

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

AN APPEAL TO PRESERVE THE U.S. BUREAU OF MINES

SPEECH OF

HON. JAMES L. OBERSTAR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1995

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, minerals are the building blocks of modern industrial society. Americans consume 75 percent of the world's entire minerals production: four billion tons a year—that's 20 tons per capita, the highest per capita mineral consumption of any country in the world.

Yet, our domestic self-sufficiency in minerals has deteriorated over the last decade and a half, as the mining industry has, increasingly, turned to ore deposits that are leaner, deeper and more costly than those of the past.

Minerals exploration has declined in America; new mine development has dropped; and, smelting and refining of American ores have regressed. Yet, mineral demand has increased and will continue to grow. Last year, our output of raw, nonfuel minerals was estimated at \$34 billion—a value growth of about 6 percent over 1993.

In 1974, the year I was elected to Congress, the value of both raw and processed minerals imported into the United States was \$9 billion. Three years later, when former Congressman Jim Santini and I organized the Congressional Minerals Caucus, we pointed out, in a White House meeting with then-President Carter, that mineral imports had jumped to \$21 billion.

Today we import \$44 billion in nonfuel minerals and we have a \$17 billion deficit in minerals trade.

More alarming than the trade deficit figures, is the fact that of the 44 strategically important minerals, the United States imports 25 of them to the extent of more than 50 percent of domestic needs: 100 percent of our manganese, 79 percent of our cobalt, and 66 percent of our nickel—all of which, incidentally, are vitally important to steelmaking.

Moreover, for a wide range of strategic and critical minerals, we are dependent upon countries with a history of social and political instability, making the United States vulnerable to events over which we have little influence or control.

These are sobering facts for this \$360 billion industry, which employs almost 2 million workers and provides a more than \$4.5 billion payroll.

We, in Minnesota, know how crucial minerals are to the economic strength of the Nation and to our national security—we have supplied the iron ore for the domestic steel industry to carry America through two World Wars, Korea, Vietnam, and other military actions of this century—nearly 4 billion tons of iron ore.

Our mining industry must have the most efficient extraction, processing, and refining technologies possible to lower the minerals trade deficit, and without the Bureau of Mines and a

coherent national minerals policy our economy will be hurt, and we will be limited in our ability to compete in the global marketplace.

We northern Minnesotans also know that research has been the key to keeping our iron ore mining industry competitive. For us, that has meant the University of Minnesota School of Mines and brilliant researchers, like Dr. E.W. Davis, the father of taconite, and the Twin Cities Research Center of the U.S. Bureau of Mines. The Taconite Enhancement Committee that I founded 3 years ago has worked hard to combine the School of Mines, the U.S. Bureau of Mines, the Natural Resources Research Institute, and private sector engineering and research capabilities into a coherent, cohesive effort to keep the mining and processing of Minnesota ores ahead of the state-of-the-art and to keep our region economically competitive.

The House Appropriations Committee's action to abolish the U.S. Bureau of Mines will be a very serious blow to our future competitiveness. Should this nefarious proposal succeed, it will eliminate a program that has created more jobs and generated more tax revenue every year than any other governmental initiative on behalf of the mining, minerals, and metal industry.

The Bureau has a long tradition of innovation that has advanced the state of the art of mining and minerals processing, creating new industries, revitalizing old ones, and in some cases saving industries that have been threatened with extinction due to economic or regulatory constraints.

I am going to mention just a few of the Bureau's contributions, beginning with the Tilden Mine operation in the Upper Peninsula, Michigan. The Bureau developed a process called selective floatation to treat the low-grade ores now being mined at Tilden during a 10-year research project whose investment totaled \$2.5 million—from 1961–1971. During the subsequent 21 years that the Tilden has been operating, over 98 million gross tons of high-grade iron ore pellets have been produced with a value of over \$3 billion. Total production taxes generated over this time period were approximately \$85 million. In 1994, production at the Tilden Mine was 6.1 million gross tons which represents approximately 11 percent of America's 56.7 million gross tons of iron oxide pellets and well over 800 employees are currently employed. That is an impressive return on investment—a very modest investment, at that.

GOLD AND SILVER MINING TECHNOLOGY

Gold and silver mining in this country was in rapid decline until the Bureau developed advanced technologies which reversed that trend. The Bureau's contribution in these technologies over the last 10 years is approximately \$9 million. In 1993 there were 68 active heap-leaching operations in Nevada alone, using Bureau technology. The gold mining in Nevada contributes \$2.7 billion to the economy. Only South Africa and Russia produce more gold than the State of Nevada. Considering the nature of the Nevada gold de-

posits, without Bureau technology, the industry would likely be only 20 percent of the current output.

REACTIVE METALS INDUSTRY

The Bureau's \$10 million investment developed the Kroll Process and the consumable-electrode, arc melting process which are used to extract titanium and zirconium. Titanium is used in making jet engines and zirconium is an essential component in nuclear reactors. Without the developments of these processes, we would lose over \$140 million in annual production, and our aviation industry would be dependent on foreign mineral resources and our nuclear power plants would be much less safe.

MANGANESE

Here, in Minnesota, the Bureau has been vigorously involved over the past 8 years in a research project now reaching fruition to extract the more than 2 billion pounds of manganese reserves on the Cuyuna Range and to produce an economically competitive product, the mining and processing of which can restore jobs and renew economic vitality on the Cuyuna Range.

The Bureau of Mines has already taken its fair share of funding reductions and they are already going through a reorganization and downsizing which can be felt throughout the mining industry—facilities in Denver, Reno, Anchorage, and Spokane will be closed, the Mineral Institutes program, which supports minerals research at 32 universities, will be eliminated, and administrative and informational offices across the country will be streamlined.

The Bureau of Mines continues to succeed in its mission to help ensure that the Nation has an adequate and dependable supply of minerals and materials for national security and economic growth at acceptable economic, human, and environmental costs.

We need national research centers for the development of minerals technologies and we need a national minerals policy, and I am afraid that without a coordinating agency, like the Bureau, to work in cooperation with industry, communities which depend economically on mining will drastically suffer.

I deplore the action to terminate the Bureau of Mines, in an appropriation bill—without debate or opportunity to amend that provision. I urge the Senate to restore viable funding for the Bureau, and I further urge the House conferees to recede to the Senate on this point, and preserve this small, highly productive agency.

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

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

SPEECH OF
HON. JOSÉ E. SERRANO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1995

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2127) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes:

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 2127, making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, as well as several Related Agencies.

Mr. Chairman, traditionally, the Labor-HHS-Education bill has been one of the most important bills before Congress each year. It funds programs that are key to the Nation's well-being: health, education, social and employment services that touch every person in the United States and provide the means for all of us to live healthier and more productive lives.

That is why this bill, this year, is such a tragic mistake. Its initial problem was the misguided priorities the Appropriations Committee used in allocating spending authority among the subcommittees. A grater problem is the equally misguided priorities used in writing the bill.

No amount of tinkering will make H.R. 2127 livable, Mr. Chairman; the Appropriations Committee should simply tear it down and rebuild it from the ground up.

In many ways, H.R. 2127 is a 180-degree turn from the priorities in last year's bill, in which, even within tight budgetary limits, we were able to strengthen the Nation's investment in our youngest children by increasing funding for Head Start and Healthy Start.

We were able to increase funding for title I, our country's primary mechanism for assisting disadvantaged children, and continue to fund Pell grants and Federal students loans, strengthening our commitment to access to higher education regardless of one's ability to pay.

We were able to strengthen our ability to save lives and improve health with increases for critical public health, health research, and health care programs.

We were able to increase funds for key employment and training programs.

H.R. 2127 is in sharp contrast to those priorities.

It cuts Head Start—cuts Head Start, Mr. Chairman—and whacks 50 percent out of Healthy Start.

It guts spending for title I and for bilingual and migrant education, and totally eliminates funding for Safe and Drug-Free Schools, Dropout Prevention, vital literacy programs, and Goals 2000, President Clinton's ambitious plan to prepare our children for the 21st century.

Minor increases in certain health spending come at the expense of an important family

planning program and both the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Health and the Office of the Surgeon General, all of which are eliminated under this bill.

It slashes key employment and training programs and kills the summer youth program.

Just as hundreds of unfortunate people have died in the nationwide heat wave, it kills the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program.

And so far, Mr. Chairman, I have referred only to the funding priorities in this bill.

The limitations and legislative provisions in H.R. 2127 are far-reaching meddling in issues under the jurisdiction of authorizing committees.

Among other things, they threaten the health and safety of women, the safety and rights of working people, and the ability of Federal grantees to share their expertise with or represent the needs of their members and clients before policymakers.

Mr. Chairman, this cruel bill makes victims of the most vulnerable people in our Nation, our children, our seniors, our minorities, even our increasingly beleaguered working people.

There is just no reason to support such a mean-spirited bill. I urge my colleagues simply to vote it down and let the Appropriations Committee try again to produce a new bill that will deserve the support of the House.

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

SPEECH OF

HON. BRUCE F. VENTO

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1995

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2127) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes:

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 2127, the Labor-HHS-Education appropriation for fiscal year 1996. More than any other legislation, this bill represents an all-out attack against working families. This bill is, in fact, an assault on American working families. Under the Republican leadership this bill targets the very programs that help working families to get ahead and to make a better life for their families.

This legislation seeks to return to the sad days of the 1930's, yesterdays work environment, when the working man and woman was nothing more than a tool for corporate interests—discarded when broken on the job. This antiworker bill eliminates the concept of a fair day's pay for a fair day's work. This legislation attempts to silence the voice of American workers by undermining their right to seek fair representation in the workplace through law. This legislation attacks the children of working families by putting them at risk in the workplace and by denying them the essential education assistance that they need to get ahead.

Mr. Speaker, denying our children the opportunity to attain requisite skills is perhaps

the most wrongheaded and heartless feature of this measure. The families and working people that I represent work hard to provide for their families. Some are more fortunate and can plan ahead for their children's education. Others have to struggle to meet the day-to-day expenses. To cut vocational education, student loan and grant programs slams the door to opportunity in the face of youth from working families and destroys their dreams of a good life.

Mr. Speaker, I most strenuously object to the treatment of basic worker rights and protections in this spending legislation. Today on the House floor, the term "workers' right to know" has taken on a different meaning. In the past that phrase referred to the right of workers to know when they worked with materials hazardous to their health. Today, workers' right to know, should be a warning that congressional actions are hazardous to workers' health and rights.

As the House considers this Labor-HHS appropriations, C-SPAN should include a workers right to know disclaimer that this bill is hazardous to workers. This workers' hazardous warning should point out the impact of the bill on:

Workers health—a 33-percent cut in OSHA which means that thousands more American workers are going to be injured or die on the job. Workers' lives, health, and safety are at risk on the job. Over 1.7 million workers are seriously injured on the job each year. The cuts in OSHA will only exacerbate the situation.

Workers pay—workers are getting short-changed by this legislation. The 12-percent cut in the employment standards administration means that businesses can ignore minimum wage and overtime requirements with impunity.

Workers' rights to representation—this legislation denies workers a fair chance to unite to fight for themselves and their families. The 30-percent cut in the Labor Relations Board will do more than tilt the management-labor playing field in favor of the companies. This cut will lock out the unions and frustrate workers' ability to be represented and achieve positive results.

This bill will also have a disastrous impact on education in this country. This measure denies opportunity for our youth, cutting programs designed to equip them for the world of work.

And the litany of cuts to education programs goes on with cuts to Head Start, title 1, safe and drug-free schools and summer jobs programs which in essence strike at our most vulnerable children and most apparent needs evident in today's America. Eliminating programs to help communities train teachers and improve student performance are a slap in the face to a nation that places education as a No. 1 priority. Limiting access to higher education and job training programs pulls the ladder to a better future away from the young men and women who will be charged to lead our Nation into the next century.

For my State of Minnesota alone this means that, in 1996, 2,081 children would be denied Head Start, 14,000 students would go without title 1 education benefits, over 5,000 Minnesota youths would miss their first summer job opportunity, 658 young people would be denied the chance to serve in Americorps,

154,000 college students would pay significantly more for college, and job training opportunities for 3,408 dislocated workers would be refused.

Education is a core value shared by all Americans; they realize that an investment in education is an investment in our future. Our Nation benefits greatly from developing the skills and abilities of future generations. Support for education helps citizens build a better future for themselves, their families, and America by contributing to a successful and stronger overall economy.

Indeed, an educated population—along with the roads, airports, computers, and fiber optic cables linking it up—today determines a nation's standard of living and a country's ability to compete. Nothing is more critical to the future economic success of America than making sure that all Americans possess the education and skills they need to compete and succeed in the global economy. Education is the key to a nation's success. When Congress cuts education programs, we all lose. That is why the distorted priorities of this spending measure are so ironic.

Education funding is less than 2 percent of the total Federal budget, yet it plays a critical role in enhancing the self-reliance, economic productivity, and well-being of our Nation's populace. Cutting education is a short-term solution that will cost us dearly in the long run. Some may boast of fiscal discipline and deficit reduction, but if we add so much to the human deficit, the education and job deficit, what have we accomplished?

This legislation also contains provisions that would seriously harm family planning activities in this country, which could have disastrous effects on the health and security of American families. The legislation we are considering today zeros out funding for title X of the Public Health Services Act, a cornerstone of the Federal family planning program since its inception in 1970. Title X provides family planning and health services to low income and uninsured women across the country who would, without title X, have no other means of attaining these or other primary health care services. Along with family planning services, title X provides valuable medical services such as cancer screening and mammograms and prenatal care.

Government expenditures on family planning services such as those funded through title X have been linked to lower rates of abortion, fewer cases of low birthweight babies, increased utilization of prenatal care, and fewer infant deaths. In 1989, Government-funded family planning activities prevented an estimated 1.2 million unintended pregnancies, eliminating the need for 516,000 abortions. Allowing women access to these family planning programs also saves money in the long run in medical expenses, welfare payments, and other services associated with unintended pregnancy and childbirth.

Another provision of this legislation which deeply concerns me is the proposal to zero out the funding for the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program, known as LIHEAP. As a member from one of the coldest States in the Nation, I am alarmed by the potential impact of this mean-spirited action. In 1994, approximately 6.1 million households received aid to help cover heating costs. Nearly half of these households contain elderly or handicapped persons, and about 80 percent of

them earned less than \$10,000 a year. Where are these people to turn when they can no longer afford to heat their homes? Where are my constituents in St. Paul to turn when the temperature drops to 30-degrees below zero and they do not have the money to pay for heating fuels.

The majority's answer to us is that the States and the utility companies will pick up the tab—apparently some in WDC believe that the local government and utilities are ready and waiting to excuse utility bills. Well the reality of the situation is that by zeroing out LIHEAP, the Republicans are leaving many poor families out in the cold.

There is a better way; not all of the cuts need to be made from people programs. The Pentagon, space programs, and corporate welfare grants, are just some of the other Federal programs that should also be subject to fiscal discipline. Surely the process of digging the deficit hole deeper with new tax breaks for corporations and investors by hundreds of billions of dollars would not be even considered, not if good policy is the issue. But, of course, the issue isn't fair policy or good policy, the issue is politics. The issue is ideology of dismantling the Federal Government and impairing the ability of the Federal Government to empower people, hence the attack is directly on this legislation involving working men and women programs and their families needs.

Mr. Speaker—the Labor-HHS appropriations is an assault on American working families. I urge my colleagues to stand up for the backbone of our Nation and to vote "No" on this antiworker bill.

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

SPEECH OF

HON. GLENN POSHARD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1995

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2127) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes:

Mr. POSHARD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this bill. I am vehemently opposed to the wide range of attacks this bill launches on the American people.

This is the 7th year I've been through the appropriations cycle in the House. I regret to say this may be the most disappointing appropriations bill I've ever voted against.

Let me say that I know my good friend and colleague, Chairman JOHN PORTER, has had to make a lot of tough choices. I don't want my criticism of this bill to be construed as any criticism of him.

But I am compelled to say that this bill is not right for the American people.

I represent central and southern Illinois, America's heartland, an area of corn fields, oil wells, coal mines, and some of the world's leading manufacturers. I represent good, hard-working people.

As I travel the district, I hear the growing fears of workers who see their jobs put at risk by unwise trade agreements such as NAFTA. I hear from miners and factory workers who fear the loss of life and limb in their dangerous lines of work if we gut labor protection laws. And I hear from families who are trying to do more with less, who see their productivity on the job remaining high while their wages don't keep up with inflation.

More specifically, in the 19th District of Illinois, we have two tremendously difficult situations which face our communities. On the northern end of the district, Decatur is home to three contentious labor and management disputes which have affected thousands of workers, their families and the entire community. I have encouraged labor and management to meet each other at the bargaining table to resolve their differences. One key element in the collective bargaining process is the existence of the National Labor Relations Board, which this bill will cut by nearly 30 percent.

The bill also eliminates the Presidential order barring permanent replacement of workers who are striking against companies with Federal contracts. Let me again emphasize, I support the collective bargaining process which has served this country well. But part of that process must include the right of men and women to strike without being permanently replaced. This bill takes sides against workers who are exercising their bargaining rights and should be changed.

In the southern part of the 19th District, men and women have for years fueled the economy of this Nation by mining the coal found hundreds of feet into the belly of the earth. Things are much better than they used to be, but those are still dangerous jobs. This bill cuts funding for the Occupational Safety and Health Administration's enforcement budget and limits its ability to act in certain instances. Surely this country is rich enough to make sure that people can go to work with out best efforts to make sure they have a safe place in which to work.

We also have men and women who've worked in the coal mines for decades and have lost their jobs because the Clean Air Act has closed down markets for the coal at their mines. These people need new jobs—quite often they need training to help them come back into the work force—but this bill provides \$166 million less than current spending and \$255 million less than the administration request for adult job training. The same is true for the dislocated workers program—\$378.5 million less than current spending and \$546 million less than the administration request.

Those are tough numbers at a time when the American economy is in transition and people are discovering that the jobs they used to have are gone, or the ones they have could be pulled out from under them at a moment's notice. We don't guarantee anyone a job for life, but we ought to recognize that changes in the world economy impact real people, who want to buy a car, send their kids to college, and support their communities. They need help doing that, so that if their job disappears, they don't have to spend months on unemployment and we can help them get back into the work force.

And what investment are we making in our children? We're reducing funding for title I programs which help school districts which have

students from low-income families. The bill reduces funding for Head Start, student loans, summer jobs, and school-to-work programs.

At this point in time, I enter into the RECORD the variety of changes being made to programs which serve working people in my State and district.

SELECTED CUTS IN THE LABOR—HHS—ED BILL BELOW THE FISCAL YEAR 1995 RESCISSION LEVELS

Program	Nationwide cut	Illinois cut
Summer Jobs	\$867,070,000	\$34,955,000
Dislocated Worker Training	378,550,000	13,104,000
Adult Training	166,813,000	6,785,000
Older American Employment	46,060,000	1,724,000
Title I, Comp. Education	1,143,356,000	54,142,000
Goals 2000	361,870,000	15,993,000
Safe and Drug-Free Schools	240,981,000	10,167,000
Teacher Training Grants	251,207,000	10,904,000
Vocational Education	272,750,000	10,577,000
State Incentive Grants	63,375,000	3,423,000
Senior Nutrition	22,810,000	1,015,000
Head Start	119,374,000	5,857,000
Low-Income Energy Assistance	965,940,000	56,108,000

Mr. Chairman, I know we need to cut the budget and get our financial House in order. I've made plenty of tough votes to cut spending, eliminate programs and do without things which could not be identified as priority items.

This bill might not be so objectionable were it not for the fact that so many of these cuts are being used to finance an ill-advised tax cut which will accrue almost entirely to the highest wage earners in the country. I've voted for a budget proposal by moderate Democrats which gets us to balance in 7 years. Believe me, that plan has some tough cuts in it—any credible plan does. But we ignore the siren's call for tax cuts and put our spending cuts on deficit reduction.

I know tax cuts sound good and are popular on their face. But the best tax cut we could possibly give our families and our country is a cut in deficit reduction.

That is why I so strongly oppose this bill. The priorities are out of order, the cuts are out of balance, and the attack on the American people is out of bounds.

I strongly oppose this bill and urge its defeat.

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

SPEECH OF
HON. NORMAN Y. MINETA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1995

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2127) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes:

Mr. MINETA. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong and unequivocal opposition to this grotesque piece of legislation. If ever we needed an example of the skewed priorities of the new majority in this House, this bill is it.

In the area of health and human services, vitally important programs have been completely terminated:

Black lung clinics, the Native Hawaiian Health Care Program, AIDS education and

training, substance abuse prevention and training, the National Vaccine Program, rural health grants, developmental disabilities projects, the elder abuse prevention program, aging research, preventive health grants, and funding for the Federal Council on Aging—all would disappear under this bill.

The bill eliminates the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Health and the Office of the Surgeon General—the two offices which are on the front lines of coordinating American public health policy.

The bill cuts almost \$400 million from Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Programs, and \$15 million from homeless and runaway youth programs, a \$288,000 cut for child abuse prevention, and a reduction of \$2 million from the fund for abandoned infants assistance.

The bill cuts the Office of Civil Rights at the Department of Health and Human Services by \$8 million—a reduction of almost 40 percent.

The bill contains four provisions that roll back women's reproductive health care and seriously undermine women's rights to make fundamental choices about their bodies and their lives.

It eliminates title X funds for family planning—which 83 percent of women receiving Federal family planning services rely on. This makes no sense, socially or fiscally. Every government dollar spent on contraceptive services saves an average \$4.40 in expenditures on medical services, welfare, and nutritional services associated with unintended pregnancies and childbirth.

Title X funds are not used for abortions—they are used for family planning and birth control. This bill would deny millions of women access to all major methods of family planning—cutting them off from the help they need to make informed personal decisions about their own health and well-being.

The bill would also deny Medicaid funding for abortions for rape and incest survivors. Up to 1 in 3 women will be victims of rape or attempted rape in their lifetime. A woman living in poverty who has already been brutally victimized would be victimized yet again by being forced to bear a child against her will.

I also rise in opposition to the provision in this bill to undermine the Accreditation Council on Graduate Medical Education [ACGME] requirement for medical instruction in abortion. Any reduction in the number of doctors who are properly trained to perform abortions will place women at greater risk of losing access to safe and legal abortions. The right of women in this country to exercise control over their own bodies, and choose whether or not to have a child must not be eroded.

The bill is also an attack against the most vulnerable members of our communities: Children and senior citizens.

It would cut 50,000 eligible children from Head Start and cut the Healthy Start infant mortality initiative by half. These programs prepare our children for school and provide support for their parents to help them leave welfare and become independent.

In another short-sighted move, the bill would eliminate the Summer Youth jobs program, leaving 600,000 youth without work next summer. 2,500 young people will lose summer jobs in my hometown of San Jose alone.

The bill would cut total job-related spending on disadvantaged youth by more than half, denying them the work experience and education

assistance they need to become productive members of society rather than turning to crime or welfare for survival.

Education is the most important investment our country can make for meeting the challenges of the 21st century, but the plans in this bill to eliminate or cut a host of education programs will leave us unprepared to compete in a changing world economy.

First, the bill would completely eliminate the Goals 2000 program for statewide school reform. Over 1,800 schools in 226 districts in California had planned to participate in local level reform emphasizing early literacy and mathematics, demonstrating the importance of this program. The elimination of the Eisenhower Professional Development program would also remove my state's primary source of support for professional development.

Even though Americans rank safety and drug use as their priority concern in schools, the bill would cut the Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program by 57 percent.

Education programs targeted toward the disadvantaged students are an essential investment for lifting them out of poverty and preparing them to become productive members of society. Cuts to Title I programs would affect services to 209,000 disadvantaged children in California. One-quarter of California's elementary school students have limited English proficiency, and the proposed 74% cut in bilingual education will decimate our programs that serve these students.

To compete in the information-based, global marketplace of the 21st century, our students need practical job skills. Yet the bill would cut vocational and adult education and the School-To-Work program that would allow them to contribute to our economy.

The proposed \$162 million cut in Special Education Programs under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act would virtually eliminate nationwide efforts to help provide 5.6 million children with disabilities with the education they need to live independent, self-sufficient lives.

Mr. Chairman, though these cuts might save money in the short term, they deny children already facing tremendous challenges the education and skills they need to become productive members of society.

The investments we made now in our children are essential for the future of this country. Our children deserve better than this.

Our seniors will also be hard hit by the Republican Appropriations bill.

Many seniors rely on senior nutrition programs as their only or primary source of daily food—but the bill would eliminate 12 million meals through cuts in Congregate Nutrition Services and the Meals on Wheels programs.

The elimination of the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program is an appalling move in the face of the hundreds of seniors who have died in the last month from lack of air conditioning. Next winter, thousands more seniors will be freezing in the dark.

Finally, the bill would eliminate the long-term care ombudsman program, which protects the most vulnerable group of senior citizens—those in nursing homes—from abuse, neglect, and fraud.

These provisions will only hurt those who have the least ability to cope with the attack. I do not believe that our budget should be balanced on the backs of our senior citizens and children—and especially not on the backs of the most vulnerable.

The anti-worker provisions in this bill constitute nothing less than a full-scale attack on basic rights of working Americans.

Six thousand American workers are injured on the job each day, costing businesses \$112 billion each year. In California alone in 1993, 750,000 workers suffered from occupational injuries and illnesses and 615 workers lost their lives while doing their jobs.

In my district, workers face dangers from working with solvents, acids, metals, and toxic gases that can cause birth defects, cardiopulmonary problems, and damage to vital organs such as liver and kidneys.

The Occupational Safety and Health Administration [OSHA] has succeeded in reducing on-the-job injuries by 57 percent since its inception. OSHA does have problems that need to be addressed. It needs to be made more efficient and to provide meaningful incentives to employers to provide safe and healthy workplaces. But OSHA should be fixed, not dismantled.

This bill would force OSHA to close half its offices and shed half its inspectors, resulting in as many as 50,000 more injuries and deaths to hard-working Americans.

Limited to the resources provided under this bill, OSHA inspectors would need 95 years to inspect each workplace in my State just once.

Furthermore, in yet another example of backroom legislating on an appropriations bill, the Republicans are restricting OSHA's development of ergonomic standards. Musculoskeletal injuries from repetitive motions account for 30 percent of lost workdays due to injuries and illnesses and more than \$2.7 million annually in workers compensation claims. Ergonomics, the science of physically fitting a job to a person, can reduce serious injury and illness and improve worker productivity and quality.

Yet the bill would prohibit OSHA from even conducting research to develop ergonomic standards that could help save millions of dollars and prevent hundreds of thousands of injuries. The cost to our society goes beyond the value of these claims. Workers who are disabled at unsafe workplaces end up on our unemployment and welfare rolls.

Those workers who lose their jobs will face a tougher time finding work under this bill. It would deny retraining and benefits to 273,000 dislocated workers and 84,000 low-income adults. The employment and training budget has been cut \$2.5 billion below 1995 levels. A \$357 million cut in California's education and training programs will force my State to drop 200,000 participants.

Finally, the right of working people to bargain collectively would be weakened through drastic cuts in funding and authority of the National Labor Relations Board [NLRB] and the prohibition on enforcement of the President's Executive order on striker replacements.

Hardworking Americans have basic rights to a safe and healthy workplace and to organize for these and other rights. The Republicans would take our worker protections back by decades.

This has been a fractious budget cycle so far, and I expect that it's going to get worse. Those who say that balancing the budget requires that priorities be identified are absolutely correct: and the priorities of the Republican leadership are coming through loud and clear during this Appropriations cycle.

If you're a corporate polluter who wants the government to just leave you alone—you're in luck.

If you're a defense contractor who wants to sell a few more of those planes—even if the Pentagon doesn't want them—you're in luck.

If you're an employer with an unsafe workplace and you just wish those busybodies at OSHA would leave you alone—you're in luck.

If you're cheating your employees by paying them less than the minimum wage, and you think it would be great if those guys at the Wage and Hour Division of the Department of Labor didn't have time to deal with you—you're in luck.

But if you're a senior citizen who's wondering whether to buy medicine or food this month, or a poor mother hoping for a better education and a better life for your children, then this bill has a message for you: You're on your own.

That's a message which I can never vote to send to the people of this country, and I urge my colleagues to vote down this bill.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

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

SPEECH OF

HON. C.W. BILL YOUNG

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1995

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2127) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes:

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise to commend the chairman of our subcommittee for his leadership on this bill under the most difficult of circumstances. Discretionary spending in the bill we consider today is \$9.2 billion below the 1995 bill, a reduction of 13 percent. This is the reduction required by the allocation given our subcommittee under the direction of the House Budget Committee.

Needless to say, our subcommittee was required to make some very difficult decisions and to establish spending priorities for fiscal year 1996. The criteria we used emphasized programs that work well, provide the maximum return on our investment in them, and save lives. We also sought to make better use of Federal funds by eliminating or consolidating duplicative or ineffective programs to provide maximum program dollars and minimum bureaucratic overhead. In all, 170 programs were terminated in the bill.

High priority was given to continued funding for the National Institutes of Health, which received \$642 million or 5.7 percent over the 1995 level. NIH remains the preeminent biomedical research program of its kind anywhere in the world. Our investment in unlocking the mysteries of many diseases and determining effective and lifesaving treatments is repaid many times over in lower health care costs, a higher quality of life, and a cure for

many diseases for which there was no successful treatment just a few years ago.

We have made great strides in the war on cancer, heart disease, stroke, diabetes, mental illness, and other diseases that rob the young and old of valuable years of life and leave many disabled and suffering. As with any battle when we are so close to victory on many fronts, now is not the time to retreat from our commitment to remain the world leader in this field.

One area of special interest where a small but continuing investment by our committee over the past few years has paid off is the National Marrow Donor Program. Through advances in research sponsored by NIH, doctors and researchers determined that unrelated bone marrow transplants were just as effective as related bone marrow transplants in curing patients diagnosed with leukemia or any one of 60 other fatal blood disorders. The problem, however, was the lack of access to a large pool of prospective unrelated individuals who might have matching bone marrow for patients in need of transplants. With the great diversity in the genetic make-up of people, the chances of finding a matched bone marrow donor range from 1 in 20,000 to 1 in a million.

Having brought the need for a national registry of potential bone marrow donors to the attention of our committee in 1986, I am proud to say that my colleagues have provided support to me in this effort every step of the way. The result of this effort is a program that is a true medical miracle which is saving lives every day throughout our Nation and around the world.

The National Marrow Donor Program now maintains a registry of 1.7 million prospective donors and is growing at a rate of 36,000 donors per month. My colleagues may recall that early in my search for a home for the national registry, some Federal officials told me we would never recruit more than 50,000 volunteers who were willing to donate their bone marrow to a complete stranger.

We proved them wrong and in doing so have given a second chance at life to thousands of men, women, and children and the numbers are growing. As the registry continues to grow so do the number of transplants. More importantly, we have given hope to thousands of families who otherwise would have faced the prospect of certain death for a loved one.

Our committee has included in the bill \$15,360,000 for the continued operations of the national registry under the oversight of the Health Resources and Services Administration. Responsibility for the registry was transferred last year from NIH to HRSA. The U.S. Navy also continues to play a leading role in providing operational support and direction to the program with additional funding made available by our Appropriations Subcommittee on National Security.

Other small, but significant programs supported by our subcommittee likewise save lives. The Emergency Medical Services Program for Children celebrates its 10th anniversary this year and we have included \$10 million to continue its operations. These funds increase public awareness and train health care professionals for the unique emergency medical needs of acutely ill and seriously injured children. Forty States have now established training programs to improve the quality of care available for children. The leading cause

of death for them continues to be accident and injury.

Children in the United States also continue to be at risk from illness due to the lack of timely immunizations, which can prevent diseases such as measles, mumps, and whooping cough. Unbelievably, our Nation continues to rank far below many lesser developed nations in the immunization rate for children. Our committee remains concerned about this problem and has consistently provided additional resources for childhood immunization programs. Again this year, we fulfill this commitment with increased funding to procure and distribute vaccines through public health centers and clinics.

We have made a significant investment in this bill in other areas of preventive health care. Funding is increased for the Centers for Disease Control to continue its breast and cervical cancer screening program, its surveillance for chronic and environmental diseases, screening for lead poisoning, tuberculous and infectious diseases, and for education and research activities to prevent injuries.

In another area of the bill, our committee maintained its commitment to the Social Security Program. For the first time, our committee has provided funding to a newly, independent Social Security Administration. Our bill includes \$5.9 billion for the administrative costs of the program, a \$300 million increase over the 1995 level, this despite the severe constraints faced by our committee.

This increase will enable the Social Security Administration to continue to make the investments necessary to automate agency operations based on a strategic plan that will improve the quality and efficiency of services. It will also allow for improvement in the processing of disability cases and in providing face-to-face phone service.

This reaffirmation of our support for Social Security sends a message that we strongly support the program, its almost 50 million current beneficiaries, and the countless millions of current contributors to the program who are future beneficiaries. We recognize the need to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of Social Security service delivery.

Mr. Chairman, we have had to make many difficult decisions in the preparation of this legislation, but we have clearly defined some high priority areas in which the Federal Government must maintain its leadership responsibilities. This was not an easy task and it is one that will continue as this legislation moves through the House, Senate, and into conference.

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

SPEECH OF

HON. VIC FAZIO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1995

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2127) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education,

and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes:

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Chairman, this bill is an outrage, and it deserves to be rejected and repudiated by every Member of this body.

This bill is unfair to the people who depend most on our Government: Our children and the elderly. This bill is shortsighted. It does not provide for investment in students and workers—the very people who will grow our economy.

This bill cuts \$6.3 billion from programs that average working families depend on.

Why? The unvarnished truth is that my Republican colleagues need to finance a tax break for wealthy Americans.

Every Democrat in this House is prepared and committed to bring our budget into balance, and provide a solvent, secure future for our children.

Yet, one-half of the cuts in this bill are stolen directly from the single best investment we can make in our future: education.

Overall spending on education has been slashed by nearly \$4 billion. Few children have been spared. Some of the most significant and effective programs for kids—including title 1, school-to-work, and safe and drug-free schools—are subject to potentially crippling cuts.

It's an exhaustive list, and frankly, to reduce this bill to a series of programmatic cuts, masks the underlying meanness of this bill. In its breadth and scope, this bill is simply a monster of inequity.

If you are the principal wage earner in a hard-working family, or you have found yourself among the growing ranks of the working poor, and you desire to provide a brighter future for your children, this bill is a declaration of war.

This bill declares war on opportunity. This bill puts politics ahead of principle. This bill values pay-offs ahead of people.

This much is certain. The Republicans do not discriminate. If you are not on the receiving end of the Republican tax bailout—that is, if you are elderly, poor, young, unemployed, or just struggling to get by—you suffer in equal measure.

Seniors fare no better than our children. This bill sends a strong message to our senior citizens that their past efforts are no longer acknowledged, and that their current contributions are no longer appreciated.

This bill guts the Older Americans Act, including Green Thumb. It targets other programs which provide preventive health support, pension and Medicare counseling, and home meals to a growing senior population.

This bill undercuts the health and safety of American workers. It undermines the enforcement of hour and wage laws. It makes it more difficult for people who have lost their jobs to find new jobs by slashing job training.

Some of the most vulnerable members of our society are subject to the most extreme—the most harmful—and the most mean-spirited provisions in this bill. If this bill is passed, victims of rape and incest will no longer be guaranteed the right to an abortion.

I urge my colleagues to stand up for working families and reject this bill. Don't allow the GINGRICH Republican to sell us down the river so they can reward their wealthy friends.

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

SPEECH OF

HON. ERNEST J. ISTOOK, JR.

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1995

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2127) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes:

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Chairman, I have consulted with Mr. STUMP, chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, regarding concerns raised by some veterans service organizations about the definition of grants in the provision of H.R. 2127 prohibiting use of Federal grants for political advocacy. They have long been furnished space and office facilities, if available, by the Department of Veterans Affairs for the free assistance and representation of veterans by veterans service organizations in making claims for their veterans benefits. The furnished space and facilities are specifically authorized by section 5902 of title 38. The VA is authorized under section 5902 to recognize the veterans representatives as well.

Chairman STUMP has informed me that the furnishing of space and office facilities for this purpose has never been considered a grant to veterans service organizations. The free assistance given to veterans by the service organizations is in fact of considerable benefit and value to the Government because the Government itself is legally obligated to assist veterans in making their claims.

Furthermore, Chairman STUMP has emphasized to me that the assistance and representation given to veterans by the veterans service organizations has not involved political advocacy in any way, shape, or form. The assistance has been solely for the purpose of helping individual veterans to make their claims for VA benefits. This free representation for veterans by veterans service organizations is unique. I know of nothing else like it and I want to see it continued.

Therefore, I want to make it crystal clear that there is no intent for this measure to apply to section 5902 of title 38. It does not. I have assured the veterans service organization that I will make every effort to make the legislation more specific about this point during conference.

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

SPEECH OF

HON. JOSÉ E. SERRANO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1995

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under

consideration the bill (H.R. 2127) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes:

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, the outrageous cuts to the Department of Labor and related agencies proposed by the Republican majority are a vicious attack on hardworking Americans.

The proposed cuts to OSHA enforcement, to the Wage and Hour Division, and to NLRB would result in a dangerous shift in the policies which protect working Americans. The prohibition on enforcement of President Clinton's Executive order banning striker replacement is but one example of the egregious and inappropriate legislating occurring on this year's appropriations bills.

From Youth Fair Chance, School-to-Work, and Summer Youth Employment, to the Job Training Partnership Act and Community Service Employment for Older Americans, opportunities for job training and employment are being severely reduced, and in some cases, completely eliminated. The funding cuts to the National Labor Relations Board and the Wage and Hour Division will mute two strong advocates for working people.

These programs are an essential part of providing opportunities for millions of Americans to achieve a decent standard of living. The cuts in this bill would move us farther and farther away from this goal. We cannot, with any conscience, allow these cuts to happen. This bill has devastating consequences for all Americans. I strongly urge defeat of this bill.

RECOGNIZING 13 RETIRED MEMBERS OF THE FREMONT FIRE DEPARTMENT FOR THEIR 370 YEARS OF SERVICE

HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 3, 1995

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, today, I would like to pay tribute to 13 firefighters for their years of service to the city of Fremont. These firefighters have collectively provided 370 years of protection to the citizens of Fremont. In addition to their dedicated years of public service, these individuals also served their country in branches of the armed services. I would like to share with you and my colleagues some of their accomplishments.

Robert Andrade, over 29 years of distinguished service. Hired September 1, 1964, promoted to captain on April 16, 1972 and retired May 31, 1994. Captain Andrade made many significant contributions to the department, particularly in the training division and in fire hose and nozzle research and development. He served 3 years in the U.S. Navy and was active during the Cuban missile crisis.

Robert L. Asher, Jr., over 26 years of distinguished service. Hired January 3, 1967, promoted to captain on April 16, 1972 and retired June 9, 1993. Captain Asher served in the fire suppression division for the majority of his career, with 1 year in the fire prevention division. He coached little league baseball and CYO basketball for several years. He was also a volunteer assistant football coach at Ohlone College in Fremont.

Edward Bauchou, over 30 years of distinguished service. Hired March 15, 1963, promoted to engineer December 1, 1982 and retired July 1, 1993. Mr. Bauchou served in the fire suppression division his entire career. He also served 3 years in the U.S. Navy and was on active duty during the Korean conflict. Mr. Bauchou coached several years in CYO Basketball and in the city of Fremont youth baseball. Mr. Bauchou was a volunteer catechism and first aid instructor at Saint Leonard School in Fremont.

Richard L. Cabral, over 29 years of distinguished service. Hired September 1, 1964, promoted to captain July 1, 1979 and retired December 3, 1993. The majority of Captain Cabral's career was spent in fire suppression with years of exemplary service in the fire prevention division. He ended his assignment as the assistant fire marshal. Captain Cabral coached 8 years in CYO Basketball, little league baseball and youth football. He was also a volunteer football coach at St. Mary's High School in Berkeley, CA.

John R. Ford, over 25 years of distinguished service. Hired October 16, 1968 and retired December 15, 1993. Mr. Ford worked in the fire prevention division, was a member of the hazardous materials response team, and was one of the first tillermen on the department. He served 4 years in the U.S. Navy and also volunteered as a first aid and CPR instructor at the Church of the Latter Day Saints. He is currently active as a director at his local homeowners association.

Campbell G. Gillies, over 29 years of distinguished service. Hired on September 1, 1964 and retired March 1, 1994. Mr. Gillies was one of the first tillermen trained to work on Fremont's tillered ladder trucks. Mr. Gillies' entire career was in fire suppression. He coached 2 years of little league baseball and was also active in the Boy Scouts for about 5 years. Mr. Gillies served for several years as the president of his local homeowners association in the Mission San José area of Fremont.

Robert A. Guardanapo, over 29 years of distinguished service. Hired on June 1, 1964, promoted to captain on April 16, 1972 and retired December 15, 1993. Captain Guardanapo's years of service were mostly in the fire suppression division, with 8 months in fire prevention. He coached for several years in CYO Basketball and has been an active member of the Elks Club for many years. Captain Guardanapo helped to organize the Desert Storm Veterans appreciation event in the city of Fremont.

Frank A. Horat, over 33 years of distinguished service. Hired on August 1, 1960, promoted to captain on April 16, 1972 and retired October 30, 1993. Captain Horat's years of service were all in the fire suppression division. He also served 8 years in the National Guard. He also coached 4 years with the Centerville Little League and 3 years with CYO basketball.

William J. Kaska, over 26 years of distinguished service. Hired on October 16, 1968 and retired on January 26, 1995. Mr. Kaska's years of service were all in the fire suppression division. He also served 3 years in the U.S. Naval Reserve. He was active in the Boy Scouts of America as an assistant scoutmaster for 35 years and coached 7 years in Fremont youth baseball. Mr. Kaska also assisted with the Fremont Fire Department Historical Project.

Donald H. Promes, 31 years of distinguished service. Hired March 15, 1963, promoted to captain on April 16, 1972 and retired June 30, 1994. In addition to Captain Promes' years as a suppression officer, he worked as a fire inspector investigator in the Fire Prevention Division for 7 years. He also served 6 months in the U.S. Army. Captain Promes coached Fremont youth baseball for 7 years and 8 years in CYO youth basketball.

John L. Schacherer, nearly 30 years of distinguished service. Hired on September 1, 1964 and retired August 1, 1993. Mr. Schacherer spent his career in fire suppression and was one of the first tiller-qualified firefighters. He also served in the U.S. Navy for 4 years.

Richard M. Schreiber, over 25 years of distinguished service. Hired on March 1, 1968, promoted to engineer on December 1, 1982 and retired on October 30, 1993. Mr. Schreiber spent his entire career in fire suppression and is especially remembered for his fabrication skills in apparatus outfitting. Mr. Schreiber also served 5 years in the Marine Reserves. His community service includes coaching little league baseball, CYO basketball and also youth track. Mr. Schreiber is currently volunteering as the Bucks Lake Homeowners Association director and is also on the board of directors for Gallippi Ranch. Mr. Schreiber was also an active PTA member for many years.

Philip L. Soria, over 29 years of distinguished service. Hired on September 1, 1964, promoted to captain on July 1, 1974 and retired August 1, 1993. Captain Soria served as the training officer of the Fremont Fire Department. As well as working several years in the fire prevention division, he was an acting battalion chief in his final year. Prior to joining the department, he served 3 years in the U.S. Army where he attained the rank of corporal. Captain Soria has coached many years in little league baseball, youth soccer, adult soccer and was also active as an adult soccer referee. Captain Soria was very involved in Fremont's Sister City Program. He delivered a donated fire engine to Fremont's Mexican sister city. Captain Soria was a volunteer adult literacy teacher and active as a room parent for his children's elementary school.

Mr. Speaker, I come before you today to recognize these men for all their years of public service and commitment to our community. On Friday, September 8, 1995, these individuals will be honored by local officials, their colleagues, friends and families at a dinner in Fremont, CA. I hope you and my colleagues will join me in congratulating these role models and wishing them well in their future endeavors.

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

SPEECH OF

HON. NICK J. RAHALL II

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1995

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under

consideration the bill (H.R. 2127) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes:

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, it isn't often that a Member of this body would be tempted to rise in opposition to a bill, especially a funding bill, and to say unequivocally that there is so much in the measure to condemn it, that it is impossible to vote for good that is contained in it. Such is the case today, as I rise in strongest opposition to H.R. 2127 the Labor-HHS-Education appropriations bill for fiscal year 1996.

Mr. Chairman, using appropriations bills, such as this one and like many others we have debated recently on the floor of the House, to establish policy and make decisions best left to authorizing committees, is just reckless and irresponsible behavior. Such use of the appropriations process cannot be the decision of this or many other subcommittees, or even full committee chairmen. It is obviously being directed by those at higher levels in cooperation with outside interests.

The only thing of any real value in the Labor-HHS-Education appropriations bill are those provisions that protect the unborn. I strongly support every one of them. I commend the Members of this House who fought to get this antiabortion language in the bill, and I will do all that I can to keep it in the bill. But I cannot support the final product—even if all the pro-life language is preserved. I can't, in good conscience, do so. Let me tell you why.

Mr. Chairman, this bill decimates not only longstanding, vitally important, life-giving Federal programs for children, it also decimates longstanding workplace health and safety standards and the enforcement of such laws; it takes families earning at or below poverty wages and places them at greater risk of becoming homeless, by decimating labor laws and prevailing wages that keep them afloat. It takes those without jobs and tosses them aside like garbage—refusing to fund job search or job training programs so individuals can reenter the job market and care for themselves and their families and be contributing members of society. It attacks senior citizen programs to the point where I wonder: what is happening to us as a compassionate nation?

The bill cuts funding for programs that train and protect working Americans by 24 percent below last year's level. Training alone is cut by more than \$1 billion; worker protection programs embodied within OSHA, the Employment Standards Administration, and the National Labor Relations Board are cut by \$180 million. Legislative riders eliminate or restrict the ability to enforce collectively bargained agreements, a safe work environment, and child labor protections.

The bill nullifies the President's Executive order keeping Federal contractors from hiring permanent replacements for striking workers. Worse, the Labor-HHS-Education appropriations bill terminates black lung clinics that serve as the only caring, human, face-to-face contact for coal miners dying from black lung disease who are struggling to obtain appropriate life-giving health care, and who are struggling equally hard to qualify for benefits to enable them and their families to live in peace and dignity as they die of an incurable, progressive lung disease.

With respect to child labor laws, I could not believe it, until I read it, but this bill actually terminates a child labor law that protects 14-year-olds against being maimed or killed by balers—baling machines—that are almost too dangerous for adults to operate. Those who placed this language in the bill actually call it a job creating provision for youth even though it could be a job that kills.

These same members, in writing this same bill, Mr. Chairman, have terminated the summer youth job program for 14-year-olds and older youths—jobs that nourish rather than kill them.

The bill declares war on the Nation's senior citizens. Low Income Energy Assistance [LIHEAP] is terminated—so all the elderly folks who have had to choose between heating or eating every winter—are forced to choose to eat fewer meals in order to pay utility bills. Six million households receive LIHEAP assistance—two-thirds are seniors, and the rest are disabled.

To make matters worse for seniors, the minimum wage jobs that employ 14,000 seniors with incomes less than 125 percent of poverty are terminated—gone. Foster Grandparents and counseling programs to prevent MediGap ripoffs are cut.

Senior nutrition programs are cut by nearly \$23.5 million—meaning that 114,637 fewer seniors will be able to get a hot meal at their senior center, and 43,867 frail elderly persons will be cut off from Meals on Wheels.

Millions of workers will be more vulnerable to employers who avoid paying even minimum wage, and who also avoid a 40-hour week, fair labor practices, and standards for safe work places.

Education overall is cut 18 percent below last year's level. Employment and training by 35 percent; other cuts include \$2.5 billion in assistance to local schools, \$266 million from drug-free schools and communities, and \$66 million from the school-to-work program.

Student aid for college is cut by \$701 million including a \$219 million cut that terminates Federal contributions to Perkins loans and the SSIG scholarship program. Goals 2000 and the summer youth jobs program are eliminated.

Head Start is cut by \$535 million below the President's request; President Bush's Healthy Start Program to lower infant mortality is cut in half.

Perhaps more than any other appropriations bill, the Labor-HHS-Education bill is the people's bill. When you make drastic cuts in this bill's funding, you are stabbing at the heart of this Nation—its people. For example:

Labor.—Translates into jobs and job training, safe workplaces, decent wages, and dignity of life that comes with the dignity of a paycheck.

Education.—Translates into quality of life for an educated citizenry, better jobs for better futures, for stable families. Most importantly, education translates directly into our national economic security, if not our national defense.

Health and Human Services.—Translates into quality of life for those in need of life-giving care, from cradle to grave, regardless of station in life or income.

How we can propose to make these funding cuts, and programmatic changes, and to disregard the educational needs, the health, well-being, and safety of every one of our constituents who rely upon us—while at the same

time proposing to increase defense spending by \$58 billion over the next 7 years? How can Members of this House decimate labor, health, and education programs in order to fund higher defense spending than any President has asked for in over 14 years, and this in spite of the fact that the cold war is over, the Soviet Union as a competing superpower is no more, and with communism on its knees?

This bill is, in all truth, beyond my understanding.

Hubert Humphrey said: The moral test of government is how it treats those who are in the dawn of life—the children; how it treats those in the twilight of life—the elderly; and how it treats those who are in the shadows of life—the sick, the disabled, the needy, and the unemployed.

We have failed the moral test by bringing this bill to the floor of the House, and I am appalled.

Have we, finally, no shame?

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

SPEECH OF

HON. CONSTANCE A. MORELLA

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1995

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2127) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes:

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 2127, the Labor-Health and Human Services-Education appropriations bill, is loaded with legislative riders that have no place in an appropriations bill, and it cuts too deeply into critical programs. I will be voting against the bill unless major changes are made today.

First, I want to acknowledge Chairman Porter for his efforts. He was given an allocation that was significantly lower than the fiscal year 1995 allocation, and he did his best to craft an acceptable bill. He also opposed the many riders attached in the full committee. I am strongly supportive of the 6 percent increase in funding for the National Institutes of Health, the increased funding for breast cancer research, and breast and cervical cancer screening, increased funding for the Ryan White CARE Act, the funding for the Violence Against Women Act programs in the bill, and the preservation of the DOD AIDS research program.

Unfortunately, I cannot support the bill for many reasons. I am strongly opposed to the changes made in the full committee. The most egregious amendment eliminates funding for the title X family planning program, transferring the funding to block grants. To eliminate this program when we are trying to end welfare dependency and reduce the number of abortions and unwanted pregnancies is an outrage.

Not only does the transfer to block grant programs fail to ensure that the \$193 million for title X will go to fund family planning programs, but the very nature of the block grants

selected ensures that this funding will be drastically reduced. The maternal and child health block grant includes many set asides, resulting in the diversion of \$84 million of the \$116 million transferred from title X. Thus, 70 percent of the money transferred to this block grant could not go to family planning services even if States wanted to earmark the funds for that purpose.

Later today, Representatives GREENWOOD and LOWEY will be offering an amendment to restore the funding for title X. Congressman SMITH will then offer an amendment that restates the bill's provision to eliminate the funding for title X. The Greenwood-LoweY amendment includes specific language clarifying what is already the case for title X—no funding can be used for abortion, nor can funding be used for political advocacy. Title X prevents abortion—these clinics are prohibited from providing abortions or directive counseling.

I will also be offering an amendment later today with Congresswoman LOWEY and Congressman KOLBE to strike the I-stook language in the bill allowing States to decide whether to fund Medicaid abortions in the cases of rape and incest. This is not an issue about States' rights. States can choose to participate in the Medicaid Program; however, once that choice is made, they are required to comply with all Federal statutory and regulatory requirements, including funding abortions in the cases of rape and incest. Every Federal court that has considered this issue has held that State Medicaid plans must cover all abortions for which Federal funds are provided by the Hyde amendment.

Abortions as a result of rape and incest are rare—and they are tragic. The vast majority of Americans support Medicaid funding for abortions that are the result of those violent, brutal crimes against women. I urge my colleagues to support the Lowey-Morella amendment.

Another amendment added in committee makes an unprecedented intrusion into the development of curriculum requirements and the accreditation process for medical schools. An amendment will be offered by Congressman GANSKE and Congresswoman JOHNSON to strike this language in the bill, and I will be speaking in favor of their effort as well.

There is also troubling language in the bill that restricts the enforcement of title IX in college athletics. Congresswoman MINK will be offering an amendment to strike this language, and I urge support for this amendment.

Several additional amendments attempt to legislate on this bill, and I am opposed to these efforts as well. The entire appropriations process has been circumvented in the last several bills, and I am outraged at the efforts to bypass the appropriate, deliberative legislative process in this House. I am particularly troubled by the efforts of several colleagues to severely restrict the advocacy activities nonprofit organizations. If my colleagues believe that current law regarding such activities is insufficiently restrictive, then they should seek to change it through the appropriate legislative channels, not through the appropriations process.

In regard to funding cuts in the bill, I am very concerned with the scope of the cuts in education programs. I am very dismayed by the elimination or severe reductions in the Goals 2000 Program, the Women's Educational Equity Act, the Safe and Drug Free Schools Act, the Office of Civil Rights in the

Department of Education, Head Start, the IDEA Program, title I, Vocational Educational, and the School to Work Program.

I am also concerned with the bill's disproportionate cuts in drug and alcohol treatment and prevention programs. The bill would cut 68 percent of the demonstration programs and 18 percent of the total HHS treatment and prevention funding. Some of the current programs that will be hardest hit are those serving women and children. I am particularly concerned with reductions for residential substance abuse treatment programs serving pregnant women and children; Congressman DURBIN and I have worked over the past several years to expand the availability of these critical services that save lives and tremendous health and social costs. The cost of not treating drug and alcohol problems far exceeds the savings in this bill.

I am further concerned with the elimination of the consolidated AIDS research budget appropriation, and, for the first time since 1983, the lack of a specific funding level for AIDS research at NIH. While report language added by Congresswoman NANCY PELOSI improves the bill, I remain concerned that the current centralized AIDS research effort through the OAR will be diminished. A strong OAR vested with budget authority is the most effective way to coordinate and guide the 24 AIDS efforts within the institutes at NIH. I will be working with the Senate to restore the current structure of the OAR consolidated budget of the NIH.

I will also be working to restore funding for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, the Older Americans Act, and the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program [LIHEAP]. While it is impossible to provide level funding for every program in this bill with such a reduced allocation, I believe that many of these programs have suffered cuts that are too deep to sustain their important functions.

I urge my colleagues to vote for amendments to address many of the problems in the legislation, and if they fail, to oppose the bill.

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

SPEECH OF

HON. HARRIS W. FAWELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1995

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2127) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes:

Mr. FAWELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Greenwood amendment to restore Federal funds for title X family planning.

Title X of the Public Health Service Act was enacted in 1970. In its 25 years of existence, the program has enjoyed bipartisan support. This program provides services to low-income and uninsured working women. In addition to family planning services, title X clinics provide screening for breast and cervical cancer, sex-

ually transmitted infections, and hypertension. As stated in Mr. Greenwood's amendment, funds are prohibited to be used for abortion, directive counseling, literature or propaganda that promotes abortion or a political candidate.

I believe this plants the Title X Family Planning Program firmly in the realm of prevention and wellness. Often, the battle that young women face is a battle of education. In many cases what these women need is self esteem, belief in themselves, and confidence in the strength that they possess. These qualities are enhanced by education and care. Title X clinics are a part of that process. The educational and emotional assistance offered by family planning clinics can increase awareness, decreasing the chance of an unplanned pregnancy.

Mr. Chairman, I do not often rise to speak on the issue of reproductive rights and family planning. My wife and I have been married 42 years, reared three fine children, and have been blessed with eight grandchildren. It is my hope that the women who receive title X services can be blessed with such a family if they so choose. Let us give them those choices. Let us continue to fund the education and services offered by title X family planning clinics. Support the Greenwood amendment.

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

SPEECH OF

HON. JERROLD NADLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1995

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2127) marking appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes:

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to express my dismay over the elimination of the Summer Youth Employment Program in the Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, Appropriations bill of 1996. Over the course of this summer, this program will enrich the lives of more than 600,000 low-income students across the Nation, helping them develop the skills essential to achieving self-sufficiency, independence, and career success.

The Summer Youth Employment Program provides young men and women between the ages of 14 to 21 with summer positions in libraries, hospitals, parks, and recreation centers. In addition to work experience, the program provides basic and remedial education and job search assistance, preparing our Nation's youth for further successful participation in the work force.

The program has helped employ and train more than 7 million students over an 11 year period. A survey conducted by the National Society for Hebrew Day Schools found three-fifths of former SYEP participants successfully employed in professional, managerial, computer, technical, sales, health or public safety fields. The Summer Youth Employment Program does more than give students a positive

way to spend their summers. It proves to them that they can succeed by helping them develop the skills to succeed.

Mr. Chairman. I am appalled at the elimination of this very valuable program. It is shameful we cannot make a commitment to devote a portion of \$1 out of every \$100 toward our youth's future by funding this program. Termination of this program will send the following chilling message to our Nation's youth: Your future is not worth even 1 percent of our Federal budget.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote against the elimination of this very fundamental program. The Summer Youth Employment Program is an investment in America's youth that yields positive returns for America's present and future.

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

SPEECH OF

HON. SHEILA JACKSON-LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1995

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2127) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes:

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong opposition to the proposed cuts in various Labor Department programs that are affected in title I of this bill.

Among the most outrageous are the massive cuts in worker training programs. Cuts in adult job training, a 22-percent reduction in appropriations for the School-to-Work Program, and a reduction in funds for dislocated worker programs send a clear message to the American worker: Congress is not willing to invest in your human capital. Also through the gag rule in this bill Congress does not want to listen to your rightful grievances.

What is worse is the lack of concern this bill displays over the needs of our working youth. This appropriations bill zeros out funding for the Summer Youth Employment Program—effectively making this summer, the summer of 1995, the last year of operation for this program. It would be a tragedy for me to have to return to my district in Houston this August recess and relay the message to the working youth that benefit from this program: Enjoy your jobs while you have them this summer, kids. This will be the last year you'll have this opportunity.

The Summer Youth Employment Program works. This program reduces the number of teens that participate in gang activity and other nonconstructive behaviors during the summer months. It is better that the income from this program be used to enhance youthful opportunities for employment, challenges them with responsibilities, and provides them with an enhanced sense of self-worth.

I find the labor provisions of this bill to be a serious threat to a longstanding commitment

to invest in our people—this is a tragedy as we move toward the 21st century. Shame. Shame. Shame.

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

SPEECH OF

HON. TOM A. COBURN

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1995

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2127) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes:

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to insert the following article about a crisis pregnancy center in Rockville, MD, into the RECORD.

[From Family Voice, Aug. 1995]

MAKING A DIFFERENCE

(By Candy Berkebile)

Negative advertising campaigns have targeted pro-life crisis pregnancy centers in an attempt to marginalize the role they play in young women's lives. These centers, they say, are deceptive; only care about the baby before it's born; and don't care about women. To counteract these accusations, Family Voice interviewed two young women who have made life and death decisions. Millions of women have gone through similar experiences. Their stories demonstrate the vast difference between an abortion clinic and a pregnancy center. More importantly, they help us see beyond the rhetoric to the heart of the issue. We are dealing with real women faced with crises that they don't know how to handle.

Anna, a young unwed Christian entered a Planned Parenthood clinic in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania in 1985.

What happened to me that day changed my life forever. The day I walked into the clinic was a muggy August afternoon. I was seventeen years old and I was eight weeks pregnant. I can't tell you step by step what happened, because I remember that day in snapshots.

I went into the room, a quiet and rather serious teenager; I left a silent, deeply hurt young woman. I sat and talked to the counselor in a room that, like most others at the clinic, was clean but shabby in appearance. It was bright and cold—there was no comfort, no luxury, just the tools to change life. I'm sure the counselor told me her name, but I don't remember it. She tried to put me at ease, to let me know it was alright, and to explain what was about to happen to me. She told me about the procedure, about the qualified medical resident who would be carrying it out. Then she asked, "Anna, is this what you really want? Are you sure you have no other options?"

My voice quavered as I said, "I have to do this. My parents would never understand. They expect so much out of me and my future. I can't let them down." My mind was made up. I had to do this. There was no other way out. I hated myself for what I was about to do. But I could do nothing else.

She ushered me to another room, a room which will stay vivid in my imagination for-

ever. She gave me a smock to change into and left me alone with my thoughts and fears for a few moments. When she returned, I was sitting on the padded table-top wearing the flowered smock. She gave me a cotton blanket to wrap around my waist as I waited.

"Do you want to know the funniest thing about this whole situation?" I laughed nervously as tears brimmed my eyes.

"What's that?" she asked.

"I never believed that this could happen to me. Even when I thought I might be pregnant. I prayed to God it wasn't true. But I was still pregnant."

The resident dressed in surgical green entered the room. The counselor placed her hand over mine to calm my fingers, which had been nervously fraying the edge of the wax-like tissue paper I sat on. She said, "Anna, scoot down here to the end of the table. Put your heels in these holes—these are called stirrups." She pointed to the shiny pieces of metal protruding from the end of the table. "Now, lie back and relax. Let your knees fall to the sides. It's okay. That's right. Now relax," she said. "I'll be here with you. I'll talk to you, we'll go through this together."

I knew that while in some respects this was the truth, that nothing could be further from it. She would hold my hand, but I would experience this alone. I stared at the ceiling and counted the watermarks as the resident opened the cold steel speculum inside me. I tried to block out the discomfort and humiliation I was feeling. I was scared. She tried to divert my attention.

"Anna, what do you have planned now that you have graduated?"

"I'm going to college," I answered bravely. "I leave in to weeks." I clamped my mouth shut quickly as the pressure began to build in my lower abdomen.

"Do you know what you want to do?" She tried to speak softly, reassuringly. She knew the pain was quickly approaching.

"I want to be a lawyer," I stated in an anguished voice.

One tear sprang to the corner of my eye. She squeezed my hand, I experienced the pain—at least some of it—when the eight-week-old fetus was scraped from the inside of my womb. This, I was prepared for. But what I was not prepared for was the pain that followed in the next few seconds.

"We need more women as lawyers," she continued talking. I think she wanted to drown out any other sound I would hear. But her voice was barely a whisper to me now; I was not focusing on her. She asked me if I knew the area of law I wanted to pursue but I barely heard her, and I didn't answer. I only heard one sound; a sound which was, for me, amplified to a deafening crescendo. I flinched as I heard the hollow splash of the sopping sponge-like tissue when it bounced off the bottom of the awaiting utility bucket. I began to move my head back and forth slowly, my swollen eyes were closed, but the tears crept out.

"No, no," I repeated.

The medical resident left the room, but I didn't notice. I must have been in shock. The counselor helped me dress. Then she took me to a recovery room to lie down. I curled up on one of the many grey cots which lined the room. She sat in a chair by my side. I turned my back on her and faced the blank wall my knees were pulled almost to my chest. My body was quivering. Wave after wave of cramping pain clawed at my insides—the pain of a womb hysterically trying to readjust to its recent loss. I know she probably wanted to help, but what could she do?

Five hours later, I walked out the door. The counselor must have given me a reassuring hug as I walked out, but I can't remember anything beyond the recovery room. She

has faded from my memory. I can barely remember her face. But what I do remember is that, there in that clinic, I alone experienced pain and death. But, that was my choice.

Vena a young 24-year-old college student walked into a crisis pregnancy center in Rockville, Maryland in 1994.

I walked into the center in October. I'd taken a home pregnancy test and wanted to verify it. I was scared. I was still in college. I wasn't married. So I looked through the yellow pages. But I didn't want to go to an abortion clinic. I didn't want to make a drastic choice right away. And if I hadn't finally seen the ad for the Pregnancy Center, I may not have kept my baby—because I wouldn't have known who to turn to. I was so confused and scared. I couldn't tell my parents. I knew they wouldn't be supportive. And I didn't think I could handle the responsibility of a baby right then.

I needed someone to talk to, someone to help me get through this. And I needed support. When my boyfriend and I went into the center, that's when I met Sylvia. She confirmed that the pregnancy test was positive. I was about six weeks pregnant. At first Joe was excited about the baby. But the more we talked about it, the more I knew it was a bad time to have a baby. I was in my junior year at the University of Maryland. I knew I didn't want to have an abortion. I wanted to give the child life. But I needed someone's support. Joe was not supportive at the time. He was so confused. His parents had died when he was a teenager, so he couldn't go to them for advice.

My parents were divorced. And I had a difficult time figuring out how to tell them because they were very strict. Besides, they believed in getting married before you have kids. I ended up telling my mother I was pregnant a few weeks after visiting the center. She said, "It's your responsibility. You got pregnant; you have to deal with it." She also told me to get married. I was afraid to tell my father. We hadn't had a good relationship up to that point so I didn't tell him until the eighth month.

It was late December. I was having trouble with one of my roommates at school. Joe's attitude at that point was, "It's your baby, and you're the one who has to deal with it." I was depressed and crying. I didn't think I could do well in school. I was working a job. I didn't have any support—and I wanted to scream.

It was 11:45 at night. I called Sylvia and woke her up. I didn't think I could deal with anything anymore. I asked her, "What should I do about the pregnancy?"

Sylvia was great. I don't think she realizes how important she was to me. "You're going to be okay. Just take one day at a time. Don't worry about anything right now," she said. "You don't want to jeopardize your health. You need to calm down and think rationally." Sylvia encouraged me, "Talk to me as long as you want to." I talked for about an hour. She got me through the night. Sylvia isn't the only counselor I talked to. I called a couple of times and spoke to some others. Especially when I needed things I didn't have money for—like maternity clothes. The counselors gave them to me. It was wonderful to be able to use the resources of the center.

Then in January, I called Sylvia again for emergency counseling. I had just moved from one dorm to another. Here I was moving in January and I was about five months pregnant. At least my old roommates knew the situation and I was close to them. I had no transportation. Money was tight. Everything I had was going towards transportation and food. I was providing for myself. It was difficult. No one was giving me money. I needed to talk to someone, so I called Sylvia.

"I don't have any money, and I don't know what to do." I told her. "I need to go to a doctor, but I don't have any money to get there. I want to take care of this baby. I can't make it to my doctor appointments. And no one can give me a ride there. I really need to talk to you."

She said okay. She met me after work. She reassured me that even though it was difficult, I had to understand that I might be the only one who could take care of this baby. She reminded me that I couldn't always depend on someone else to do it.

"You can't blame someone else or feel sorry for yourself because other people aren't helping you. You can't dwell on that," Sylvia said. "You have to think positively. Think about what you can do." She was always concerned about how I was doing financially.

Sylvia was very good about talking to Joe too. She helped him understand that he was going through a difficult situation as well. And she really let him know that she was there for him. There were a couple of sessions where she helped Joe and me communicate. Before that, we fought all the time. Sylvia helped us cope with our feelings.

In late January, we went to visit Joe's relatives. When he took me to visit them, he was very confident. I felt secure because he was very sure of what he wanted to do. He wanted this baby. He told them I was pregnant a few weeks afterwards. "We're happy for you," said his aunt and uncle. "This baby will be really special." They also hoped we would get married if we really loved each other. It was important to Joe that we have family support. Soon after that we started to talk about getting married. But we were both nervous and kept putting it off.

In April, Joe and Sylvia convinced me to tell my dad. I had wanted to wait until I had a plan to tell him. But his response surprised me. He encouraged us to get married. Then he invited us to move in with him. So we did. He helped us with groceries. And after I had the baby—when I couldn't walk—he was a great help.

Joe and I married on May 18, two days before the baby's due date. Six days later, I delivered a beautiful baby boy—Benjamin Cleveland. Everyone was at the hospital—Sylvia, Joe, my Mom and my Dad. I told Sylvia she was welcome to watch the delivery because I couldn't have done it without her. She was really my constant, main support during my pregnancy.

Clearly both situations were hard. But, in Vena's case, the strengths of the modern-day crisis pregnancy movement are in full evidence. So, the next time you hear someone say these centers are deceptive or that they don't care—remember Sylvia and the thousands of other counselors who are out there helping the Venas of this world make it through another night.

SUPPORT OF THE DAVIS-MORAN AMENDMENT

HON. DAVID FUNDERBURK

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 3, 1995

Mr. FUNDERBURK. Mr. Speaker, last week I supported the Davis-Moran amendment to the VA/HUD appropriations bill. In my district in North Carolina the EPA has increased its permanent bureaucracy by hiring employees away from the private sector. This amounts to a confiscation of the primary asset—their human capital—of these small private, for-profit, taxpaying companies.

EPA's contractor conversion program in the Office of Research and Development was created not because of the private contractor's performance but because of EPA's own poor contract management. Rather than fixing their problem, EPA saw an opportunity to divert our attention, expand its bureaucracy, and raid the resources of its private sector competitors.

EPA promised the Congress that savings would accrue to the Government if the contractor conversion program was approved. In fact, they projected over \$6 million in savings in fiscal year 1996 for ORD alone. But like many bureaucrats' promises it was all smoke and mirrors. Instead of a surplus, they've come running back to Congress asking for more money.

Mr. Speaker, it is high time to end this unfair practice. I believe that private contractors constitute a flexible and efficient mechanism for the delivery of necessary research services. Private companies should not have to worry that their human capital will be raided by a bloated, out-of-control government bureaucracy.

FAREWELL TO THERESA VOILS

HON. G.V. (SONNY) MONTGOMERY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 3, 1995

Mr. Montgomery. Mr. Speaker, I want to take a minute to thank one of the public servants who takes care of us, the public servants—the people who stand at the door of this great Chamber and bring messages, tell us that constituents are waiting and generally are of great service to the running of our governmental system. I am talking about the doorkeepers—the Chamber security as they are now known.

As of Friday, we are losing a smiling face and a helpful assistant. Theresa Voils who has served us for 5 years, is going back to her home State of Indiana. She is going to finish her degree in political science at Indiana University and no doubt—after standing at the door of this House Chamber she will have some great stories to tell.

Mr. Speaker, I want to salute Ms. Voils for her service and thank her for the invaluable assistance she has provided to me and the hundreds of other Representatives in this body. She hopes to return to this Chamber someday. I, for one, will welcome her back and wish her well in Indiana.

VILLAGE OF TANNERSVILLE CELEBRATES CENTENNIAL

HON. GERALD B.H. SOLOMON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 3, 1995

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I have always been proud of the heritage and physical beauty of the 22d Congressional District of New York, which I have the privilege of representing. It is for the history and the picturesque sites and towns that I return home every weekend.

We often forget, Mr. Speaker, that the real America is not Washington, but the small

towns and villages where real people live and work. I would like to talk about one such village today.

The village of Tannersville, NY, is nestled in the majestic peaks of the Catskill Mountains in Greene County. Early on, the tanning industry was thriving and was the focal point of the region, behest the name Tannersville. However, the arrival of the Ulster and Delaware Railroad in 1882 brought a tourist boom to the village which still exists today. This boom prompted the building of new roadside stores, sidewalks, and expanded streets leading to vacation hideaways in the countryside. This industry contributed to the rapid expansion of Tannersville's public services not to mention the village's cultural heritage. The influx of part-time neighbors such as Mark Twain and Maude Adams made musicals, stage performances, and dancing all a part of life in Tannersville.

Mr. Speaker, massive fires coupled with the devastation of the Great Depression in the 1930's couldn't keep this village down. Following World War II the tourist industry again resurfaced and with the arrival of nearby Hunter Mountain ski slope and other winter recreation spots, there was a new focus on tourism. Now, the various village shops, inns, and restaurants offer both hometown hospitality and down home charm to the thousands of tourists who flock to this picturesque mountaintop community throughout all seasons.

Mr. Speaker, I take great price in representing the people like those who make their home in Tannersville. They truly reflect those traditional American qualities of pride and community which made our Nation great. Just ask anyone who visits the area from near or far and they'll tell you the citizens of Tannersville exemplify the terms courtesy and hospitality while offering a sincere sense of camaraderie. These characteristics are most definitely a product of their history and way of life making Tannersville an ideal place to work and raise a family or vacation year round.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you and all Members rise with me today and salute the village of Tannersville on their 100th anniversary and wish the people there many more years of prosperity and comfort.

COMMEMORATING THE 10TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE TOMAS RIVER CENTER

HON. ESTEBAN EDWARD TORRES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 3, 1995

Mr. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Tomas River Center [TRC] on its 10th anniversary.

TRC was established in 1985 by a group of visionary college presidents and chief executive officers of major corporations. Named after former University of Riverside chancellor, Tomas Rivera, an accomplished scholar and community activist, the center is a national institute for policy studies. It conducts relevant and timely research and policy analysis on issues important to the U.S. Latino community.

As the Nation's premier Latino organization for policy analysis and research, TRC strives to foster sound public policies and programs concerning the Latino community, particularly

in the areas of education, immigration, and civic empowerment.

TRC's rigorous research and critical analysis has consistently led to a better understanding of the needs of the Latino population. TRC conducted an extensive analysis of 1990 census data to provide information available on ethnicity, employment, and income for use in the affirmative action debate. TRC is currently researching the availability of computers in the classrooms and homes of Latino students to determine whether they are receiving the education needed to participate in 21st century society.

Mr. Speaker, it is with pride that I rise to recognize the Tomas Rivera Center on the occasion of its 10th anniversary and I ask my colleagues to join me in extending best wishes and continued success to TRC.

THE BUDGET CRISIS

HON. ERNEST J. ISTOOK, JR.

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 3, 1995

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Speaker, my fellow Oklahoman, Paul Harvey, recently gave this commentary on the budget debt and the cronic budget deficit. This reemphasizes the importance of our work on balancing the budget within the next 7 years and reversing the trend of Federal budgets of the past. It is important for Congress to continue working to restore fiscal integrity to the Federal Government.

[Paul Harvey commentary follows:]

TOO MANY ALARMS

There are too many alarms going off: Americans are refusing to heed any of them.

Seismologists predict quakes which may or may not happen and about which we can't do anything anyway.

Even the sky is falling, as ten thousand hunks of space junk wait their turn for re-entry.

Daily headlines threaten us with invasions of killer ants, killer bees and killer diseases for which we have no cure.

And so it is that it is that a time bomb more certain than any of these is mostly ignored.

We are about to be buried alive under a national debt of 4.8 trillion dollars and it's growing 10 thousand dollars a second!

But are not both the President and the Congress promising to defuse the bomb? They are.

President Clinton says he can balance the budget in ten years; Congress talks of doing it in seven.

But nobody is doing it!

And history justifies anxiety.

The President who promises to balance the budget in ten years told Larry King in June of 1992 that he'd accomplish that objective in five years.

However, instead of presenting a balanced budget in 1993—the year he took office—he increased our debt by \$253 billion.

Then, instead of presenting a balanced budget in 1994, he increased our debt another \$203 billion.

Then, instead of presenting a balanced budget for 1995, he proposed a budget that would increase our debt another \$320 billion.

Then, instead of promoting Congress' plan to balance the budget in seven years, he's threatening to veto it claiming that that's going too fast!

Now, a full three years after Mr. Clinton promised to present a five-year plan to bal-

ance the budget, he is promising—oh, so promising—to balance the budget in ten.

If the situation were less dire . . . if the time bomb were not so big and so unstable perhaps we could wait and see and hope and pray that this time—this time—something will be done.

We must not wait.

Even Newt Gingrich says it may take ten years. We may not have ten years.

Every child born today will pay a lifetime tax rate of over 82%.

Every child born tomorrow will pay \$187,000 in taxes for the interest on what we owe.

That's just the interest . . . \$187,000 in interest on our debt.

Every American man, woman and child will owe \$24,000 by the year 2000, and that, by the way, is just one presidential election away.

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

SPEECH OF

HON. NICK J. RAHALL II

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1995

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2127) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes:

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the cuts proposed in the Labor-HHS-Education appropriations bill, and particularly for title I compensatory education.

This House is proposing to cut the lifeline of education for disadvantaged children in this country—known as title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

Remember all the horror stories you've heard about little Johnny who can't read? Remember the report about the huge number of 17-year-olds in this country who had been given high school degrees but who couldn't read or write? Title I is the remedial program that is putting a stop to illiteracy among young children that carries over to adulthood.

Title I services are paid for with Federal dollars which local folks can't afford to pay for themselves—or at least, not without raising taxes.

Mr. Chairman, I represent 16 counties in West Virginia. My 16-county, title I children stand to lose more than \$5 million in fiscal year 1996 title I funds.

I am here to tell you, Mr. Chairman, there is no way that my 16 counties can afford to raise taxes to replace \$5 million in lost title I dollars next year.

Is there anyone here on this floor whose district can afford to raise taxes in order to replace Federal title I dollars?

Mr. Chairman, education cuts don't heal. They bleed and stay sore, but they never heal.

Children who are already wary from bumping up against the wall of poverty, without title I remedial education, will never heal from these cuts.

If these kids are to avoid running into the wall of indifference and illiteracy as adults, we must help them right now by keeping their educational lifeline open to them.

This is a crucial vote—vote “no” on H.R. 2127.

WILLIAMS D. EVANS: DAYTON INVENTOR'S CONTRIBUTION TO ENDING WORLD WAR II

HON. TONY P. HALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 3, 1995

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise to call to the attention of my colleagues the achievements of William Deane Evans and his contribution to ending World War II. Mr. Evans is a resident of Madison Township in the Third Congressional District of Ohio, which I represent.

Mr. Evans developed an improvement to the bombsight that was used on the Enola Gay on its historic mission 50 years ago this month that helped bring a speedy end to World War II. The improved bombsight was also used on the Bockscar, which is on display at the United States Air Force Museum in my district.

Mr. Evans, an innovative engineer, was responsible for numerous other technological developments in aviation that improved the fighting capabilities of our airmen during World War II and later. These inventions include the automatic parachute opener and a bag to protect downed flyers in freezing weather.

Last year, the Dayton Daily News ran an article by Dale Huffman detailing some of the achievements by Mr. Evans. For the benefit of my colleagues, the article is reprinted here.

[From the Dayton Daily News, Aug. 14, 1994]

DAYTONIAN'S BOMBSIGHT AIDED U.S.

(By Dale Huffman)

Things were cloaked in top secrecy, and it was two years after World War II ended before William Deane Evans found out he had played a strategic role in one of history's gruesome turning points.

His contribution was created in a three-car garage behind a home in the 600 block of Volusia Avenue in Oakwood.

It was there in 1944 that Evans, a 29-year-old engineer, was commissioned for a special assignment by the bomb control department at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base. In that garage, he worked for Kendal Clark, an engineer who later invented the automatic washer for Frigidaire in Dayton. Evans developed a bombsight. It was used on the Enola Gay, a B-29 aircraft, to drop the atomic bomb on Hiroshima, Japan, 49 years ago this month.

Evans is 79 now and lives on Brenton Drive in Madison Twp. with Helen, 78 his wife of 55 years. Their home is cluttered with possessions and mementos, and photographs that document their years together.

But there are no photos, no blueprints no prototypes, no physical evidence of the monumental contribution he made for his country in the controversial atomic attack that claimed 130,000 Japanese lives and hastened the end of the war.

Evans is a portly, kindly looking man with a short white beard and thinning snow white hair. He has diabetes and a pacemaker.

But his mind is keen and, at request, he sat down and deftly sketched a hand drawing of the bombsight he developed those years ago.

"They took everything at the time, it was all such top secret," he said. "They locked

the finished plans, the prototype, everything up in some vault somewhere and I have no idea if those items still exist today."

He used a lot of engineering terms as he rambled, but he tried to simplify a description of his device and how it worked.

"Often, on a fairly cloudy time of day, only snatches of clear air were present for the bombardier to fix the sight on the target. Time was crucial. We designed a set of optics tied into the bombsight, which would in effect put crosshairs on the target, instead of in the eye piece.

"To do this, we made the cross of light and focused it at infinity. A light shone through a reticle, which was projected onto a telescope mirror. If the bombardier could see the target, he could swing the sight to fix the cross on the target in the short time the non-clouds permitted him."

His device was used Aug. 6, 1945, when the atomic bomb was dropped on Hiroshima, Japan surrendered, ending World War II on Aug. 14, after a second bomb was dropped on Nagasaki on Aug. 9, 1945.

It was in 1947, two years after the bombings and V-J Day, that Evans read about the bombsight in a magazine, recognized it as his work, made some calls and confirmed his sighting mechanism had been used.

"So many little shops were working here in the Dayton area during the war," he said. "Many contributions were being made to the government and to the military.

"The little guys did the behind-the-scenes work. We developed. Then our products were tested by the government, eventually used, quite successfully at least in this case, and then the higher-ups would take the credit. I am not being sarcastic about it," he said, smiling. "It was just done that way."

Evans has known all these years that his device played a big part in the bombings. Yet, he has seldom talked about it, even to family, his wife says. He has never before been interviewed about it for a publication.

As the countdown is now under way to the 50th anniversary of V-J Day, Helen Evans said she thought it was time the world knew about her husband's contribution.

"I initiated this, so that he would get some credit," she said. "All his life, he has been so modest. He is such a fine man and such a hard worker. But he never has gotten his due. He helped change the face of history. In his own way he helped end a war."

Her husband spoke. "I am . . . glad that Harry Truman did what he did. He knew that if he didn't, what we would lose a lot more American men . . . that their blood would flow. Sure we are sorry anyone had to die. But the war had to be stopped. I am behind Mr. Truman in what he did.

"And, quite candidly, I am . . . glad that I was an engineer and able to support my country by developing this bombsight. We all give as we can and we all pull together in war."

Evans got his engineering degree at Ohio State University and spent his life in the profession. From 1970 to 1984, he owned and operated his own company called Plastomatics in Dayton.

"Bill always worked hard, but always was his own man," Mrs. Evans said. "He also trusted a lot of people and was naive in business. He would develop something, or invent something, and someone else would take it and make a lot of money on it.

"Bill has always been a workaholic. He didn't care about making money or building a fortune. He just loved what he did. He worked 80-hour weeks and would forget to come home. He is an incredible person when it comes to dedicating yourself to a challenge."

She smiled and added, "We never had a lot of money. But we have always been happy.

We have always been comfortable. We have had ups and downs, but we have survived. And I love Bill so much for all that he has done. He is a wonderful man who simply wants to know what makes things tick."

Evans smiled, reached over and lovingly tapped his wife's arm.

After a few moments he said, "I guess I feel it's fun to be fooled in this world. But it's . . . more fun to know."

HONORING DON MOSER UPON HIS RETIREMENT

HON. BART GORDON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 3, 1995

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a dear friend, Don Moser, who has contributed much to my hometown of Murfreesboro, TN. He has been a wonderful source of advice and support over the years, and I wish him well upon his retirement.

Don has served Murfreesboro for many years. From his undergraduate days at Middle Tennessee State University, to serving as president of the local chamber of commerce, Don has contributed time and time again.

He cochaired the recent fund raising drive to secure funds for the chamber's new headquarters building and has been a long time member of the Murfreesboro Water and Sewer Board. Don's love for his community can be seen in his commitment to the Rutherford 20/20 Task Force, which is hard at work planning for the future of Rutherford County.

Most in our community will tell you if you want something done and done right, call on Don and his wife, Jean; they are the busiest people in town. They complement each other well and make an unstoppable team.

The banking community is sure to feel his absence after 38 years as an active leader and friend. He is retiring as regional president of Third National Bank in Murfreesboro.

Don is an avid golfer and I feel sure that many of his free days now will be spent hitting the links. He and Jean plan to do some traveling, as well as spending time with their two grown children, Donald S. and Michelle.

The bank's loss is the community's gain, for he will now have even more time to contribute, and we are grateful. Please join me in congratulating this outstanding individual.

COMMENDING KEITH JEWEL

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 3, 1995

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, Keith Jewel is just that. For the House of Representatives, he has been a splendid gem for a very long time.

Keith is the one who takes the pictures of the Boy Scouts and Girl Scouts on the steps of the Capitol. And before one makes too light of that, remember this: to high school kids who visit Washington, the experience lasts forever. The taxpayers got their money's worth from Keith's service. And we have all enjoyed his warm and friendly personality. He goes on now to a well earned retirement. And we wish

him the happiness he has given so many others through the years.

A TRIBUTE TO ALBERT BARNES
JR.

HON. JERRY LEWIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 3, 1995

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to your attention the fine work and outstanding public service of Mr. Albert Barnes, Jr. Al, a dedicated professional and longtime community activist, is retiring as the southeast California district manager for the United Parcel Service [UPS]. A tribute will be held in his honor on August 24 to recognize his years of service to California's Inland Empire.

Al began his career with UPS as a delivery driver in Dayton, OH in 1967. Two years later, he became a supervisor and in 1972, was named center manager. Al served as a feeder manager, package division manager, and hub division manager before joining the Arizona District as a division manager in 1975. In addition, he has served on a number of special assignments and worked as a member of the UPS Part-Time People Support Committee.

In 1989, Al was named southeast California district manager for UPS, which has become one of the most respected corporate citizens in the region. Al was in charge of the planning, construction, and opening of the largest UPS west coast air hub in Ontario, CA in 1992. To say the least, Al has played an extraordinary and active role in our community. In addition to his outstanding business contributions, Al has been a longtime supporter of and deeply involved with the Boys and Girls Club of the Inland Empire as a member of the board of directors.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you join me, our colleagues, and Al's family and many friends in recognizing his many fine achievements and selfless contributions. I'd also like to wish Al, his wife Margaret, their daughter, Rebecca, and sons John, Mike, and Ed the very best in the years ahead. Throughout his career, Albert Barnes has touched the lives of many people and it is only fitting that the House of Representatives recognize him today.

TRIBUTE TO CONGRESSMAN
THOMAS MORGAN

HON. FRANK MASCARA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 3, 1995

Mr. MASCARA. Mr. Speaker, I rise with pride today to pay tribute to a man who served the people of Pennsylvania and this Nation for 32 years.

Dr. Thomas Morgan passed away on July 31, 1995. He retired from Congress in 1977, but the memory of "Doc" Morgan will be engraved in American politics, having guided our Nation through significant world events.

We can point with pride to a man who rose to the chairmanship of the prestigious House Foreign Affairs Committee, advising Presidents and Secretaries of State, while never

compromising the integrity of the institution in which he served.

I was pleased to know "Doc" Morgan and honored to now represent the district he once served. After he retired, we regularly kept in touch. He was always a man of his word, with a depth and breadth of knowledge that he maintained all the years of his life.

It is an honor and a privilege to be standing before you today, where he once stood, representing the next generation of southwestern Pennsylvanians.

I hope that I can do credit to his legacy while serving in the U.S. Congress. I extend every sympathy to those who are now grieving his loss. He will not be forgotten.

THREATENED PRESIDENTIAL
VETO OF LEGISLATIVE BRANCH
APPROPRIATIONS BILL

HON. RON PACKARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 3, 1995

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, President Clinton has declared his intention to veto the 1996 legislative branch appropriations bill. It should no longer surprise me that the President has once again chosen to put petty politics above the interests of effective and efficient Government, but it does. This is not because the President rarely threatens veto, far from it, in fact, it is beginning to appear that this is the norm. Rather, the President surprises me because there is absolutely no justification, however flimsy, for such a threat.

President Clinton alleges that we are taking care of our own business before we take care of the people's. This is simply not the case. There is nothing unusual about sending the legislative branch bill first. Traditionally, the legislative branch has been done first because it has tended to be the least controversial. Furthermore, all 13 appropriations bills have never been sent to the President at the same time.

The fiscal year 1996 legislative branch appropriations bill is a good piece of work, crafted with the assistance of Democrats and receiving bipartisan support all along the way. The bill sets out to downsize and streamline Government in pursuit of a balanced budget. By providing \$206 million in deficit reduction, it shows that Congress is committed to cutting itself first. The message of this bill that President Clinton does not understand is that reform starts at home. This Congress is committed to achieving a balanced budget and we will not be stopped by a President intent on meddling in the affairs of the House out of petty political motives.

75TH ANNIVERSARY OF WWJ
NEWSRADIO 950

HON. DAVID E. BONIOR

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 3, 1995

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, later this month, on August 20, 1995, America's first commercial radio station, WWJ Newsradio 950, will be celebrating its 75th anniversary. For three

quarters of a century the listeners in metropolitan Detroit have tuned in to 950 AM for news, sports, and entertainment.

Back in 1920, when radio was still in its infancy, and long before television, WWJ was pioneering a new way for people to become and remain informed and entertained. On that historic August 20th, listeners heard: "This is 8MK calling." It was just one of the many firsts for WWJ.

WWJ Newsradio was first to broadcast a news program, election returns, and sports. WWJ was also first to do a play-by-play sportscast live from the scene. On October 25, 1924, Ty Tyson described the University of Michigan's 21 to 0 victory over the University of Wisconsin. WWJ continues to carry U of M football to many fans throughout southeast Michigan. WWJ also broadcast the first play-by-play of a Tiger baseball game on April 19, 1927. The Tigers beat the Cleveland Indians 8 to 5 with famed Tiger Marty McManus making several outstanding plays at second base.

WWJ has a proud heritage and a reputation for integrity and public service. In the words of one of the WWJ newsradio team members, "tradition is exceeded only by our commitment to continued service."

Celebrating a 75th anniversary is a proud milestone. Through the Depression and too many wars, the New Deal and the Great Society, the folks at WWJ have been with us all the way. I applaud WWJ for keeping our community well-informed.

I urge my colleagues to please join me in saluting WWJ on the event of its Diamond Anniversary. The people of metropolitan Detroit have long depended on its role in the community and we hope the next 75 years will continue to be as successful.

CREATING A 21ST GOVERNMENT

HON. STEVEN SCHIFF

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 3, 1995

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, in our recent series of field hearing on creating a 21st government, the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight traveled to Cleveland, OH. Members heard testimony from several experts in the field of government restructuring.

One of our panelists was the Mayor of Philadelphia, Edward Rendell, who described the structure of the city of Philadelphia's government when he took office in January 1992. He concluded that:

The city was operating with management systems that were designed for a different era. The city's budget process, personnel system, contracting process, management hierarchy, and information system were layered with unwieldy, bureaucratic practices that did not encourage innovative and effective management of limited resources.

As a public servant myself, I have watched our Federal Government structure grow out of control for decades. Perhaps we can learn from these cities and apply some of their successful reorganization methods to the Federal Government. Republican members of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight remain dedicated to creating a Government structure through innovation, revitalizing management practices, and distinguishing the

functions that are needed to produce the results that the American public demands.

HONORING THOSE WHO SERVED
THE CAUSE OF FREEDOM IN
WORLD WAR II

HON. JACK FIELDS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 3, 1995

Mr. FIELDS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, for America, World War II began on a day that will live in infamy, and it ended at the dawn of the nuclear age. In between those two events, America and the world as a whole changed forever, as did the lives of each and every American alive at that time.

Americans have begun observing the 50th anniversary of the end of World War II—a horrible war that inflicted more pain, death and destruction on the world than any conflict before it or since. It was a war that claimed the lives of more than 1 million young Americans struggling to defend liberty here at home and around the world. It was war that injured and maimed hundreds of thousands of military personnel and civilians alike. It was a war in which young men demonstrated superhuman courage and determination in places like Pointe du Hoc and Iwo Jima. And it was a war in which others demonstrated almost inhuman depravity in places like Auschwitz and Dachau.

It was in which my father, Jack Fields, Sr., fought as a bombardier aboard a B-24 Liberator in Europe.

But why did he and millions of other peace-loving Americans, eagerly answer the call to take up arms during World War II?

Like millions of other young men in towns and cities across this great country, my father joined the war effort because he knew that there are things worth fighting, and dying, for: ideals like freedom and democracy, and places like America in which those ideals had been brought to life. Like millions of other veterans, he did his part in a worldwide effort to free those who had been conquered and enslaved by the forces of darkness. Countless young Americans traveled far from their homes, risked their lives and endured terrible hardships to defeat the forces that had, temporarily, defeated democracy in western Europe and throughout much of Asia. They did so as well because they knew that the cause in which they were engaged was just. They knew that God would watch over them, as He had always watched over America. And they knew that with His help, they would prevent the flame of freedom from flickering out on this planet.

Many brave young men gave their lives in that successful struggle to ensure that freedom lived on. Many more suffered wounds and injuries that changed their lives forever. Most, thank God, just returned home, found jobs and raised their families. But they, too, were changed by the war. They knew firsthand its horrors, but they knew that it had been necessary to preserve the American way of life that too many of our citizens take for granted.

The men who fought and won World War II were, for the most part, ordinary Americans from ordinary towns across our country. But

they had accomplished an extraordinary feat: they had preserved freedom in America and England; they had restored freedom to France; and they had helped bring about a rebirth of freedom in post-war Germany, Italy, and Japan. The world, then, not only America, owes each and every one of them a huge debt of thanks.

But America owes them even more. It owes them this solemn promise: that each of us will do everything we can to keep America militarily strong—so strong that never again will young Americans be called upon to fight and die in a world war to defend democracy and freedom, because no one will ever again dare threaten democracy and freedom anywhere around the world.

PROTECT EQUAL JUSTICE FOR
ALL—DON'T CUT THE LEGAL
SERVICES CORPORATION

HON. BERNARD SANDERS

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 3, 1995

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Legal Service Corporation, and in opposition to the destructive 30 percent cut of that program in the Commerce-State-Justice appropriations bill.

Mr. Speaker, a bedrock principle of this Nation is equal justice for all. But we all know that access to justice for ordinary Americans usually means access to legal counsel.

Often, the most vulnerable among us—those most in need of legal help and representation—cannot afford an attorney. That is why the Supreme Court ruled everyone has a right to a lawyer in a criminal case, and it is why President Nixon founded the Legal Service Corporation to offer low-income Americans representation in civil court.

Mr. Speaker, when this House voted to slash funding for the Legal Service Corporation, in my view it voted to restrict access to justice for the over 15 percent of Americans who live in poverty. Mr. Chairman, that is unconscionable.

Legal services attorneys were there for family farmers who couldn't afford high-priced, downtown lawyers, when they helped prevent over 250,000 illegal farm foreclosures. In Vermont and across this country, they are there for battered women seeking orders of protection, child support enforcement, and divorces from abusive spouses. These attorneys were there to safeguard coal miners' rights in Kentucky, and to protect Oregon farmworkers from beatings, kidnappings and illegally low wages.

These public servants are funded by a model of efficiency and federalism. Only 3 percent of Legal Service Corporation expenditures go to administrative costs, meaning 97 percent goes directly to provide legal services for poor Americans. There is no large bureaucracy; the approximately 100 employees of the Corporation spend their time distributing Federal funds to 323 independent, local legal services programs and ensuring they receive the support needed to deliver top notch legal level help. Each individual program is a private, nonprofit corporation governed by a locally appointed board of directors.

Mr. Chairman, the Legal Service Corporation simply extends equal rights and justice to

all Americans; it does exactly what Government should be doing. If we are serious about deficit reduction, we should cut the hundreds of billions of dollars in corporate welfare in the Federal budget. We should eliminate tax giveaways to the rich before we eliminate these protections for the most vulnerable members of our society.

For the benefit of my colleagues, I ask unanimous consent to insert into the RECORD a resolution from the New England Bar Association board of directors, which succinctly makes the case for the Legal Service Corporation.

NEW ENGLAND BAR ASSOCIATION

BOARD OF DIRECTORS RESOLUTION

Whereas, equal justice is fundamental to the American system of government under laws; and

Whereas, the inability to afford legal counsel effectively denies access to justice for individuals with legal needs; and

Whereas, the New England Bar Association is strongly committed to support adequate legal services for the poor; and

Whereas, the federal Legal Services Corporation is the organization charged by Congress with funding legal services programs throughout the country to deliver civil legal services to the poor; and

Whereas, local legal services programs funded by the Legal Services Corporation represent the federal government's effort to fulfill the promise that all Americans have an equal opportunity to utilize the justice system, and

Whereas, local legal services programs funded by the federal Legal Services Corporation are a frugal and effective expenditure of federal tax dollars, inexpensively and efficiently serving a broad range of persons with typical legal problems through more than 900 local offices and effectively leveraging local, state and private funds as well as pro bono services from the private bar, and

Whereas, the future of the Legal Services Corporation is at a critical juncture, facing Congressional threats to eliminate or severely cut funding of the Legal Services Corporation; and

Whereas, it is imperative that bar associations and others concerned with equal access to justice and legal services for the poor continue to express support for the civil legal services delivery system which has served the legal needs of the country's poorest citizens; and

Now, therefore, be it resolved that the New England Bar Association Board of Directors urges all members of the Congressional delegation to support adequate funding for the Legal Services Corporation to address the tremendous unmet need for civil legal services for the poor.

Be it further resolved that the New England Bar Association strongly opposes any amendments to the Legal Services Corporation Act to restrict legal services and pro bono programs in their use of IOLTA and other government and private monies; create obstacles to low income people obtaining justice in the courts and legal system; impinge on confidentiality between attorneys and their clients; or dismantle local control and destroy the effectiveness of the current legal services delivery system.

LAFAYETTE, IN: NAMED ALL-AMERICAN CITY

HON. JOHN T. MYERS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 3, 1995

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, the National Civic League named Lafayette, IN an All-American City at its annual convention in June. Lafayette was one of only 10 cities nationwide that received this designation out of 145 communities under consideration. The citizens of Lafayette will observe the well-deserved recognition this Sunday with a day long celebration.

Lafayette was recognized by the National Civic League for the ability of its citizens to effectively solve problems by working together as a community. I can attest to that ethic as it relates to the Lafayette railroad relocation project. This massive rail relocation effort was designed by city officials, corporate and business leaders and local citizens with the safety needs of the community in mind. I am continually amazed at the near unanimous support the project receives from all of the community's citizens.

The willingness of the community to help its neighbors is exhibited by the altruistic work done by the Lafayette Neighborhood Housing Services and the family services organizations. These nonprofit groups, comprised of lenders, city officials, businesses, residents, and other interested parties, have successfully developed 50 safe and affordable rental units for lower-income citizens. No one can argue that Lafayette doesn't take care of its own.

Lafayette is a city that has retained the values of hard work, faith, and patriotism even as it has grown into a major metropolitan area. It is a community that should serve as a model to cities across the Nation and I am proud to represent its citizens in Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate Lafayette on this designation and encourage the citizens and elected officials to wear the title of "All-American City" with pride. It is certainly deserved.

IN HONOR OF THOMAS K. BLALOCK

HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 3, 1995

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mr. Thomas K. Blalock, the public works director of the city of Fremont in California's 13th Congressional District. Tom is retiring after 34 years of dedicated service to our community.

Tom began his professional career in Fremont in November 1960, when he became Fremont's assistant city engineer. As assistant city engineer, he was responsible for managing the engineering division and overseeing the areas of project design, construction management, real property, and traffic engineering. In March 1975, Tom became Fremont's director of public works where, for the last 20 years, he has managed from 172 to 254 employees in four areas: engineering, maintenance, integrated waste, and administration.

Tom has been a resident of the South Bay for over 43 years. After graduating from San José State University with an engineering degree in December 1954, he began his career as a planning aide in the city of Mountain View, where he had worked as an engineering aide throughout college. In April 1955 he moved to the city of Sunnyvale to work as a design and traffic engineer. He held this position until November 1960 when he came to Fremont.

Tom belongs to a number of professional organizations including the American Public Works Association [APWA] of which he is a life member. In 1991, he was the recipient of the APWA's Samuel A. Greely Award. He is also a member of the American Society of Civil Engineers [ASCE] where he has served as an executive board member for 10 years in the urban planning and development division. In 1985, he received the ASCE's Harland Bartholomew Award, a national award for urban and regional planning. He is also a member of the League of California Cities. In 1991, he was president of the league's public works officers department and has also served on a number of the league's policy committees.

Tom has also served on the boards of many of our community organizations including the Chadbourne School Family and Faculty Association, from 1962 to 1965, and the Mission San José High School Parent Faculty Association, where he was chair from 1976 to 1978. He also participated as a Mission San José Little League umpire from 1970 to 1974 and has been an active member of St. Anne's Episcopal Church, serving both as bishop's committee member and a senior warden. He was a member of the Children's Home Society of California for 14 years and represented that organization at the both local and the state level.

Although Tom's expertise will be sorely missed by those in the city of Fremont, he was elected last November to the Bay Area Rapid Transit [BART] Board for region 6. Therefore, citizens in this area will continue to benefit from his knowledge of and involvement with engineering and transportation issues.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to recognize Mr. Thomas K. Blalock for his commitment to our community. I hope you and all of my colleagues will join me and all of Tom's friends and neighbors in congratulating him on his retirement and wishing him well in all of his future endeavors.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE LEW ENGMAN

HON. HENRY A. WAXMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 3, 1995

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Lew Engman. Lew died on July 12 of this year at the age of 59. His sudden and premature death saddened all of his friends and associates who knew and worked with Lew over the years.

Lew was an honorable and honest man who was a pleasure to deal with. Whether or not you had a difference of views, you could depend on him to be straightforward, fair-minded, and true to his word. And a difference in view never translated into personal enmity or unpleasantness.

At the time of his death, Lew was president of the Generic Pharmaceutical Industry Association. Previously, when I first got to know him in the early 1980's, he was president of the sometimes rival Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association, representing the industry's research firms. That Lew could head both associations, first one then the other, yet never be caught in contradiction or inconsistency, says a lot about the integrity with which he went about everything he did. In each case, he managed to stay totally loyal to his clients, and totally dependable as a man of his word.

I got to know Lew during the negotiations that led to passage of the 1984 Drug Price Competition and Patent Term Restoration Act. In securing support for that act, we had to balance the research-based drug companies' need for an adequate patent term with the goal of the generic drug industry to be on the market and able to compete as soon as those patents expired, with all the benefits that could bring to the public.

The issue was complicated, and the players fractious. Lew Engman put his name on the line to seal the compromise, approved by his companies, that made a bill possible. And when later some of his members broke ranks, he stuck to his word. His refusal to break his promise to Senator HATCH and me cost him his job, a considerable irony in view of the fact that the patent-restoration half of the compromise which he worked so skillfully to obtain might never have occurred without his deft guidance.

In the end, passage of the 1984 Waxman-Hatch Act was a testament to Lew Engman's conviction that the best form of legislation can achieve the aims of private interests while serving the public interest as well.

Lew of course had achieved a lot long before I knew him. An antitrust lawyer and economist by training, he had served in the Nixon and Ford administrations, as general counsel to the President's special assistant for consumer affairs, on the White House Domestic Council staff, then as Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission from 1973 to 1976. In the latter position, Lew was one of the first Government officials to note that some Federal agencies had become servants of the industries they regulated, and to call for some deregulation where appropriate.

I won't try to list all of Lew's achievements. Suffice it to note that two decades ago, Time magazine picked him among the country's young leaders to watch, and Lew proved the pick a good one. It saddens me that we will watch him no more; at just 59 and full of energy, he was far too young to die.

CITIZEN EXCHANGE PROGRAMS
CRITICAL TO FOSTERING BETTER UNDERSTANDING BETWEEN NATIONS

HON. STENY H. HOYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 3, 1995

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my concern about the proposed cuts in the commerce, state, justice, and related agencies appropriations bill for fiscal year 1996 as it relates to educational and cultural exchange programs within the United States Information Agency.

As a member of the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe, I have witnessed first-hand the importance of people-to-people exchanges. They are instrumental in promoting our country and the democratic ideals that make our country great.

In addition, like many Members of this House, both Republican and Democrat alike, I, too, have been a part of a citizens exchange program. The American council of young political leaders, one of the recipients of USIA funding, was formed nearly 30 years ago as a non-profit bi-partisan educational exchange organization to enhance foreign policy understanding and exposure among rising young American political leaders and their counterparts around the world.

Since its establishment, Mr. Speaker, more than 3,000 political leaders from the United States and 2,000 foreign delegates have participated in some 500 governmental and business exchanges with their counterparts in more than 70 countries. The ACYPL's efforts are a key component of not only our exchange programs but in fostering better relations and understandings between nations. I am only sorry that programs such as ACYPL's may be at risk as a result of these proposed cuts in educational and exchange programs.

SISTER GRACE IMELDA
BLANCHARD

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 3, 1995

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep regret that I inform our colleagues of the passing of a truly outstanding and caring individual who dedicated her life to the education of our young people.

Sister Grace Imelda Blanchard was in many ways the epitome of those with whom so many Americans are familiar—the women of the religious community who truly believed that expanding the minds of young men and women was instrumental in carrying out God's intentions.

A native of New Haven, CT, Sister Grace received her bachelor of arts degree from Albertus Magnus College in 1936, a master's in secondary supervision in 1943, and a Ph.D. in education from New York University in 1968. Realizing that only by becoming a religious would she be able to fully devote her life to education, she entered the order of the Dominican Sisters of Newburgh, NY, on September 8, 1957. She subsequently entered the novitiate June 11, 1958; made her first profession June 17, 1959, and her final profession August 21, 1962.

Sister Grace's career as an educator encompassed a number of high schools, but it was at Mount Saint Mary College in Newburgh that she truly made her mark, beloved by her students, by her peers, by the administration, and by the community at large. She was an associate professor from 1968 to 1977 and a professor of education from 1978 to 1983. The administrators at Mount Saint Mary asked Sister Grace to take charge of the college's efforts to receive grant funding. They could not have made a better choice, for Sister Grace soon became a regular visitor to my congressional offices and other offices throughout

Washington and Albany, where her perseverance and expertise in obtaining funding for the students became legendary.

Sister Grace was universally respected because she never hid the fact that she considered the education of the students to be her prime responsibility. We all admired the professional manner in which she knew how to obtain funding in an ever more competitive environment.

Sister Grace Imelda's accomplishments were not confined to her college. Her work on the literacy program for adults at the local high school, at the soup kitchen at St. Patrick's Church in Newburgh, and as a catechetical teacher in Montgomery, NY, made her known and loved in all of those communities.

In 1986, Sister Grace was presented with the Mount Saint Mary Faculty Award. The text of that award states:

We are in her debt, not only for her stewardship over grants and goals, but also because she makes us better individuals. It is possible to calculate the dollars she has obtained for the college in writing Title III Grants, but impossible to measure her more priceless contribution of self.

Sister Grace Imelda was traveling to the founding chapter of the Dominican Sisters of Hope in Massachusetts when she was taken ill. We lost her while the chapter was in session and she was buried with a rite of commitment on July 24. However, on next Monday, August 7, will mark a memorial mass in her honor at the college chapel, where her many friends and admirers will gather to bid farewell to a remarkable woman.

I happened to speak to Sister Grace just a few days prior to her passing. As was her practice, she had called to remind me that education must remain one of Congress' top priorities, and to underscore the need for continued quality in higher education. As always, Sister Grace was seeking future funding to assist in the laudable goals of her college.

Mr. Speaker, I extend my condolences to her sister-in-law, to her niece, to her four nephews, and to her many grandnieces and grandnephews. Their grief may be tempered with the knowledge that it is shared by many, and by the realization that Sister Grace Imelda Blanchard was a rare individual who will long be remembered.

BOSNIA-HERZEGOVINA SELF-
DEFENSE ACT OF 1995

SPEECH OF

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1995

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (S. 21) to terminate the United States arms embargo applicable to the Government of Bosnia and Herzegovina:

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, this week the Congress spoke its mind on the situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina, and we did so clearly and forcefully, just as the Senate did last week. By an overwhelming majority, we supported the right of the people of Bosnia and Herzegovina to defend themselves.

The Congress, however, is not the only voice expressing outrage over the toleration of

aggression and genocide. On Monday, 27 nongovernmental organizations released a joint statement on Bosnia. It is a powerful statement which I request be inserted into the RECORD, and which I commend to my colleagues. Let me quote from it:

Bosnia is not a faraway land of no concern to our "national interest." At stake is the global commitment to fundamental human values—the right not to be killed because of one's religion or ethnic heritage, and the right of civilians not to be targeted by combatants. The time has come for multilateral military action to end the massacre of innocent civilians in Bosnia. Nothing else has worked. Force must be used to stop genocide, not simply to retreat from it. American leadership, in particular, is required.

These words, Mr. Speaker, come from a variety of American organizations. They include religious organizations, those dedicated to humanitarian causes, including the care of refugees; and groups dedicated to the rule of law. These are not organizations which one would assume support military options; the fact that they do says something about the gravity of what is happening in Bosnia. Moreover, some are Arab-American organizations, and some are Jewish-American organizations. The list represents a broad spectrum.

Another statement on Bosnia has also been released recently—the letter of resignation by the U.N.'s rapporteur on human rights in the former Yugoslavia, former Polish Prime Minister Tadeusz Mazowiecki. Mr. Mazowiecki is known as a thoughtful and principled man; his dedication to human rights is evident as much in his resignation as it was in his acceptance of this position 3 years ago. I would like to submit that statement for the RECORD as well, Mr. Speaker, and let me quote a few lines from it:

One cannot speak about the protection of human rights with credibility when one is confronted with the lack of consistency and courage displayed by the international community and its leaders. The reality of the human rights situation today is illustrated by the tragedy of the people of Srebrenica and Zepa. . . Crimes have been committed with swiftness and brutality and by contrast the response of the international community has been slow and ineffectual. . . I would like to believe that the present moment will be a turning point in the relationship between Europe and the world toward Bosnia. The very stability of international order and the principle of civilization is at stake over the question of Bosnia. I am not convinced that the turning point hoped for will happen and cannot continue to participate in the pretense of the protection of human rights.

These words, Mr. Speaker, reflect the frustration of many of us who see the conflict in Bosnia for what it is, and know what needs to be done to stop it. This is not a civil war based on ancient hatreds. This is not simply about Bosnia. This conflict is about aggression and genocide, and we must beware the message which the international community is sending should give to those around the world willing to use force to achieve their political ends.

In responding to crises and conflicts, we must remain objective, and attempt to see things as they really are, without bias. That means we must abandon an artificial neutrality. We must instead identify aggressor and stand with the victim of aggression. Just as these 27 nongovernmental organizations and Mr. Mazowiecki have taken that step, so must

this Congress and this country, Mr. Speaker. We must take a stand. It's a matter of principle, and of lives.

JOINT POLICY STATEMENT ON BOSNIA

The international community's half-measures and evasions have not ended three years of ethnic slaughter in Bosnia. It is time for leadership and action. Bosnia is not a far-away land of no concern to our "national interest." At stake is the global commitment to fundamental human values—the right not to be killed because of one's religious or ethnic heritage, and the right of civilians not to be targeted by combatants.

The U.N. General Assembly, the U.N. Commission on Human Rights, the World Conference on Human Rights, and the International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia have all decried the slaughter in Bosnia as genocide, one of the most heinous crimes known to humanity. The international community has a moral and legal duty to prevent genocide (Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, Art. VIII) and to see that its instigators and those responsible for parallel war crimes and crimes against humanity are brought to justice.

The time has come for multilateral military action to end the massacre of innocent civilians in Bosnia. Nothing else has worked. Force must be used to stop genocide, not simply to retreat from it. American leadership, in particular, is required.

We represent 27 different human rights, humanitarian, religious and professional organizations. So far, our organizations have worked individually to end the atrocities in Bosnia. Today, in an effort to end the paralysis, we join together. We urgently call on President Clinton and the leaders of the other major powers to take the following steps:

Protect civilians in all "safe areas." The major powers, through their votes on the Security Council, established the six "safe areas" in Bosnia. Tens of thousands of Bosnians, many of whom had been driven from their homes elsewhere in the country, entrusted their lives to the international forces. Instead, in Srebrenica and Zepa, they have been abandoned. The major powers' recent vow to retaliate forcefully against Bosnian Serb forces if they advance on Gorazde is not enough. It should be extended to all remaining "safe areas"—Bihac, Sarajevo and Tuzla, as well as Gorazde—and triggered not only if troops advance on those havens but also if their civilians are shelled. Any military action by intervening troops should comply strictly with international humanitarian law.

Insist on immediate access to all detainees from Srebrenica and Zepa. Thousands of men who had taken refuge in Srebrenica and Zepa have now been detained by Bosnian Serb forces or face imminent detention. Reports of brutality in Srebrenica demonstrate that these detainees face an all-too-real threat of murder. To prevent further massive loss of life, the major powers should insist that international humanitarian organizations are given immediate access to all detainees and demand that their safety and well-being are ensured.

Ensure the delivery of humanitarian supplies to civilians in the "safe areas." The major powers must ensure the delivery of humanitarian supplies to the "safe areas," if necessary by employing military force in response to the obstruction of those supplies. For instance, the major powers should secure the passage of supplies to Sarajevo over the Mt. Igman road and ensure the delivery of supplies by airdrop to enclaves that are not accessible by land. Deployment of the rapid reaction force on Mt. Igman has begun, but

we remain concerned by the major powers' continuing unwillingness to insist on the right to deliver humanitarian supplies in the absence of Bosnian Serb assent.

Stigmatize those who direct, assist and supply abusive troops. The major powers should publicly name the senior political and military leaders who are presiding over atrocities. Details of their crimes should be made public and provided to the International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia. The major powers, and particularly the U.S. government, should also disclose all available information, including intelligence, that implicates Serbia in supplying, assisting or directing Bosnian Serb troops. The major powers should also strengthen the regime for monitoring external support to Bosnian Serb forces.

Do not lift, suspend or weaken sanctions against Belgrade until it cooperates fully with the investigation and extradition of suspected and indicted war criminals. The creation of the International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia is an historic opportunity to demonstrate that genocide, war crimes and crimes against humanity cannot be committed with impunity—a message that was reaffirmed with last week's indictment of Bosnian Serb political and military leaders Radovan Karadzic and Ratko Mladic. The Tribunal promises justice for victims, deterrence against further abuse, and a basis for eventual peace and reconciliation by substituting individualized guilt for the assumptions of collective ethnic guilt that now fuel the conflict. In recognition of the need for the Serbian government's active support to secure the presence of defendants for trial, the U.S. government had insisted throughout much of 1994 that sanctions against Belgrade would not be eased until it cooperated in the investigation and extradition of suspected and indicted war criminals. But to date, Belgrade has blocked Tribunal investigators and done nothing to secure custody of Bosnian Serbs under indictment. We are deeply disturbed that the major powers are nonetheless now offering Belgrade an opportunity to suspend sanctions in return for political concessions that have nothing to do with the Tribunal. That offer should be withdrawn, and Belgrade's active cooperation with the Tribunal should be made a prerequisite for any new suspension, lifting or easing of the sanctions.

Signed by: The American Jewish Committee; The American Jewish Congress; American Nurses Association; Anti-Defamation League; Arab-American Anti-Discrimination Committee; B'nai B'rith; Center for Civil and Human Rights; Center for Constitutional Rights; Equality Now; Human Rights Watch; Institute for War and Peace Reporting; International League for Human Rights; International Human Rights Law Group; International Human Rights Law Institute, DePaul University, College of Law; Jacob Blaustein Institute for the Advancement of Human Rights; Lowenstein International Human Rights Clinic, Yale Law School; Minnesota Advocates for Human Rights; National Association of Arab Americans; National Jewish Community Relations Advisory Council; Physicians for Human Rights; Refugees International; Saferworld; Travelers and Immigrants Aid of Chicago; Union of American Hebrew Congregations; Women's Refugee Project (Harvard Law School); World Vision (Andrew Natsios, Executive Director and Bob Seiple, President); U.S. Committee for Refugees.

UNITED NATIONS OFFICE AT GENEVA,

CENTRE FOR HUMAN RIGHTS,

CH 1211 Geneva 10, July 27, 1995.
His Excellency TAN SRI DATO MUSA HITAM,
Chairman of the Commission on Human Rights,
Kuala Lumpur.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Events in recent weeks in Bosnia and Herzegovina, and above all the fact that the United Nations has allowed Srebrenica and Zepa to fall along with the horrendous tragedy which has beset the population of those "safe havens" guaranteed by international agreements, oblige me to state that I do not see any possibility of continuing the mandate or special rapporteur entrusted to me by the commission on human rights.

On accepting the mandate which was given to me for the first time in August 1992, I declared unequivocally that my goal would not simply be writing reports but helping the people themselves. The creation of "safe havens" was from the very beginning a central recommendation in my reports. The recent decisions of the London conference which accepted the fall of Srebrenica and resigned itself to the fate of Zepa are unacceptable to me. Those decisions did not create the conditions necessary for the defense of all "safe havens".

These events constitute a turning point in the development of the situation in Bosnia. At one and the same time, we are dealing with the struggle of a state, a member of the United Nations, for its survival and multi-ethnic character, and with the endeavour to protect principles of international order. One cannot speak about the protection of human rights with credibility when one is confronted with the lack of consistency and courage displayed by the international community and its leaders, the reality of the human rights situation today is illustrated by the tragedy of the people of Srebrenica and Zepa.

Human rights violations continue blatantly. There are constant blockades of the delivery of humanitarian aid. The civilian population is shelled remorselessly and the "blue helmets" and representatives of humanitarian organizations are dying. Crimes have been committed with swiftness and brutality and by contrast the response of the international community has been slow and ineffectual.

The character of my mandate only allows me to further describe crimes and violations of human rights. But the present critical moment forces us to realize the true character of those crimes and the responsibility of Europe and the international community for their own helplessness in addressing them. We have been fighting in Poland against a totalitarian system with a vision for the Europe of tomorrow. How can we believe in a Europe of tomorrow created by children of people who are abandoned today?

I would like to believe that the present moment will be a turning point in the relationship between Europe and the world towards Bosnia. The very stability of international order and the principle of civilisation is at stake over the question of Bosnia. I am not convinced that the turning point hoped for will happen and cannot continue to participate in the pretense of the protection of human rights.

Mr. Chairman, please understand the motives behind my decision and convey them to the members of the Commission on Human Rights. I will submit my final eighteenth report based on my recent mission to Tuzla to the commission in the near future.

Please accept, Excellency, the assurances of my highest consideration.
Tadeus Mazowiecki,
Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the territory of the former Yugoslavia.

TRIBUTE TO DR. ALICE WALKER-DUFF

HON. JULIAN C. DIXON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 3, 1995

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have this opportunity to salute the outstanding contributions made by Dr. Alice Walker-Duff to the children of Los Angeles. As executive director of Crystal Stairs, Alice presides over one of the largest nonprofit and most enduring child care resource and referral providers in California. She has earned a well deserved reputation as an indefatigable advocate for comprehensive, quality early child development services as an essential ingredient to helping children mature into successful, productive adults.

Alice's career with Crystal Stairs began nearly two decades ago. It was not, however, the career she had envisioned but one that she came to out of a desire to help her good friend and Crystal Stairs' founder, Karen Hill-Scott. In the early 1970's, in a venture that would serve as the precursor to Crystal Stairs, Alice and Karen had teamed together to found the Childcare Resource and Referral Service. The program was the sole African-American alternative program in California. It offered working parents, most often single mothers, with quality child care development services, affording many the opportunity to return to school or to the employment roles.

In the mid 1970's, while supervising a classroom project in one of her urban planning classes at UCLA, where she taught, Karen discovered there was a paucity of information available at the city and county level regarding available day care providers located in the urban areas of Los Angeles. Armed with this information, she applied for and received funding from the State of California to establish an agency that would address this shortage. Thus was born Crystal Stairs, a nonprofit agency incorporated in 1980 that supervises and certifies affordable, safe, and reliable child care development providers in the African-American community of southern California.

Alice agreed to help Karen by managing the day-to-day operation and management of Crystal Stairs. Karen was still a professor at UCLA and she needed an individual who was smart, politically savvy, and above all, knowledgeable about early childhood development. Although the initial agreement had Alice remaining at Crystal Stairs for just 8 short months, 2 years ago, when Karen stepped down as executive director to serve as a consultant in children's television programming, Alice settled in as the agencies executive director.

During her nearly 20 years of dedicated service and commitment to Crystal Stairs and the children of Los Angeles, Alice has been instrumental in expanding the agency's outreach to include a comprehensive array of services, including child-care research, a food program in Los Angeles, Orange, and Riverside Counties; parenting classes, and employment training programs.

Last year, Crystal Stairs added one more jewel to its crown with the opening of SAGE, a child-care center in the Nickerson Gardens public housing development. The center offers a range of afterschool classes, including in-

struction in computer skills and math and art classes. SAGE is providing a tangible resource to the children of Nickerson Gardens by helping to enhance their development and offering a beacon of hope for a future that is too often viewed as hopeless.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud and honored to salute the outstanding accomplishments of Dr. Alice Walker-Duff to the Los Angeles community. Her career has been marked by a level of excellence that is worthy of the accolades she receives this day. She has labored nobly and steadfastly in her quest to ensure that children receive the appropriate day care and essential nurturing to which all children are entitled. Please join me in commending her for her contributions to the children of Los Angeles, and in extending to her, her husband attorney Joe Duff, and their two daughters Gingi and Laura, our appreciation and best wishes for continued success in the future.

HONORING VETERANS OF THE
KOREAN WAR

HON. BARBARA B. KENNELLY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 3, 1995

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Speaker, as we remember the 42d anniversary of the armistice of the Korean war, and as we dedicate the new Korean War Veterans Memorial on the Mall, I want to commemorate the patriotism of the 1.5 million Americans who served, the courage of those who were wounded or taken prisoner-of-war, and the sacrifice of the more than 54,000 who did not come home. These soldiers, including many from my congressional district and the State of Connecticut, have made an indelible contribution to our nation and to our world by exemplifying America's uncompromising devotion to freedom.

The soldiers who fought in Korea were the first American servicemen and women to directly contest a Communist army. Their bravery in combat against North Korea and China proved that the United States would not appease Communist aggression. Their defense of freedom in one corner of the world gave hope to millions of people under Communist rule in other corners that the democratic nations had not forgotten their plight. Korea was the first volley in the battle that was won when the Berlin Wall came down and the Soviet Union crumbled.

Our Korean war soldiers also demonstrated to the world that we were ready and willing to help even our smallest and most distant allies fend off foreign aggression. While no one questioned America's strategic interest in defending Europe during the world wars, our commitment to our friends in Asia was not as certain. But in the summer of 1950, the United States spoke loud and clear: we would stand up for freedom anywhere it was threatened by tyranny. That message still resonates today.

But our soldiers did not merely engage in battle against international aggression; it was a contest between democracy and totalitarianism. In Korea, our soldiers proved that Americans did not just talk about the importance of democracy—they would risk their lives for it. The march of American soldiers up the Korean peninsula from Pusan to the 38th Parallel was a remarkably brave demonstration of our

commitment to lead by example. Today, as nations on every continent strive towards democracy, they rightfully look to us for moral guidance.

By fighting side-by-side with soldiers from around the world, American soldiers also demonstrated that multi-national coalitions can bring about peaceful ends. When we contemplate the awesome success of Desert Storm 4 years ago, we can look back to Korea as the prototype.

Through these accomplishments, the soldiers of the Korean war left an indelible mark on the modern world. Sadly, Korea is at times called the forgotten war. But the freedom and security it brought the world will long be remembered.

Were it not for the courage of our soldiers, South Korea would not be a free and prosperous nation, one of our most trusted and valuable allies in the Pacific rim.

And were it not for the fortitude of our neighbors, relatives and friends in uniform who joined the battle against North Korea, the fall of Communism in Eastern Europe and in Central America would have been far less assured.

Most importantly, were it not for the selflessness of American servicemen and women who triumphed over dictatorship in a country many had never even heard of, the guiding light of democracy we extend to other nations would not be nearly as bright.

We still live in a dangerous, unpredictable world. But the heroic, selfless efforts of Americans in places like Inchon, Chosin, and Pusan have ensured that future generations of Americans will live in a world where freedom is cherished and tyranny is repelled. For that, we owe the veterans of the Korean war our eternal gratitude.

I commend the Korean war veterans from the First District of Connecticut and from around the United States on the occasion of the 42d anniversary of the end of the Korean war.

CLEANING UP BROWNFIELDS

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 3, 1995

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise with my colleagues from Ohio, Mr. BROWN, and my colleague from Missouri, the distinguished minority leader, Mr. GEPHARDT, to introduce legislation which, if enacted, will promote the cleanup of lands containing abandoned or under used industrial facilities where legal, environmental, and financial barriers prevent redevelopment.

Contaminated, often vacant industrial sites, known as brownfields, pose significant economic and environmental challenges for communities throughout southeastern Michigan. These challenges are formidable, but not insurmountable. I will explore the issues which determine how to succeed in converting our brownfields in Downriver and Detroit back to engines of economic progress.

Industrial properties, contaminated from years of use, are very difficult to redevelop. Even ongoing operations may be difficult to sustain. Cleanup costs are high and liabilities for past contamination scare potential purchasers, developers, and lenders. However,

not cleaning and reusing these sites means that sites with the potential to contribute to local economic development and job creation sit dormant, and pollution remains unchecked. The lack of usable properties in long-term manufacturing centers like those in metropolitan Detroit and other cities encourages builders and investors to look for more distant locations for development.

The bill which I am sponsoring with my colleagues will address these concerns by providing more than \$100 million over 3 years so that local governments can choose and develop the sites which have the best chance of success if they are cleaned up. The grants will be used to assess the environmental conditions and economic potential of a site. Loans will allow cities and other development authorities to finish the job. Perhaps most important, current Federal laws would be amended to reduce fears of liability for purchasers and lenders. Together with the enhanced public funding, it is hoped that these steps will leverage additional private investment in brownfields.

I am pleased to say that local governments in my congressional district are not waiting for this legislation to get started on these efforts. However, organizations like the Southeast Michigan Council of Governments [SEMCOG] and the Port of Monroe assure me that this legislation should help guarantee success.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to working with my colleagues on the Commerce Committee to see how this legislation fits with efforts to reauthorize the Superfund.

BROWNFIELD BILL—SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

SECTION I. FINDINGS

SECTION II. FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

Purpose

Provide financial incentives that encourage redevelopment efforts of brownfield sites.

Help create a more level playing field relative to the more desirable "greenfields".

Aid with the expenses involved with cleanup activities at brownfield sites.

Summary

Provides grants to local governments for site investigations to assess the level of contamination; authorizes \$15 million each fiscal year from the Superfund trust fund.

Provides interest-free loans to local governments for cleanup activities. Such loans are to be repaid within 10 years to be deposited back into the Superfund trust. Authorizes \$30 million each fiscal year from the Superfund trust fund for such purposes.

Establishes a 3 year sunset for authorization of funds.

Permits local governments to submit to EPA an application for a grant or loan for specific redevelopment project(s).

Specifies criteria by which applications are ranked; includes: Stimulation of economic development (eg. job creation, increased revenue); extent local community participates and supports remediation and development; financial involvement of State and local governments (in lieu of matching requirement); extent the local community supports the redevelopment project(s); and extent health and environmental risks (or threat of) are reduced.

SECTION III. LENDER LIABILITY

Purpose

Encourage lenders to help finance brownfield redevelopment efforts by reducing liability fears induced by unfavorable court interpretations. The US v. Fleet Corp. court ruling inflicted uncertainty among lending institutions regarding liability.

Clarify activities that lenders can perform without being held liable under Superfund.

Summary

Upholds EPA's 1992 Lender Liability rule which was invalidated by a court ruling:

Species lender's activities that give rise to potential liability. These include undertaking responsibility for hazardous substance practices and day-to-day decisionmaking with respect to environmental compliance and operational functions.

Specifies activities that do not give rise to liability. Includes: Mere capacity to influence or unexercised right to control facility operations; actions to require environmental inspection and/or cleanups; work out' activities (eg. preventing foreclosure by restructuring terms).

To remain exempt from liability after foreclosure, a lender must sell, re-lease, or otherwise divest itself of the property in a reasonably expeditious manner.

SECTION IV. PURCHASER LIABILITY

Purpose

Protect new purchasers and redevelopers from liabilities for past problems.

Under N.Y. v. Shore Realty, the court held the current owner responsible for response costs; it reasoned that CERCLA unequivocally imposes strict liability on the current owner of a facility from which there is a release without regard to causation.

Summary

Exempts prospective purchasers from liability when acquires ownership of a facility and establishes each of the following:

All active disposal of hazardous substances at the facility occurred before that person acquired the facility.

Person made all appropriate inquiry into the previous ownership and uses of the facility and poverty.

The person provided all legally required notices with respect to the discovery or release of any hazardous substances at the facility.

The person exercised appropriate care with respect to hazardous substances found by stopping on-going releases and preventing future releases of hazardous substances.

SECTION V. FIDUCIARY LIABILITY

Purpose

Reduce banks' fears of liability in their capacity as a fiduciary. Fiduciaries are wary of accepting real estate into their trust portfolios due to unfavorable court decisions.

Summary

Limits the liability of fiduciaries (trustees) to the value of the assets of the trust or estate unless: Person undertakes fiduciary status to avoid preexisting personal liability; fiduciary is personally, causing or contributing to release of hazardous substance; fiduciary participates in planning and implementing a scheme to evade CERCLA; and fiduciary fails to comply with requirements set by EPA.

Fiduciaries undertaking or directing others to undertake a response/cleanup action under CERCLA are precluded from liability.

IN SUPPORT OF SUPERFUND REFORMS TO PROMOTE THE REDEVELOPMENT OF "BROWNFIELDS"

HON. RICHARD A. GEPHARDT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 3, 1995

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I join today with Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. DINGELL, Mr.

STOKES, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. RUSH, Mr. KLINK, Mr. MANTON, Mr. TOWNS, and Ms. FURSE in introducing legislation to redevelop abandoned or underutilized industrial sites. As many as 500,000 sites that once sustained industrial or commercial activities now lie vacant or idle across the country in our rural and urban areas. Returning these sites to productive use must be an important national goal.

This legislation is intended to promote the cleanup and redevelopment of such abandoned properties, commonly referred to as "brownfields." Too often the private sector is deterred from redeveloping such brownfields because of their high cleanup costs and the potentially open-ended liability associated with undiscovered contamination. Likewise, cities have lacked the resources to assess contamination levels at abandoned sites or to help finance cleanups.

Like many cities across the country, St. Louis has hundreds—perhaps thousands—of abandoned sites that sit idle and need to be reused. In many cases, private owners have simply given up on their properties, allowing them to revert to the public domain; the municipality of St. Louis owns more than 40,000,000 square feet of abandoned property and buildings. But many other underused sites remain in private hands as well.

St. Louis has seen some neighborhoods deteriorate as investment and jobs have gone elsewhere. Many times it has been more attractive for businesses to invest in untouched property that does not carry with it potential environmental liability and expensive cleanup costs. Thus, many sites—the old Carondelet Coke plant in south St. Louis City, areas along the Mississippi riverfront, and the former National Lead site in St. Louis County—remain unused.

Our goal is to encourage the cleanup and reuse of brownfields for productive uses, thus bringing new job opportunities to blighted areas. This bill contains provisions to encourage private sector investment in redevelopment and provide cities with the resources to coordinate site characterization and promote cleanups. There are three major objectives.

First, this legislation provides cities new resources necessary to promote the cleanup of sites. Developers or purchasers often find capital out of reach when potentially costly environmental liabilities are present. In addition, cities often have difficulty in obtaining the necessary resources to assess the extent of toxicity of individual sites, the first step in brownfield redevelopment.

To help provide funding that the private sector cannot always provide, the bill authorizes the EPA to provide funds from the Superfund trust fund for cleanup activities. Local government entities, such as the St. Louis community development agency, would be able to apply and compete for interest-free loans or grants to perform site assessments and cleanup activities. The grants and loans would be competitively awarded based on their capacity to create new jobs, as well as the amount of local participation and financial support.

The cities have emphasized that site characterizations and assessments are extremely useful in marketing contaminated sites to prospective buyers or developers. After determining the level of contamination, parties are more inclined to invest in brownfield properties since the projected cleanup costs are better known. This bill authorizes the EPA to provide

up to \$15 million annually from the Superfund to local governments to perform such assessments. Furthermore, to facilitate cleanups, the bill authorizes the use of up to \$30 million annually in loans to finance remediation activities.

Second, this legislation clarifies the lender liability issue in order to encourage private sector investment. The Fleet Factors case obscured the intent of Superfund's secured-lenders exemption. This confusion has made many lenders reluctant to become involved in potentially contaminated properties. Bankers now often fear that their interest may make them subject to cleanup liability for newly discovered or released contamination. The bill makes it clear that lenders who are merely performing a lending function and not managing a site's daily operations or contributing to the contamination can lend for redevelopment purposes without fear of incurring large environmental liabilities. The bill also provides protections to lenders who act in their capacity as fiduciaries.

Third, this legislation provides protection for good faith prospective purchasers. To protect innocent landowners from Superfund liability when they acquire property subsequently found to be contaminated, the bill exempts prospective purchasers from such liability if certain precautionary measures are taken. Under Superfund, the owner of a contaminated tract of land may be held responsible for cleaning it up even if the pollution was created by the prior owner. Thus, potential purchasers are often deterred from investing in sites with potential contamination. This provision allows a purchaser who checks the site carefully before purchase to avoid liability if contamination is subsequently discovered.

This legislation is the result of our discussions with many leaders on this issue. St. Louis Mayor Freeman Bosley, Jr., cochair of the U.S. Conference of Mayors' Brownfields Committee, has been committed to finding solutions to problems associated with brownfields. We have also worked closely with St. Louis lenders, environmentalists, and the St. Louis Regional Commerce and Growth Association. Finally, I am pleased that this bill has the support of the National League of Cities. Their contributions helped us focus on the most critical problems and develop solutions that are workable in an era of fiscal limits.

This legislation does not solve all aspects of the brownfields redevelopment problem. The solutions require a comprehensive reform of the Superfund bill, of the sort that nearly passed the House last year. There are also other aspects of the problem—such as those involving the treatment of leaking underground storage tanks—that must be addressed as well.

Generally, this legislation begins us on the way toward confronting the most important factors that have blocked the redevelopment of communities throughout urban and rural America. I thank all of my colleagues, particularly Mr. BROWN and Mr. DINGELL, for their hard work in developing this bill.

A BROWNFIELDS CLEANUP PROGRAM

HON. ROBERT A. BORSKI

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 3, 1995

Mr. BORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join today with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL], the ranking Democratic member of the Commerce Committee, and the Democratic leader, Mr. GEPHARDT, to introduce legislation to help cities attract jobs by cleaning up brownfields sites.

This initiative will bring jobs to Philadelphia and every other city that has been facing inflexible environmental laws.

This bill is necessary because Superfund has become an obstacle to the economic redevelopment of our cities. Superfund has become a job-killer in our Nation's cities and that has to be changed.

Mayor Ed Rendell of Philadelphia, America's mayor, made revision of the Superfund brownfields program a prominent part of his new agenda for urban America.

The current Superfund Program has required America's cities to fight the battle for jobs with one hand tied behind their backs. Cities must be able to attract jobs—new jobs—if they are going to be able to expand their tax bases and provide funds for all the other services that are essential in urban areas—schools, housing, transit and many others. Cities cannot survive without new jobs.

In Philadelphia, the city is attempting clear away the more than 30,000 abandoned buildings that dominate far too much of the city. They want to clear the lots for development but they have run into a stone wall because no developers want to touch land that poses the threat of Superfund involvement.

Our Commissioner of Licenses and Inspections, who is in charge of this effort, testified before the Subcommittee on Water Resources and the Environment about an atmosphere of fear among prospective developers.

It is clear that we must take the steps that are necessary to dispel the atmosphere of fear that pervades our cities.

This bill that we are introducing today will help Philadelphia and all the other cities with the same problem a small measure of help by setting aside Superfund money to be used just for these sites.

During the next 3 years, \$45 million would be available for grants to cities for preliminary site characterization work and \$90 million would be provided for loans to cities for cleanup.

The bill also includes protection for prospective purchasers—people who want to buy property but may be scared away by the potential liability.

Under this bill, prospective purchasers who have no connection with the waste disposal will be shielded from liability.

The brownfields problem has a major impact on communities across the country. Experts have estimated as many as 500,000 contaminated sites that could be available for productive industrial development if the liability issue was settled.

EPA Administrator Carol M. Browner has done a good job moving this program in the right direction with her brownfields action agenda, especially removing 25,000 sites from the CERCLIS list.

That removal eliminates the taint of a Superfund listing from sites that don't belong on a Superfund list.

More must be done legislatively to focus attention on the brownfields problem.

As the ranking Democratic member on the Water Resources and Environment Subcommittee, I am prepared to offer this bill during the Superfund debate in the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee.