agricultural Worker Protection Act, the Secretary of Labor is authorized to promote health and safety education and training in the mining community through cooperative pro-
grams with States, industry, and safety asso-
ciations, and any funds available to the Dep-
artment may be used, with the approval of the Secretary, 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 113 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.
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The language under this heading in Public Law 85-67, as amended, is further amended by adding the following before the last period: "and there is established an Investment in Reinvention Fund (IRF), which shall be available to invest in projects of the Department designed to produce investments that improve 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 $3,615,000 may be derived from the Employment Security Administration account in the Unemployment Trust Fund to carry out the provisions of 38 U.S.C. 4100-4900, inclusive, and Public Law 85-67, as amended, 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 Title I 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 direct or indirect, or, or to contract for services of a person under 18 years of age, or by indirect means, such as lease, or to provide 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.

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

SEC. 103. 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 at part 1926 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 adopt 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 expend funds designated for the enforcement of an interim fall protection standard which adds height requirements referenced at subparagraph (B) of paragraph (2) of §1926.500 of this subpart to paragraph (B) of §1926.501 of this subpart, which shall be adjusted in accordance with the American National Standards Institute standard ANSI Z359.5 1990, adopted and used in cooperation with the American National Standards Institute safety standard ANSI Z245.5 1990, adopted and used in cooperation with the American National Standards Institute safety standard ANSI Z245.2 1992.

SEC. 104. 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. 105. None of the funds made available in this Act for the years 1995 and 1996 may be used to establish or maintain, or to contract for services of a person under 18 years of age, or by indirect means, such as lease, or to provide 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."

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

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

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume. The Secretary finds that the operation of a Hazardous Occupation Order Number 2 (HO 2) with respect to incidental and occasional driving by minors 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, adopted and used in cooperation with the American National Standards Institute safety standard ANSI Z245.2 1992.

The Secretary shall adopt 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 expend funds designated for the enforcement of an interim fall protection standard which adds height requirements referenced at subparagraph (B) of paragraph (2) of §1926.500 of this subpart to paragraph (B) of §1926.501 of this subpart, which shall be adjusted in accordance with the American National Standards Institute standard ANSI Z359.5 1990, adopted and used in cooperation with the American National Standards Institute safety standard ANSI Z245.5 1990, adopted and used in cooperation with the American National Standards Institute safety standard ANSI Z245.2 1992.

The Secretary shall adopt 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 expend funds designated for the enforcement of an interim fall protection standard which adds height requirements referenced at subparagraph (B) of paragraph (2) of §1926.500 of this subpart to paragraph (B) of §1926.501 of this subpart, which shall be adjusted in accordance with the American National Standards Institute standard ANSI Z359.5 1990, adopted and used in cooperation with the American National Standards Institute safety standard ANSI Z245.5 1990, adopted and used in cooperation with the American National Standards Institute safety standard ANSI Z245.2 1992.

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 major cities and rural areas, 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 this program 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 the work of this transition. 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 benefits 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 2.5 percent. We have provided 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.

Language is also included to prohibit OSHA from issuing a standard on ergonomic protection. This agency serves a noble purpose, but it needs urgent priority. The majority side has 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.

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

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

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

Mr. Chairman, working people pay most of the costs to support the activities of Government. Yet the activities of Government that are most being chipped 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 top 1 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.

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 in a 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 train each one of the workers, is being reduced. Further, the need for 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 debate.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlelady who is introducing this small but significant bill. As I said, this is one of this 114-hour discussion on title I, focused on the problems that it presents to American workers.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking Republican chair, my friend, for being so articulate 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, 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 33 percent in safety and health enforcement. 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 come by, and that would 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 miners 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 cuts 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...
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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 or death. I think it's wrong 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 1971 and that 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 declined by as much as 22%.” In fact, OSHA's own data tell us 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. The study 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 and a major printing company.

During the 1980s and my first five years with this employer the department's focus was compliance based. During this time period our accident rates and workers' compensation 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 occurred, namely the occurrence of and not compliance. 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 a more historical focus on managing safety and not compliance. With the return to our historical focus on accident prevention, we achieved an accident rate reduction of 16%, a loss rate reduction of 35% 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 60% of their 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 minimal 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, programs for 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. 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 Pennsylvania, the state where 33 percent of the enforcement budget is cut, 33 percent is cut from an already small workforce. With the number of inspectors that OSHA has presently, it would take them 86 years to inspect every business establishment in America once 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 death sentence 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 N.R.A. 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 outside interest.

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 in the United States. Fifty-six thousand workers die in a year. Fifty-six thousand workers die 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 on the job.

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 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 Hartberl 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, the head of our authorizing committee that is out to assassinate and destroy OSHA resides, on December 13, 1993, a Mr. Reaver, the 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. Reaver 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 has gone down. We must save OSHA from this micro-management, and the authorizing language in this bill, which is part of the appropriations for appropriation, is part of the same 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 some of the nations leaders 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 red tape, 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 trucks.

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 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 rules and regulations 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 business worker. When 8 out of 10 violations are paperwork violations, you can have a safe workplace but it may not be OSHA safe.

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 the American worker without funding OSHA at the extent that people 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 provisons 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 a business 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 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. We could 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 provide 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 work in this country have told me they are frightened by the new majority's efforts to gut workplace health and safety rules and supports.

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 workplace injuries and illnesses. Just in my region in the last 6 months there have been 11 work-related fatalities, a record number, two electrocutions, a
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 socially beneficial 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 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, or 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 promote their clearinghouse, a clearinghouse at a cost of only $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 a economic strike. 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 use, the employer has the right to hire permanent replacement workers in an 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.

It means that a group of Kansas City employees would have lost all the hard-earned money that was contributed to their employer’s profit sharing plan when the employer failed to forward their payroll deductions.

It means that more than 13,000 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 powerhouse. In fact, a recent Brookings Institution report presented the PWBA as “The most highly leveraged operation in the entire Federal government.” On average a single employee of
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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.

The federation dollars of 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 would be able to commit fraud with no repercussions. And 30,000 requests for information and assistance from working families of disabled workers is an indication that 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.

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, the massive crumbling 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 in guarding against unfair labor practices by both employers and employees.

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 circumstances 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 obliging the provider of 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. But, abortion, St. Mary’s is 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 to one 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 reauthorize the St. Mary’s rule for federal 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 receiving Federal funding.

Members of this body will not have the chance to vote on the Kolbe-Price-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. Unfortunately, with the changes made in the full committee, the bad cuts, but 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 their findings are retaliatory, and these actions, by both unions and employers, which are so egregious that they prevent a fair election from taking place. They want to enjoin state rules that are otherwise valid.

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 performance of an independent counsel over an anti- 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 under those circumstances.

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 learn 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.

In 1974, Donnie was in an accident while at work. He lost his arm and was off work for 6 months. But he went back to work and worked for another 16 years.

That is what is wrong with this legislation. Time 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 independent agencies. 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, the NLRB serves the workers and the 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. 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 New York to tell this House about someone who they call a company, the Kentucky [Mr. WARD].

Mr. BROWNBACK. 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 that we can balance.

The cruellest 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.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman 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 170,000 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 who work for the Government are the kind that are in every community 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 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 provisions 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 counterfeit 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 orders I, my colleagues, and you, the House, would be forced to vote against any amendment to strike those 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 money managers. They say if you go to that cherished American right of withholding your labor, you are fired, you are fired. You are a woman, kids at home, you are trying to make it, you have this job, you are fired, you lose health. Same thing with I. 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 withheld their labor under the law, legally withheld 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 yawning 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, you are 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 1993 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 want their money to be there when they need it, 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, beginning with Secretary 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 economic 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," not happen. 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 think and begin to do things with other people's money that 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 invest in 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 via Wharton 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 be cut. 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. OLIVER].

Mr. OLIVER. 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 an accident. He 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 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.

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 development and job training programs.

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 do it. Who is going to do it? And who will they do it to? I think we ought to ask who is going to do it. Who is going to do it? And who will they do it to?
Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I again thank the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBIEY], 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 to tell us what is 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. It is not fair to talk about someone who traveled 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 provide health and dental benefits that were required under the terms of the contract.

Beverly and her coworkers 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 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 women and workers, 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.
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 with 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 businessmen. Those who are business people will understand it. Lawyers are not deal makers, they are deal takers. My colleagues 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 CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES] and a Member opposed will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES].

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, number 70.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. 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 $3,185,441,000, on line 16, strike $2,936,154,000, and on line 21 strike $3,180,441,000 and insert $3,185,441,000.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, number 70.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, number 70.

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 CHAIRMAN. 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, attacks 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, a highly skilled workforce, while our technology driven and increasingly changing labor market requires a highly skilled workforce, and while the American business community recognizes the importance of training, the majority on the committee voted against 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 they so 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 training needed 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.

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 graduates earn approximately 19 percent more than their non-skilled counterparts. Skilled college graduates earn over 40 percent more than their non-skilled 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 $135 million cut in school-to-work, 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. The IG also reported that 35 percent of the participants turned over to crime. In August of this year, the IG testified that the program is being asked to address education failures, physical dependencies, and emotional and physical problems. The IG said in testimony that the program is to be 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 failed to produce 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 proven successful 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 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 permitted 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. 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 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 just one, 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 $6.68 an hour. After being laid off, she entered classroom training to become a nurse. She completed her classwork with flying colors and passed the licensing exam. She now works at the Robert Ballard Rehabilitation Hospital, earning $12.86 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 a job 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. DICKEN], a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. DICKEN. 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 so that because I am in the fast-food/taurant 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 nothing 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. 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 a kid gets off one 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 them.

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 them in 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 off one 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 them.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LEVIN].

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I have been listening to the explanations for the majority position. Your bill is extremism run amuck. It rips whatever common sense. The fact of the matter is that 11½ minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I think 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 Henry Penny. The world is going to come apart at the seams.

Now, I say goodby; $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 another way. 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.

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 think 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 Henry Penny. The world is going to come apart at the seams.

Now, I say goodby; $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 another way. 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.

Mr. CLAY 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 common sense. The fact of the matter is that 11½ minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I think 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 Henry Penny. The world is going to come apart at the seams.

Now, I say goodby; $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 another way. 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.

Mr. CLAY 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 common sense. The fact of the matter is that 11½ minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I think 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 Henry Penny. The world is going to come apart at the seams.

Now, I say goodby; $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 another way. 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.

Mr. CLAY 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 common sense. The fact of the matter is that 11½ minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I think 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 Henry Penny. The world is going to come apart at the seams.

Now, I say goodby; $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 another way. 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.

Mr. CLAY 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 common sense. The fact of the matter is that 11½ minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I think 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 Henry Penny. The world is going to come apart at the seams.

Now, I say goodby; $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 another way. 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.
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, for the last 6 years, 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 duplicative 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.
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Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 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.

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 workforce 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 workforce programs. There are going to be 193,000
out of 10) ob 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. 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, we need to look at the 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 1½ 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, 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 the 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 redsigned the Job Training Partnership Act. In a bipartisan way we agreed to a 20-percent cut in that program. They cannot claim 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 authorizing 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 gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE].

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES] for his honesty. He wants to get rid of 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.

I do not know what you are saying to the American people; lets just get to 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, etcetera.

When you look at the authority and the amount of money available, you cannot do any of those things. So basically, the amendment gives 40 minutes of talk, zero dollars in relationship to doing the kind of things Members are talking about. I just want to make sure that everybody understands.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania [Ms. GOODLING].

Ms. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, the true story is with the amendment, 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, etcetera.

When you look at the authority and the amount of money available, you cannot do any of those things. So basically, the amendment gives 40 minutes of talk, zero dollars in relationship to doing the kind of things Members are talking about. I just want to make sure that everybody understands.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. WYNN].

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman 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 the amount of 27 percent. People ask me at town meetings, why do we not have apprentice-ship programs like they have in Germany to give our kids technical skills? They say, Congressman, our jobs are gone. 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.
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 more jobs. They 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 restoration came from the liberals on that subcommittee, not one vote. They voted to keep programs that discriminated as higher priority than Head Start, so we ought to stop the talk.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 45 seconds to the gentlewoman 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 a 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 Texas [Mr. BONILLA] 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, 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 program that has been proven 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 piece 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 the middle class. 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 amendment 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. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BONILLA].

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BONILLA].

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment. The Chair will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. OBEY

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. 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 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 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 record in terms of legitimate 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 this way we cannot do 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 to legislate for this. These legislative riders 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 do not 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 many 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. Many days after they went on strike, the 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 1. Unless Members have read it, if they have 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 that money to save lives, or keep your workers safe, 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 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 let us debate it. 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 my time.

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 suit 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 of the day, and we have fewer absence, 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 not asking the Administration 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.

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, is the amendment 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 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 has a very important role in setting the stage for 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 of 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 $4 million that the Surgeon General 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 an incredibly ill-conceived provision generally referred to as the Istock 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 would put the American 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 helping displaced workers, gun clubs being allowed to do 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 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 silo, nonoperating baler by teenage employees under 18.

Unfortunately, efforts to change this regulation through high level 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 700 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 House Committee, 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 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.

Once 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. NORWOOD. 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 accurate number.

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.

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...
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does the same thing whirls 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 looks at every job to determine if it has become a disorder waiting to happen is based on 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 for those risks. OSHA'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, 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. 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 off $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 Oney amendment, says, direct lending is the only way to go, yet very skilled 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 led 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 slide, and it will not see the light of day. The Oney 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 urge my colleagues to do the right thing and vote "yes" on the Oney amendment.

Mr. OBEY. 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 there are strikes, 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 from Georgia [Mr. Norcross] 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 the 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 legislative language 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 for 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 this remark.)

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, the kind of so-called science; the Republicans on this side do not know this when they see it.

Let me talk to 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 by our workers.

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 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. Chairman, 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 they deserve 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 line.

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. And 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. Chair, 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 in other 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 when 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 bureaus 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 get this piece of legislation. It needs to be defeated and the bill as a whole needs to be passed.

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 the kind of language we are talking about was protected. Not one in that 14 years. It was not protected last year 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 the interest of their employers.

The other side believes that we are going to have massive problems, unless these people are minutely watched by
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 the 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 30 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 handmen, 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. 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 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, a 15- and 16-year-olds are supposed 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 industry ought to be reprimanded by a regulation that has to do with benefits for injuries as associated with this problem. And that is what this language does.

Let me simply state, in response to the gentlewoman from Oklahoma [Mr. ISTOK], 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, 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 fund that organization.” 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 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 on 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 am 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. 11, legislation which has 119 bipartisan sponsors. 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
This is a jobs issue as well as a safety issue. This small change will encourage supermarket executives 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.


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. 2277).

Among other things, this amendment will allow the Department of Labor (DOL) to continue issuing huge fines against grocery stores for situations where there is clearly no risk of injury to 16 and 17 year old employees. As you well know, the amendment seeks to prevent hazardous conditions under 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 Congressmen 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). This law requires that employees be provided with training and equipment to upgrade or purchase new equipment that meets the ANSI standards; and finally, job opportunities 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 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. Legislative language has no place in an appropriations bill.

This bill addresses complex and controversial issues—from abortion to workers’ rights. The American people deserve and expect us to address these issues before they are 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 enforce Title IX enforcement—that the 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. In this bill, court decisions in labor cases are overruled.

The demolitions will not end here. The supporters are attempting to give political payback 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 in school. The language in this bill would halt Title IX enforcement. Intercollegiate athletic opportunities for female students—hammered 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 obstetrician/gynecologists. One provision 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 pri-vileges 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 these unnecessary and outrageous provisions.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of Mr. Obey’s amendment to strike the
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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 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, 10 minutes on each side.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California [Ms. 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, if not resolved in accordance of a court order or 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 the issue is when these en 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 very potent 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 gentleman 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 gentlewoman 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 any ordinary speaker—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.

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.

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 to a final settlement that 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 10(j) injunctive setting 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 basically it 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? Will 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 the job they destroy the workers of this Nation, the Republicans, the majority, has moved in this appropriation 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 had for at least 50 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 NLRB. 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 a Gary Enterprise situation. The Board and the court were 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 not to 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 room 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 today. It could 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 appropriate 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 resort to this expedient and try to extend 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, 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 OSHA.

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 on this side as well as in the President.

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 racket 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, 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 tender his hands? I do not have the 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 Com-
mittee on Economic and Educational Opportunities. We concur with the work that has gone on here in the Com-
mittee on Appropriations. These provi-
sions will give you and the general statements by the Committee on Ap-
propriations 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 ergo-

nomic 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 re-
ducing fatalities and workplace acci-
dents rather than on developing regula-
tions to protect workers from repeti-
tive injuries and other ergonomic haz-
ards, regulations which will cost jobs, create paperwork, and will not work.

What we do in the area re-

petitive-motion injuries is use common sense and not look for a bureaucractic paperwork maze to solve our problems.

The provision on 10(j) injunctions re-

quires the Board to pursue injunc-
tive relief to the point of uniformity 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 re-

quires 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 Massa-

chusetts [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 mistakes, b oss, b 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 al-

ows OSHA to set standards protecting workers from repetitive-motion inju-

ries, and that is clearly going to be one of the largest of the issues of the com-
munication and information revolution that we are going to be having in the 21st century.

So, it is an extremely important amendment that we adopt and make certain that we go ahead with the abil-

ity 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 em-

ployment. The provisions that are before us today 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, in-

juries rates increased. Workers’ com-

pensation 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 amazing little evidence to support a mandatory standard.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, how much time is remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from California has 2½ minutes re-

aining.

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

In that time I want to urge our col-

leagues to support this amendment which supports American workers, and
to give to the people in America con-
cerned about ergonomics the same op-
portunity 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 col-

leagues to vote for fairness and against that proposal in the appropriations bill. Please vote for the Pelosi amend-

ment 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 gentle-

man from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], the rank-

ing member of the committee.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, how much time remains?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from California has 2 minutes remain-

ing.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, there are a lot of people here that seem to laugh at OSHA as a pointy-headed agency. If you need a homework lesson today, 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 atten-
tion because I used to work with asbes-

tos.

What I found out, after I started to dig into it, is that Manville Corp. knew since 1939 that their product killed peo-
ple. 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 is-

sues, 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 deci-
sions.

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 in-

formation and based on the best possible medical evidence.

If we want to toss this into the politi-

cal arena and have worker health de-
cided 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 remains 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 inter-
ferring 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 ei-

ther 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 whim 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 backside 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 strong disagreement with 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 lives of American workers, enshrined in the National Labor Relations Act of 1935, more difficult. 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].

Mr. O'BAH. 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.
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 for the fiscal year 1996 and any subsequent fiscal year.

(b) PROVISIONAL.—In the case of any appropriation bill for fiscal year 1996 engrossed by the House of Representatives on or after the date this bill is engrossed by the House of Representatives and thereafter, the date of enactment of this Act, 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) APPROPRIATIONS.—For purposes of this section, the appropriation of the House of Representatives and the appropriation of the Senate shall be considered to be appropriation bills for the fiscal year 1996 and any subsequent fiscal year.

(d) DEFINITION.—As used in this section, the term "lock-box amendment" means any general or special appropriation bill, and any bill or joint resolution making supplemental, deficiency, or continuing appropriations through the end of any 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 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. BROWN] 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. UPSON, 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 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, quite often, 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 in the 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 to the Appropriations Committee, that the 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 was a major issue was on the rescissions bill, when major reductions in the existing fiscal year's budget were considered by this House. In that bill, in committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTA] 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 then superimposed the Brewer 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 in the bill, 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 gentleman from California, Mr. 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. The matter, the gentleman from Ohio [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 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, actually this is going to reduce spending and we will use it to reduce spending.

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 respond 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 have had that number of 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 in cut spending 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 anymore.

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 involvement was critical in moving the amendment as quickly as it did move. Let me not forget my colleague, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BRENSTER], 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 one appropriation bill is simply shifted to another.
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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 [Ms. 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 is to bind 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 credit 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 in 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.

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 some-what of a technician in the effort to de- vise 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 and members worked long and hard hours to ensure that lockbox would be more than 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 current 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.

If 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 propose 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. 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 includes the 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 deficit under control. And then, after you 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 us have the courage to come out here and vote for those cuts, it means 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 have the opportunity to 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 invalidates 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 Jersey.

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 that gets 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 620(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 rescissions. I saw them after they accepted a tax cut 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 then distributed as tax dollars, 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 member 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 the freshman from New Jersey 

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico [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 103rd Congress. Think of all the money we could have saved if it had been passed under the previous major.

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 the 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 day we will 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.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STEINHOLM].

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

Mr. STEINHOLM. 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 Berman from Oregon [Mr. KASICH], and I included in our commonsense budget reform bill last year, but this provision was only one of 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 made, 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.

Mr. CRAPo. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute 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 the 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 you, my colleagues, the gentlewoman from Oklahoma [Mr. LARGENT] spoke eloquently on the freshman class. I want to read you from the Fort Lauderdale Sun-Sentinel editorial, "Aplaud House Foley, for 'revolt'":

Congress has played the old shell-and-pea game with this 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 seem determined to make good on their leadership on this issue.

My colleagues, we were sent here from districts across America to serve the taxpayers, not the leadership of House today. Foley today should earn his passage to 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 Foley and me to thank for 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 Brewer-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 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...
Mr. OBEE. 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 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. HOKE. 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 at home who look at home folks 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 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. OBEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BARRETT].

Mr. BARRETT. 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 this side of the aisle get up and talk about 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 the Democrats.

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 infrastructure work, but in 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 any-how afterward, because it will not actually cut the budget in a way that gets long-term and hard to be supplied 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.

Mr. OBEE. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests of 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. BREESTER] 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. BREWER] 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 a strong and vigorous debate on 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, cutting 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 vote. 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. 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 purpose 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 we choose 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 our 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 unnecessary 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 we also know that we must 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 I urge my colleagues to support it.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the gentleman’s 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 by 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, re- build 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 violence which 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 certain organizations.

Mr. PORTER. Reclaiming my time, I ask the subcommittee chairman if he can address the concerns I just mentioned.

Mr. PORTER. 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.

I ask the subcommittee chairman if he can address the concerns I just mentioned?

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the willingness of Mr. PORTER to present the reauthorization bill, I directed the National Academy of Sciences to conduct a 4-year review of the Census Bureau’s effort to produce accurate 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.
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The text of the amendment offered as a substitute for the amendment is as follows:

Part 2, amendment No. 2-2 offered by Mr. GREENWOOD 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 offered by Mr. GREENWOOD.

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:

- Provides that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] is also a 30-minute amendment, with 15 minutes being controlled by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GREENWOOD], 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. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, amendment No. 2, as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. GREENWOOD.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, amendment No. 2, as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. GREENWOOD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GREENWOOD] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the time will be fungible. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GREENWOOD].

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

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, amendment No. 2, as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. GREENWOOD.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, amendment No. 2, as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. GREENWOOD.

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. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, amendment No. 2, as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. GREENWOOD.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, amendment No. 2, as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. GREENWOOD.

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. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, amendment No. 2, as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. GREENWOOD.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, amendment No. 2, as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. GREENWOOD.

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. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, amendment No. 2, as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. GREENWOOD.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, amendment No. 2, as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. GREENWOOD.

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.
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 simply amends the existing program. 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 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.

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. 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, vote for 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 1985, 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 centralize it into the Wards program into the comprehensive health care programs for low-income women and children.

Both of these programs already provide family planning services, so this amendment does not eliminate 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 $400 million 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 nonprofit 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 already under 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 health care 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 adults 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 services for our people, I 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 [Ms. 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 are determined 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 with 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 daugther 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] would replace title X with $553 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.

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 dependence 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 decrease the number of sexually transmitted diseases, including HIV, and 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.

The clinics provide a number of services, including natural family planning, not just for abortions. The clinics provide screening services for STD's—some test for HIV—cervical cancer deaths; when we are trying to decrease the number of sexually transmitted diseases, including HIV, and 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.

The clinics provide a number of services, including natural family planning, not just for abortions. The clinics provide screening services for STD's—some test for HIV—cervical cancer deaths; when we are trying to decrease the number of sexually transmitted diseases, including HIV, and 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.

The clinics provide a number of services, including natural family planning, not just for abortions. The clinics provide screening services for STD's—some test for HIV—cervical cancer deaths; when we are trying to decrease the number of sexually transmitted diseases, including HIV, and 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.

The clinics provide a number of services, including natural family planning, not just for abortions. The clinics provide screening services for STD's—some test for HIV—cervical cancer deaths; when we are trying to decrease the number of sexually transmitted diseases, including HIV, and 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.
X services were not provided, between 12 million and 21 million unintended pregnancies would occur each year, rather than the 400,000 occurring today. The Greenwood-Lowey amendment restores funding for this critical program. The amendment has a 2 to 1 vote margin in both Chambers and under the Livingston-Smith compromise which makes needed reforms in the Nation’s family planning effort.

Mr. LIVINGTON. 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 Federal 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. It redirects 1/3 of the funds now used for title X to the States to administer their own family planning programs. As many of my colleagues know, the Federal Government spends 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 Smith compromise leaves this money and this program as it 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 recognize the right of minors to receive $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 compromise saves $33 million from overhead costs and allows that money to go directly to 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 parliamentary review. 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 contents 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 the lack of accountability. 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 already prohibited under the Hyde amendment. The pro-life side knows 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. 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.

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 they will argue that the Greenwood amendment restores controls that the proabortion side favors about childbirth. In 1993, for example, Planned Parenthood clinics directly provided 134,277 abortions, but only provided pre-natal 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.

Just this month, a pro-life Member got hold of an “Action Alert” from Planned Parenthood of Central Florida—which receives title X funds under the Livingston compromise and took the livingston-smith 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 seems like it has restrictions on funding of abortion, but it does not. The pro-life side has merely restored 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 believes in giving out contraception. And yet, title X funds regularly 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 they will argue that the Greenwood amendment restores controls that the proabortion side favors about childbirth. In 1993, for example, Planned Parenthood clinics directly provided 134,277 abortions, but only provided pre-natal 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.

Just this month, a pro-life Member got hold of an “Action Alert” from Planned Parenthood of Central Florida—which receives title X funds under the Livingston compromise and took the livingston-smith 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.
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 must choose between supporting programs that cost 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 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 abortion services.

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 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 supporting family planning. It is about whether we should continue supporting a failed and less controversial, and more effective at providing family planning services other than abortion services.

Mr. Chairman, I am delighted to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nevada [Ms. 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 $163 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. 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 the point 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 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 under threat of elimination, 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.

Finally 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 amendment.

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, how do they expect us to 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 remind 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 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 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 programs will provide basic infertility services, cancer 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 other organizations' 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 pediatric 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. For any of these women, for any of these 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 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 Florida [Mr. STEARNS].

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 Democratics, 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.
reviewed and revised through the reau-
lorization process. I am certainly will-
ing to consider means testing the pro-
gram. However, I strongly submit that
you can be both pro-choice and pro-life and support the title X family planning
program. Let us be clear what the Smith-Livingston amendment is all about. It is not to
improve family planning around this coun-
try. It is not for women to get bet-
ter access to primary care, which they
now get under the existing title X pro-
gram, which for the most part, is dis-
tributed through State funds for the
States to operate.

What this is is ideological; it is a pay-
back 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 contracep-
tion for that reason. Let us understand
something else: That many of the peo-
ple who are going to be denied family
planning services are still going to
have sex. What we are continually 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 put the American people to-
ward the limit and, unfortunately, reject
the language included in the appro-
priations bill.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I am
pleased to yield 1 minute to the
gentleman from California [Mr. Don-
nan], 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 plant Earth
with the sole exception of the Chinese
oppressor and the American oppressor.
They promote abortion, they lobby for
abortion, and they litigate about
abortion.

How many Members saw the movie, TV
movie, this last few months glorify-
ing Margaret Sanger, the very first
president of Planned Parenthood, still
praised by its rank and file members?
A young talented actress, Dana
Delany, Irish, one time I guess prac-
ticing Catholic, played her in this glo-
ification piece.

Here is a few Sanger quotes, and I
will fade out. She believed that Ne-
groes, as she used the term, and South-
ern Europeans were mentally inferior
to northerners. She said the Jewish
were feebleminded, human
weeds, and a menace to society. The
poor were sinister forces of the hordes
of irresponsibility and imbucility. She
argued that organized attempts to help
the poor were sinister forces of the hordes
of irresponsibility and imbucility. She
argued that organized attempts to help
the poor were sinister forces of the
hordes of irresponsibility and imbucility.

I did not make me so happy, because
I have, after, the 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 in this amendment that I am
proposing, we will put 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 pro-
grams 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.

I found out there was all this con-
troversy. Still could have abortion? De-
cide 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 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 peo-
ple's values would have to be reflected.

I am not sure why I would want to
compete for it. I would just as soon get
rid of title X. 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 admin-
istrations Title X clinics were prohib-
ited from providing abortion counsel-
ing, but Planned Parenthood clinics
continued to provide abortion counsel-
ing 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 gentleman 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 peo-
ple constantly say abortion is fam-
ily planning, and states are allowed to
take title X funds. But if you flip it the
way they are trying to go, what you are really
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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 paying for their American Women. We have heard all sorts of outrageous charges on this floor that title X has caused teen pregnancy. Please, no. Title X 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. $303 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 unwanted 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 as 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.

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 believe why anyone would want to cut the Nation's principal family planning program, one that through preventive medicine saves $95 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 that this program was initialed 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 level of our concern about title X 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 26,000 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 345 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 six 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
Mr. ISTOOK. 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 comprehensive 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 restate 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 spent $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 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ISTOOK].

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Livingston and Smith language and in opposition to the Greenwood language.

Mr. Chairman, I urge opponents of 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, too young to be held accountable, can and do otherwise pursue a course without a parent’s permission, go to a government family planning clinic, without knowledge of parents or family. 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, for which they are reimbursed with my tax dollars.

As a father of five, I don’t want government to be able to set priorities for the use of our scarce Federal 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. 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 proven 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 set aside 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 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
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launderable: (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 Illinois [Mr. FAWELL].

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

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 he may consume to the gentleman 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.

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 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 en- compasses 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 and am pleased that my amendment to the bill's language 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 help those who want it to access 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 in 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 versions of 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 do not.

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 just not affordable and not available 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 hearing of my experience point out all the terrible baggage 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 believe 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 is 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. 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. I 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 to them, "What I need is help." She finally left the clinic with no more help than when she had entered it, to go home and talk to her mother.

Mrs. WALDHOLTZ. 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 Members 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. 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, substance abuse, and other social services.

Health 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 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 all 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, has the Government 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 effective-
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, and 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 women are 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. Where are these women going to turn when title X begins, teen pregnancy rates. In 1970, 5 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 is best for them.

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 1-minute 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 says the right thing. Forty-four 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, we are against escalating welfare costs, we must be. It is 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 [Ms. JOHNSON].

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 for pregnant women and children 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.

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 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 it 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, 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, all have 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.

It is supported 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 is a pro-gestation. 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 interesting that this prevention program has come under attack only after its termination was urged by the Coalition in its "Contract with the American Family." Mr. Chairman, we can't allow special interests to ruin 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 arise 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 members, mainly 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 is the single entry point into the 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.
MESSRS. BARCIA, HOEKSTRA, KILDEE, RAHALL, AND LAFALCE changed their votes from "aye" to "no."
Mr. WILSON changed his vote from "no" to "aye."
So 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 that the House will recess for a minimum of five minutes to permit time within which a vote by electronic device will be taken on each amendment on which the House 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 gentleman from California [Ms. PELOSI] on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noses prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendments en bloc.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

A recorded vote was ordered.

A recorded vote was ordered.
| Amendment Offered by Mr. CRAPo | The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. CRAPo], on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote. The Clerk will redesignate this amendment. The Clerk redesignated the amendment. | RECORDED VOTE | The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded. | The result of the vote was as announced above recorded. | AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LIVINGSTON AS A SUBSTITUTE FOR THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GREENWOOD | The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote 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], on which further proceedings were postponed and which the noes prevailed by a voice vote. The Clerk will redesignate the amendment. The Clerk redesignated the amendment. | RECORDED VOTE | The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded. | The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 373, noes 52, not voting 7, as follows: | [Roll No. 61] | AYES—373 | NOES—52 | [Roll No. 61] | AYES—207 | NOES—207 | [Roll No. 61] | AYES—207 | NOES—207 | [Roll No. 61] | AYES—207 | NOES—207 | [Roll No. 61] | AYES—207 | NOES—207 | 

| Amendment Offered by Mr. CRAPo | The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. CRAPo], on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote. The Clerk will redesignate this amendment. The Clerk redesignated the amendment. | RECORDED VOTE | The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded. | The result of the vote was as announced above recorded. | AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LIVINGSTON AS A SUBSTITUTE FOR THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GREENWOOD | The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote 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], on which further proceedings were postponed and which the noes prevailed by a voice vote. The Clerk will redesignate the amendment. The Clerk redesignated the amendment. | RECORDED VOTE | The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded. | The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 373, noes 52, not voting 7, as follows: | [Roll No. 61] | AYES—373 | NOES—52 | [Roll No. 61] | AYES—207 | NOES—207 | [Roll No. 61] | AYES—207 | NOES—207 | [Roll No. 61] | AYES—207 | NOES—207 | [Roll No. 61] | AYES—207 | NOES—207 | 

| Amendment Offered by Mr. CRAPo | The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. CRAPo], on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote. The Clerk will redesignate this amendment. The Clerk redesignated the amendment. | RECORDED VOTE | The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded. | The result of the vote was as announced above recorded. | AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LIVINGSTON AS A SUBSTITUTE FOR THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GREENWOOD | The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote 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], on which further proceedings were postponed and which the noes prevailed by a voice vote. The Clerk will redesignate the amendment. The Clerk redesignated the amendment. | RECORDED VOTE | The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded. | The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 373, noes 52, not voting 7, as follows: | [Roll No. 61] | AYES—373 | NOES—52 | [Roll No. 61] | AYES—207 | NOES—207 | [Roll No. 61] | AYES—207 | NOES—207 | [Roll No. 61] | AYES—207 | NOES—207 | [Roll No. 61] | AYES—207 | NOES—207 | 

| Amendment Offered by Mr. CRAPo | The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. CRAPo], on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote. The Clerk will redesignate this amendment. The Clerk redesignated the amendment. | RECORDED VOTE | The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded. | The result of the vote was as announced above recorded. | AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LIVINGSTON AS A SUBSTITUTE FOR THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GREENWOOD | The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote 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], on which further proceedings were postponed and which the noes prevailed by a voice vote. The Clerk will redesignate the amendment. The Clerk redesignated the amendment. | RECORDED VOTE | The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded. | The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 373, noes 52, not voting 7, as follows: | [Roll No. 61] | AYES—373 | NOES—52 | [Roll No. 61] | AYES—207 | NOES—207 | [Roll No. 61] | AYES—207 | NOES—207 | [Roll No. 61] | AYES—207 | NOES—207 | [Roll No. 61] | AYES—207 | NOES—207 | 

| Amendment Offered by Mr. CRAPo | The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. CRAPo], on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote. The Clerk will redesignate this amendment. The Clerk redesignated the amendment. | RECORDED VOTE | The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded. | The result of the vote was as announced above recorded. | AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LIVINGSTON AS A SUBSTITUTE FOR THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GREENWOOD | The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote 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], on which further proceedings were postponed and which the noes prevailed by a voice vote. The Clerk will redesignate the amendment. The Clerk redesignated the amendment. | RECORDED VOTE | The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded. | The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 373, noes 52, not voting 7, as follows: | [Roll No. 61] | AYES—373 | NOES—52 | [Roll No. 61] | AYES—207 | NOES—207 | [Roll No. 61] | AYES—207 | NOES—207 | [Roll No. 61] | AYES—207 | NOES—207 | [Roll No. 61] | AYES—207 | NOES—207 | 

| Amendment Offered by Mr. CRAPo | The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. CRAPo], on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote. The Clerk will redesignate this amendment. The Clerk redesignated the amendment. | RECORDED VOTE | The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded. | The result of the vote was as announced above recorded. | AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LIVINGSTON AS A SUBSTITUTE FOR THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GREENWOOD | The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote 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], on which further proceedings were postponed and which the noes prevailed by a voice vote. The Clerk will redesignate the amendment. The Clerk redesignated the amendment. | RECORDED VOTE | The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded. | The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 373, noes 52, not voting 7, as follows: | [Roll No. 61] | AYES—373 | NOES—52 | [Roll No. 61] | AYES—207 | NOES—207 | [Roll No. 61] | AYES—207 | NOES—207 | [Roll No. 61] | AYES—207 | NOES—207 | [Roll No. 61] | AYES—207 | NOES—207 |
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

SO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED AS A SUBSTITUTE FOR THE AMENDMENT ASPennsylvania [Mr. Greenwood].

So the amendment offered as a substitute for the amendment was re-

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—aye 224, noes 204, not voting 7, as follows:

RECORDED VOTE

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

SO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED AS A SUBSTITUTE FOR THE AMENDMENT AS

The CHAIRMAN. Are there additional amendments to title II?

The text of title II is as follows: Title II—DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

HEALTH RESOURCES AND SERVICES ADMINISTRATION
For carrying out sections 301 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act with respect to the administration of vaccines before the effective date of the National Childhood Vaccines Injury Compensation Program Trust Fund, such costs, including the acquisition of real property, the payment of interest subsidies, and that the Congress is promptly notified of any amount for indirect expenses in connection with such grants.

NATIONAL CENTER FOR HUMAN GENOME RESEARCH

For carrying out sections 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, $25,000,000.

NATIONAL LIBRARY OF MEDICINE

For carrying out sections 301 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act with respect to health information communications, $314,200,000, of which $314,200,000 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, $263,488,000. Provided, That funding shall be available for the transfer of five passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; Provided further, That the Director may direct up to 1 percent of the amount made available for this purpose to all National Institutes of Health appropriations to activities the Director may so designate: Provided further, That no such appropriation shall be increased 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 1980, and section 301 of the Public Health Service Act with respect to program management, $1,788,946,000.

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 before fiscal year 1981; and that the Congress is promptly notified of any amount for indirect expenses in connection with such grants.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF DIABETES AND DIGESTIVE AND KIDNEY DISEASES

For carrying out sections 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 GENERAL MEDICAL SCIENCES

For carrying out sections 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 sections 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 sections 301 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act with respect to eye diseases and visual disorders, $314,185,000.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF ENVIROMENTAL HEALTH SCIENCES

For carrying out sections 301 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act with respect to environmental health sciences, $288,896,000.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE ON AGING

For carrying out sections 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 sections 301 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act with respect to arthritis, and musculoskeletal and skin diseases, $241,626,000.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE ON DEAFNESS AND OTHER COMMUNICATION DISORDERS

For carrying out sections 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 sections 301 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act with respect to nursing research, $991,500,000.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE ON ALCOHOL ABUSE AND ALCOHOLISM

For carrying out sections 301 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act with respect to alcohol abuse and alcoholism, $366,607,000.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE ON DRUG ABUSE

For carrying out sections 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 sections 301 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act with respect to mental health, $661,328,000.

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 until September 30, 1981, 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 $320,000,000. 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 vaccine-related claims administered prior to September 30, 1988, pursuant to subtitile 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 claims resolved by the United States Court of Federal Claims related to the administration of vaccines before October 1, 1988, $810,000,000, 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, section 301, and title IV 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 indirect motor vehicle cost 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, the following 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 201 of the Public Health Service Act, to carry out the National Center for Health Statistics surveys.

In addition, $333,000,000, to be derived from the Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund, for carrying out sections 4015, 4021, and 4029 of Public Law 103-322.

NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH

For carrying out sections 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 sections 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 sections 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 sections 301 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act with respect to diabetes and kidney diseases, $771,252,000.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF NEUROLOGICAL DISORDERS AND STROKE

For carrying out sections 301 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act with respect to neurological disorders and stroke, $661,334,000.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF ALLERGY AND INFECTIOUS DISEASES

For carrying out sections 301 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act with respect to allergy and infectious diseases, $1,169,626,000.

NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH

The budget estimates for the Public Health Service, as provided in this Act, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1988, for activities under the jurisdiction of the National Institutes of Health, shall be increased or decreased by the amount of any appropriation made by any other Act, and that the Congress is promptly notified of any such appropriation.
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 Civilian's Family Protection Plan and Survivor Benefit Plan and for medical care of dependents and retired personnel (except Dependent Medical Insurance Trust Funds (10 U.S.C. ch. 55)), for payments pursuant to section 229(b) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 428a), 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 provided, under titles XI, XIV, XVI and XX of the Social Security Act, the latter provided, titles XI, XVIII, and XIX of the Social Security Act, sections 103(c) and 111(d) of the Social Security Act, sections 102(a) and (b) of the Public Health Service Act, the latter provided, the Public Health Service Act, the Clinical Laboratory Improvement Amendments of 1988, and section 4005(e) of Public Law 100±203, not to exceed $55,094,355,000, to remain available until expended.

For making, after May 31, the current fiscal year, payments to States or other non-Federal entities, except as otherwise provided, under titles I, IV±A and D, XVIII, and XIX of the Social Security Act, for the last three months of the current year for unexpected 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 420(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, 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 under title XIX of the Social Security Act, $55,094,355,000, to remain available until expended.

That the amount made available pursuant to section 926(b) of the Public Health Service Act is to be credited to this appropriation and shall remain available until expended.

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 420(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.

OB OPPORTUNITIES AND BASIC SKILLS

For grants to States to aid them in providing programs for assistance under part B of title I 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 as authorized by title IV±E of the Immigration and Nationality Act and section 501 of the Refugee Education Assistance Act of 1980 (Public Law 96±422, 94 Stat. 1617) and under sections 414(a) and 414(b) of the Social Security Act, $934,642,000, which shall be available for obligations under the same program or programs for the same or similar terms and conditions applicable in the prior fiscal year.

SOCIAL SERVICES BLOCK GRANT

For making grants to States pursuant to section 202 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 Programs 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 1988, the Abandoned Infants Assistance Act of 1984 (title B) of the Social Security Act; for making payments under the Community Services Block Grant Act; and for necessary administrative expenses, not to exceed $56,333,000, 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.

FAMILY PRESERVATION AND SUPPORT

For making payments to States for foster care and adoption assistance to States and other eligible entities for activities conducted in such year and in fiscal years 1995 and 1996.

ADMINISTRATION ON AGING

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, 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 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 $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.

OFFICE FOR CIVIL RIGHTS

For expenses necessary for the Office for Civil Rights, $10,249,000, together with not to exceed $2,613,000, 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, $800,000.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Sec. 201. Funds appropriated in this title shall be available for not to exceed $37,000 for official reception and representation expenses 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 AID programs through and with funds provided by the Agency for International Development, the United Nations 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 399A(b)(ii) 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 regular fund 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.

EXTENDING AUTHORITIES UNDER THE MIDDLE EAST PEACE FACILITATION ACT

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent 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.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, there being no objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois, there was no objection.

The Motion was agreed to.

The Speaker agreed to the request of the gentleman from New York.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not intend to object to the request.

Mr. Speaker, I am continuing my concern, and as I do have an approach to this legislation.
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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 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 unilateral 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 and 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 a bill (H.R. 2161) to extend authorities under the Middle East Peace Facilitation Act of 1994 until October 1, 1995, and for other purposes, I 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.