

where the heat has been up in the 115 range at various times, those are the kinds of places where even a little bit of money is used on exceptionally hot days like today, and here in Washington for that program.

Six million people are covered by this program, mostly half of them are elders, the most vulnerable people to both heat and cold, the most vulnerable people, and those are the people. That is the priority for cutting off a program on the part of the Republican majority here.

The question of priorities, this \$1 billion that is eliminated from the Low Income Heating Assistance Program, their priority is to put in instead, in a different bill, their priority, one new B-2 bomber that costs the same amount, or one new amphibious transport ship, neither of which was acquired by the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. OLVER] talked about the LIHEAP Program. The LIHEAP Program came out of the energy crisis we had in the 1970's. It was a program that has outlived its usefulness. It is a very costly program of over \$1 billion a year.

The cost of energy now as a percent, compared to that, is less, and yet, we want to keep that billion dollar a year program going. Even President Clinton has asked for dramatic reductions in that program. Mr. Chairman, we have to set priorities. We have to balance this budget.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. TALENT].

Mr. TALENT. Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] on bringing an excellent bill to the floor today. I would like to discuss with him the Transitional Living Program.

Mr. PORTER. If the gentleman from Missouri would yield, I would be glad to engage him in a colloquy.

Mr. TALENT. Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that the en bloc amendment adopted yesterday includes an additional \$1.3 million for the TLP Program. It is also my understanding that this funding will be used for nine agencies who provide services to homeless and runaway youth. This funding will provide a 1-year extension to those nine TLP grantees whose grants are expiring in September 1995. The nine grantees could then competitively compete in the spring or summer of 1996 for fiscal year 1997 grants without having to dismantle or eliminate their programs in October 1995.

Mr. PORTER. The gentleman is correct. This funding will provide a 1-year extension for these nine agencies only.

Mr. TALENT. I thank the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] for his time and for his attention to this matter.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOGGETT].

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Chairman, we have seen all this before. You have seen it on late night television, and ad, the fellow with the Ginzu knives. He brandishes them. He swings them over his head, and whack, an onion is in two. Before you know it, a radish lies in slivers. He can whack anything with those knives, whether it needs whacking or not, and what we have this morning is the Republican equivalent of a Ginzu knife ad.

The Older Americans Act, whack; student financial assistance, whack; assistance for education, whack. They keep slicing up the American middle class. Well, we have heard for 40 years from the Republicans about how they could solve all these problems by simply whacking out waste and fraud. If they can do it with whacking the waste and fraud, why do they not do that and stop slicing with their Ginzu knives the American middle class?

I have got a program called the Retired Senior Volunteer Program. It has operated for 23 years in Travis County. It provides 2,000 of our citizens opportunities to volunteer. Nobody has ever suggested that it involved one cent of waste or fraud, and yet, they have got their knives out whacking it, terminating it, so that seniors in our community will not have the opportunity to have the coordination they need to give back to the community.

Mr. Chairman, it is wrong. It is wrong. Why not use a surgical knife and cut out the waste and the fraud and leave middle-class America alone?

□ 1100

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. TALENT].

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

Mr. TALENT. I thank the gentleman for yielding time.

Mr. Chairman, I have heard a lot about what my distinguished colleagues on the other side of the aisle are upset about with this bill. Now, I am not on the Committee on Appropriations, I do not deal on a day-to-day basis with millions of dollars for this program or to this person, so I have a little bit different perspective. I thought maybe I would discuss a little bit about what I am upset about and what this title is designed to address.

I have a 3 year old little girl, she is going to be 3 in 2 weeks. She is going to owe \$100,000 in taxes during her working lifetime just to pay the debt service that the last generation of congressional leadership ran up on the Federal debt in the last 20 years, and I am kind of upset about that.

This country, if we continue on the current course of spending, will be bankrupt inside of 10 years. It will take the entire Federal revenue to pay for Medicare, Social Security, Medicaid,

and the debt service. I am a little bit upset about that.

My parents believed what you did was you paid off the mortgage and left your children the farm. The last generation of congressional leadership sold the farm and is leaving the rest of us the mortgage, and I am kind of upset about that.

Now what does this bill do about it in this title? It does not cut spending in this bill; it slows the growth rate of Federal spending. What are my honorable and distinguished colleagues on the other side doing about this? Well, they voted against the balanced budget amendment by and large. They have opposed our seven year plan to balance the budget, they are offering no plan of their own, and they savage their own president when he even talks about developing a consistent plan to balance the budget, and I am pretty upset about all of that.

Mr. Chairman, and I am going to speak here to the people who are listening also, what you are hearing here is a desperate attempt to preserve a status quo that has failed and that is indefensible. We are trying to turn this budget around, it is like a big ocean liner. We are taking some initial steps to turn it around now. This is a good bill and it should be passed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would remind all Members that all remarks should be addressed to the Chair and to the Chair only.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. OBERSTAR].

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

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, it may seem incongruous in these days of 90-degree weather and high humidity to be talking about home heating assistance, but in northern Minnesota, although the glacier retreated, it makes a return attempt every fall, and lasts well into April and sometimes May. Last year we had wind chill temperatures of 77 below zero, midwinter. I visited a home in Duluth where the Energy Assistance Program was conducting weatherization for an 84-year-old widow with one leg amputated. Her husband had worked all his life in the steel mill in Duluth and left her a modest little pension. Her total income is about \$480 a month. Half of it was going to pay the energy bill. The Energy Assistance Program weatherized the home and helped her buy a new furnace so she could stay in her home and not have to go to a nursing home.

In the city of Duluth alone, 3,746 households last year received primary heating assistance. Look at the record of this program in Duluth, alone: 374 households received primary heating assistance; their average income was \$9,208 a year. Furnaces were replaced in

107 of more households, making it possible for the homeowners to remain in their homes, rather than seek public assistance in the form of welfare or be committed to a nursing home. Heating system repairs were made in an additional 560 households. Of the total number of households receiving LIHEAP assistance, 926 have children under the age of 6 and the average household income is \$11,400.

Senior citizens account for 712 of the total households served; their average income is \$8,286. There are AFDC families assisted under this program, they have an average household income of \$7,631.

The point I want to drive home is that this program is preeminently designed for and targeted to the poorest families, the neediest among us. Cutting these funds, altogether, as this heartless Republican majority proposes to do, will reduce these people the most among us to a condition of abject dependency, cause each of them needless anguish and anxiety, emotional, as well as physical stress, and simply shift the cost from the weatherization program to welfare or Medicaid and Medicare. Cutting off these funds will not make the problem go away; it will only worsen the condition.

But, I want my colleagues to hear the beneficiaries of the Energy Assistance Program tell the story in their own words, as expressed in letters to the Arrowhead Economic Opportunity Agency, which serves a seven-county area of northeastern Minnesota, which is geographically about the size of New England, excluding Maine:

I've been a widow since 1989 and as time goes on, I find it very difficult to adjust to all the changes. I live on a fixed income and with costs of living always rising, I don't even dare to think of the future. I thank the Lord and ask him to bless all the people that makes the Fuel Assistance Program possible.

Thank you so much for the fuel assistance. If it weren't for this program, I wouldn't be able to afford to live in my own house.

I thank God for the very existence for your agency. Never in my wildest dreams did I, as a former middle class American worker, believe that I could be reduced to poverty level in 3 years. I've always been proud of myself as a self-employed carpenter, but now have no work to be proud of.

I am a diabetic, and if it weren't for the Energy Assistance Program, I'm certain I would have a tough decision to make in deciding between insulin or fuel oil.

I do not know what these previous speakers are talking about on the other side of the aisle, but if you cut home heating assistance, you are making people choose between life or death, and that is not right.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. WELDON].

(Mr. WELDON of Florida asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, during my campaign for the U.S. Congress last year I met a man who lived in my district. His name was Dave Exley, and he was a painter, and

I got talking to Dave. I was interested in talking to him. I had an uncle, Joe Ditta, who raised a family of seven as a painter. I got to talking to him about his business and what it was like, and he got out something and gave it to me that I will never forget. It was a paint stirrer, and he told me that he had been using that same stirring stick to stir the paint for 5 years.

Each time he would use it, he would wipe it carefully off, and he said he was saving himself about 5 cents a day by using that paint stirring stick over and over and over again, and he showed it to me, and he said something to me that I will never forget.

He said, every time you think about spending money or raising taxes, I want you to remember me because I am trying to feed my wife and my two sons, and I have trouble making ends meet. At the end of the month I have trouble making sure I have got enough money to pay the mortgage and to pay the electric bill.

That is a lot of what this debate is about. We are taking money out of the hands of a lot of hard working Americans, and we are spending it the way we see fit, on programs that we think are good, and I think this committee has worked very hard to analyze these programs and come up with what they think are some difficult decisions, but nonetheless are the appropriate decisions that need to be made in order to get us toward a balanced budget.

We cannot keep spending money over and over again because we think it is the right thing to do. We have to have some real good hard objective measures. We have to make the difficult decisions because if we do not, let us face it, there will be no money for anything. We will be bankrupt.

That is what has propelled us, the freshmen Republicans, into this body and led to the Republican majority this year, and why we are seriously changing the spending priorities of our Nation. The public knows that if we do not make a change there will be no money for anybody, and I think of Dave Exley, the painter, every time I am asked to vote on a spending decision, and, yes, the decisions are hard, but we are ready to make the hard decisions, and I think this bill is a good bill, it is a tough bill, it makes some tough decisions.

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

Mr. WELDON of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. As the gentleman knows, I am for a balanced budget, I am trying to make some of these tough choices to balance the budget for our children's sake and future generations. The gentleman is from a great part of the United States where the climate is between 70 and 95 degrees all year. I am from South Bend, IN, where the weather can be 50 degrees below zero.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Mary-

land [Mr. HOYER], a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, Dave Exley takes care of that stirring stick so his paint will be well mixed, and it will give a good coat. How much more, Mr. Chairman, should we take care of our little children so that when they grow they can paint America successful, they can paint America with more opportunity?

Now, I see the Chairman of our committee standing up here, or sitting here, he is going to stand pretty soon, and he is going to show that little red chart over there. And he is going to go bankrupt as a businessman if he uses that chart, because that chart relates to this chart. How many children are we serving in America that we promised in 1965 to serve under Lyndon Johnson, concurred in by Richard Nixon, followed on by President Ford and endorsed by President Carter, and then said to be by Ronald Reagan one of the programs that works, and what did we do? We retreated. We retreated, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman's little red chart over there is serving less children. Less children in America who are eligible for Head Start are being served today, Mr. Chairman, and that red chart will not change those statistics, and as that happens, we are losing children in America, and we cannot afford to do that.

This Head Start budget that you talk about drops 48,000 children through the cracks. This budget alone, 48,000 children. I do not know whether your painter thinks that is a good investment. He cares about that stirring stick because it saves him a nickel a day, and he is smart. Would that every American would do that, America would be a more successful Nation. But would that every Member of this Congress, ladies and gentlemen, would understand that those little children, 3 and 4 years of age are America's stirring sticks. They are America's future. They will paint America as a successful, competitive community. They will paint America the kind of land of opportunity of which your Speaker speaks. but opportunity does not just happen for some kids, for any children.

The best solution, Mr. Chairman, as we all know, is two loving, caring nurturing parents. Would that every child had that. And the economic opportunities that all of us can provide our children, God bless them as God has blessed us. But ladies and gentlemen, cutting Head Start makes no economic sense. It makes no common sense, and it makes no human sense.

That is why we ought to reject this bill, because notwithstanding the Chairman's little red chart, we are serving less children who are eligible to be helped and who America has promised to help in Head Start. Let us not have a false start once again. Let us reject this bill. Let us save those little stirring sticks that we call our children, our future.

Mr. Chairman, this is a defining moment for this Congress. With this bill we declare our priorities as a nation.

Should we invest our money in our children and in our future as a nation, or give the money in a tax break to the wealthiest Americans?

The cut to Head Start is only one example of the misguided choices Republicans have made in this bill.

There is a good reason why Head Start is America's best loved program for children. Head Start isn't perfect. But it is a place where children get the education, nutrition, health checkups, and skills they need to learn and succeed in school.

In 1993 and 1994, we reached a high point of serving 40 percent of eligible Head Start kids. At the high point, 6 out of every 10 needy preschoolers couldn't go to Head Start because we didn't have the room.

Despite these shortages, the Republican bill cuts Head Start by 50,000 children in 1996—allowing us to serve only 36 percent of eligible children, the same percentage served in 1991.

Under this bill, 50,000 fewer children will go to Head Start in 1996 than could in 1995.

That's 50,000 children who are more likely to be high school dropouts, juvenile delinquents, or teenage parents.

Fifty thousand children who are more likely to be on welfare—taking from society rather than contributing to it.

Head Start helps children like Guy, who began Head Start in southern Maryland unable to learn and far behind his peers.

Guy's mother and stepfather were overwhelmed and unable to help their son.

That's when Head Start sprang into action. Guy's mom was given medical cards so Guy and his sister could go to the doctor for immunizations and to the dentist for checkups.

Head Start got Guy an appointment at Children's Hospital, where his learning disability was diagnosed and addressed.

Head Start found parenting classes for Guy's parents to help them help Guy.

As Guy's behavior improved, his mom was able to go back to school at Charles County Community College.

Because Guy was in Head Start, his mom could attend school 5 days a week, and graduated from the secretarial program. She is now working for a small business and supporting her family.

In September, Guy will start kindergarten. Thanks to Head Start, he is doing well and is ready to learn.

In 1990, Frank Doyle, the CEO of General Electric called on Congress to fully fund Head Start. He spoke on behalf of TRW, Goodyear, Eli Lilly, AT&T, Mobil, and many other businesses who know that getting children ready to learn is the key to future economic success.

But this bill goes in the other direction. This bill isn't a Head Start—it's a false start. I urge a "no" vote on this bill.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would again remind Members that they are to address the Chair and only the Chair in their remarks from the floor.

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

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

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I thank my good friend from Illinois for yielding time to me, and I will try to be brief.

Mr. Chairman, a couple of comments: First of all, about the gentleman that preceded me, I want to say how much I appreciated his performance. It was a preformance. The gentleman always makes a magnificent speech and gives a great performance. Sometimes he is a little short on the facts, as this time, but it was a good performance.

That being said, yesterday the gentleman from Wisconsin, the ranking minority member of the committee, and I had a dialog back and forth, and we discussed one of us winning versus the other, and I said at the time I hoped I won on this bill.

I want to rephrase that. Because I had an opportunity to reflect on my comment. I do not know whether he will win or whether I will win, but I hope that America wins, and I hope that America's children win, and I think they will with this bill, contrary to the statements of the gentleman from Maryland, who went before me. Because we are beginning to understand that simply by sitting down and writing a check on a bank account where somebody else puts the money in is not the answer to our problems. It is certainly not the answer to educating and nourishing the youngsters of America.

The fact is that I do have a red chart, and what it illustrates quite clearly is that in 1989 the Head Start funding was \$1.2 billion. It rose in 1990 to \$1.5 billion and went on up, up, up, until now, just a few short years later, 1995, it is virtually three times the size that it was in 1989. As Everett Dirksen said, a billion dollars here and a billion dollars there, and pretty soon you are talking about real money; \$3.5 billion is what we will spend this year on just the Head Start Program.

Now, as we know from additional debate on this floor in the last few days, this is just one program. There are 240 separate education programs for the youngsters of America run by the Federal Government, spread over some 11 departments, 15 agencies, and other offices.

□ 1115

This is only one of those programs currently funded at \$3.5 billion. To hear the hue and cry of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] and other people who have said, oh, my goodness, the heartless, heartless majority in Congress today, the Republicans, have cut the program. We have cut it all the way back by \$3.4 billion.

Now, I have to question the premise the world is coming apart and our children are going to grow up illiterate because of this cut. It is simply not so or, as the song says, "It ain't necessarily so." In fact, there is some great question, some significant doubt as to

whether or not this program works at all.

Mr. Edward Zeigler, the Yale professor who founded Head Start, the man that started the program, is quoted in the Washington Post of February 19, 1993, "Until the program has reached a certain minimum level of quality they should not put one more kid in it".

That was 1993. And in 1993 we spent \$2.7 billion.

In 1996, we propose to spend \$3.4 billion.

Now, if the gentleman really seriously was concerned about the children of America he would remember that the children in Head Start are not the only children in America. All of the children of America, roughly 100 million, are the future of America, and their prosperity, their education, their nourishment is important to the future of America. The more we take money out of the pockets of the parents who are trying to raise and educate them, the more we take that money away from them, send it to the bureaucrats in Washington, put it in a program that does not work, the more we stifle the opportunity for those children to become the real future of America.

This cut is meaningless, and for these people to say the world is coming to an end when all we are doing is trimming back a measly 2.9 percent, \$1 billion out of \$3.5 billion, then it seems to me this is much ado about nothing. We are speaking about how many angels can dance on the head of a pin.

Many of my colleagues do not care about rolling back the cost of Government. They do not care about getting the budget under control. What they say is, in effect, we will not balance the budget. We will not be concerned about the escalating interest on the debt. We will not be concerned with the fact that interest alone will exceed the cost of the national defense of this country within 2 years. We will not be concerned with the fact that nearly \$20,000 is piled on every man, woman, and child in America to pay off the debt. We will just wear blinders and keep spending money and writing checks because, after all, the good old American taxpayers will pay the bill.

It is time to say no. It is time to make a trim. It is time to make the cuts. It is time to pass this bill.

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

Mr. Chairman, listening to all this, I would think I was born in Jamaica where the motto is "No problem, No problem."

You are taking 150,000 student loans away from kids under the Perkins Loan Program. You are cutting drug-free schools by 50 percent. You are eliminating 1 million kids out of chapter 1. You are cutting 55,000 kids out of Head Start.

Eight hundred people died in this country 2 weeks ago and you are saying, no problem, we are going to eliminate the program for them.

You are cutting MediGap counseling so seniors do not get chiseled by insurance companies on phony MediGap policies. You are cutting that promise to help them by 50 percent. Yet you have got guts enough to talk about spending. Before your President Ronald Reagan took over and you swallowed his line of malarkey, we never had a deficit larger than \$65 billion.

We followed your advice, passed those budgets, deficits are now over \$200 billion. Thanks a lot for your fiscal discipline. Ha, ha, ha.

You are talking about spending, cutting spending. You are going to keep the F-22. You are going to keep the B-2.

Just one of those B-2 bombers—and you are buying a heck of a lot more than the Pentagon wants—just one of them will fund the tuition for every student at the University of Wisconsin for the next 12 years. Where in God's name are your priorities?

Then you talk about Head Start. That chart talks about the dollars. As Members know, we have had a bipartisan recognition that Head Start needed a quality improvement. We need to improve the quality of teachers. We need to improve the quality of services. And so that is where the money has gone, to try to improve quality.

As a result, under your budget, the number of kids who are going to be enrolled in Head Start next year is going to drop from 752,000 to 704,000. Maybe you do not care about those kids who are going to be dropped off the program. We do. Forget your phoney numbers game. Look at the people behind those numbers.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BONILLA] an eminent member of our subcommittee.

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, the first thing I would like to say is that I am a proud supporter of Head Start and proud to support the 190-percent increase in this program in the last 5 years. The program is working very well in many parts of this country, and the sourpuss look on the faces of our opponents this morning is because we are telling the truth, we are exposing the hypocrisy of those who are trying to say that we are not concerned about this program and are not interested in preserving it.

I would like to turn attention now to another aspect of this portion of the bill. That is rural health. I am also most proud of the overall funding for rural health care.

According to the National Rural Health Association, it would like to have \$1.4 billion worth of funding in this bill. With the leadership of our chairman and the hard work by the Rural Health Care Coalition this bill has \$1.33 billion or 95 percent of that request. We got 95 percent of what we wanted. In anyone's book that is a tremendous success rate.

In this budgetary time, I consider that a big success. However, some

think this is not enough. I do. Of the 24 programs deemed important to rural health care, we increased the most vital components, community and migrant health care centers, and health care for the homeless cluster.

We provide last year's funding levels minus the rescission bill, for 12 other line items, including health service corps, rural health outreach grants, family medicine, physicians assistants, allied health, area health education centers, health education training centers, and many of the nursing programs that are so vital to rural areas that have no health care provider whatsoever.

My colleagues, we have worked very hard in subcommittees to secure adequate funding for rural health care. The Rural Health Care Coalition should be able to hold its head high and declare a job well done.

While I understand that an amendment will be offered to increase funding even more, regardless of the outcome of the Gunderson-Poshard amendment, I hope all members that support rural health care will support this bill in the end. This bill is a good bill for rural America in helping to meet their needs and not penalizing them for living in the heartland of this great country.

I call attention to all Members who represent rural areas in America; this is a good bill for rural health care. Please vote for the bill.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER].

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

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, this debate is not about who is for balancing the budget and who is not for balancing the budget.

Many of us Democrats are going to make the right choices and vote to cut the B-2 bomber and not to kick children out of the Head Start Program.

Now, let us talk about Head Start for a minute. Here is a program that President Reagan talked about how much money do we put in to increase funding on Head Start. President Bush talked about how much money do we put in here to increase our education for low-income children. Now in this Congress we have Republicans talking about how many children are we going to kick out of the program.

Here is the chart. We currently have 752,000 children enrolled. After this bill passes, and I hope it does not, 48,000 children are going to be kicked out of this program.

Now, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations [Mr. LIVINGSTON] quotes the Washington Post and Washington charts. How does this program work in Michigan City, IN? We have 80 children waiting to get into this program in Michigan City, IN. We have a waiting list of eligible children. Yet you are going to tell us who to kick off.

Whoever votes for this bill, my colleagues, you go back to Michigan City, IN, and you point out who gets kicked out of this program.

Whoever votes for this bill, my colleagues, you decide how many, 5, 10, 12 children, in your programs do not get to enroll and get kicked out of maybe the most successful Government program ever put together.

We have got to make some tough decisions around here on our spending priorities.

The chairman of the committee said it does not make any difference how many angels dance on the pin of a needle. There are our angels dancing right there. Do not kick those children off of Head Start. Defeat this bill.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I would inquire of the chairman how much time is remaining on each side.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] has 18 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] has 21 minutes remaining.

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

(Mrs. MEEK of Florida asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, it is really a very, very hard message to listen to the Republican arguments for cutting Head Start. It is one of the few programs, Federal programs, which has succeeded over the years. But now to cut it is a dangerous thing, because what we are doing on one hand is giving a big tax cut to the rich and we are cutting off at the pass these poor children who need Head Start.

It has been shown by a bipartisan commission that Head Start does improve the lives of these children. It improves the educational outlook of these children. So you are going to cut funding for the little ones who cannot speak for themselves, these little ones, 3- and 4-year-old preschool children and not open up to even younger.

If you are going to restore the kinds of things in America that we need to restore, you should be restoring the lives of these young children. Study after study has shown that it works and it works well.

Since 1965, nearly 14 million children have participated in the program. So why are they saying it should be cut? To pay for the tax cuts for the rich. It currently serves fewer than half the poor children who are eligible. You have heard the arguments. It is well documented that this program worked. So then Head Start helps children in both urban and rural areas.

□ 1130

Does it work? You bet. There are thousands of success stories.

Mr. Chairman, I remember Winnie Jordan of Miami. She came from a very poor family and started out in Head Start at the age of 4. She still remembers her Head Start teacher that led

her on to grade school with more success. She was on the Dean's List at Fordham. She was president of the Law Association, and today she is a law clerk for the U.S. State district judge in Miami.

Mr. Chairman, it is a great Federal program, one of the few where we can see documented success. We must continue to help this Nation's children, and we cannot use what we call fiscal conservatism only for the poor.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this wrong-headed bill. This bill is nothing more than an attack on little children. Somewhere along the line the Republican leadership seemed to forget a few basic facts: They forgot that children are our future, and they forgot that we need to invest in our children.

Mr. Chairman, just a few months ago, the Republican majority was falling all over itself to give a big tax cut to rich people.

But today, this bills cuts funding for Head Start—cuts funding for little 3- and 4-year-old pre-school children who live in America's poorest families.

Mr. Chairman, I tried to restore Head Start funding in the House Budget Committee, and I was told that "everybody has to suffer a little pain." This bill puts the hurt of budget cuts on little children. I say, shame on you.

The American people support Head Start—for good reason.

Study after study, evaluation after evaluation has shown that Head Start works and works well. Head Start gets toddlers ready for school. Children who participate in Head Start enter school better prepared to learn, with improved health and with better self-esteem. According to the Bipartisan Advisory Committee on Head Start quality and expansion, "The evidence is clear that Head Start produces immediate gains for children and families."

Head Start gives the American taxpayer good value for the dollar: Grantees have to contribute 20 percent of the cost of the program.

Since 1965, nearly 14 million children, most of them 3- and 4-year-olds, have participated in the program. By law, virtually all of them are from families with incomes below the poverty level.

The Republicans say Head Start should be cut. Why? To pay for tax cuts for the rich? Head Start currently serves fewer than half the poor children who are eligible. If anything, we should increase funding for this program.

President Clinton wanted to increase Head Start by \$537 million. This bill cuts Head Start by \$137 million. I'm surprised this bill doesn't change the name from "Head Start" to "Fall Behind."

Mr. Chairman, Head Start helps children in urban areas and rural areas, it helps the truly needy and poor; and it helps the tiniest and most vulnerable in our society.

Does Head Start work? You bet. There are thousands of success stories—like Winnie Jordan of Miami. She came from a very poor family and started out in Head Start at the age of 4.

She still remembers her teacher, Ms. Whitelaw. The boost that Winnie Jordan got in Head Start helped her succeed in grade school, and success led to success.

She was a dean's list student at Florida State University; she was president of the Black Law Students Association at the Univer-

sity of Miami Law School. And today, she is law clerk for U.S. District Judge Wilkie Ferguson, Jr.

Head Start is a great Federal program. It is what the Federal Government should be doing to help this Nation's children and to help the most vulnerable in our society to learn and to succeed.

This bill has many terrible provisions. But, in my view, it should be defeated soundly because it ignores the needs of our children.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to voice my very grave concerns about the more than \$21 million in cuts to the Senior Volunteers Program. These cuts are consistent with the mean-spirited attacks that the Republicans are making on elderly Americans. Medicare, Medicaid, Meals on Wheels, Senior Volunteers, the GOP's attacks on the elderly continue.

The Senior Volunteer Program's small budget is perhaps one of the best investments in all of the Federal budget. For every dollar we spend coordinating this program we get back many many more dollars worth of services in return.

These harmful cuts to the Senior Volunteers Program will have a devastating affect on the 23,000 foster grandparents who last year cared for more than 80,000 disabled kids; the 12,000 senior companions who, last year, helped 36,000 frail elderly people to continue to live in their own homes; and the more than 400,000 seniors who participated in volunteer programs last year.

These mean-spirited cuts aren't necessary to balance the budget, and they won't. What they will do is make it harder for a lot of older Americans to do a lot of good in our communities.

Shame on the Republicans for picking on senior citizens and volunteers. Shame on the GOP for robbing the elderly of opportunities to live meaningful and committed lives just to finance huge tax breaks for the wealthy. Shame on them for producing this very bad bill. Let's defeat this bill and give senior volunteers a chance.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA].

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

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Chairman, this bill is loaded with legislative riders that have no place in an appropriations bill, and I hope further changes will be made today.

But 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, the full committee attached a number of legislative riders in the full committee. I will be offering

an amendment later today with Congresswoman LOWEY and Congressman KOLBE to strike the Istook 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 these violent, brutal crimes against women. I urge my colleagues to support the Lowey-Morella-Kolbe 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 even before a fall report is submitted. Congresswoman MINK will be offering an amendment to strike this language, and I urge support for her 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 urge my colleagues to vote for amendments to remove the riders before they consider final passage.

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

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in defense of Head Start.

How dare the gentleman from Louisiana, who has never been to a Head Start site, who has probably never talked to a Head Start parent, how dare he attack Head Start on the floor of Congress?

I was an employee in the Head Start Program. I worked first as a teacher's aide. Because of Head Start, I returned to college. I graduated. I became supervisor of the Parent Involvement and Volunteer Service.

Mr. Chairman, Head Start is not a baby-sitting program. It is an early childhood development program. It is a program for children of working parents and poor parents. Yes, rich parents can buy early childhood experiences for their children. Working parents do not have the money to do it.

Head Start provides a little bit of an opportunity.

Mr. Chairman, we have children who have learning disabilities that never would have been discovered had it not been for Head Start. They would have sat in school, not been able to learn, and been relegated to being a dropout.

Mr. Chairman, we had children who never owned a book.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, in response to the gentlewoman from California, nobody is attacking the Head Start Program. The Head Start Program is being reduced by about 3 percent for a very good reason. The reduction is made only because in the testimony before our subcommittee, and before the authorizing committee, it is very, very clear that there is money that is being misspent in the program and not providing the kids with the services that the program is designed to provide.

We are all fans of the Head Start Program. We are strong supporters of the Head Start Program, but we are not for wasting Government money, taxpayer money, on programs that do not work for the kids. That is the only reason that any cut is made in the program. We are supporters of Head Start.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. EMERSON].

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

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise to engage in a colloquy with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER].

Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman is aware, there has been a recent proposal for a federally funded research study on the cost effectiveness of applying case management services to substance abuse treatment.

The research would study, in a practical and applied manner, the use of care management techniques to reduce the cost of treatment and incidents of relapse for those patients suffering from addictive diseases.

Case management techniques have proven to be cost effective in treating other chronic diseases and since substance abuse is a progressive, chronic, and potentially fatal disease, these techniques should be equally successful in treating substance abuse.

Mr. Chairman, I am both pleased and appreciative that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] has agreed to support this effort, which would address a critical need in this country, and I thank the gentleman for the opportunity to raise this issue and would invite the gentleman's comment.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would yield, I thank the gentleman from Missouri for his thoughtful points on an issue we both agree on. Addiction is a chronic disease that affects 10 percent of American adults and 3 percent of adolescents.

The economic costs associated with alcohol and other drug problems are

truly staggering; over \$165 billion in 1990 alone. This research study would help to advance both the private and public sectors' understanding of what mix of services is necessary in order to cost effectively treat substance abuse.

Mr. Chairman, substance abuse is not a disease that we can continue to take lightly if we are ever to control the spiraling health care costs associated with it. I look forward to working with the gentleman from Missouri further to address this issue.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. POMEROY].

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Chairman, in the history of this Chamber there have undoubtedly been some unbelievably hypocritical statements made from this well, but I do not think there are any more hypocritical statements ever made than those coming to the microphone professing to care about children, while supporting a bill that makes the mean-spirited, targeted cuts at programs essential for kids that this budget, this appropriations bill represents.

Take for example the Healthy Start Program a program geared at reducing infant mortality. This country of ours ranks 20th in the world for infant mortality, and in different places in the country, places like the Native American reservations in North Dakota, we even rank behind the countries of Bulgaria, Cuba, and Jamaica, for God's sake, with infant mortality.

Mr. Chairman, we have reduced infant mortality with Healthy Start by programs that have allowed little fellows like E.J. Chantell, to survive when he otherwise would not have made it. He came into this world with water on his brain and serious stomach disorders, but with Healthy Start, and his fighting spirit, E.J. is alive. He is going to make it.

In fact we have taken 4 percent off of our infant mortality rates in the reservations in just 4 years. Why in the world would someone come to a mike professing to care about kids, while arguing for a program that cuts Healthy Start by 50 percent? Tomorrow's E.J. might die because of this cut, and no more hypocritical statement would be made to say that you are for kids while you take away the very programs that let them live.

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

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Chairman, in my view, there is a gap in the debate we are engaged in. The mantra is that we must cut, cut drastically for the long term, for future generations.

Mr. Chairman, there is a new generation, Congress, and they are alive today. They are our young; they are our kids. They have a right to hope and fulfill their dreams for themselves. They are the little ones of America today. Today, Mr. Chairman.

We need to balance our budget, but the Republican budget priorities, tax

breaks for the most fortunate of our country, who are not even asking for them, by the way, coupled with increased defense spending on the one hand and massive cuts in critical health and education programs on the other, shows just how little this majority really cares about the children of today.

Healthy Start is a small program with a big payoff. It began 4 years ago as a demonstration project, providing funds to 15 communities with the highest rates of infant mortality in the country.

Every industrial society measures itself by infant mortality rates. It operates on the premise that we should plant a seed, which is nurtured by local communities, with input from health care providers, so that we can solve this terrible problem.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is a sad commentary on the priorities of this Congress, and this country, to increase defense spending, provide corporate subsidies that total over \$100 billion, and insist on hundreds of billions of dollars in tax cuts while denying our tiniest citizens a chance at a healthy start. It is wrong-headed, it is wrong for the future of our Nation, and I think that it is shameful that the Congress would be doing this.

□ 1145

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

Mr. Chairman, let me point out, first of all, in response to the previous speaker's comments, that, of course, we are talking about an appropriations bill here that does not in any way affect the Tax Code or tax policy and certainly does not grant any kind of tax breaks to American citizens or businesses.

Mr. Chairman, proceeding under my own time now, I would like to direct the attention to one section of the bill. I would like to, Mr. Chairman, point out that this particular appropriation bill, despite the very real budgetary constraints that we have been discussing here on the House floor this morning, provides level funding for three of the titles of the Ryan White AIDS Care Act, and an additional \$23 million increase over 1995 for title I of the Ryan White Care Act, which provides assistance to American citizens. This increased funding for title I, which I fought for in both the subcommittee and full committee markup of the bill, is to address the funding pressures resulting from additional cities becoming eligible to join the program in 1996. This is the so-called hold-harmless funding that is intended to address the growing AIDS epidemic in our major metropolitan centers in America.

At least 7, and perhaps as many as 10, new cities will be eligible for this funding in 1996. Many of those cities, in fact, are located in California, where we have borne the brunt of the AIDS epidemic, and again this bill is intended to provide funding for those

communities that are struggling to cope with the AIDS crisis.

I think we are all aware and, again we have attempted to reflect this in the priorities set out in the bill, that the impact of the HIV epidemic continues to grow in America, both in the numbers of people infected as well as the geographic areas of the country that are impacted. The people affected are often medically underserved, with substantial access problems to quality health care. Demographic changes in the epidemic, for example, the increasing proportions of women, youth, and minorities contracting the HIV virus, require changes in our planning and in our thinking. They also require changes in the organization and delivery of care in health services.

It is estimated that 800,000 to 1.2 million individuals have HIV in the United States. Large numbers of people are still not receiving care. Others receive insufficient or inappropriate care or are being served in inappropriate care or are being served in inappropriate or high-cost settings.

The committee has maintained funding for Ryan White programs in recognition of the extent of unmet need in serving this population. We have increased funding again for those larger metropolitan areas where the HIV epidemic continues to grow.

I want to salute my colleagues on the subcommittee and the full committee for finding the funds to increase the Ryan White AIDS funding overall, again within the very difficult fiscal constraints of this bill.

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

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

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Chairman, the cuts in the Republican Labor-HHS-Education bill, that targets the national senior service corps' volunteer program, is a display of blatant arrogance toward the value and experience of our country's older Americans.

As we place emphasis in ensuring that all people become productive and contributing members of our society, we must not forget those who have already contributed greatly to our Nation and will continue to do so, if we do not deny them the opportunity.

Recent figures indicate that there are 13,000 senior volunteers and the numbers are growing.

The retired and senior volunteer program helps hospitals nurture and care for children afflicted with a serious illness.

In the foster grandparent program, the forgotten child benefits from the guidance and love of a senior.

The senior companion program provides frail adults with assistance in daily activities helping them remain independent and in their communities.

These programs allow seniors to play a role where their expertise, time, and attention fill many voids that the rest of our society neglects.

It is a disgrace that Republicans will help destroy the spirit of senior volunteerism with these cuts.

Instead of praising senior volunteers as a model of citizenship, Republicans are dismissing their contributions and treating them as if they have nothing to offer.

Republicans are wrong.

Seniors most certainly have much to offer.

Those of us who highly value the worthwhile contributions of our seniors have yet another reason to vote against the Labor-HHS-Education bill.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ROBERTS], the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I am rising in support of an amendment that will be offered later in the debate to restore approximately \$9 million for rural health care research.

As a past cochairman of the House Rural Health Care Coalition, and that involves about 140 Members who are obviously very much interested in the rural health care delivery system, we have really worked very hard to strengthen and preserve the rural health care research. Our coalition was organized back in 1987, and we have been able to establish a Federal office of rural health policy. We have worked very hard to try to eliminate the urban-rural Medicare reimbursement differential with State offices of rural health and the rural health transition grant program.

I know that we have very severe budget responsibilities, Mr. Chairman. However, let me point out that these are just a few of the letters I have from my small community hospitals in my 66 countries out on the prairie, pointing out the value of the \$9 million, and note I said "million," not "billion," in regard to research. I just cannot stress how important it is that we maintain a presence for rural health at the Federal level.

We have been working for years to overcome our physical and our age and our geographical barriers to health care. Let us not put up one more barrier by removing the rural health research component.

So, when the amendment is introduced as of later this afternoon, I certainly urge all Members to support it.

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

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, behind me are pictures of three of my constituents who are participants in senior volunteer programs in Orlando, FL. The first, largest, and best in the State of Florida.

These successful programs, such as the Foster-Grandparents and RSVP programs, will be cut by \$21 million in this shameful bill. Not only do these programs provide opportunities to older people of all backgrounds and in-

come levels to contribute to our communities, they also allow seniors to make a difference in the lives of so many of our children by providing the structure and guidance that would otherwise be missing from these children's lives. This prevention program is often the only thing preventing these kids from a life of crime.

Mr. Chairman, these programs work. It is disgraceful and downright shameful to cut these programs which provide so much to our communities, to be cut.

I strongly urge my colleagues to oppose the Labor-HHS appropriations bill. Shame, shame, shame.

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

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, most of my colleagues would think that Green Thumb would be a garden club or an environmental group. But if they know someone whose life has been changed through Green Thumb, they know that it is a unique employment training program for low-income seniors.

In fact, this chart shows the typical participant. There is a Green Thumb program in my hometown of Petaluma, CA, and one woman in my county whose life has been changed by Green Thumb is Lynn Gibbs. Lynn Gibbs is a 62-year-old graduate. A few years back, Lynn lost her successful business and was left living on an income below the poverty level. Thanks to Green Thumb and the training and job placement assistance program, Lynn is now working at a local boys' and girls' club.

I will bet that almost every one of my colleagues knows someone who has worked hard, played by the rules, but who found they needed a helping hand in their older years.

Last year, Green Thumb placed more than 19,000 seniors in jobs and community service projects.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PETERSON].

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I just want to follow on with the comments by my friend, the gentlewoman from California, on the Green Thumb program.

This is a senior community service employment program. It is a major, critical part of the Older Americans Act that we have supported here for many years. This program is very critical to the quality of life for our senior citizens.

We talked about children. They are important. We want to take care of our children. They are our future. But we cannot forget our seniors.

This is a means-tested program. This is people over 55 with incomes lower than 125 percent of the poverty level. We have got to take care of these people because it is quality of life. It allows them to participate in our communities.

This budget that we are setting in front of us, this appropriations bill, cuts this program by \$60 million under what was budgeted, \$42 million over what was in last year's.

As a result of this bill, 14,000 seniors will lose their jobs. Ladies and gentlemen, we owe it to our children to protect their future. We owe it to our seniors for their efforts for paying them back for the sacrifices they have made in our behalf.

Vote against this appropriations bill.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BONILLA], my colleague on the subcommittee.

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, I would like to talk for just a minute about the hypocrisy of those who are standing up to oppose our bill this morning.

We have fully funded the TRIO program, for example. We have fully funded the community and migrant health care center program. We are supporting the 190 percent increase over 5 years of the Head Start Program. We are increasing funding for the Ryan White Program. We are increasing funding for the National Institute of Health.

Anyone who supports these programs on the other side of the aisle ought to stand up proudly and say these are good programs, that we need to support the increased funding for, and vote for this bill.

They have taken a handful of items out of over 400 items that this bill addresses, taken a handful and turned it into a huge propaganda machine to try to act like we do not care about TRIO, we do not care about community and migrant health care centers or Head Start or Ryan White or the National Institutes of Health.

So let us stop this hypocrisy that we are hearing on the floor today of those who say that we are not interested in preserving and supporting and increasing funding for these programs.

What do you want us to do, take money out of TRIO to fund an increase for OSHA? Do you want us to take money out of community and migrant health care centers to give it to the Labor Department, to attorneys at the Labor Department? Do you want us to cut funding for Head Start to give it to phony, duplicative job training programs? Do you want us to cut Ryan White money to support Goals 2000? Do you want us to cut the National Institutes of Health to support some of these other boondoggles in the program?

If not, stand up and vote for the bill and stop being hypocritical.

The former chairman of this committee, Mr. Natcher, who I worked very closely with, and for whom we all had tremendous respect, always said, "If I had my way, we'd double everything in this bill." He did not have the money to do it either. We do not have it either. We are doing the best we can.

I encourage all of my friends on the other side of the aisle to stand up for

these good programs that we are trying to support and vote for the bill.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself ½ minute.

The fact remains you are cutting \$9.5 billion out of education, health and job programs. It is true that a few programs managed to escape your ax. Big deal. Even a stopped clock is right twice a day.

□ 1200

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. MARTINEZ].

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

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Chairman, this bill is cutting back on all the programs that benefit families. I am not sure the family values new majority understand the dire consequences of their actions. One of the most onerous cutbacks is on a program that was designed to ensure that seniors receive adequate nutrition. Enabling them to live independently and not be an economic burden on their families or society.

The Senior Nutrition Program is the major reason that seniors can live independently in the community rather than in \$34,000 per year nursing facilities. Another program that is being eliminated is the Ombudsman Program which protects vulnerable seniors in nursing homes. It has been shown that most nursing home operators are caring professionals who provide significant support to frail elderly patients.

But "20/20" recently graphically demonstrated instances of real physical abuse of elderly patients in nursing homes.

Without the independent Ombudsman Programs, those abuses will continue and will, I believe, grow in number and in severity.

In addition, the bill proposes slashing the budget of the three senior volunteer programs—Foster Grandparents, Senior Companions, and the Retired and Senior Volunteer Program [RSVP].

These programs were developed at the grass-roots level, tried in many places and then presented to the Federal Government as an idea whose time had come.

Since these programs were first funded, they have shown time and again that the small investment by the Federal Government reaps significant rewards, such as the cooperative agreement between the Senior Companion Program and the Visiting Nurses Association. By providing a visiting nurse to visit only 1 day a week, in support of the daily visit by the Senior Companion, the patient is ensured that he or she can live independently.

I remember a volunteer from my own district who organized his fellow retirees into a community street patrol. They provide mature eyes and ears for the public safety service and allow police officers to respond quickly and provide greater community safety.

These stories are not unique to the 31st District of California, they are repeated in every congressional district.

I urge Members to oppose these cuts, vote "no" on this bill, and protect the economic benefits of these programs.

Send a message that this is truly a family friendly Congress—not one that is ready to destroy the elderly, the children, and the family.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON].

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Texas wanted to know what he would have us to do on this side. We would have you to balance your priority. The gentleman from Texas, we will say, we will have you to have a sense of compassion. We also would have you to recognize that is not ineffective, non-essential to make sure that senior citizens have heat in the winter and have air-conditioning in the summer.

It is not ineffective, no longer needed, that those almost 500 people who died in Chicago, the majority of them senior citizens, the majority of them low-income, had no air-conditioning. That was life and death. So we are talking about priorities.

This bill, more than any other bill, makes the distinction between the policies of the minority and the cruel extreme policies of the majority. You will go to a balanced budget at the cost of anything, regardless of whether people live or die.

You raise the issue about children, and yet you depress the opportunity for them to learn, to live, and to be healthy. You claim that you are about family values and yet you deny the opportunity, even want to deny the opportunity of family planning. This is, indeed, lack of consistency and borders on hypocrisy.

So what we would have you to do is to understand there are consequences to your actions. You cannot ignore the pain and distress that you cause millions of people if you pursue this policy.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote against this unthinkable bill.

Mr. Chairman, this bill clearly demonstrates the differences between the policies of the minority and the extreme policies of the majority.

Over the past several days, cuts have been made in programs which have benefited Americans for many, many years. But now we are debating the most unconscionable cut of all—elimination of a program which serves thousands of senior citizens across America.

Next week, as we begin the August recess of the House, we will come face to face with our constituents.

As much as I enjoy visiting in my congressional district, I am not looking forward to having to explain why there is less money for low-income housing programs; why there is less money to combat homelessness; why there is less money for construction of VA facilities; why there will be no more drug elimination

grants; why there is no summer youth employment program; and why there is no Goals 2000 Education Program.

But just how do you explain to people that the House of Representatives has eliminated a program so critical to the health and well-being of so many people. LIHEAP is a program which provides assistance to thousands of senior citizens across our Nation to help them pay for heat in the winter and cooling in the summer.

This is certainly an appropriate time for us to vote on this program.

Think about it. Weather people have been telling us that this past July has hosted a record number of days over 90 degrees. And the hardest hit—those most affected by the heat—are our senior citizens.

How can we in good conscience tell those thousands of senior citizens that they will just have to “make do.”

“Stay cool the best way you can.”

Tell that to the families of the more than 500 people in Chicago who died as a result of the heat. And most of these people were senior citizens.

They were someone's parents—someone's grandparents. That's an unsettling thought.

I wonder just how well we would do if the air-conditioning in this Chamber—and our offices—was cut off for just 1 day during this sweltering heat.

Where is our compassion?

I cannot—in good conscience—vote to eliminate this program which serves so many. I ask for your compassion as well.

Vote “no” on H.R. 2127.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY].

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, this bill is such a crime against senior citizens, there should be an assault weapons ban included to protect them.

It says it will cut your Social Security and cost-of-living increase; we will ask you to pay \$5,000 more in out-of-pocket expenses for Medicare, take away your fuel assistance program, take food out of your mouths, take away protections to protect seniors against elder abuse, and restrict your jobs. It forces seniors to choose between heating, eating, lifesaving medicines, providing for fuel assistance, and cooling bills. Make no mistake about it. This bill makes tough choices even tougher.

What are the Republicans thinking about when they end the fuel assistance? This heat wave has already killed over 700 Americans, most of them senior citizens, and many, many more will die as the actions are taken on this bill today.

There are 12 million people that count on the Congregate Meals and the Meals on Wheels program; 150,000 seniors will be cut off from their only source of daily food. It abolishes the program that protects our seniors from fraud and nursing home abuses and, finally, it restricts opportunities for older workers who still want to work.

Have the Republicans gone to Washington and forgotten about their parents and grandparents? What is hap-

pening to the conscience of this party? The Grand Old Party has sunk to a low of coming to this House floor trying to cut the budget of America in order to protect the tax cut for the wealthiest people in this country.

Mr. Chairman, let us stand up for our senior citizens that build this country up, not knock them down for the sake of our pockets today.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GUNDERSON].

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

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I think this is the most difficult bill I have debated in 15 years. Going to war was easy compared to this.

I come here with the greatest respect for the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] because I think he was given the most impossible and most unfair task that any subcommittee Chair should ever be asked to do. I do not blame him, because he was given a 602(b) allocation cutting \$10 billion from last year, and I got to talk to my own party.

Our macro priority of balancing the budget is absolutely right, but the micro priority that cuts \$10 billion in human investment is absolutely wrong and we will pay for that for future generations in this country.

We all want to break down the barriers to trade for a global economy. We all want to pass the tax incentives to modernize and equip business for high technology, and we somehow suggest that in that process there is no time, there is no effort, and there are no resources to train and to educate a skilled force to be able to compete in that high technology global economy.

One cannot cut 63 percent from child training programs and expect those kids to get off the street and to give up crime and drugs and to go to work. One cannot cut 33 percent from the adult job training programs in 1 year and expect that we are going to transition rural America, where I come from, where we are losing farm jobs, or the inner city, where some of you come from, where we are losing industrial jobs, and expect us to put those people back to work. Because we do not like the delivery systems of the past does not give us the right to deny that the problems exist, and that is the problem with the bill in front of us, and it is the price that our party will pay, which I personally regret, but worse than that, that our Nation will pay, that every one of us as a citizen must be totally disturbed by.

We are debating the section on health care. I do not know what some of you know about health care, but I've got to tell you, we are struggling to keep the hospital open in my hometown, and we are struggling in western Wisconsin to give people an access to emergency lifesaving care, and this bill guts, totally guts, trauma care. Zero money.

Now, when you close down our hospitals and you eliminate our emergency health care, that is not a problem in some of America's beautiful suburbs, but I got to tell you, that is life and death in rural Wisconsin. It is not just the State offices of rural health being eliminated. Probably some of them should not have been continued. It is not just eliminating the Office of Rural Health or a 43-percent cut in transition grants. It is the basic bottom line. We have got to find some different priorities or, trust me, we will pay a lot more in the future.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM].

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

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, I want to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GUNDERSON] on his commendation of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] and the other statements that he made about priorities.

It is not necessary for us to have had to do what the gentleman has had to do in bringing the bill before us today. There was an alternative budget that was out, but I want to speak just briefly to the area of rural health, something that is a minor portion of this bill but is a major portion to my district, appropriations for rural health.

I want to just say I am confused, because it seems to me that the committee report states that big government is better and small government is not preferable, and I talk specifically about the Office of Rural Health, and I would like to submit for the RECORD what I have received from the Texas Rural Health Association and the Texas State Grange in support of the good work done by the Federal office.

These folks do not talk about some distant bureaucratic wasteful Federal office. They talk about a friendly face, an advocate in Government which rolls up its sleeves and provides support and advice and administers small but vital programs. It helps them communicate with other rural programs across the country. These are the kinds of things that are working in our Government and should not be left out.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to talk briefly about something which is a very minor portion of this bill but which is of huge importance to my district and my State—appropriations for rural health.

I do want to thank my Texas colleague, Mr. BONILLA, for his good work in promoting a number of rural health programs in this bill and I also want to thank Chairman PORTER and the committee for recognizing the importance of programs such as the National Health Service Corps and outreach grants.

I do have to say, however, that I am confused by one decision the committee made and confused by the committee report language which explained that decision.

The committee report stated:

The [Federal Office of Rural Health Policy's] size and location at HRSA limit its impact on Federal health reimbursement policies and other concerns of rural areas.

What I am unclear about is whether the committee is suggesting that small government can not be effective, that big government is preferable?

It's true that the office is tiny, especially in government standards. It employs only 15 people out of a total of 60,000 HHS. The funding is tiny as well. Very few Federal offices can operate effectively with less than \$10 million. But the Office represents the best concentration of expertise on rural health in the Federal Government. Even with their David status, they have taken on the Goliath of HHS and frequently been victorious. The Office has been instrumental in raising the awareness that a one-size-fits-all approach does not work in rural America. For example, they have helped to win victories on hospital reimbursements and small laboratory regulation.

Or, is the committee arguing that the Federal Office should be enlarged and raised in the Department structure?

As one who was around when the bipartisan Rural Health Coalition first called for the creation of this office, I can tell you that it was intentionally established outside of Department headquarters to ensure that it would serve as a quasi-independent office to look out for the concerns of rural health. It functions as a broker, not a bureaucracy. In fact, you might say it was intended to be a thorn in the side of Federal bureaucracy.

Today, the Office is the Federal voice bringing attention to obstacles in the path of rural telemedicine and rural managed care. It is also the Government's only official rural voice in the debate over restructuring Medicaid and Medicare. We would be happy for it to be bigger or higher if the committee wishes to finance such stature, but absent that, let's make sure we support its current role rather than eliminating it, as this bill does.

I would like to submit for the record letters I have received from the Texas Rural Health Association and the Texas State Grange in support of the good work done by the Federal Office. These folks do not talk about some distant, bureaucratic, wasteful Federal office. They talk about a friendly face and advocate in the Government which rolls up its sleeves, provides support and advice, administers small but vital programs, helps them communicate with other rural programs across the country, and assists them in avoiding mistakes and duplication. In these days when so few people speak of positive experiences with the Federal Government, why would we want to eliminate one of the bright lights that exists?

Like my constituents, I certainly hope that before this appropriation bill is signed into law, funding for these valuable services will be restored.

TEXAS STATE GRANGE,
San Antonio, TX, July 31, 1995.

Hon. CHARLES W. STENHOLM,
17th Congressional District of Texas.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE STENHOLM: The Texas State Grange is very concerned with the cuts/elimination of funding for the rural health care programs contained in the FY '96 appropriation bill for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies. If passed, this bill will eliminate the following essential rural health care programs:

Federal Office of Rural Health, State offices of rural health, rural health research, telemedicine, new rural health grants, trauma care, and essential access community hospitals.

The Federal Office of Rural Health is the only office that provides a voice for rural health care in Washington, D.C. It is also a crucial link in the federal-state-local health care provider chain. This office needs to be maintained, not eliminated.

While we understand that when originally authorized, funding for the State Offices of Rural Health was to be eventually phased out, not all states have made an investment in their State Offices of Rural Health. Ten to fifteen of the offices predict they will close if funding is eliminated now.

Rural residents comprise approximately 22% of our population. In addition, farmers have the highest percentage of injuries and/or deaths per industry. Eliminating funds for trauma care (and EACH is shortsighted) and as more rural hospitals are forced to close, funds for telemedicine become a necessity for those communities.

The Texas State Grange recognizes and appreciates the 104th Congress' attempts to be fiscally-minded in its appropriations. However, zeroing out funds for essential services to rural health care programs is not a "fair share" cut.

We ask that if floor amendments are brought up dealing with reinstating funds for rural health care programs, you will vote "yes"! Thank you.

Sincerely,

ARCHIE D. KNIGHT.

TEXAS RURAL HEALTH ASSOCIATION,
Austin, TX, August 2, 1995.

Hon. CHARLES STENHOLM,
Longworth House Office Building,
Room 1211,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE STENHOLM: The House will be voting this week to eliminate the Federal Office of Rural Health Policy (ORHP). As President of the Texas Rural Health Association, I implore you not to let this happen. The Office of Rural Health Policy is a voice for rural health in America. Jeff Humans and his very concerned and committed staff monitor what is happening to the health of rural Americans and advise the Secretary of HHS as to trends and needs. This Office helps coordinate and guide what would otherwise be totally fragmented and potentially duplicative rural efforts of other Federal agencies.

ORHP Programs like the Rural Health Outreach Grant Program (RHOG) help promote the development of community coalitions to improve the delivery of health care by maximizing available resources. In Mount Pleasant, Texas, RHOG funds were employed to open a high risk prenatal clinic. In East Texas, RHOG funds are being used to develop a network of lay health advocates through area minority churches and housing projects to assist with health outreach and education.

The telemedicine grant program helps bring specialty care to rural Americans, lessens provider professional isolation, and enables patients to stay in their communities. The ORHP Rural Research Centers provide a very important glimpse into rural health care delivery systems—helping us determine what works, under what circumstances, and where—this is real world research.

Through the State Offices of Rural Health, the Center for Rural Health Initiatives here in Texas, the ORHP helps link health providers and communities, provides technical assistance, and is a continuing source of local support.

In sum, the Federal Office of Rural Health Policy represents rural Americans, it hears rural voices. We cannot afford to lose it!

Sincerely,

GAIL R. BELLAMY,
President.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HINCHEY].

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

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Chairman, Republicans have been running ads about how they are helping the children in the next generation by reducing the deficit. That is very nice but they are making sure that the kids pay for it by cutting programs that help those same kids and provide them with an education.

Elementary and secondary education cuts force communities to make an unwelcome choice. They either reduce the services that Federal funds paid for or they raise property taxes to keep them going. Either way, it is the people least able to help themselves, children or older homeowners with fixed incomes who are being required to pay the bills.

This bill cuts funding for title I compensatory education by \$1.1 billion, that is 17 percent. My state, New York, will lose \$123 million, and 100,000 New York students will be affected.

This program has the strongest support of any Federal education program from our own school districts, whether they are urban, rural, liberal, or conservative. They tell us how important the program is. The program cuts funding for safe and drug free schools. It will cost New York \$59 million at the same time that we hear about students shooting other students and selling drugs in schools.

It is time that we had some rationale about what we are doing and pass a sensible bill. This bill needs to be defeated.

Republicans have been running ads about how they are helping children and the next generation by reducing the deficit. That's very nice, but they are making sure that the kids pay for it by cutting programs that help kids and that provide them with an education.

Elementary and secondary education cuts force communities to make an unwelcome choice: either reduce the services that Federal funds paid for, or raise property taxes to keep them going. Either way, it is the people least able to help themselves—children or older homeowners with fixed incomes—who are being required to pay the bills.

The bill would cut funding for title I compensatory education by \$1.1 billion, 17 percent. New York will lose \$103 million, and 100,000 New York students will be affected. Title I pays for remedial education. It has the strongest support of any Federal education program from our own school districts—liberal and conservative, rural and urban. They tell us how important they think the program is.

It cuts funding for Safe and Drug-Free Schools Programs by 59 percent, \$286 million nationwide, \$59 million in New York. Does this make sense when we hear almost daily about students shooting other students, or students selling drugs in schools?

It cuts funding for children at risk—52-percent cut in Healthy Start, HHS program to reduce infant mortality; \$137 million in Head Start, cutting 60,000 children out of Nancy Reagan's favorite program for children; cut of 20 percent in programs for homeless children.

It cuts funding for education reform—\$250 million in funding for Eisenhower Professional Development Program for teacher improvement; total elimination of funding for Goals 2000, to improve and upgrade school curricula. Cost to NY: \$18.8 million for Eisenhower, \$27 million for Goals. Goals was the product of the bipartisan effort by governors, blessed by the Bush Administration, to respond to the "Nation at Risk" report which said that our education system was weak enough and inconsistent enough that it threatened our economic future.

So, maybe today's kids will be paying less in Federal taxes—but they'll be living in a third-rate economy that was too cheap to give them the good education that all children need and deserve.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. WYDEN].

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

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. Chairman, the real story of this bill is that it is punishing those in the dawn of life, our children, and those in the twilight of life, our senior citizens.

In the case of the elderly, if this bill passes in its present form, our Nation better get out the ambulances. At a time when our aging population is growing so rapidly, this bill hits 16 key programs for the elderly that are a lifeline for our seniors. It eliminates programs like the elderly abuse program at a time when elderly abuse has gone up 94 percent over the last 5 years. These are seniors that are being physically abused. They are being exploited. They are in a position where they cannot defend themselves and, yet, this Congress eliminates that program.

The same is true of the long-term care ombudsman program, a program that provides an early warning signal to seniors that are being abused in long-term care.

Let us not do this. We have supported those programs in the past on a bipartisan basis. Let us keep them strong for our Nation's seniors.

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

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

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to what the Republicans and what the chairman of this committee is trying to lay before the House.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Labor-HHS-Education appropriations bill. H.R. 2127 is an assault on our Nation's most vulnerable.

Mr. Chairman, historically, the Labor-HHS-Education bill has been a testament to our commitment to the things which have held our

Nation together: good health, education, and jobs.

But this bill is a disgrace. In one giant sweep we manage to cut the funding for programs that alleviate the misery this Nation experiences from lack of economic opportunity and poor health.

If this bill is passed, we will turn our backs on poor mothers, babies and young people.

HEALTHY START

Healthy Start cuts will deepen the infant mortality crisis in the United States.

The bill will cut Healthy Start by \$55 million in 1996 and eliminate funding after 1996.

The United States—the wealthiest and most industrialized country in the world—has an infant mortality rate that is worse than many third world countries.

Babies born in the United States are less likely to reach their first birthday than babies born in 22 other industrialized countries.

In my district alone, the infant mortality rate is over 17 percent. In other urban areas across the United States, the infant mortality rate is over 20 percent.

These cuts will be devastating to the public hospital in my congressional district that is struggling to reduce the number of low-birthweight babies.

LOW-INCOME HOME ENERGY ASSISTANCE

Abolishing funding for LIHEAP will worsen the devastating effects of this summer's heat wave.

According to the public health officials, over 700 people have died from the heat wave this summer. Of these, 550 were in Chicago which has had temperatures as high as 103 degrees and average temperatures of 96 degrees. Are we going to turn our backs on the hundreds that could die as a result of eliminating LIHEAP?

The National Weather Service predicts that this heatwave will continue unabated. Are we going to turn our backs on the 6 million families who will suffer if LIHEAP is eliminated?

SUMMER YOUTH EMPLOYMENT

This bill cancels appropriations for summer jobs for young people. The President rightfully requested \$958 million for this program.

In Memphis, over 30,000 young people have benefited from this program since 1984.

In 1995, Memphis received \$2.3 million and employed 1,600 kids who worked in summer jobs as a result of this program.

Summer jobs give our neediest young people a vital income and keeps them productive when school is out.

CONCLUSION

Abolishing Healthy Start, summer jobs, and energy assistance will result in the deaths of thousands of Americans.

In South Carolina, a jury sentenced Susan Smith to life imprisonment for killing two innocent children.

What will the sentence be for Republicans who are cutting programs that will cost the lives of thousands?

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER].

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I want to balance the budget for our children. I agree. I voted for a balanced budget amendment this year and in years past. I voted for the Stenholm amendment to balance the budget in 7 years.

But those who stand on this floor and say we are balancing the budget do not tell the truth. We are taking \$9 billion from children that my constituents do not believe are pork, from seniors that my constituents do not think is waste, from rural health that my constituents do not believe is fraud, and from people who need energy assistance to keep warm and cool in distress, and people do not believe that is abuse.

Mr. Chairman, we are taking that \$9 billion and we are giving it not to balance the budget, not to bring down the deficit, not to save our children from debt, but we are taking that money and we are shifting it over here to the wealthiest Americans among us so that they can have a tax cut.

We are not saving any money. We are not reducing the deficit by these cuts. In point of fact, we have been on a downhill slide on domestic spending like education and like health care.

Reject this bill. It is bad for America, it is bad for the future, it is bad for our children, and it does not make sense.

□ 1215

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

Mr. Chairman, all of us in Congress have our priorities. We are rural or city. We are putting education or health or national defense or agriculture at the top of our list. Every one of us are here crying for a balanced budget, provided we do so on someone else's priorities.

The gentleman from Indiana, the gentleman from Wisconsin said earlier it is the B-2 bomber that is the problem. We are for balancing the budget provided we do it on the B-2 bomber or national defense or elsewhere.

Let me say that you cannot balance the budget on someone else's priorities. Everyone has to contribute to this process. I voted against the B-2 bomber, consistently. I am voting against tax cuts now until the budget is into balance. We cannot do it without everybody giving something to the process. Those who say balance it on someone else's priorities are part of the problem and not part of the solution.

If I may say to the gentleman on the other side and some on my side as well, the funding under this section of the bill is not going down. It is going from \$181 to \$198.2 billion. It is going up substantially. The cut in the discretionary portion is 3.5 percent and in services probably a good deal less than 3 percent.

Should it make a contribution? Yes. Is this the way to move toward a balanced budget? Yes. I believe that we have done a very responsible job in handling this section of the bill. I think the hyperbole on the other side is, frankly, just that, hyperbole.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Time for general debate on title II has expired.

Are there any amendments to title II?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MORAN

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment numbered 95, offered by Mr. MORAN: Page 30, line 13, insert before the period the following: "Provided further, That of the funds made available under this heading, \$7,500,000 shall be available for carrying out the activities of the Office of Alternative Medicine under section 404E of the Public Health Service Act".

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of yesterday, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN] will be recognized for 10 minutes in support of the amendment, and a Member opposed will be recognized for 10 minutes.

Does the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] wish to claim the time as the opponent?

Mr. PORTER. We have no objection to the amendment, so if there is a Member opposed, they should claim the time.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, I know of no one who objects to the amendment. I would like to explain it, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment simply earmarks an additional \$1.9 million within the Office of the Director of NIH for the Office of Alternative Medicine. It does not increase the budget. In fact, as I say, this is unallocated money, but I think it is terribly important that we put a little bit more money into the Office of Alternative Medicine.

You know, 80 percent of the world's medicine is considered alternative medicine. It is amazing, the fact that 80 percent of the rest of the world uses different therapies than the conventional therapies that we use in the United States and that, in fact, 50 percent of the American people who are faced with a very serious illness like cancer try alternative medicines. In fact, they pay out of pocket about \$10 billion. As much as they pay out of pocket for hospital care, they are paying out of pocket, uninsured, for alternative approaches to traditional medicine.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I came across this issue because of a personal experience in our family. My child had a malignant brain tumor and had maybe a 10- to 20-percent chance of living up to the age of 5, we were told, and so it was recommended to take the traditional approach, which is surgery, chemotherapy and radiation. Essentially cut, poison, and burn.

The surgery was not able to get all of the tumor and so we gave her chemo-

therapy. We soon realized, the debilitating effect that chemotherapy was having on her. She is only a 3-year-old, but it generally has an adverse impact on anyone taking chemotherapy. We also put off the radiation.

A story was written about our situation, and we got thousands of letters from all over the world, primarily from the United States. We got boxes of them. I do not have the time to read them. My wife has been reading most of them. It is amazing the common experiences that are shared and the fact that the majority of people have tried alternative approaches and yet they do not have anywhere to go to determine the efficacy of these different approaches, because there are no random clinical professional trials done on most of these approaches.

We are trying something that we found out about from hundreds of people who have had success with powdered shark cartilage. People wince when we mention it. We do not have anywhere to go to determine whether, and under what conditions, it is likely to be effective, but the reality is, it seems to be working with our daughter in combination with high doses of vitamin C and other nutrients.

I only mention the personal experience because our experience is being shared by thousands of families, if not millions across the country. We need some professional analysis. We need random trials that are done in a professional, scrupulous manner.

We have a new director at the Office of Alternative Medicine with the right kind of background in clinical trials. He was at Walter Reed. He is an extremely competent physician. He is going to direct this office, but we need to give him at least the minimal amount of resources to determine whether some of these alternative therapies work.

They will be done in collaboration with what the other National Institutes of Health are doing, and so I would urge that this small amount of increase to the Office of Alternative Medicine, which would bring it up to \$7.5 million out of billions we put into the total budget for the National Institutes of Health, be approved by this body and that we make some progress in giving the kind of professional analysis we have the ability to provide, to so many American families who are desperately in need of it.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DEFAZIO].

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding time to me. The issue is, you know, will we transfer a small amount of funds, \$1.9 million, to the Office of Alternative Medicine. The director's office from which we would transfer this receives \$3.5 million more than the President asked for. The Office of Alternative Medicine is receiving the same small amount of funds it got last year.

We are in kind of a catch-22. People say to me, well, Congressman, your

idea is here, the ideas expressed by Mr. MORAN are not clinically and scientifically proven, but we are not funding the Office of Alternative Medicine so we can conduct those scientific and clinical tests.

You know, the problem is many of these potential cures are nonproprietary. They are not going to be billion dollar drugs. Many of them are natural substances. Many of them have long been in use in other countries. They cannot be patented in the United States under current law. They are orphans.

So unless the Office of Alternative Medicine has the budget to research these substances, to do clinical tests, we are not going to move forward.

This is preventive medicine. It can save tremendous amounts of money. You can look at folic acid for heart attack prevention. A lot of documentation in other countries, some in this country, but no clinically scientifically proven tests, so doctors are prescribing other things that perhaps are not even as effective.

Deglycyrrhizinated licorice, tough word to say, for stomach problems, as opposed to tagamet and other proprietary drugs, not a lot of enthusiasm out there for something that you can buy for \$15 a month when you can prescribe something for \$100 or \$200 a month.

If we are going to save money, if we are going to have a healthier populous, we need to begin looking at some of these alternatives, and this small amount of money transferred over to the already existing Office of Alternative Medicine, doing nothing to impact the director's budget which will still exceed the President's request, would move this country forward tremendously, and it would meet the goals of all of us who want to see that Americans have the widest range of choices available to them when they or their loved ones have health problems.

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

Mr. Chairman, since it is such an important topic, I am going to make a few more remarks, and I appreciate the fact that the chairman is not opposed to this amendment. In fact, he would probably like me to speed this up as rapidly as possible and get on to more controversial amendments.

□ 1230

I think it is important to recognize that with a \$1 trillion health budget, 70 percent of the illnesses that we come down with are preventable, if we had a better concept of how to keep ourselves healthy, and that is largely what this is all about. It is determining how we can bring about the healthiest population possible and not rejecting things because they are not taught in traditional schools of medicine, even though they have been used efficaciously throughout the globe.

So I would appreciate greater attention being given to what I think is an area at NIH that holds tremendous

promise, that does not cost a lot of money. The rewards are going to be far more than what they cost for investing in the Office of Alternative Medicine.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Is there any Member who wishes to be recognized in opposition to the amendment?

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say it is acceptable on both sides of the aisle.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there other amendments to title II?

If not, the Clerk will designate title III.

The text of title III is as follows:

TITLE III—DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
EDUCATION REFORM

For carrying out activities authorized by titles II and III of the School-to-Work Opportunities Act, \$95,000,000, which shall become available on July 1, 1996, and remain available through September 30, 1997.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

For carrying out title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, \$6,014,499,000, which shall become available on July 1, 1996 and shall remain available through September 30, 1997: *Provided*, That up to \$3,500,000 of these funds shall be available to the Secretary on October 1, 1995 to obtain updated local-educational-agency-level census poverty data from the Bureau of the Census: *Provided further*, That no funds shall be reserved under section 1003(a) of said Act.

IMPACT AID

For carrying out programs of financial assistance to federally affected schools authorized by title VIII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, \$645,000,000, of which \$550,000,000 shall be for basic support payments under section 8003(b), \$40,000,000 shall be for payments for children with disabilities under section 8003(d), \$50,000,000, to remain available until expended, shall be for payments under section 8003(f), and \$5,000,000 shall be for construction under section 8007: *Provided*, That notwithstanding the provisions of section 8003(a)(2), children described in section 8003(a)(1)(D) shall have a weight of zero for the purpose of computing basic support payments under section 8003(b) and construction payments under section 8007: *Provided further*, That no payments shall be made under section 8003(d) or 8003(g) for children described in section 8003(a)(1)(D): *Provided further*, That none of the funds provided shall be used for payments under section 8003(e).

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

For carrying out school improvement activities authorized by titles II, IV-A-1, V-A, VI, and X of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 and the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act; \$842,000,000, of which \$723,000,000 shall become available on July 1, 1996, and remain available through September 30, 1997.

BILINGUAL AND IMMIGRANT EDUCATION

For carrying out, to the extent not otherwise provided, bilingual and immigrant education activities authorized by title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, \$103,000,000: *Provided*, That State educational agencies may use all, or any part of, their part C allocation for competitive

grants to local educational agencies: *Provided further*, That the Department of Education should only support instructional programs which ensure that students completely master English in a timely fashion (a period of three to five years) while meeting rigorous achievement standards in the academic content areas: *Provided further*, That no funds shall be available for subpart 3 of part A.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

For carrying out parts B, C, D, F, and H of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, \$3,092,491,000, of which \$3,000,000,000 shall become available for obligation on July 1, 1996, and shall remain available through September 30, 1997.

REHABILITATION SERVICES AND DISABILITY RESEARCH

For carrying out, to the extent not otherwise provided, the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, the Technology-Related Assistance for Individuals with Disabilities Act, and the Helen Keller National Center Act, as amended, \$2,455,760,000.

SPECIAL INSTITUTIONS FOR PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES

AMERICAN PRINTING HOUSE FOR THE BLIND
For carrying out the Act of March 3, 1879, as amended (20 U.S.C. 101 et seq.), \$4,000,000.
NATIONAL TECHNICAL INSTITUTE FOR THE DEAF

For the National Technical Institute for the Deaf under titles I and II of the Education of the Deaf Act of 1986 (20 U.S.C. 4301 et seq.), \$39,737,000: *Provided*, That from the amount available, the Institute may at its discretion use funds for the endowment program as authorized under section 207.

GALLAUDET UNIVERSITY

For the Kendall Demonstration Elementary School, the Model Secondary School for the Deaf, and the partial support of Gallaudet University under titles I and II of the Education of the Deaf Act of 1986 (20 U.S.C. 4301 et seq.), \$72,028,000: *Provided*, That from the amount available, the University may at its discretion use funds for the endowment program as authorized under section 207.

VOCATIONAL AND ADULT EDUCATION

For carrying out, to the extent not otherwise provided, the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act, the Adult Education Act, and the National Literacy Act of 1991, \$1,057,919,000, of which \$1,055,000,000 shall become available on July 1, 1996 and shall remain available through September 30, 1997: *Provided*, That of the amounts made available under the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act, \$1,000,000 shall be for national programs under title IV without regard to section 451.

STUDENT FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

For carrying out subparts 1 and 3 of part A, part C, and part E of title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended, \$6,916,915,000, which shall remain available through September 30, 1997.

The maximum Pell Grant for which a student shall be eligible during award year 1996-1997 shall be \$2,440: *Provided*, That notwithstanding section 401(g) of the Act, as amended, if the Secretary determines, prior to publication of the payment schedule for award year 1996-1997, that the \$5,697,000,000 included within this appropriation for Pell Grant awards for award year 1996-1997, and any funds available from the fiscal year 1995 appropriation for Pell Grant awards, are insufficient to satisfy fully all such awards for which students are eligible, as calculated under section 401(b) of the Act, the amount paid for each such award shall be reduced by either a fixed or variable percentage, or by a

fixed dollar amount, as determined in accordance with a schedule of reductions established by the Secretary for this purpose: *Provided further*, That no Pell grant shall be awarded to any student during award year 1996-1997 if the amount of that grant as determined under section 401(b) of the Act is less than \$600.

FEDERAL FAMILY EDUCATION LOAN PROGRAM ACCOUNT

For Federal administrative expenses to carry out guaranteed student loans authorized by title IV, part B, of the Higher Education Act, as amended, \$30,066,000.

HIGHER EDUCATION

For carrying out, to the extent not otherwise provided, parts A and B of title III, without regard to section 360(a)(1)(B)(ii), chapter 1 of subpart 2 of part A of title IV, subpart 2 of part E of title V, parts A and B of title VI, title VII, part D of title IX, and part A and subpart 1 of part B of title X of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended, and the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961; \$757,700,000, of which \$16,712,000 for interest subsidies under title VII of the Higher Education Act, as amended, shall remain available until expended.

HOWARD UNIVERSITY

For partial support of Howard University (20 U.S.C. 121 et seq.), \$170,366,000.

HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES LOANS

The Secretary is hereby authorized to make such expenditures, within the limits of funds available under this heading and in accord with law, and to make such contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal year limitation, as provided by section 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act (31 U.S.C. 9104), as may be necessary in carrying out the program for the current fiscal year.

COLLEGE HOUSING AND ACADEMIC FACILITIES LOANS PROGRAM

For administrative expenses to carry out the existing direct loan program of college housing and academic facilities loans entered into pursuant to title VII, part C, of the Higher Education Act, as amended, \$700,000.

COLLEGE HOUSING LOANS

Pursuant to title VII, part C of the Higher Education Act, as amended, for necessary expenses of the college housing loans program, previously carried out under title IV of the Housing Act of 1950, the Secretary shall make expenditures and enter into contracts without regard to fiscal year limitation using loan repayments and other resources available to this account. Any unobligated balances becoming available from fixed fees paid into this account pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 1749d, relating to payment of costs for inspections and site visits, shall be available for the operating expenses of this account.

HISTORICALLY BLACK COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY CAPITAL FINANCING, PROGRAM ACCOUNT

The total amount of bonds insured pursuant to section 724 of title VII, part B of the Higher Education Act shall not exceed \$357,000,000, and the cost, as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, of such bonds shall not exceed zero.

For administrative expenses to carry out the Historically Black College and University Capital Financing Program entered into pursuant to title VII, part B of the Higher Education Act, as amended, \$166,000.

EDUCATION RESEARCH, STATISTICS, AND IMPROVEMENT

For carrying out activities authorized by the Educational Research, Development, Dissemination, and Improvement Act; the National Education Statistics Act; part A of title III, parts A and B and section 10601 of

title X of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended, \$255,107,000: *Provided*, That \$3,000,000 shall be for section 10601 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act: *Provided further*, That \$25,000,000 shall be for section 3136 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (K-12 technology learning challenge): *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated in this paragraph may be obligated or expended for the Goals 2000 Community Partnerships Program.

LIBRARIES

For carrying out, to the extent not otherwise provided, titles I and III of the Library Services and Construction Act, \$101,227,000.

DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT

PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION

For carrying out, to the extent not otherwise provided, the Department of Education Organization Act, including rental of conference rooms in the District of Columbia and hire of two passenger motor vehicles, \$327,319,000.

OFFICE FOR CIVIL RIGHTS

For expenses necessary for the Office for Civil Rights, as authorized by section 203 of the Department of Education Organization Act, \$53,951,000.

OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

For expenses necessary for the Office of the Inspector General, as authorized by section 212 of the Department of Education Organization Act, \$28,154,000.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 301. No funds appropriated in this Act may be used for the transportation of students or teachers (or for the purchase of equipment for such transportation) in order to overcome racial imbalance in any school or school system, or for the transportation of students or teachers (or for the purchase of equipment for such transportation) in order to carry out a plan of racial desegregation of any school or school system.

SEC. 302. None of the funds contained in this Act shall be used to require, directly or indirectly, the transportation of any student to a school other than the school which is nearest the student's home, except for a student requiring special education, to the school offering such special education, in order to comply with title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. For the purpose of this section an indirect requirement of transportation of students includes the transportation of students to carry out a plan involving the reorganization of the grade structure of schools, the pairing of schools, or the clustering of schools, or any combination of grade restructuring, pairing or clustering. The prohibition described in this section does not include the establishment of magnet schools.

SEC. 303. No funds appropriated under this Act may be used to prevent the implementation of programs of voluntary prayer and meditation in the public schools.

SEC. 304. No funds appropriated under this Act shall be made available for opportunity to learn standards or strategies.

SEC. 305. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds available for section 458 of the Higher Education Act shall not exceed \$320,000,000 for fiscal year 1996, of which \$160,000,000 shall be available for the payment of administrative cost allowances to guaranty agencies. The Department of Education shall, within 30 days of enactment, develop a plan for the payment of administrative cost allowances which shall be submitted to the Chairs of the House Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities and the Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resources. Notwithstanding section

458 of the Higher Education Act, the Secretary may not use funds available under that section for subsequent fiscal years for administrative expenses of the William D. Ford Direct Loan Program during fiscal year 1996, nor may the Secretary require the return of guaranty agency reserve funds during fiscal year 1996.

No funds available to the Secretary may be used for (1) marketing, advertising or promotion of the William D. Ford Direct Loan Program, or for the hiring of advertising agencies or other third parties to provide advertising services, or (2) payment of administrative fees relating to the William D. Ford Direct Loan Program to institutions of higher education.

None of the funds provided by this Act may be used to hire staff at the Department of Education if such hiring would increase on-board employment at the Department as of the date of enactment of this Act.

None of the funds provided by this Act may be used to conduct an evaluation of the William D. Ford Direct Loan Program except as administered by the Advisory Committee on Student Financial Assistance.

None of the funds provided by this Act may be used by the Department of Education to implement new Individual Procurement Agreements (IPAs).

SEC. 306. None of the funds appropriated in this Act may be obligated or expended to carry out sections 727, 932, and 1002 of the Higher Education Act of 1965, section 621(b) of Public Law 101-589, the President's Advisory Commission on Educational Excellence for Hispanic Americans, and the President's Board of Advisors on Historically Black Colleges and Universities.

SEC. 307. Section 444(b)(1)(E) of the General Education Provisions Act (20 U.S.C. 1232g(b)(1)(E)) is amended to read as follows:

"(E) State and local officials or authorities to whom such information is specifically—

"(i) required to be reported or disclosed pursuant to State statute adopted before November 19, 1974;

"(ii) allowed to be reported or disclosed pursuant to State statute adopted before November 19, 1974, if the allowed reporting or disclosure concerns the juvenile justice system and such system's ability to effectively serve the student whose records are released, or

"(iii) allowed to be reported or disclosed pursuant to State statute adopted after November 19, 1974, if—

"(I) the allowed reporting or disclosure concerns the juvenile justice system and such system's ability to effectively serve, prior to adjudication, the student whose records are released; and

"(II) the officials and authorities to whom such information is disclosed certify in writing to the educational agency or institution that the information will not be disclosed to any other party except as provided under State law without the prior written consent of the parent of the student;"

SEC. 308. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used by the Office of Civil Rights of the Department of Education after December 31, 1995, to enforce title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 (20 U.S.C. 1681 et seq.) with respect to gender equity in intercollegiate athletic programs, except when it is made known to the Office that the Department has issued updated policy guidance to institutions of higher education which includes objective criteria clarifying how such institutions can demonstrate a history and continuing practice of program expansion for members of the underrepresented sex and full and effective accommodation of the interests and abilities of the underrepresented sex.

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

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

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

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

Mr. Chairman, at the outset, let us agree that if money, both Federal, State, and local were the problem, we should have already solved our education problems. Between 1960 and 1990, inflation adjusted spending for education rose from \$50 billion to almost \$190 billion and per pupil spending, again adjusted for inflation, increased from \$1,454 in 1960 to \$4,622 in 1990; an increase of over 300 percent in real terms. However, student scores on their SAT's and National Assessment of Educational Progress declined. Between 1976 and 1994, Federal funding for elementary, secondary, and vocational education rose from \$4.6 billion to \$14.8 billion, again, an increase of over 300 percent.

As in other titles, the bill sets clear priorities while providing significant contributions to our goal of eliminating the Federal deficit by 2000.

Total discretionary funding for the Department of Education declines by \$4.5 billion from the fiscal year 1995 originally enacted levels and \$3.7 billion from the post-rescission levels.

The bill places a high priority on student assistance. The maximum Pell grant is increased by \$100 to \$2,440, the largest increase ever provided to raise the grants to the highest levels in history. Federal Supplemental Educational Opportunity grants, Federal Work-Study and TRIO programs are all held at last year's levels.

The Committee recommendation maintains the \$6 billion available for Perkins loans. While ending the Federal contribution, prudent management by the schools plus their continued contribution to this high priority program will allow the balance available for loans to students to increase.

The bill eliminates over 90 mostly small, duplicative programs in the Department of Education.

The mark terminates many of over 50 planning, dissemination, technical assistance, and research programs in education, including Goals 2000.

The Goals 2000 program initiated by the Bush administration was a voluntary effort by States to develop and implement goals and standards. The current program is simply another Federal grant-in-aid program which, while having few formal requirements, will see a proliferation of informal rules and specifications as it is implemented down through the multi-layered bureaucracy of the Washington office and the regional offices.

While this program has no specific, written substantive requirements, there are many connections between Goals 2000 and funding for other programs. Not so subtle pressures will

surely arise to address issues such as opportunity to learn, gender equity and other issues that are part of the administration's national educational policy.

This account funds National Opportunity to Learn Standards and School Financial Equity programs. The administration would impose these social experiments on localities with little evaluation and where evaluation exists, it indicates that there is little relationship between spending and learning outcomes. According to Dr. Dianne Ravitch ". . . No one knows what such standards are, so it seems premature to expect States to establish them."

School-to-Work and tech-prep activities are funded at \$190 million in anticipation of their inclusion in larger block grants. These programs are slated to be consolidated into a block grant by the Economic and Educational Opportunities Committee and this funding level was decided upon in anticipation action by the authorization committee.

Title I funding for Education for the Disadvantaged is reduced by \$1.14 billion, or 17.9 percent based on evaluations indicating little impact and the fact that the broad distribution of funds, to even the wealthiest school districts in America, diffuses the effectiveness of this program.

I would say, Mr. Chairman, that I believe very strongly that this money should be targeted only to the schools most in need, those in the inner cities and rural areas that have a high percentage of at risk children, and not be sent to school districts all over the country, including those in the most wealthy areas, as it is today. The program is extremely poorly targeted.

Mr. Chairman, according to the final report of the National Assessment of the chapter I program, the program " * * * Does not appear to be helping close the learning gap." Recently enacted reforms make some changes, but their impact on performance is unclear.

There is little targeting in the program, 90 percent of the local school districts receive funding from this program, including many of the most wealthy school districts in the country. Those districts that do not participate are generally not those that are rich, but those that are so small as to not meet the minimum number of poor school aged children.

Four hundred eighty-nine million dollars of fiscal year 1994 funding for Education for the Disadvantaged went to the 100 richest counties in America—with per capita personal income ranging from \$24,000 to \$49,000. While these counties surely contain disadvantaged children, with this level of income, these localities can provide more of the support for disadvantaged education themselves.

Impact Aid, which reimburses local schools for the costs of educating military dependents, is reduced by 11 percent to \$645 million. Funding is tar-

geted only to students whose parents live and work on Federal installations. Funding for military "b" students is provided for in the Defense bill.

Library service grants and inter-library cooperation programs are supported at approximately last year's level while funds are terminated for smaller, categorical library programs.

The bill amends authorizing statutes to limit the administrative costs of the Direct Student Loan Program and to prevent implementation of opportunity to learn standards.

Opportunity to learn standards focus on inputs rather than results. They divert attention to issues such as amounts spent per pupil, class size, years of schooling of the teacher, numbers of computers, and allow justification of failure rather than the focus on results.

This title represents the clearest example of priority setting by the committee, of elimination of duplicative and redundant programs and of reform of programs and administration.

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

Mr. Chairman, in the first section of our debate we discussed what this bill was doing to cripple our workers and worker programs. In the second section we talked about what it was doing to savage programs that support the most vulnerable people in this society. Now we are turning to a discussion of how this bill is, pure and simple, an attack on education.

This bill is the anti-education appropriation act of 1995, pure and simple. It cuts 18 percent out of what we appropriated just last year for Federal education programs. That means almost one out of every 5 dollars that was there a year ago will not be there this year.

It takes almost \$2.5 billion away from local school districts, and that is most assuredly going to result in lower quality and higher property taxes. And it does it all to provide a \$20,000 tax cut for people making \$350,000 a year.

I would suggest there are an awfully lot of people in society who make that amount of money, who recognize that if they have to choose between getting a \$20,000 tax cut at that bracket, and seeing to it that the basic education structure of this country is sound, they will opt for education, because they know they cannot in the end disconnect from society. You cannot achieve success by working up the opportunity ladder yourselves, and then pull it on up so that someone else cannot use that ladder as well.

The answer from the Republican side of the aisle seems to be, Well, our education programs do not work, so let's give up and give some rich guy a tax cut. Well, I do not think that is an especially effective way to go about it.

I have one last simple thought: For as long as I have been in this House, support for education has been a bipartisan proposition. But whether back home in Wisconsin, when I served in

the legislature, or here in the Congress, support for education has always been bipartisan. Look at some of the programs that are named after distinguished Republican leaders in the area of education: Stafford, Javitz, Goldwater, Eisenhower. Has this party really moved even beyond them? Are they no longer acceptable? I simply do not believe it.

It just seems to me that the most fundamental purpose of any society is to see to it that its children are made top priority, that they receive decent opportunity, decent education. That is what this bill walks away from. That is why this bill ought to be defeated.

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

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] be allowed to control my time and yield time from this point.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, let us get back to basics on this and why we are doing this. These are tough choices we are making. It is not easy to have to establish priorities in our spending. But that is exactly what we are doing. So let us remember what we are doing. We are balancing the budget, the most important single thing we can do for the generation today and for future generations.

Let me just show you what numbers amount to. The budget of approximately \$176 billion means we are overspending right now \$670 for every man, woman, and child in this country. We are overspending. We are going into debt. I have a family with two children. That is \$2,700 worth of debt we are going into this year. We have a debt for every man, woman, and child in this country of over \$18,000 per person. We are going to build it and get it larger and larger, and spend more and more on interest.

So our goal is to balance this budget, start that glide path to a balanced budget. The other side just wants to spend, spend, spend, and we know how to spend in Washington. We have had lots of experience in spending for the past 25 years. We have to get some sense and fiscal sanity to what we are doing here.

We keep hearing the rhetoric: We are cutting this. We heard it earlier this year: We cut the school lunch program. We increased it by 4.5 percent. They say we are cutting Medicare. We are increasing Medicare spending from \$4,800 for every man and woman in Medicare, to \$6,700, in 7 years, in the Medicare Program. We are increasing spending. So the most important thing we can do is to balance this budget and get on that glide path. It is important to every American.

Let me show why. As a member of the Committee on the Budget, Mr.

Greenspan, the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board appeared before us on two different occasions, discussing what would it mean if we balanced the budget. He uses the word remarkable, what is going to happen over the next years. Some of the thoughts he is talking about is children will have a higher standard of living than their parents if we can get this budget under control and stop wasting money on interest of the national debt. There will be improvement in the purchasing power of their incomes. There will be a rise in productivity.

Our competitiveness in the world is important in this issue. There would be a reduction in inflation. There is a strengthening of the financial markets, actual rates of long-term economic growth. That means jobs.

There would be a significant drop in long-term interest rates. He says it will be around 2 percent; that is, for someone having a \$75,000 mortgage on their home, that is about \$100 a month less they are going to have to spend on that mortgage. That is money in someone's pocket.

We have to get this deficit under control. That is what we are talking about here today. We can say I wish we had more money here or there. Maybe we could have changed it a little bit. These are tough choices. We are trying to balance what we have to work with. We have to live within our budget.

I have to live within my personal budget. Every American has to live within a personal budget. Only the Federal budget has this credit card that has no spending limit; you just spend, spend, spend. That is not right. It is wrong. Balancing the budget is the best thing we will do for every single American today and for the future generations.

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, this title of the bill is education. Americans believe strongly in education, and everybody on this floor wants to balance the budget. As a matter of fact, unlike the gentleman who just spoke, I voted to reduce the deficit by \$500 billion in 1993. The gentleman did not.

Whether conservative or liberal, all Americans believe in the American opportunity society. My parents wanted me to have a better life than they had. That is what I want for my three daughters, and, yes, for my granddaughter. The United States is a great Nation because we give people that opportunity, the opportunity to make a better life for themselves and their children. Education is the doorway through which American access that opportunity.

But this appropriation bill is an all-out assault on the American opportunity society. The words opportunity

society are meaningless if you do not have the education you need to compete in today's global marketplace. The word opportunity is meaningless if you cannot make a living wage and your kids cannot get a good education in school.

Why are the Republicans waging this attack? The reason is not so they can bring that deficit down, I tell my friend, but so that we can take that money and shift it over to a tax cut for the wealthiest folks in America.

□ 1245

That is what we are doing. We are not taking that money that they gentleman just talked about to bring down that \$670 figure, what we are doing is taking that money and shifting it over here for a tax cut: a \$245 billion tax cut.

Nobody likes paying taxes, but I do not talk to any constituents who believe that it is not important to see that our kids are educated, and that is what that title is about.

Mr. Chairman, what does this attack mean for local schools? Let me talk about a school in my district, Carrollton Elementary School in Prince George's County.

At Carrollton, parents attend workshops to learn what their children are learning in the classroom to help their kids at home. We know if parents are not doing the job, nothing we do is going to suffice. The budget cuts in this bill would end those parent workshops.

Carrollton needs reading and writing materials to reach the new higher educational standards the State of Maryland has set, appropriately, so we can compete in the world markets. The school board has approved them and the contract has been signed, but these budget cuts will cancel that program.

Mr. Chairman, at Carrollton more than 100 third- and fourth-grade students are struggling to learn to read. Some kids have a tough time. These cuts mean the teacher who works to help those kids catch up with their classmates will lose their job.

This is real. This is not some chart so that we can shift money to the wealthiest in America, not bring down the deficit, I tell the gentleman from Florida. It is to give that \$245 billion cut, that seems so important, at the expense of these kids.

The American people know that cutting support for kids at Carrollton and across the country is bad educational and economic policy. That is why the polls show, I tell my colleagues, over 90 percent of the voters in America believe we must invest more, not less, in improving education.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is shortsighted. I am going to mention this again, but I want to mention it now, do not take my word for it. Let me quote from a statement made by Secretary Terrel Bell, who served as the Secretary of Education under Ronald Reagan. It was not a Democratic ad-

ministration, you understand; Ronald Reagan. Let me read to my colleagues what he says on July 13, 1995:

"The drastic and unwarranted education cuts made in congress by the House Appropriations Subcommittee," the bill we are considering, "must be restored or we will undercut community efforts to better educate our children."

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

That is what he refers to this bill as. That, Mr. Chairman, was Secretary Terrel Bell, the Secretary of Education under Ronald Reagan.

Mr. Chairman, let us reject this political extremism that is masked as deficit reduction, when it shifts from our kids to the wealthiest Americans our resources to improve this country.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING], the chairman of the Committee on Education and Economic Opportunities.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I rise to put to rest, once and for all, this phony business that has been going on in this House for many weeks, in fact several months, where people keep trying to say that we are taking from the poor and giving to the rich through a tax program.

Let me tell my colleagues a little bit about the tax program. Is a \$500 credit for home care for the rich? Darn right, it is not. It is for the most needy people around here.

Is a \$500 credit for long-term care insurance for the rich? One of the most important things for senior citizens is that long-term care. That is not for the rich.

Is a \$2,000 IRA for the parent who stays at home for the rich? No, that is not for the rich.

Is the \$500 for an adoption? We talk about pro-choice/pro-life all the time. Is that for the rich? No, it is not.

Mr. Chairman, I was a sucker for a while, thinking that the \$500 credit for every child was for the rich. Then I got off my high horse and did a little study, and I discovered that, as a matter of fact, 31 percent of that goes to families with incomes of \$18,000 and less; 65 percent of it goes to families with incomes of \$50,000 and less.

Yes, then they say, but what about capital gains? In my district, every farmer and every fruit grower that I have is not rich by a long sight, but they sure are at the point where they should be retiring and they would love to retire.

If they retire, Mr. Chairman, they have to sell what it is they have in order to take care of themselves in their golden years, or we have to send money out to do that. But if they sell, between us and the State, we take 60 percent of everything that they have.

So I think we ought to put that nonsense to rest.

If this were a perfect world, Mr. Chairman, I would be here screaming

for billions more for education and billions more for training. I would be screaming for what Terrel Bell said, which we had better emphasize.

He talked about quality education, and I have been here saying over and over again for 20 years, just do not pour \$40 billion into chapter 1. Do not just pour \$20 billion into Head Start, if that is all you are going to do. Pour it in to get quality. We do not have any studies to really tell us that we have done a remarkable job in helping the people that we wanted to try to help with that \$60 billion of expenditure.

Mr. Chairman, as I said yesterday, the one thing I wanted to do with a slight reduction in both of those areas is finally get a message out there that they have to clean up their act and they have to provide quality in every one of those programs, all over this Nation. Access is not acceptable. Access will not serve us well in the 21st century.

Mr. Chairman, I would hope that we can do the very best we can with what we have, because if we do not, since it is not a perfect world, we are then faced with a deficit that does this to the very young people we are trying to train, the very young people we are trying to educate.

We are saying to them, after you get all your training and all your education, we will take 80 percent of everything you make in tax dollars. Why get up in the morning and go to work if that is what we are going to do?

Mr. Chairman, I hope we can develop a program where we are talking about quality education, quality training. I hope we will be in a position sometime to put more money into those programs, and we will do some of that today, after we are ensured that it is quality that we are talking about.

Again, access is no longer acceptable, Mr. Chairman. It has to be access to quality, because we are failing the very young people we are trying to help because we are not giving them an opportunity to get a piece of the American dream because they do not have, in many instances, a quality program.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODLING. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise simply to say that the statement of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] is one of the finer statements I have ever heard on this floor.

Mr. Chairman, just sending money without worrying about quality is what has been wrong with this place. It is why the American taxpayer is reacting. They want to see people served and they want to see them served well.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania has worked at this for years, very, very effectively. Finally, the gentleman is in a position to really impact that process, and I commend the gentleman for his good work.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the

gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MENENDEZ].

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

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the bill. I rise today to express my disgust with this bill. This is the bill where Republicans rewrite the world in their own image—where they create their own brave new world, if you will. They will weed out the poor, the needy and the weak to provide subsidies to corporate interests and tax cuts to the wealthy. And the middle class will foot the bill. A world where capital is more important than labor.

Let me tell how this image will play out in New Jersey. According to the Children's Defense Fund, this image will mean 3,850 children will lose Head Start services, 54,200 New Jersey students will lose access to remedial education through title I and 42,200 babies, preschoolers and pregnant women in New Jersey will lose infant formula and other WIC supplements. This is the new America Republicans have created for your children and grandchildren.

The new America will have \$4.5 billion less in funding for education, less funding to keep schools safe and drug free and less funding for young people struggling to earn a bachelor's degree. The new America will provide less assistance for dislocated workers, like the 2000 individuals working at MOTBY, in my district, unemployed due to recent base closings. It will have fewer resources for job training and it will have no funding for the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance which serves 51,000 needy seniors in New Jersey.

And yet Republicans can find the resources to fund Agriculture subsidies for wealthy farmers and to fund B-2 bombers that the Defense Department didn't even want?

I have a clear image of this brave new world which Republicans seek. It has nothing to do with balancing the budget and it has nothing to do with making a better America for the working poor, our children, our young people or our seniors. Clearly it is designed to be a world where the rich and privileged will be free to prosper without the nagging and nettlesome problem of caring for their less fortunate brothers and sisters.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KILDEE].

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in very strong opposition to the Labor-HHS appropriations bill, because it will result in very real damage to very real students and teachers in real schools in communities throughout this country.

Mr. Chairman, I say to my colleagues, the education policy in this bill is based on two somewhat conflicting assumptions. First, that because the national contribution to education funding is so small that it does not matter and will not be missed; second, that the national role in education is too large and too intrusive and needs to be scaled back.

Mr. Chairman, these assumptions are both wrong. These assumptions dishonor decades of bipartisan cooperation over education policy as a shared priority.

Mr. Chairman, this bill will seriously erode the long-standing role that we play on the national level to ensure that educational opportunities are available to those who have been denied them. Laws like the Individuals With Disabilities Education Act [IDEA] were enacted 20 years ago because over 1 million disabled children were excluded entirely from public schools. Those 1 million disabled children now have a chance to realize their full potential and contribute to American society because of what Congress did then.

Mr. Chairman, ask the parents of Caitlin Cody, who live in my community. Caitlin is a bright 8-year-old with spina bifida who joins her classmates every day in her neighborhood public school to discover the joys of learning. They will tell you that in the absence of the Federal role in education, Caitlin's future would not be as promising as it is.

Mr. Chairman, this bill cuts IDEA. It cuts funding which will severely curtail professional development, research, and outreach activities which are crucial for improving services to children with disabilities.

This bill also cuts chapter 1 by \$1.2 billion. With this cut, over 1 million disadvantaged children across this country will be denied a chance to succeed. In Flint, MI, which is struggling right now to regain its economic footing, over 2,800 students will lose vital academic help. These students will lose the guidance of 47 teachers and 109 teaching aids.

Who are these children and who are their teachers? Mr. Chairman, let me tell my colleagues the story of one chapter 1 student. Shelly is a real person who lives right now in my district. She is not a composite; a real individual person.

Shelly entered middle school in the seventh grade last fall. Shelly came to school every day, because there she could get a meal. Then her teachers discovered that Shelly lived with her mother and younger brother right in my neighborhood, wherever they could find a place to stay at night. They had been evicted from their apartment and stayed in a shelter or with friends.

When Shelly moved to Michigan, she was identified as a chapter 1 student. Shelly's teacher recognized that she needed the stability of a regular classroom and instead of pulling her away from her peers, she provided Shelly with reading support services in her science and social studies classes.

As the year progressed, because of this program, Shelly's life improved and her teacher made connections to mentors and helped find a place for her to live because this teacher believed in Shelly's potential.

Shelly entered middle school as a homeless child. She finished the year as an honor student.

Mr. Chairman, we should not take opportunities away from the Caitlin's and the Shelly's to finance a tax cut for the very, very rich.

Vote "no" on this.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HUTCHINSON].

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Chairman, I especially commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING], my chairman, for his outstanding statement a few moments ago in which he gave a clear rebuttal for the mindless political rhetoric, that we hear over and over again, in which the opponents of this bill recite like a mantra the phrase "tax breaks for the wealthiest in our society."

Mr. Chairman, are the wealthiest in our society like that couple in my district that makes \$25,000 a year with two children who are going to find, with the \$500 per child tax credit, that their Federal tax liability will be eliminated altogether? Or like my wealthy friends, the grandmother and the grandfather who have worked for 30 years on a farm in northwest Arkansas and as they reach retirement age and want to move in town, to get close to quality health care, discover they cannot afford to sell their farm because of exorbitant capital gains tax rates?

Mr. Chairman, yes, these are the wealthy friends that we want to help in our society.

My colleague says that, yes, 90 percent of the American people support higher investment in education. I believe that. I believe my constituents do. But they want to invest it where it will work and it will work when we invest that money locally, not when we invest it in more Federal spending on education.

Mr. Chairman, Americans last November rejected the "government-knows-best" philosophy that has held sway for far too long.

Goals 2000, which we defund in this appropriation bill, is a manifestation of that very failed philosophy. What Goals 2000 does is lay the groundwork for all future Federal experimentation with education, which takes control away from parents and local school districts where it belongs.

It increases the Federal role by imposing a congressional formula for reform on any State, school district, or local school that wishes to receive funding under the act.

□ 1300

Only 40 percent of the money appropriated for Goals 2000 ever reaches the schools. The other 60 percent constitutes the bureaucratic skim that is being used at each level to create the new framework for the educational system.

The American people did not buy into the misguided idea of national health boards in the last Congress, and they do not want national school boards. If the past 30 years have taught us anything, it is that national solutions do not solve local problems.

It is amazing to me my colleagues on the other side of the aisle can stand

and defend the status quo. The past three decades, American taxpayers have been pouring money into the public school system with almost no encouraging signs that this money is buying better education for our children.

Who knows best what children need but their parents and people who are in contact with them every day? This appropriation bill begins to put the focus back upon the local schools, empowering parents to control the education of their children.

There were originally six national goals that were developed in 1989, hand in hand with the States, but they now have been increased to eight. The two additional goals differ from the States' original intentions, leading us even further away from the direction that education in this country should be taking, which is back to the parents.

We can, in defunding Goals 2000, as we do in this appropriations bill, we can take a decisive first step in returning education to the State and to the local school boards and empowering parents to participate and to control the education of their children.

I urge support of this Labor-HHS appropriations bill.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SAWYER], a distinguished member of the authorizing committee.

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

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Chairman, I am grateful for the opportunity to join with my colleagues on this side of the aisle, but with some regret, to oppose the passage of this bill.

The work that we do today, the work that has preceded us over the last decade really emphasizes a singular important message, and that is that today's graduates have got to be prepared to enter a world of profound and constant change. The people of this Nation are moving more rapidly across and within this Nation than we have for 100 years, and all of today's children simply must be able to graduate equipped with skills that are not just technologically adaptable to a variety of different employment situations across the United States, but which also will make them intellectually flexible.

Now, our colleagues have suggested that somehow this is not a national problem. The truth of the matter is that education has always been a local function and a State responsibility, but today, my colleagues, it is an overarching national concern. Education from the national level is not a matter of federalizing education at all. It is not even a matter of directing education, but it is recognizing that if we are to be successful, we must connect education all across this country, 50 million students, 2.5 million faculty, 15,000 school districts in diverse communities all across this country, as diverse as Missoula, MT, or Meridian, MS, or all of the metropolitan areas of

this Nation. The children have got to be equipped to be competitive and to contribute to this Nation's capacity.

Education is, indeed, a national priority, nowhere more so than in recognizing that the expectations that we have for these children have vastly outstripped the ability of some schools to keep pace. We have got to elevate the expectations of our schools, of our teachers and our children, and in that sense what we do here today or ought to be doing here today is to provide the connective tissue, the ability to improve and elevate a curriculum, not to be forced upon local schools, not to be adopted, but to be adapted throughout this country to local need. We have got to recognize that in a 30-year career, a teacher who began with certification that may have been perfectly sufficient in 1960 is no longer suitable to the kind of change that has been undertaken in this world and in this Nation in the 30 intervening years.

We need to have the capacity to share that improved curriculum, that improved professional development all across this country. I have to tell you I do not think that anybody ever said it better than Allen Wertzell, vice chairman of Circuit City, who agreed that growing businesses need students to graduate with higher skills. He said, "High academic expectations in schools is probably the single most important component of education reform."

Drawing this Nation together in that capacity is our single highest priority.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. CLEMENT].

Mr. CLEMENT. Mr. Chairman, I wish to enter into a colloquy.

Mr. Chairman, with regard to the Education Research Statistics and Improvement account within the Department of Education there is an interest among a number of House Members to provide funding of about \$300,000 within the total provided to not less than two institutions to support programs utilizing innovative technologies and practices for the professional development and training of teachers in music education. Is it correct to say that the House report accompanying the Labor-HHS fiscal year 1996 bill speaks favorably, but with less specificity, to music education and its impact on learning?

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLEMENT. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is correct. We attempted to economize on verbiage where we could in preparing the committee report.

Mr. CLEMENT. Mr. Chairman, the bill will shortly be considered by the other body. If, during that consideration, the other body includes more specific language regarding music education, could I have the chairman's assurance that the House conferees would carefully consider the generic direction

for these funds in light of my favorable recommendation to accept the more specific allocations of funds for music education programs?

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I assure the gentleman from Tennessee that the House conferees will keep your recommendation in mind when we address this issue in conference.

Mr. CLEMENT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his support on this issue.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. BECERRA].

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

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Well, we hear the Republicans say they want to balance the budget and that is why we are cutting so dramatically into education programs.

Well, do we want to balance the budget?

We are cutting about \$450 million out of two programs very important to our children: Safe and Drug Free Schools, which makes sure we try to protect our children as they go to school so they do not have to worry about drug dealers on the corner trying to sell them drugs or the gang violence they may encounter on the way to school; Special Education, \$174 million is being cut out of that program for our kids who are disabled, who need a little bit of extra attention so they can succeed with their peers.

On the other hand, we put \$500 million extra into the defense budget which was not even requested by the Department of Defense for new spending on barracks and other pork that the Pentagon, as I said, never requested, and all of it targeted to 26 of the 31 States represented by the people who sit on the Committee on Appropriations.

Cut in education: \$1.2 billion in our title I program that helps kids that are behind in their reading and in their sciences learning. What is not cut? Well, we see on the Senate side the Armed Services wants to spend \$1.3 billion for an amphibious assault ship that the Navy says is does not even want. Cut in education: \$55 million for a school-to-work program which helps our kids have abilities once they get out of school. What is not cut? Well, \$42 million, that is the amount the Committee on Appropriations preserved in taxpayer subsidies for tobacco growers.

We are talking about balancing the budget? At the same time that we hear that we must cut the \$4 billion out of education to balance a \$5 trillion debt and an annual deficit of about \$200 billion, we find that the Defense Department got \$8 billion more than it even asked for, and we find that the Republicans are trying to spend about \$300 billion on tax cuts over 7 years.

That is not the way to go. We do not need to cut \$4 billion out of education when it is so dramatic and so needed.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. WYNN].

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

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Chairman, I take strong exception to the unconscionable cuts in this bill for the Safe and Drug Free School zones.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER], one of the ranking members of the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities, former chairman of the Children's Task Force.

(Mr. MILLER of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me and for adding to my resume here.

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, these cuts in education are deep, and they are serious, and they are real, and they are going to have an impact in each and every one of our districts.

Because let us understand something, they are not cutting this money to give it back to the schools at the local level. They are cutting this money to provide for a tax cut, the overwhelming benefit of which goes to people earning in excess of \$200,000 a year. So they are gathering up money from poor schools, from poor children, from handicapped children, from all of the school districts in the country and transferring that to the wealthiest people in the country. That is simply not fair, and it does not make sense.

Let us understand that these Federal dollars are what allows these school districts to engage in teacher training, to provide inservice training for teachers, to move toward 21st century technologies for many of our school districts that have no ability to do that. They do not have the financial capability of doing that.

These Federal dollars are what allows school districts to take care of the neediest, the poorest children in our society, because they do not have the capability of doing it without these dollars.

Let us understand something. We hear time and time again about the inability of the local school board and the local school district. Let me explain to you that many of those school districts are bringing you today the abysmal education that America's children are reaching. And why? Because they do not do these activities without Federal help. They were not educating the poorest children in this country without Federal help. They were not educating handicapped children without Federal help. They were not providing teacher training without Federal help, and it is very likely they will

not again if the Federal Government does not help them out.

So understand the Federal Government is a catalyst for education programs. Goals 2000 is a catalyst to make the States, and to help them, finance world-class standards for our children so that our children can compete with the children of any country in the world in the future.

Today they cannot. They cannot compete in math. They cannot compete in language skills. They cannot compete in critical thinking. It is a national disgrace, and these few Federal dollars, very, very important to meeting those goals, because in fact in my own district and many other districts, without these moneys, those efforts will go by the wayside and we will continue to see children graduated who cannot read their diploma. We will continue to see children passed on to the next grade who cannot read at grade level.

This is that opportunity. But this is the opportunity that the Republican budget cuts would deny our school districts. This is a disinvestment, a disinvestment in the children of this Nation, in the education of this Nation and their ability to participate in the world economy of the future.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. BUNN], a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. BUNN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I wish to enter into a colloquy with the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER].

Mr. Chairman, I understand the great fiscal pressure under which the chairman put together his appropriations bill. I applaud his efforts to make this a fair bill, not only for the taxpayers of the country but also by addressing the out-of-control spending that is costing our children their future earnings.

With that in mind, I would like to address the level of the general strengthening institutions program, title III(A) of the Education Act. I am concerned that the current funding level of the program will not allow the Federal Government to fully fund continuing multiyear grants. Under the administration's request, the title III grants will be phased out over 2 years, with public community colleges cut out of the system immediately.

□ 1315

Mr. BUNN of Oregon. As the gentleman knows, I offered an amendment during the full committee to partially restore the necessary funding to the title III program. But due to the tight constraints that we are working under, we were unable to find adequate funding for the program.

I ask the subcommittee chairman if the other body does find a way to more fully fund the title III section A program, if there is a way to consent to the other body's funding level?

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

Mr. BUNN of Oregon. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I understand that the level of funding in our bill would perhaps create financial difficulties for many of the institutions that have relied on this funding in the past and I will work with the members of the conference in the other body to achieve a higher level of funding of transition funding for this program than was possible in this bill.

Mr. BUNN of Oregon. I thank the gentleman and appreciate his efforts on behalf of community colleges of the Nation.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK].

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. I thank the gentleman from Maryland for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, I stand here in absolute dismay at this bill that we are being asked to vote on today, which decimates the funding for education throughout the country. This debate is basically a debate of the disavowal of the majority of our national promise that we would care, defend, and protect our Nation's children.

Under this camouflage of budget rhetoric, the majority party has appropriated an appropriations bill that cuts \$3.9 billion from our education programs and dismantles a 30-year record of increasing support for our children.

I feel betrayed because I always believed the discussions with respect to our national priority, always put our children on the top. In discussing our care and compassion for children in this country, we always pledged our full support to their education.

Mr. Chairman, we all recognize that there are vast differences in our country, rural, urban America, rich and poor, but we have always said that the National Government has a responsibility to make sure that no matter what the circumstances of poverty or whatever the location is in geography, that the children would be protected and that the assurance of equal educational opportunity was a solemn pledge and contract that we made for our children.

This appropriation bill denies that. It takes money away from children in the poorest of circumstances, children who come from middle America, who have disabilities, who have difficulties, who come from troubled circumstances, who have handicaps, who have deficiencies in learning. The smallest of our children all over the country are going to be hurt by this budget. I ask this House to vote it down.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER].

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

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I was on the floor 1½ hours ago talking about how this bill is devastating and cutting Head Start children out of the

program when even President Reagan, President Bush, talked about how much do we increase this bipartisan program that is working. Where in Michigan City, IN, 80 children are waiting to get into the program, this bill is going to say to these children, not only can you not get in, we do not have room for you; we are going to cut more children out of Head Start. That is what this bill says.

This bill is like a Shakespearean comedy of errors. It is tragically almost funny. We debated drug-free schools the last few years and I have joined with my colleagues on the Republican side, many of whom I have the utmost respect for, and the gentleman from Delaware, Mr. CASTLE and I, Mr. BARRETT and I proposed amendments to restore Dare and drug-free school money. This year, we are cutting drug-free school money by over 50 percent.

Mr. Chairman, it is not that Democrats want the status quo and Republicans want to balance the budget. I voted for a balanced budget amendment. I led the efforts to cut a space station that is \$80 billion over budget. I will vote to cut 20 B-2 bombers that the Pentagon doesn't even want out of the budget. Let us make up our minds what is important around here.

A recent survey done by the Columbia University Institute asked our schoolchildren, What is the biggest problem you face in school today? Is it an algebra equation? They did not say that. Was it a biology test? No. Was it a gun in a school? No. By a 2-to-1 margin, children in America today said, we are afraid of drugs in our schools, 2 to 1.

So what are we doing about it? We cut the drug-free school money by over 50 percent. What does that tell you about our priorities? I want to move toward a balanced budget. I want to make some of the tough cuts to move there, but we should do that in a fair and evenhanded manner.

Mr. Chairman, it seems sometimes around here that if you have got a lobbyist working for you, you are going to do real well. You are going to maintain the B-2 bomber. You are going to maintain a space station. You are going to maintain hydrogen programs. But if you are a child, if you are in a Head Start program, if you are in a drug-free school program, you are on your own. Good luck.

Mr. Chairman, that is not what the priorities of America should be about today.

Doris Kerns Goodwin has got a wonderful book and I will have to continue my review of that wonderful book later.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. DICKEY], an excellent member of our subcommittee.

Mr. DICKEY. Mr. Chairman, I think what we need to do is have the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER] go talk to the members of the subcommittee of the Labor-HHS Committee on

Appropriations because what happened one night was that Head Start was made available to have funds restored to the tune of \$161 million. Every member of the subcommittee who were Democrats voted against Head Start, \$161 million.

Those of us who voted for both of those issues said we wanted to put children first. We wanted Head Start to come first, and those members on that subcommittee could have taken the argument of the gentleman from Indiana and said, we want to honor Head Start.

Who did they honor? We honored lawyers in the NLRB, \$26 million. The offer was made to your colleagues, let us give this to Head Start because we are listening to what you are saying that it is important—

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

Mr. DICKEY. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ROEMER. As the gentleman knows, I am not a member of the Committee on Appropriations. I did not vote on that particular appropriations bill as it was going through at 1 or 2 o'clock in the morning. But certainly we have the ability on the floor today to try to correct the bill that is kicking 48,000 children off of Head Start, and I know the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. DICKEY] would love to support those children.

We do not want to go to places like Michigan City, IN, where 880 children are waiting to get on Head Start, where I only have 35 percent of my eligible children enrolled, and tell the children there, which ones are going to get kicked off, I ask the gentleman?

Mr. Chairman, I would not want to be going into Head Start programs around this country saying, you, you, and you are out of Head Start. That is not the direction this country should be going in.

Mr. DICKEY. Reclaiming my time, all I am trying to say, for the sake of the people who might be listening to this conversation, is that your talking should be to them, not to us. If we had been successful on our end of the table late that one night for Head Start, we would have \$161 million restored.

Not one of your colleagues voted in favor of that because they wanted to honor things like lawyers, and they wanted to honor the NLRB that is going out here and causing destruction in our economy and walking over people who are trying to keep jobs in place so that we can have taxes so we can have more money for education.

All I am saying is it does not seem proper. It is not right that we get to the point where we start talking about you all over there, or you all over there, when we are all trying to help Head Start.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. DICKEY. Certainly, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ROEMER. I would just like to engage the gentleman, the Republican

gentleman from Arkansas, in a colloquy. He and I worked together on many issues. This should not be a partisan issue. We have always agreed in this body to support Head Start and increase funding on Head Start, whether it was in committee or on the floor.

Now, for the first time, we are kicking children off. How can we work together to restore that cut, increase Head Start?

Mr. DICKEY. I think what we ought to do is we ought to look from the standpoint of trying to help the children, rather than trying to make a political statement. What is unfortunate about this is that \$161 million could have been restored to Head Start and it was not because there were other programs that were preferred over this.

Now, if your colleagues could talk it over and we could talk it over, then we would not have this partisanship. The partisanship occurred. All five Democrats voted against Head Start in both of those instances, and there are two standing right here that will also try to make this a partisan issue and say that we somehow are at fault for not bringing Head Start in in the proper funding.

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

Mr. DICKEY. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. DICKEY] is my friend and we work closely together on some things, but so that everybody on the floor knows what we are talking about, has sought to cut justice for workers.

We will pursue it further.

Mr. DICKEY. I will be happy to.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON].

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

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, this bill clearly demonstrates our Nation's commitment to education and to our youth, mostly words but not real resources. Where a Nation invests its resources indicates its priorities. Education should be our Nation's priority.

This bill is blindness march toward a balanced budget, without consideration of the merits of the programs proposed to be cut or eliminated.

But worse, this bill ignores the pain it will cause to the many children, youth, and elderly of America. This is a shame.

The Labor-HHS bill is an obstruction to education.

Half of the cuts in the bill—some \$4.5 billion—comes from education.

Fifty thousand disadvantaged children who need a little help in the beginning of our lives—at the onset of their education—will not get that help. Head start is cut by \$137 million. Healthy Start is cut by 52 percent.

Thousands of needy school children, in my congressional districts during

their most important educational and formative years, will be without vital support. Title I is cut by \$1.1 billion. Drug-free schools is cut by 59 percent. The Goals 2000 Program is eliminated, and, vocational education is cut by 27 percent.

And, thousands of those school children, willing to work, who have found hoe in a mountain of hopelessness, will not be able to work. The School-to-Work Program is cut by 22 percent. And, worse, the Summer Jobs program is terminated.

The privilege of an education belongs to all in America. Many have toiled long and hard to achieve that aim.

The Labor-HHS appropriations bill, with the stroke of a pen, takes that privilege away.

The deep and irresponsible cuts in education are made worse by other cuts in this bill.

In fact, more than 170 programs are eliminated by the kind of slicing and carving undertaken in this bill, like nothing we have ever seen before in the history of this Nation.

Even the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program [LIHEAP] is eliminated.

This bill says to young people in America, "You have no future" and to seniors, "You have no past."

Mr. Chairman. I am at a loss.

Critical programs are being cut—programs that have served our citizens well—and, the savings will go to increasing the wealth of the wealthy.

Mr. Chairman, our colleagues tell us that this bill and others puts us on the glide to a balanced budget.

To balance, however, means to steady. Steadiness promotes stability. Stability promotes security. And, security is what every American seeks.

This bill gives us neither steadiness, nor stability, nor security. It is not good for this Nation. It should give us shame.

Vote "No" on this bill.

□ 1330

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOEKSTRA], a member of the authorizing committee.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] for yielding this time to me.

This morning in the Committee on the Budget we had the opportunity to have what I thought would be a good dialog and debate about much of what has been going on here on the floor today, a discussion and a debate about what our policy agenda is on both sides of the aisle as the President and as the majority here in the House both strive to reach for a balanced budget. But then it became very, very clear that the two sides are playing with a different set of rules. The Republican plan scored under this Congressional Budget Office does within 7 years get to a balanced budget. The President's plan scored under the same rules, however, enables the president to have \$200 billion more per year to spend.

So, as we are talking about how are we going to achieve and what policies are we going to implement to achieve a balanced budget, we are finding that one side is playing with one hand tied behind their back. One side actually gets to a balanced budget, the other side can continue going around the country and can continue going around to special interest groups promising a whole set of programs and priorities and spending that really does not exist and that totals out to about \$200 billion.

We also find that the other side is really trying to perpetuate a program and a philosophy that over many years we know does not work, and this book here, "Reviving the American Dream," written by Alice Rivlin, who is the head of the Office of Management and Budget, Director of the Office of Management and Budget, she highlights the failed policies that in many cases we are finding are being debated in this bill. Here is what she said about education, and remember this person works for the President:

Improving education will take bottom-up reform, Presidential speeches and photo opportunities, national testing and assessment, federally funded experimental schools. Even new grants spent in accordance with Federal guidelines can make only marginal contributions in fixing the schools. The popular Federal Head Start Program demonstrates that preschool education helps children from poor families cope better in school. The negative legacy of Head Start, however, is that States and communities have come to believe that the responsibilities for preschool education lie with Washington, not with them. Change would come more rapidly if concerned citizens, parents, and educators worked to improve their own preschools instead of lobbying Washington to allocate more funds for Head Start.

Mr. Chairman, she goes on to say that top-down management by the Federal Government is unlikely to bring about needed change in education, skilled training, and other areas where reform is essential. She also goes on to state that when these programs and responsibility for these programs are moved from the Federal Government to the State government, we will see more action, more effectiveness, and better results.

This is coming from the administration.

All of what we are seeing here debated from the other side is a continuation of pushing policies and programs that we have had for too long and that we know do not work. Let us embrace the future, let us move to a balanced budget, and let us move to move decisionmaking where it is most appropriate.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WATT].

(Mr. WATT of North Carolina asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong, vigorous opposition to this bill and title III, and I rise today to protest the

shortsighted cuts included in this mean-spirited bill. In an effort to frantically balance the budget on the backs of poor and middle income families, Republicans have completely lost sight of those important, cost-effective programs which work well.

One such program is the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program. This program is not welfare. Each State participates in this program. It reaches more than 5.8 million people nationwide. Last year, the average benefit for the 452,000 recipients in my home State of North Carolina was \$91. Seventy-nine percent of these recipients have an average income of less than \$8,000. In many cases this was the safety net that kept the poor and elderly from being cold or freezing to death.

Who are these people, you might ask. In North Carolina, almost 64,000 households have recipients over the age of 60. Almost 60,000 households have recipients who are children under the age of six. And over 36,000 households have recipients who are disabled. How can we expect these people, whose annual income is less than the poverty level, to survive these vicious cuts?

These cuts border on being criminal, Mr. Chairman. If they're not criminal, they're certainly irresponsible. We should not penalize these people because they are poor. Yet that is exactly what we are going to do by passing this mean-spirited bill.

In this body, we have a tendency to get caught up in arguing over numbers and lose sight of the people whose lives depend upon these programs. This program is a success. Let's not let the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program become another victim in the Republican numbers game. This program will not break the Government but it will break the little comfort and will of the 452,000 recipients in my State who depend on this program.

I urge every Member of this House to reject this bill.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Philadelphia, PA [Mr. FOGLIETTA].

Mr. FOGLIETTA. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to urge my colleagues to vote against this shortsighted, hard-hearted Labor-HHS-Education appropriations bill. As chairman of the Congressional Urban Caucus, I tell you that this bill is the most antiurban, Government act since President Ford told New York City to drop dead. It is antifamily. Antichild. Antisenior. Antieducation.

Our constituents sent us to Congress to make choices on their behalf. Sometimes they are tough choices. But the choices made in this bill are nothing but harsh, mean, and cruel. The education title demonstrates this vividly.

Last week, this Congress protected Gallo Wine's welfare program—giving them tax dollars to market their wine to the French.

But today, we vote to send our kids to school to fend for their lives—on their own—against guns and drugs. The French get Gallo wine, while our children risk their lives in schoolyards. Bad choice.

Time and time again, this Congress spares the space station from extinction. But today, we'll cut vocational skills programs for youths who will

never make it to college. We'll build shelter in space, but leave our young people little or no job opportunity at home. Bad choice.

This Congress spends billions to build B-2 bombers that we don't need. The cold war is over. Yet today, we'll vote to cut Head Start. Thus, we're making fat-cat defense contractors fatter, while Head Start turns into a no start. Bad choice.

This is a lesson in poor choices. Wrong choices. The best thing—the only thing—we can do is throw this bill out and try again. Again, I urge my colleagues to vote a resounding "no" against this legislation.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. RICHARDSON], one of the whips on the Democratic side who has done such extraordinary work internationally.

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

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Chairman, I cannot support this bill. The education cuts in it are devastating for the country and for my State.

In one school district where 60 percent of the students beginning school do not speak English, these cuts mean that 6,000 students will not understand what is being taught.

Bilingual education programs teach students like Elisa, who started the 2d grade not able to speak one word of English. Last year Elisa walked across the stage as the valedictorian of her 1,200 member graduating class.

Impact aid funds provide a kindergarten for Gallup-McKinley County School District. The cuts contained in this bill mean 300 children will not go to kindergarten.

Clovis municipal school system will lose a school counselor who works with children who are at risk of drug and alcohol abuse.

The Belen School District has over 1,700 children who need reading and math help. With cuts to chapter 1 funding, the school district will have to choose which lucky 400 students out of 1,700 will get the help they need.

Mr. Speaker I cannot go back to my district and look into the faces of children and explain to them that I voted to eliminate their chance to go to college, stay away from drugs and violence, and improve their reading and math skills.

Vote against this bill.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MILLER], a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I think it is a shame that this debate constantly veers away from the true issue for which we are here in Congress and here today. We are currently facing one of the most important moral and economic challenges of our time, to balance the Federal budget. For too long the Federal Government has lived beyond its means, and our problem in

getting this budget into balance is spending. We have got to cut the spending side. President Reagan said the problem we had was not that we are taxed too little, we spend too much. We must cut spending and control the spending in order to balance our budget.

Mr. Chairman, due to this gluttonous behavior here is what we are facing today. The national debt is almost \$5 trillion. What are the practical implications of this? In just 2 years the Federal Government will pay more for interest on the debt than we pay for national defense. Think about that. What does that say of our national priorities?

If we had adopted the President's budget proposal, the amount U.S. taxpayers will pay in taxes over the next 11 years for interest would have equaled the entire debt we have today. This is a kind of out-of-control spending, without regard to consequences. That spending must be under control now.

The Democrats cannot believe that we are only going to spend \$60 billion, over \$60 billion in this program. We are spending over \$60 billion in this one appropriation bill for the discretionary programs alone. "Why would Republicans want to make cuts in Federal spending," the frustrated minority keeps asking. Here is the answer:

Next year we are going to spend \$235 billion for interest on the national debt. That is four times what we are spending on this bill, four times more than we are going to spend on interest on the national debt, and we keep wanting to increase it.

Someone said, "What is our priority of spending?" A Member on the other side was asking, "What is our priority of spending? Where do we rate priorities?" Well, if we just want to keep spending, spending, spending, our priority must be more interest on the national debt. We are overspending this year by \$670 for every man, woman, and child in the United States, and that just adds to our national debt, and that increases our interest that we are going to pay.

Now I am a big supporter of education. I am a former college professor. My son just graduated from college. My daughter is just getting ready to start graduate school, getting a master's in social work, by the way. So I feel very strongly about the need for education, but education is primarily a local, State, and family matter. Ninety-five percent of the money for elementary and secondary education comes from the State and local government, not the Federal Government. Unfortunately for the 5 percent of money the Federal Government provides, we get all the bureaucracy, all the regulations that are imposed in our local schools.

In 1950 the average family sent 5 percent of their wages to Washington. Today, with a bloated Federal Government, we are sending 24 percent of our

money to the Federal Government. We are not spending 24 percent of our incomes for Federal Government. We cannot continue doing it. What will be the best thing we can do for our children today is to not continue to fund these duplicative wasteful programs and the huge bureaucracy in the Department of Education. Let us prioritize our spending.

Before the Democrats stand up again and rant and rave about Republicans, just stop and think for a moment that we are going to spend four times as much in interest for the national debt than we are going to spend for the Department of Labor, the Department of HHS, the Department of Education. That's the disgrace that we must stop. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

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

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, there are many reasons to vote against this Labor-HHS bill, but this education title is just an abomination. It cuts \$3.7 billion from last year's education budget, a 14-percent decrease, and it is \$5.2 billion less than the Clinton administration requests for an investment in our children.

The sad thing is to hear our colleagues come to this floor and say we have to cut the education of our children to balance the budget. I ask my colleagues, "Don't you know by now you're never going to be able to balance the budget unless we invest in our children, unless we give them personal opportunity, unless we give them the earning power, the education to achieve the earning power to contribute to the competitiveness of our country?" So balancing the budget is tied to investing in our children. Any family can tell us that.

Their protestations about balancing the budget ring hollow in light of the fact that they are cutting education for children in order to give a tax cut to the wealthiest Americans. They tried trickle down once. It didn't work then, and it will not work now. Vote "no" on this bad bill.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE].

□ 1345

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Maryland for his kindness and his leadership.

First, Mr. Chairman, we begin to eliminate good health for our children, and then we go on and put the nail in the coffin by taking away the dollars for their education.

What we are doing today with the Labor-HHS bill is simply saying that we are taking \$266 million from the

safe and drug-free schools program, we are taking some \$174 million from our special education program, \$325 million from our vocational and adult education program and \$701 million from student financial assistance.

Let me talk about special education, and that is special. It is for our special children, not our children that we have given up on. It is the child that needs an extra helping hand, the child that can be a successful contributor to this society and yet today we find that this legislation is undermining that child's opportunity to get an education.

And what about vocational and adult training for dislocated workers, opportunities for them to start anew?

Mr. Chairman, this is not a bill for our future. It is one that nails the coffin shut on the lives of Americans. I oppose the major cuts in this legislation in vital health and education services, that Americans need and deserve.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. MCKEON].

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Chairman, I rise to discuss a few key points on higher education that are contained in this bill.

First let me say this. In a perfect world, a world without these enormous deficits as far as the eye can see, it would be nice for us to consider providing additional support to our Nation's college students. They hold the future of the Nation in their hands, and they deserve our support, all that we are able and can afford to give.

However, this is not a perfect world. Given our current fiscal environment we have one overriding issue we must focus on over and over above all others, and that is reducing the Federal deficit. Given this priority, this is a bill that does the best it can for higher education. This is a bill that does a number of important things for higher education, such as providing the highest maximum Pell grant in the history of the program. It saves important campus-based programs such as work study and SEOG. It restricts the Department of Education's ability to spend wastefully on its gold-plated direct loan program by eliminating its ability to spend on lavish trips for bureaucrats and campaign ads for the President.

These key items as well as other key education reforms that my subcommittee is considering provide important supporting to higher education. Because of the fiscal realities we are facing, the time is now to bring much-needed focus to Federal higher education programs.

This bill does what it needs to do. It puts us on a path toward a balanced budget while at the same time supporting key higher education programs for young Americans.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ENGEL].

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I bring today to the floor this shirt which says "shame." It was given out yesterday by

people in the labor movement, but it is just as good to illustrate what we are doing to the children of America today, for shame.

S is for selling out the children of America, selling them out by eliminating the safe and drug-free schools program, by a 27-percent cut in vocational and adult training, \$1.2 billion cut from title I, the Goals 2000 education standards eliminated, 50-percent cut in bilingual education.

H is for Head Start, which will lose more than \$137 million when we sacrifice our future.

A is for the aged, which will have to choose between food and heat when we destroy their low-income home energy assistance program.

M is for mean spirited, which is what these attacks on the most vulnerable in our society are.

E is for enough, enough of taking from working people, the aged, our children, to pay for the Republican tax cuts for the rich, these same people who gained the most from the trickle-down years.

Mr. Chairman, this is a sad day for this institution, and it is a sad day for America. It has been said that we should be judged by how we treat those who are least able to defend themselves. By that standard, our Republican friends should feel nothing but shame for what they are about to do.

This is the worst bill I have seen in my 7 years in Congress, and it should be soundly defeated. Shame on all of us if we pass this bill. Shame on what we are doing to the children of America, to the working people of America and to the elderly of America, all to pay for a tax cut for the rich. Shame.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BONILLA], my colleague from the subcommittee.

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, I think those who oppose this bill should be ashamed of themselves for working off of a fallacy and a myth in this country that somehow throwing money at an educational problem is going to solve it.

I do not need a lecture from anyone in this Chamber about what it is like to grow up in a low-income neighborhood. I did such a thing. I went to a high school that had a 50-percent dropout rate where, when I started high school in south San Antonio, all of the teachers quit because of the mess that the school board was involved in at the time.

And you know what made a difference in me finishing school? It was not a government program. It was the fact that my parents cared enough to get involved in my education, to show up at the after-school projects and some of the events that we held in the evenings to promote education. It was not because someone threw a bunch of money at us and suddenly decided that they were going to help me graduate.

The problem with education in this country is that the parental responsibility is broken down in neighborhoods. We need to work at a grass-roots level, at a civic level like I do, trying to talk to parents at schools, trying to organize efforts and support efforts in our local neighborhoods to get parents to be involved in a person's education.

We only have to look right here in our own backyard, in Washington, DC, where we spend over \$9,000 per capita for each student to put them through the D.C. school system. What good has that done? They have a terrible success rate.

It is unfortunate that that has occurred, but it is because adults in this country have not taken the responsibility upon themselves to get involved and be responsible for their child's education. It is not going to matter what we do up here with Federal programs.

There are some that work. We are supporting Head Start. The 190-percent increase over 5 years, we are for that because it is a program that works. We are going to help the TRIO program because that works as well. We are fully funding that this year. We are funding bilingual education programs to the point where they can be administered in a transitional way and not allow students to exist on a bilingual program forever and they never learn to adapt to the English-speaking society that we have and succeed.

We are also supporting the greatest increase, to refer to this chart, the greatest increase in history, the greatest increase that is allowed by law in Pell grants, because this is a program that has helped kids as well that want to go to college.

So we are trying to preserve the good programs that work in this country, but do not stand up here and give me a lecture and give us lectures about what it takes to help people in low-income neighborhoods. We understand that very well on this side of the aisle, and we want to continue to support these good programs. Do not stand up and give us a lecture about what it is like to grow up in a low-income neighborhood. We understand that very well. So do not act like you understand it any better than we do.

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

Understanding it is not enough, I say to my friend, the gentleman from Texas, you need to act on your understanding, not just talk about it.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the very distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS].

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

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, all taxes are local. The Federal money came from the local level. We pay our income taxes and send them to Washington.

We need our money back for education. The States and the cities are

not going to be able to take care of the education problems.

Let me just tell you about two schools in my district. Public school 208 in East Flatbush, Brooklyn, is one of them. Nearly 70 percent of all the children are from low-income families. Most of them are working poor. The school is overcrowded, filled to 120 percent capacity, with an average class size of 30. About one-third of the students test below what the State considers minimum competency in math and reading. If this bill passes next year, the title I tutoring of 270 of these children will no longer be there.

Prospect High School is another school in my district. It is 68 percent of students from low-income families. The building is almost 70 years old, in shocking disrepair. Many of the classrooms do not even have blackboards. There are not even enough chairs in the cafeteria to seat all the students, so some of them must stand up and eat or they eat propped up against the wall. Extracurricular activities are nonexistent. If this bill passes next year, these students will not have title I programs they need, 1,000 students will miss out on title I programs.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. OLVER], the distinguished successor of Silvio Conte, who would have opposed this bill.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I heard this bill described today as a careful consideration of priorities and elimination of useless Federal programs. Well, Mr. Chairman, I do not consider education goals for the year 2000 as useless, nor dropout prevention useless, nor education for homeless children useless, nor a Teacher Corps useless, nor workplace literacy useless, and I deplore the cuts in student financial aid and Head Start for affording 8,000 students and cuts in safe and drug-free schools.

And as for priorities, Mr. Chairman, the start-up cost for the B-2 bombers, the 20 new B-2 bombers which are unneeded and were not even asked for by the Pentagon, they would pay for all the costs of all those cuts in all these education programs that we are talking about today.

The Republican priorities here are simply wrong. We should kill this turkey. As the gentleman from Wisconsin had said, we should kill this turkey of a bill.

□ 1400

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GENE GREEN].

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

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Maryland for yielding me this time. I serve on the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities and am proud to serve there.

Like my colleague from Texas himself, I remember where I come from,

and I remember in 1965 was the first time we received public Federal education funds at the school that I went to, at Jeff Davis High School in northside Houston. We did not have audiovisual equipment until we got that funding.

Nowadays it pays for much more than hardware. It pays for teachers and better education. That is why I wanted to serve on the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities. I represent a district that the median income is \$20,000, compared to my Republican colleagues which is double that and more.

If we are going to increase that level of funding for our families, then we have got to do it with better education. This bill today, cutting it is wrong. The difference between the Democrats who are opposed to this bill and the Republicans is that we remember where we come from and we know what we have to do to provide a better quality of life for the future of the United States, and that is provide more education funding.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I sat back in my office and I am watching the rhetoric on both sides, and I think there are some things that we can actually work to help some of these things. We have got an amendment, for example, that is coming up that is going to provide \$6 million in outlays, in which we are going to be able to plus-up the Eisenhower grants. We talk about we want teachers to be better and our students to be better. I understand you all are going to accept the amendment, which is great. This is the kind of thing we need to fight toward, to work together.

I also feel eventually I would like to take education and would like to move most of it to the States. We get a very low percentage of the tax dollars back down to the classroom. A lot of it is eaten up with the in-between in the bureaucracy. I think it is better off down there. But in the meantime, what we need to take a look at is, while we are doing this, education is front loaded. It is forward funded. And unless we provide some transportation or some in-between time to do that, we are going to actually damage some of the things that we need to do.

We are going to provide the money for Eisenhower grants. We are going to provide the money to help impact aid for B's and B's. We are going to take some of the money, over \$100 million, and put back into other programs, in job training for students. These are the kinds of things that I would hope my colleagues would focus on.

Yes, I think in some places we have probably gone a little too far. Let us work together and bring it back in line. Let us work at it, instead of just firing rockets at each other all day long.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Guam [Mr. UNDERWOOD].

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

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, we are engaged in a great debate of priorities on this floor and it is a necessary debate. We have been told by the other side that we are establishing priorities with this appropriation, that this is the basic purpose here—we want to create the glide path to a balanced budget.

Nothing could be truer and it is abundantly clear that the priorities of the other side do not include children, the priorities of the other side do not include programs which will help our young people take advantage of economic opportunities, become more competitive in the world market, in short, become educated. The priorities of the other side do not include education, planning for it, using it as a basis to expand opportunity for the most vulnerable in our society.

The other side has made the comparison to doing our own family budget and that we must get our own Nation in order in the way we get our own home in order. Well based on what the other side has come up with, we have a family budget which has invested in burglar alarms at the expense of school books, a family budget which has invested in military toys instead of computers and a family budget which guarantees that your rich uncle will be getting more in the future than your retired grandmother.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES], a senior Member of our body and a member of our subcommittee.

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

Mr. Chairman, we need to be up front in telling the American people what this bill does to the education of the Nation's children. We need to tell parents how this bill threatens the quality of their children's education, their school safety, and their future career opportunities. And, while we are doing this, let's be mindful that everyday parents across-the-country are telling their children to study hard, get a good education, and you will be a success.

Parents need to know that the Republicans on the committee voted against amendment after amendment to even partially restore funding to critical education programs. Even as we meet here today, the Republicans have said that these cuts are meaningless.

Well, I do not think that the parents of the 1 million children that will be denied title-I assisted learning in reading and math will find the over \$1 billion cut in title-I meaningless. I do not think that parents who are concerned about drugs and crime in their commu-

nity's schools will find the \$266 million cut in safe and drug free schools meaningless.

Mr. Chairman, our children should not be forced to pay for a tax cut for the wealthy. Let's not deny our children their chance to achieve the American dream. For the children's sake, I ask my colleagues to vote against H.R. 2127.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the chairman of the Republican Conference, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOEHNER].

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the chairman of the subcommittee for the fine job that he had done and for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, to my colleagues that have been about watching this debate over the last several days and to people whom I am sure have been watching it, probably wondering why all of this rancorous debate, why all of this strife. A lot of people might call it partisan bickering, yelling at one another. But what is really going on here I think we all understand is a very serious debate about what the appropriate role of the Federal Government here in Washington is today.

Now, last November the American people, I think, made a big decision. They sent this town a very serious message, that they want government in Washington to be smaller, less costly, and less intrusive into their lives.

While they said that, they sent a new Congress here to change the way Washington does its business. Probably our largest priority is to actually put forward, and we are going to pass, a plan that will actually balance the Federal budget here in Washington. As we do that, we are going to reinvent government here in Washington and reinvent the role of government here in Washington.

I am surprised as I listen to some of the debate from my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, that they think that compassion ends at the outer edges of the beltway in Washington, that our States and local communities, that parents do not really care about what happens to their children's future.

Well, they do.

Another point I would make is that as we redesign this Government and shrink this Government, what we are going to do is save the future for our children and theirs. I ask my colleagues on the other side of the aisle who have designed these 240 Federal education programs, what good it really does for our children and theirs if we are going to have these programs, but we are going to let them pay for them over the next 40, 50, 60 years, because all it is doing is adding to the national debt?

How fair is that? The fact is I think we can go a lot further moving these programs back.

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

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. WARD].

Mr. WARD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to engage the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] and the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, in a brief colloquy if I may.

Chairman PORTER, I greatly appreciate your taking the time to talk with me about my concerns over the 40-percent cut made in the budget of the American Printing House for the Blind. As you know, the American Printing House is located in my district, in Louisville, KY, and carries out the mandate of the 1879 Act of Congress to promote the education of the blind.

Over these many years, the American Printing House has produced and distributed special educational materials to legally blind students enrolled in pre-college programs. In fact, I understand that the Hadley School for the Blind in your district utilizes American Printing House materials.

Mr. Chairman, the 1995 budget last year provided \$107 per youngster for a total of \$6.6 million in the budget. The cut in this bill would have a very detrimental effect on the ability of the American Printing House to carry out its vital mission. If the cut proposed becomes final, legally blind students in every State will have less access to the educational aides that are produced only at the Printing House for the Blind.

Mr. Chairman, I know you share my concern for these young people. When the House goes to conference with the other body, I would be most grateful for any held you can give to restore the necessary funding for the American Printing House for the Blind.

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

Mr. WARD. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I am very well acquainted with the work of the American Printing House for the Blind, both through the Hadley School and through my work on the subcommittee. I do share the gentleman from Kentucky's interest in providing for the educational needs obviously of blind people. In conference I will do all I can to increase the amount of funding for the American Printing House.

Mr. WARD. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman very much, on behalf of all those people at the American Printing House for the Blind, for his assistance.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. CASTLE].

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

Mr. Chairman, I would just like to speak very briefly about three areas of concern that I have. I think, first of all, it is probably not the end of the world that we are making some cuts in education. I think we can probably live with some of that. But there are areas about which I am concerned.

I believe the goals panel, the national goals panel is a very, very important step we should reinstate. I am talking about \$3 million or some relatively small amount of money. But those goals are not standards, they are not telling anybody how to do anything, they are goals that we need to reach by the year 2000 and I do not think we are doing it.

I would hope at some point as this goes through the Senate and goes through conference, we will look at the safe and drug-free schools, and hopefully we can restore that money, because I think that program has worked so significantly well.

Also, if there is anything left over, I think that the chapter 1 program has by and large worked effectively in the United States of America. I realize that we have to make the cuts, and I realize we are going to have to make a lot of tough decisions, but I also believe these are programs we should look at.

So I would urge all of us as we continue this to take a look at those particular programs.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, we started this debate talking about opportunity, and that all of us on this floor, I believe, are for an opportunity society, and that, generally speaking, our constituents believe that opportunity's door is through the schoolhouse.

The schoolhouse door is the door that has given most Americans the opportunity to better themselves, prepare themselves for the workplace, prepare themselves to be responsible, participating citizens. Yes, taxpaying citizens of our country who wanted to participate in making America great, they have done so.

We have then talked about, however, the deficit, and how the deficit is of great concern to all of us. I want to tell again my friends that I voted for the balanced budget amendment. I voted for the Stenholm amendment, which would balance the budget in 7 years. I did not vote, however, for a large tax cut in the face of large deficits. It clearly does not make sense, because we need to get the deficit down first.

The only reason I continue to suggest that we need to make these draconian cuts in education, in shortchanging the children of America, is because of the necessity of the Republican side to get to some numbers caused by their very significant tax cut of \$245 billion.

Now, someone said oh, yes, but that is distributed evenly throughout middle American the middle class, and the rich were not getting rich, and it was unfair of us to say we were taking \$9 billion from children and putting that \$9 billion, just a portion of the \$245 billion, over here for a tax cut for the wealthy.

My friends, here is the distribution: Here is the distribution of the tax cut. On the far right you have the bottom 20 percent, then the second 20 percent, the

third, the fourth, and the top 20 percent. But then, my friends, you have the top 1 percent, and the tax cut they get.

Now, I suggest if somebody says this is factually incorrect, I am sure they will correct me. But I am sure that I will not be corrected, because this is the accurate depiction of what your tax cut will result in and that is the distribution.

□ 1415

Twenty thousand dollars that everybody in the top 1 percent will get is being taken from Head Start children, chapter 1 children, student loan children, energy assistance, from this bill.

Now, an additional argument that was made was, it all ought not to be in Washington. We agree with that. As a matter of fact, we agree very much that it ought to be local people, local school systems, local parents, local teachers that become engaged in how to make the education of our children better and more effective.

That is why only 2 percent, only 2 percent of the money in this bill for education is kept in Washington; 98 percent, out to students, goes out to State school systems and local school systems. Hear me now, 98 percent. That is not a bureaucracy in Washington being made fat. That is Washington trying to make sure that, as a nation, these are not just Maryland students and California students and Maine students and Florida students. These are Americans who will participate in the future in making America great. That is why we who represent all of the American people direct ourselves to this program.

It is \$3.8 billion cut in education in this bill, again, I suggest to you, made necessary not by budget deficit reduction but by the \$245 billion in the tax cut. You have to get it from somewhere, and the kids are here, and that is where you are getting it.

Now, title I, 1 million students are being cut out. Safe and drug-free schools, 60 percent is being cut. I frankly do not have any of my constituents come up to me and say, hey, we have accomplished our objective. We have safe schools, no violence in them, no drugs in them; we do not need to make the effort anymore. They do not believe that. We still have a very virulent cancer on our community, and it is drugs and violence in our schools. We need to help.

We are not the sole answer, but we need to help our local school systems, Goals 2000. The former Governor of Delaware rose and said this is a good program. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GUNDERSON] came up and said, the macroobjective of bringing the deficit down is excellent. I disagree with that. But the micromethod you have undertaken on your side of the aisle, he said, Republicans, you are wrong. That was Mr. GUNDERSON from Wisconsin, not the gentleman from Maryland, Mr. HOYER.

Under the Reagan-Bush 12 years, we quadrupled the budget. Let me say to my Republican friends again, not one red cent was spent in America from 1981 to 1993 that Ronald Reagan and George Bush did not sign off on. They could have stopped any and all funding in its tracks. They did not do that. They chose to endorse the priorities that were sent to them.

This President, by the way, is not going to do that, because he is right. These priorities stink and he is going to veto this bill. I am going to support his veto and applaud him in effort. I guarantee you in my opinion the American public are going to support him, too.

Why? Because over 90 percent of them think, yes, balancing the deficit is important, but saying to a child, you will not be able to compete, you will not be able to have a job, you will not be able to support your family, you will not be able to compete in global economy but, by the way, you will owe less debt, you think that makes any sense to them? They will not have a job. They will not care what debt they owe.

Vote against this cruel cut in education for our children.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Chairman, well, here we go again. Once more, my Democratic colleagues and myself are needing to stand up against the majority's assaults on poor women, children and the elderly.

Poor women on Medicaid who will be denied good health care for them and their children. The legislation even undercuts the very successful healthy short program that give poor children early preventive health care.

The Head Start program gives millions of American children the opportunity to start their adolescent and academic development on the right foot. The Republicans are choosing to reduce funding for this program. I can envision it now * * * little by little, they will try to dwindle this program into obscurity as well. We will not stand for this.

And our poor seniors. What will come of them during this so-called revolution? We have already seen a glimpse of what the majority wishes to do to the Medicare program * * * and now, they want not to reduce funding for the Low Income Home Energy Assistance program, but to eliminate it!

Houston, a city that experiences extreme temperatures and a high heat index, needs a program like LIHEAP. I spoke today with the Houston Harris County Area Agency on Aging about the effects on our seniors if this program is eliminated. The outlook is not good.

In our most recent Houston heat wave, the city's multi-purpose and senior centers increased their hours of operation for the emergency placement of elderly citizens at alternative sites—they needed a cooler place to stay * * * not only for their health, but for their safety. This can often be a life or death situation. Swiftly eliminating a program of such importance is irresponsible legislating.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this legislation which effectively disregards this Nation's commitment to life, liberty, and equality for all.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to these unwise and unwarranted cuts to the future of our country. By cutting funds to

student aid programs we are dulling the edge of our Nation's future competitiveness.

This bill decimates the Perkins Loan Program for our neediest students. In my district 682 students at Macomb Community College alone may be forced to leave school.

This bill takes seed money away from the Michigan Competitive Scholarship Program, which provides college assistance to disadvantaged students who show unusual academic promise. Isn't academic promise what we're trying to encourage?

And 250,000 currently-eligible students will be denied a Pell Grant. This is not progress, this is moving backwards.

Finally, for our youngest kids, Safe and Drug-Free Schools funding is reduced by more than 50 percent, cutting \$9.2 million from my state's DARE and school-based anti-drug efforts.

Why is this happening? Because Republicans have put a priority on tax cuts for very wealthy families that just don't need it. These priorities are backwards and just plain wrong.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate on title III has expired.

Are there amendments to title III?

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I will take just a moment because the gentleman was unable to yield to me. I had yielded to a Member on his side as part of our debate.

I say that sounds wonderful, but with the cuts in this section of the bill, in education, they amount to exactly three-quarters of 1 percent of the money spent in education in our country this year, three-quarters of 1 percent is what these cuts amount to. The sky is not falling. The sky is not falling.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GOODLING

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GOODLING: Page 45, line 7, strike "\$1,057,919,000." and insert "\$1,062,788,000, of which \$4,869,000 shall be for the National Institute for Literacy; and".

Page 49, line 1, strike "\$255,107,000" and insert "\$250,238,000".

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of August 2, 1995, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] will be recognized for 10 minutes, and a Member opposed to the amendment will be recognized for 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING].

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

Today I am offering an amendment to support the continued funding of the National Institute for Literacy. In my mind, there is no more effective solution to many of the social ills facing today's society than ensuring that we have a literate society. Unfortunately, in the United States of America we do not. A large percentage of our people have an eighth grade literacy ability.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SAWYER].

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Goodling amendment to restore funding for the National Institute for Literacy. We have done a great deal of work over the last 5 years. It has been in the best tradition of the bipartisan effort that we have enjoyed for many years on our committee. Adult literacy problems remain in the forefront of America's educational and productive economic needs throughout the country. The National Institute for Literacy has been instrumental in forwarding its goals.

I have to add that, even with this amendment, the bill will continue to force programs that invest in our people to fight for the same pot of insufficient funds, but this amendment reflects a return to the kind of bipartisan support for adult education and literacy that has been so important to our work together.

Funding from OERI to the National Institute for Literacy extends this bipartisan commitment to education research. However, given the cuts in education research and the increase in number of programs that would come out of the OERI line item, I would like to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania to clarify if it is his intention in any way to affect the current distribution of funding levels between the education and the research centers and the clearinghouses within the overall OERI budget, or is it simply a positive step toward ensuring the availability of all times of educational research.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's support for the amendment. He has always been in the forefront in our fight to improve the literacy of this country.

It is fitting that we are standing here today since we stood together on this floor in 1991, and the gentleman is correct about the intention of my amendment. I have no intention of affecting the current structure of funding for the lab, center, and clearinghouses within OERI.

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the commitment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, his leadership in this arena, commend him for his support for this and research activities. I urge my colleagues to fight against illiteracy and yield back the balance of my time.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin, [Mr. OBEY] wish to be recognized in opposition to the amendment?

Mr. OBEY. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] is recognized for 10 minutes.

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

I will not make a big thing of this because I understand that it is just a small item, but I did nonetheless want Members to understand that, while ev-

eryone would like to restore funds for the institute for literacy, it does come at a cost. I do not think that cost is advisable.

The amendment, as I understand it, obtains the funding for the gentleman's purposes by reducing the increase in the education research account by \$5 million so there would be \$15 million above last year left in the education research account.

The problem with that is that, while it sounds like that account is being healthily enhanced, the problem is that, in fact, this bill is cutting some 70 education programs, which the gentleman from Illinois, the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, has described as being duplicative. We have said about 115 times on this side of the aisle that we agree with the elimination of many of those programs in the interest of consolidation and in the interest of rationalizing administrative structures and delivering more service for dollars spent. And because of the deficit squeeze.

But the problem with the elimination of those 70 programs is that we have been told by the committee that because those programs represent about \$200 million in previous expenditures, some of those people interested in those programs have been told, well, you can try to apply, you can try to be funded in some way out of education research.

If you are cutting out \$200 million and telling folks to go apply at door B but door B is only increased by \$20 million, then you have got a very small percentage chance of actually getting an answer when you knock on that door.

So while I am certainly not going to strenuously insist on my point, and I am not even going to push this to a rollcall, I assure the gentleman from Pennsylvania, I take this time mainly to explain the fact that there is a cost to this amendment.

I am dubious about the value of the trade-off. I recognize the intention of the gentleman, but I wanted to indicate that, if this were pushed to a rollcall, I for one would vote "no" because I think that, while we can have great arguments about the Federal role in education, it seems to me there can be no argument about the necessity for the Federal Government to try to stimulate research which can help us find answers to many questions which have so far being unanswerable.

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

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

I rise to make a couple of observations. The chairman of the committee just a few seconds ago—he would not yield to me—said, look, we are just cutting a little bit of money and the sky is not falling. Well, apparently the gentleman from Pennsylvania believes the sky is falling as it relates to the literacy council.

Other colleagues on his side of the aisle said, we ought to send the money out of Washington. We ought to let the local people make the decision. We ought to have local application. We ought to have local people working on that.

Is it not ironic that the first amendment offered is to add \$5 million, and do you know where that \$5 million goes? Here in Washington, not out to the States, not out to local school systems, not out to local literacy councils, here in Washington.

So, my friends, I say to you, we have had a lot of rhetoric about the awful Democrats that centralizing money in Washington, and the first amendment offered by the Republican chairman of the committee, of the authorizing committee, offers an amendment to restore totally \$5 million which, if divided, obviously, into 50 states, means \$100,000 a State. But it does not go to the States. It stays right here in Washington,

I find it a little bit ironic. I am not against it, by the way. I want to tell the gentleman from Pennsylvania, for whom I have a great deal of respect and with whom, as he knows, I agree on his comments in the earlier part of our debate where we need to make sure that programs work effectively. He and I agree on that, whether it is chapter 1, Head Start or any other program. I am not just spending these resources and not making sure they work. But the fact of the matter is, this money, as the distinguished ranking member knows, stays right here in Washington with all those Washington bureaucrats. I am shocked that this amendment would be offered.

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

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

I want to make several points. First off, there is a 23.5-percent increase in the bill at the present time for OERI.

Second, I want to take issue, great issue with whether the money stays in Washington, DC. We have a lot of literacy programs. We need a combination, we need somebody to be a clearinghouse. We need somebody to make sure that the local and the State government efforts are coordinated. That is exactly where this money is going, my dear man from Maryland, the money is going for the development of technical assistance and information that is provided to State and local programs. They need that kind of assistance. We give them that kind of assistance, and OERI still has a 17-percent increase in this budget.

I cannot think of a better way to spend money, if you really are interested in tackling the illiteracy problem that exists in the United States.

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

□ 1430

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER].

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, as I understood the gentleman's answer was that the local governments needed to have this information coordinated and sent back to them on literacy.

Mr. Chairman, I agree with the gentleman. What I said was that the \$5 million was for work done here in Washington to coordinate that information, to send it back to the locals. But the money that the gentleman's amendment is adding back in is going to be spent here in Washington. I believe I am correct on that. If I am not, I stand to be corrected, but staff seems to believe that is the case.

The gentleman, in his answer to me, simply said that we sent it back, that we sent that information back. That is correct. He said they need it; they need that kind of coordination from Washington. I appreciate his observation.

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

Mr. HOYER. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will look on page 1079 of the hearings, part 5, you will find absolutely no question this is a Washington-based activity.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman for calling my attention to the specific page and am pleased to hear that I was correct.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS].

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I think it is important to note that there has been a misstatement about adding \$5 million. This is squeezing of \$5 million out of other programs that are already in OERI. OERI's budget was increased by 17 percent, but at the same time, they were forced to assume responsibility for a number of other programs that were defunded.

Mr. Chairman, if we add up the money taken away from those other programs, like the desegregation centers, the technical assistance centers, we will find what is taken away from them is far greater than the increase that OERI received. Assuming that this colloquy had some meaning, the colloquy protects the labs, the centers, and one other item that was mentioned there as being protected. Only those 3 items are protected. All of the other entities that are included in OERI will have to suffer as a result.

Mr. Chairman, this is a squeezing, because of the fact that we start out with the wrong amount for OERI to begin with, because we have the wrong amount for the Department of Education totally. The problem is, back to the B-2 bombers, back to the F-22s, back to all the wastes that exist in other parts of the budget. We are forcing the other education programs to eat each other, and that is not proper.

We should not be laboring under the illusion, thinking that \$5 million is being added here and that is going to take care of the literacy program and

none of the other programs in OERI will be hurt. Many vital programs in OERI have already been eliminated and they must make up for that and assume those responsibilities with the existing money that they have.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment does not allow them to do that. It only places a greater burden on what is left in OERI, including the funding of five institutes that have to be started up and they are part of the existing OERI structure that has been approved.

All of that is being put under the hammer in terms of \$5 million being taken away.

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

Mr. Chairman, of course the money does not come from the existing programs; it comes from the increase. There is still a 17-percent increase for all of those programs.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume, to make one point.

Mr. Chairman, there is \$20 million increase in the budget for this operation. There is a potential increase in responsibilities of \$200 million. Sounds to me like that is about 10 cents on the dollar. Far from having increased ability to do the research they need, they are going to be squeezed incredibly. I think Members need to understand that.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there additional amendments?

AMENDMENT NO. 129 OFFERED BY MR. HASTERT

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HASTERT: Page 54, line 14, strike "objective criteria" and insert "specific criteria".

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of August 2, 1995, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HASTERT] will be recognized for 10 minutes, and a Member opposed will be recognized for 10 minutes.

Does the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK] take the time in opposition?

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. I do, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK] will be recognized for 10 minutes.

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

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

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Chairman, I want to acknowledge the work of the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. JOHNSON] in bringing to my attention a possible unintended consequence of the current title IX language included in H.R. 2127.

As one who has pointed out the unintended consequences of title IX, in general, I certainly do not want to create any possible problems. I commend the strong commitment of the gentlewoman from Connecticut to the promotion of women's athletics and to title IX in general. We agree that women's opportunities must continue to grow.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. JOHNSON] to discuss the concern that she has with the current language in H.R. 2127.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, the current language reads that the Office of Civil Rights of the Department of Education must have updated policy guidance, including objective criteria clarifying how colleges and universities can demonstrate, first, a history and continuing practice of program expansion; and, second, full and effective accommodation of the interests and abilities of the underrepresented sex.

I believe the word "objective" can, ironically, be a subjective standard. It is my fear that parties who oppose title IX, or schools that simply do not wish to comply, could take the policy guidance developed, by OCR, to court over whether or not the criteria developed are truly objective.

If such a court case was pending, Mr. Chairman, it is entirely possible that funding for OCR's enforcement of all civil rights laws would be in jeopardy. This is absolutely ludicrous and far from the gentleman's intent and far from anyone's intent in proposing the language in the bill.

My concern is alleviated by the substitute amendment we offer today, which replaces objective criteria with specific criteria. This language still ensures OCR must provide more guidance to schools by December 31, 1995. However, it is hard to argue in court that criteria are not specific. Therefore, I do not believe the same threat of a loss of funds for civil rights enforcement due to court cases exists with this language.

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I further emphasize the intent of this language is to make sure that OCR issues clear guidance to make the second and third prongs of the opportunities test of title IX usable for colleges and universities. Current guidance is simply not working. We definitely do not want to eliminate funding for the enforcement of important civil rights laws.

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

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, last week I filed an amendment which would have struck all of the language with reference to title IX, because I felt that it would do egregious harm to the enforcement of the program and to all the wonderful things that title IX has achieved over the years since 1972.

I want to acknowledge the willingness of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HASTERT] to modify the language of the provision in the appropriations bill and to address our very grave concerns about the use of the word "objective" and how it could completely modify the enforcement potential of title IX with respect to athletic programs.

In taking the lead, my colleague, the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. JOHNSON], has shown great leadership. The gentlewoman's concern was brought to my attention at one of our meetings. I shared that concern, and we have been working together to try to work our modification of the language.

However, Mr. Chairman, I stand in opposition to the inclusion of any language whatsoever. I appreciate the modification that it makes is less onerous to the department and less difficult to deal with. However, my general feeling is that this language is not necessary, should not be included as legislation in an appropriations bill, and certainly, from the majority point of view, where it has been expressed on so many occasions that we ought not to be micromanaging the executive branch, this is a clear indication of micromanagement in an area where I do not feel this type of instruction is either useful or necessary.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to point to a letter which was sent to two of our colleagues on that side of the aisle. It is a letter from the U.S. Department of Education in June 1995. We had public hearings on this issue and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HASTERT] came and testified and provided us with a clear view of the concerns that the gentleman was raising with respect to the intercollegiate athletic programs.

The Department of Education pointed out that, notwithstanding the views that are out there in the public, the Department of Education's guidelines clearly point out that the three areas of concern that have been expressed in the hearings are in the alternative that is repeatedly expressed at the hearings, and that these three guidances that have been elaborated in part of the policy documents of the Department, are expressed in alternatives. It is not a situation where all three of these guidelines need to be complied with.

The first has to do with substantial, proportionate enrollment. That is an alternative.

The second alternative is the establishment of history and continuing practice of program expansion for members of the underrepresented sex. That is an alternative way in which the universities' programs could meet the requirements of title IX.

The third alternative is whether full and effective accommodation of the interests and abilities of the underrepresented sex have been accommodated by the universities' programs. That is another alternative.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the hearing clearly put forth the Department's understanding as to how they apply these guidance criteria and that in no case does the department take the point of view that all three criteria need to be met.

Furthermore, Mr. Chairman, the Department has recently stated that they are in the process of trying to meet these concerns that are out there in the various universities, and that they are in the process of putting forth new guidance with respect to these three guidance positions.

Mr. Chairman, the Department has more than adequately stated their position and clarified the problem. This provision in the appropriations bill is totally unnecessary. I would have hoped that the provision would have been stricken, together with all of the other legislative language that had been included in the global amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] the other day, but it was not, so the problem still persists.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR], our minority whip.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague for yielding and I want to commend her and the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. JOHNSON] for their leadership on this issue.

Mr. Chairman, as a young man, 32 years ago, I was fortunate enough to receive an athletic scholarship to the University of Iowa. Quite frankly, had I not received that scholarship, I am not so sure that I would have been able to continue my education at that time.

I went through the University of Iowa, played football, and I do not recall at that time if there were any women at that university who were on athletic scholarships.

Mr. Chairman, title IX, instituted 20 years ago, has helped literally tens of thousands of women and young women in this country get an education who normally would not have had a chance to get an education.

□ 1445

The opportunity that an athletic scholarship provided me in terms of my education is now available, the door is now open to literally tens of thousands of young women. It has been a tremendous success, and I would hope that we would not in this Congress or in this legislation or in this amendment roll back the door, roll back the opportunities that are available to young women.

I want for my daughter the same opportunities that my son will have, and title IX has provided that for literally countless numbers of young women today in America.

Even though title IX has been in force for over 20 years now, women athletes still have far fewer opportunities to play in intercollegiate sports than male athletes. While women are over half the undergraduates in our colleges

and universities, female athletes are limited to just one-third of all varsity slots.

I might also point out at this point, Mr. Chairman, that men's athletic opportunities have not suffered overall as a result of title IX. Men's participation in intercollegiate sports has increased since the passage of title IX. In fact, for every new dollar spent on women's sports, two new dollars have been spent on men's sports. So let us not turn back the clock. Let us keep the door open. Let us make sure that these young women coming out of high school today who would normally not have had a chance to get an education and live a dream that many of them seek, have that opportunity, and I encourage my colleagues to be supportive of this program.

I want to associate myself at this time with the remarks of the distinguished gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK].

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

I would like to associate myself and address myself to the gentleman, the minority whip. You know, the purpose of this thing, I absolutely support women's athletics. As a matter of fact, my spouse is a women's athletic coach, and I think it has been great, the growth that title IX has brought forward in the last few years.

The problem is in my district and in districts across this country, many schools, when confronted, because the law has not been clearly laid out for them, especially in two of the three prongs, they have decided, many schools have decided, not to expand women's sports but to instead cut back men's sports to meet the proportionality rule. That certainly was never the intent of the law.

What we are asking in this is for them to set up a more definite, specific language so they can meet those last two wordings of those tests.

I think that is certainly something that we can work together on, that I am completely dedicated to and, as a matter of fact, one of the things that has happened across this country, in the gentleman's State of Michigan, my State, Iowa, your alma mater State, we have lost literally hundreds of minor men's sports teams because of this type of cutback, swimming programs, gymnastic programs, wrestling programs, those types of sports. Those participants have lost the opportunity to participate.

We are hoping that we can clarify that language and make it easier for everybody to have an opportunity to compete.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. JOHNSON].

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to say that as one who probably would not be here today if I had not had the opportunity to participate in a very competitive women's sports program, I am pleased

that we are all united on the value of title IX. We would not have the women in basketball, women excelling at the Olympics, women tennis players of the excellence and caliber, women drivers, women excelling in all of the sports, without title IX, and I commend my friend, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HASTERT], and the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ISTOOK], for their commitment to title IX and making sure it works well for women throughout America in the course of our discussions about this amendment.

It is very important that the Federal Government be able to work with institutions so that competitive sports is a strong, healthy part of the lives of all Americans, and I believe it is critical that together we assure that not only are these regulations completed on time but they are completed in a way that the universities and colleges of America can comply with them readily, and we can all assure that progress is made toward equal opportunity for sports, to participate in competitive sports in the decades ahead for all of our kids.

I thank the gentleman from Illinois for his work on this important issue.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of my time, 1 minute, to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WOOLSEY].

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of my colleagues, the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK] and the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. JOHNSON] and in support of title IX.

I would just like to say that I have very athletic children. In fact, my youngest son is an Honorable Mention All-American college football player. I know how important that experience was to him. He also has a brother that is an athlete and a sister that is an athlete. It was equally important for them to have athletic experience. It gave them a grounding that we cannot overlook, and it taught all of them, boys and girls alike in my family, teamwork, taught them individual competitiveness, and it taught them self-assurance and self-respect.

We must, must support title IX, and we cannot ever take away from that program. As a matter of fact, I do not suggest that we cut men's sports. I suggest we expand our contribution to all sports.

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GUNDERSON].

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

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this amendment. I want everyone to understand this is not a debate about title IX. This is a debate about some kind of clarity and equity in the enforcement of title IX.

We have held hearings on this issue in front of our subcommittee in the Committee on Economic and Edu-

cational Opportunities as recently as July. I received a personal letter from Norma Cantu, the assistant secretary, where she said:

I agree OCR should take steps to clarify our existing standards and to ensure that colleges and universities fully understand what steps are required to comply with title IX.

I have to tell you this right here is just part of the communication between the University of Wisconsin and the Office of Civil Rights on this issue, and it is clear that the Office of Civil Rights has decided you meet standard 1 or you do not qualify, and if you do not accept standard 1, initially, we are going to require additional remedial corrections by you; it is absolutely absurd. Either this office clarifies and corrects this, or next year we are going to have to prohibit any funding for this particular activity, and I hope none of us arrives at that point in the process.

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute

Mr. Chairman, the whole purpose of putting this, as I regret in doing it because it stemmed out of a letter written to the Office of Civil Rights on June 30 with 134 signatures asking for clarification. We have never received that clarification.

It is not out intent to stop or to limit any activity, athletic activity, but we want to clarify that for schools who are participating.

I think this language takes that action, and I ask for a positive vote on this amendment.

Mr. EWING. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Hastert amendment. In my district in east-central Illinois, I represent Illinois State University which has been wrestling with the gender equity issue for the last half year. In the last 6 months, the university has seen lawsuits raised for fraud, the canceling of its men's wrestling and soccer programs, and student athletic scholarships canceled. We have a policy at the Department of Education that is in desperate need of clarification and review.

In May of this year, the Postsecondary Education, Training and Lifelong Learning Subcommittee held hearings in which it was abundantly clear that universities nationwide had no idea if they were in compliance with gender unity or not. In some cases, even after schools had been OK'd by the Department of Education for title 9 compliance they later found in court that they were not in compliance at all.

Back at Illinois State University, the men's wrestling and soccer teams have been eliminated in the name of gender equity while women's soccer has been added. I am happy to see that many young women have gained new opportunities in sports at ISU, but I am also disappointed that many young men have lost opportunities as well, especially when they had been recruited to the university to participate in those programs. In 1974, when Congress first enacted gender equity its intent was clear: Expand athletic opportunities for female athletes. The authors of this legislation never intended to eliminate opportunities for men. Nevertheless, in the middle of their spring semester many young men were told that their

team was going to be eliminated and that if they wanted to play soccer or wrestle they would have to do it somewhere else. These students had invested time and hard work, and were very disappointed, so disappointed that these young athletes now have an attorney.

We have heard that the gender equity regulations are under review, but promises are no longer good enough. This inconsistent and confusing regulation is another example of the Federal Government micromanaging the local lives of Americans. I urge a "yes" vote on the Hastert amendment which will require the Department to clarify their regulations by December 31, 1995.

Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by Representative HASTERT that modifies a provision in H.R. 2127 that would require the Department of Education's Office of Civil Rights [OCR] to clarify its enforcement policy of title IX of the Educational Amendments Act of 1972.

Colleges and universities across Nebraska have asked that the Department clear up the confusion that's been created because OCR has failed to clarify two of the three tests that ensure women and men have equal athletic opportunities.

While we all want to ensure that all students have equal opportunities to participate in and have athletic programs, the Department has continued to apply only one of three tests that are supposed to be used to help schools decide if they're meeting this requirement. Because of the Department's actions, there now exists a quota system in college athletics.

The other two tests have become meaningless because schools have no objectionable standard in which to gage full compliance with title IX.

The Hastert modifying amendment simply requires that the Department issue specific standards on these two tests by the end of this year, so that colleges and universities will finally be able to evaluate their programs based on solid standards, instead of the current quota system.

Mr. Chairman, current title IX enforcement is threatening viable athletic programs that have benefited men and women. In Nebraska, our outstanding football program has provided a valuable source of income to the athletic department which has in turn helped the University's other athletic programs. It would be unfortunate that what has taken years to develop and has become the pride of Nebraska, could be threatened because the Department has failed to fully clarify title IX's opportunities tests.

I urge my colleagues to support the Hastert amendment to H.R. 2127.

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

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HASTERT].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. THORNTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. THORNTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise to express my appreciation to the

distinguished colleagues on both sides of the aisle who truly believe that education is important. The gentleman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY] will be bringing forward an amendment to accent education.

This is an important occasion because we are addressing problems that will affect the future of the United States well into the next century.

We are concerned because our Nation has deep problems. We are wrestling with the problems of poverty, because we have had an imbalance in our budget.

But we are also wrestling, I submit, with a larger poverty, a poverty of vision and of self-assurance that would teach us that we have the resources in this Nation to enter the next century as the greatest Nation on Earth economically, the mightiest militarily, and the strongest in pursuit of democratic ideals. But we are too poor, we are told and I am here today to say that I am tired of people saying that this country is too poor to meet its obligations to our young people for an education, we are too poor, to meet our commitment to our veterans, we are too poor, we are told, to continue to live up to the trust of Medicare.

Mr. Chairman, this Nation does have financial problems. We have great financial problems. I have been told that every person in this country owes \$18,000 in debt. That is a terrible amount of debt. It is terrible to think that we are that deeply in debt.

But let me tell you something, Mr. Chairman, this is not the worst debt this country has ever had. At the end of World War II, after the Great Depression and after fighting Germany and the Axis powers and Japan to a victory, this Nation owed 120 percent of its gross national product in debt, head over heels in debt. We owed \$260 billion and our total income, for everyone, was only \$212 billion. By contrast, in the 1970's, we had pulled our debt down to 23 percent of our gross national product. By wise investments and increased productivity we reduced our debt down to 23 percent of our gross national product in the 1970's. Then we went on a spree of spending more and cutting revenues, creating huge deficits with the result that our debt is nearly 70 percent of our gross national product. This is bad, but not as bad as the 120 percent at the end of World War II.

These percentages of financial poverty are not as important as the poverty of courage, the poverty of vision. At the end of World War II our Nation was head over heels in debt, worse than at any point in its history, but we did not say, "We are too poor to meet our obligations to our servicemen, we are too poor to educate our young people." No, sir, we did not say that.

One of the last things President Franklin Delano Roosevelt proposed before he died at Warm Springs was that when they return from conflict, we should establish a GI bill to provide an education for every serviceman and

servicewoman in this country. Mr. Chairman, we are not too poor to educate our children. We were not then, and we are not now.

Just a few years later, another great President, Dwight David Eisenhower, proposed to a country which was still head over heels in debt, that we are not too poor to build an interstate system that stretches from Maine to California, from Florida to Washington, and we built the infrastructure of this country so we could have a thriving economy which has made us the mightiest Nation on Earth.

Mr. Chairman, I am deeply concerned that today, as we address the problems of the future, we are making the excuse we are just too poor, we just cannot afford it, we just cannot afford to educate our children, to keep our commitment to our elderly, we cannot keep our commitment to our veterans, because, you see, we are broke, we are broke. We owe \$18,000 per person.

□ 1500

But where in that accounting of debt are our assets? How much is it worth to be an American citizen? Mr. Chairman, please tell me why people from Central America and the Caribbean and East Europe are battering the doors of this country down to move here? Do you believe they want to come in and help us carry that \$18,000 of debt; that they just want to be a part of this bankrupt country? No, sir.

They know what every American citizen knows, that we are the richest and most powerful Nation on the face of the earth and that what we have is much greater than what we owe. We have an obligation to invest our money wisely.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. THORNTON] has expired.

(On request of Mr. WILLIAMS, and by unanimous consent, Mr. THORNTON was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. THORNTON. Mr. Chairman, the point is, that every businessman worth his salt has debts far greater than \$18,000, but will wisely make investments for future returns. Everyone knows that poverty is not a thing to be proud of, nor ashamed of, but to be gotten rid of as quickly as conveniently possible, and as my grandad told me, if you are head over heels in debt, you cannot spend your way out of debt, but you cannot starve you way out of debt. The only way to get out of debt is to work your way out of debt, and the way you do that is by investing in the future, in the education and training of our young people.

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

Mr. THORNTON. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

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

Mr. Chairman, along with the attention that I think we owe the gentleman in the well is also our attention to his

statements about the poverty of courage and boldness and grandness in America today.

Let me extend that just one additional step. Not only were those who came before us in Franklin Roosevelt and Harry Truman's time and the citizens who served with them, not only did they have great courage, even in the face of debt, but they understood something that this particular Congress appears not to understand, and that is, investments in education will, in fact, in the near term, reduce the deficit.

Mr. Chairman, a former Speaker of this House asked for a review of a cost-benefit analysis of the cost of the GI bill and the benefits returned to the Treasury. When the results came back, they were astonishing. The GI bill has now paid off the entire capital cost of World War II several times. Had we not spent that education money in the 1940's, the debt would be much higher than it is today.

One of the reasons that debt continues to rise under Republican Presidential leadership is because they do not understand the necessity of investment. Businesspeople understand it. Certainly the Japanese have understood it. America not only lacks, it seems to me, in its leadership the power of courage today, but we misunderstand the necessity of investments, such as continued and increased national investments in education.

Mr. THORNTON. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, every family in America understands the importance of educating our children, and, Mr. Chairman, I come before you today urging support of the Lowey amendment and to urge that we recapture the self-assurance, courage, and vision which guided us after World War II to invest in the future. An investment in education reduces our deficit, and secures our future.

AMENDMENT NO. 30 OFFERED BY MRS. LOWEY

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, marked as amendment No. 30.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 30 offered by Mrs. LOWEY: On page 45 line 15, strike "and 3" and insert "3 and 4" and on page 45 line 17, strike \$6,916,915,000 and insert \$6,920,915,000.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of August 2, 1995, the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and a Member opposed will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY].

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to oppose the bill's cuts in student aid. Unfortunately, these cuts only foreshadow the \$10 billion in student aid cuts which will be made this fall in the reconciliation bill. This bill alone cuts the Per-

kins loan program, one of the oldest and most important Federal student aid programs in this country.

Three-quarters of a million students across America depend upon the Perkins program. In my State of New York alone, Perkins provided low interest loans to nearly 60,000 deserving students.

As you can see on this chart, over 88 percent of undergraduate students who benefit from Perkins loans come from families with incomes under \$50,000. These are kids from hard-working, middle-class families who are feeling squeezed, squeezed in whatever they do in their life. These families need more, not less, help to send their kids to college.

The bill completely eliminates another program, State student incentive grants. Over 200,000 students depend upon these grants. The modest \$63 million which the Federal Government spends on the program drives over \$650 million in State funds, a huge return on the Federal dollar.

The elimination of SSIG will not be made up by other sources of student aid. Where will these 200,000 students turn for help?

Let me tell my colleagues about two students who depend on Federal student aid. Sebastian Tuccitto of the Bronx attends St. John's University in my district. Sebastian is in his junior year studying accounting. Unfortunately, like so many other families in this country struggling to get by, Sebastian's parents cannot contribute much to his education. His father is a carpenter who was injured on the job and his mom works at a supermarket. Neither of his parents went to college, and let me say, school is anything but fun and games for this young man who works several jobs struggling to get that education. He works at least 20 hours a week while he attends school and he still gets a 3.1 GPA.

Does this Congress really want to make it more difficult for young men like this to go to college?

Or Denise Fiacco who will be a senior at a State school where she will major in chemistry and math. Like Sebastian, Denise is on her own. Her parents are not able to help with her tuition so Denise works to earn money for school which supplements her student aid. She even had to drop out of school for a year in order to earn money for college.

Is this Congress willing to tell Denise and Sebastian that they cannot be part of the American dream? Are we today in the United States of America, the most prosperous Nation in the world, going to tell these young people that we are not going to invest so they can get the skills so they can earn their way in this great country our ours so they can compete in the global marketplace?

A college degree today is simply a matter of economic survival. Again, my colleagues, look at this chart. Look at the fact. A person with a college de-

gree earns close to twice as much as someone with only a high school education earns. The more a person learns, the more a person earns.

Are we willing to tell Denise and Sebastian that we do not care about their future today? I certainly am not.

I cannot find any way, my colleagues, to defend these cuts. We are going to hear a lot of excuses, but there is no way to defend these cuts. Let us not balance the budget on the backs of our Nation's future, our students. Let us give each and every student the same chance at the American dream that our own children have.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois wish to be recognized in opposition?

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I would.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] is recognized for 20 minutes.

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

Mr. Chairman, the bill contains the largest single year increase in Pell grants ever and raises the maximum grant to the highest level in history, \$2,440. This is the program that provides access to the most financially needy students in America who would otherwise not be able to afford to go to college.

The bill fully funds the supplemental educational opportunity grants at the President's request and at the 1995 level. The bill fully funds the work study program at the President's request at the 1995 level. The bill fully funds the TRIO program at the President's request at the 1995 level. That is over \$7 billion in student assistance and it is all grant assistance, not loans that have to be repaid.

As the gentlewoman from New York notes, we have reductions in funding for two programs which together previously represented less than 3 percent of Federal student financial assistance in this bill. The Perkins loan program is a revolving loan program that already has \$6 billion in assets in it. I might note that the President himself proposed terminating capital contributions for this program last year as we have done in this bill.

The Perkins funds are funds that are controlled and matched by over 2,000 participating schools. Loans are made by the schools and when they come into repayment, new loans are made.

Our bill in no way affects the \$6 billion in those revolving loan funds.

It is true, however, that we are not adding new capital to the program. In this budget environment, we simply cannot be increasing the program. But the funding that is already out there is going to stay there. Now loans will be made.

Earlier, the gentleman from Wisconsin suggested that hundreds of thousands of students are not going to get loans because we are not adding \$158 million in new capital to the Perkins

program. That contention is simply wrong. Every kid that would be served by Perkins if we put that \$158 million in new capital in the program will qualify for a direct student loan or a Federal family education loan. This decision on Perkins will not prevent a single student anywhere from getting a Federal loan, period.

Now, we have some who have suggested that if we do not add capital to this program, it will wither and die over time. This is also misleading, Mr. Chairman. Students pay 5 percent interest on Perkins loans, which means that they repay more than they are loaned. So the program actually grows over time. In addition, schools must match at least one-third of the Federal contribution. They tell us that this is a very high priority program for them.

Well, if the schools continue making their contribution to the program in addition to the \$6 billion they already have in their revolving funds, the program will continue to grow.

The only way Perkins will shrink in the absence of Federal capital contributions is if schools do a poor job of collecting loans, if they permit defaults in excess of 5 percent plus their contributions to the programs.

Mr. Chairman, the gentlewoman's heart is in the right place, but the Perkins program is going to remain strong. It is going to continue to grow despite this small, reasonable contribution to deficit reduction.

I want to address the issue of the State student incentive grant program for which the Federal contribution is terminated in this bill. Just like Perkins, this is a program that President Clinton proposed to terminate last year and he still proposes terminating it.

This program was created in 1972 as a temporary incentive program to encourage States to establish their own need-based grant programs. It was not intended to be a permanent subsidy to the States. In 1972, only 26 States had need-based grant programs. Today, all 50 States and the District of Columbia have these programs.

As the National Performance Review indicated, the program has achieved its purpose and should now be terminated. In addition, today 46 States overmatch the SSIG requirement; 42 States award need-based aid other than SSIG and 33 States award non-need-based grants; 23 States make grants to part-time students and 21 States make grants to graduate students. Clearly, the Federal responsibility and role have disappeared.

According to the Department of Education, the Federal contribution to SSIGs represents only 2.5 percent of grants awarded by States. The members of our subcommittee felt, I think rightly, that at a time when we have to reduce spending in this bill by 13 percent overall, 9 percent in this cycle, it is certainly fair to ask the States to accept a reduction in Federal subsidies of their grant programs of only one-fifth of that amount.

Some critics have suggested that some states may discontinue their grant programs if the SSIG funding is terminated. I cannot imagine a more irresponsible response to this bill. All of the States have had 24 years of Federal assistance to get their systems up and running and to become self-sufficient. If the States cannot become self-sufficient in 24 years, they have either grossly mismanaged their education funds or they have abused the Federal assistance by treating it as a permanent operating subsidy rather than as start-up assistance, as it was intended.

□ 1515

Mr. Chairman, this bill and the student loan entitlements will make available to students \$35 billion in student financial assistance in 1996. These reasonable reductions and strong support for student aid proposed in this bill will not adversely affect students, and they should be adopted.

The sky is not falling.

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

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, the Perkins Loan Program began in 1958 in response to the Russian Sputnik program. It was part of the National Defense Education Act. I would not be here in Congress today if it were not for that National Defense Education Act. That is what enabled me to get a college education.

This Congress, a long time ago, decided to give people like me the opportunity to work their way up the opportunity ladder, and I am very grateful for it. About one-third of the Members of this Congress have been beneficiaries of the very same program which we are suggesting now that we will not fund for the first time since 1958. I ask my colleagues to not pull the ladder of opportunity up after they have climbed it before they let others do the same thing. Give them the same opportunity that we have had.

The Republican majority says, "Oh, don't worry, don't worry. This isn't much of a cut." Tell that to the 150,000 students who are not going to get Perkins loans. Tell that to them. Go ahead. And keep in mind the second step is going to come in September when the reconciliation bill comes to this House, and in that bill the Congress is going to be cutting \$10 billion additional money out of student aid. That is estimated to increase the cost to student borrowers on average by 20 percent. If my colleagues think increasing the cost to student borrowers by 20 percent is opening the door of opportunity, I think they need a new dictionary.

I just cannot believe that we are about to do this. You talk about a \$10 billion reduction, they talk about the elimination of the Perkins loan program, as though it is nothing at all. Well, if it is not real savings, then how

are we going to be able to use that \$10 billion for the purpose you intend, which is again to provide those tax cuts for people making more than \$100,000 a year. It is a bad mistake.

Defeat this bill.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOGGETT].

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY] for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, Lu Ann Nye and her daughter are the kind of folks that are going to be impacted by what is happening here today. She is a courageous woman who had the courage to leave welfare, and go back to Austin Community College, and get a degree to support her daughter. Our Republican friends came after the daughter and her friends when they began cutting school lunch earlier in the year. Now they come after the big brothers, and the big sisters, and the older students, like Lu Ann, and cut into their Federal study financial assistance, and when they cut, it is not just dollars that they are cutting, but the hopes, and the aspirations, and the dreams of a generation of people, up to, as the chairman said, the ranking member said, 150,000 young people on the Perkins loan program.

How extraordinary it is that this House is headed by a Speaker who is a sometime professor of history at a time that we are ending an historic Federal commitment to education.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from San Diego, CA [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, there is a difference in philosophy, and I think, if debate boils down, I think we ought to point out the differences in philosophy.

This side of the aisle are saying that we are cutting education. On our side we think that they will fail to see the solution to a very simple problem, that there is too much bureaucracy that eats up the dollars that we send back to the Federal Government, and, by the time we send it back to the States, we only get about 23 cents out of every dollar back down into the classroom.

The second misnomer is it is not their money. Every time that my colleagues take and give a dollar out, they have got to first take it away from somebody. They are taking it away from the very people that they try to give it back to, and they give it out, and only 23 cents on the dollar. I say to my colleagues they sure could not run a business like that.

So, if my colleagues want to increase the amount of spending on education, we need to send it back to the States. We also need to limit the size of State government so that that bureaucracy does not eat up the money for the very thing that we are trying to do.

Let me give my colleagues a classic example. I have got a school in Scripps

Ranch. That school has got fiber optics into it. It was a partnership between the city and State. We have got computers in every classroom. I have got boys and girls in vocational education swinging hammers. They are building modular units. And guess what? They are selling those units, and then they reinvest the money in high-tech education equipment within that school. Those that are college-bound in architecture, design, and computerization are also encouraged, and they have actually redesigned the whole school, and guess what, in the summertime the partnership of labor and private enterprise are higher in those same kids.

Now think of the advantage that these kids have over someone that does not have that program. It is on a local level.

And then they chastise us and say we do not care about kids because we are cutting money from the summers jobs program. The summer jobs program has probably taught less than 5 percent of the kids how to work and how to get a job. The place to teach kids on how to survive in the future is in education, is at the site, either vocational or those that go for college bound, and we need to take those kinds of moneys and invest them in those programs.

We double our knowledge every year now, not 30 years like we used to, Mr. Chairman, and, if we do not have the facilities for the kids to learn, then they have a legitimate gripe that the difference between those that have money and those on a low-income will increase disproportionately, and that is what we need to do.

If my colleagues really want to take a look at how to kill education, keep the Federal bureaucracy going. We have got to eliminate the power of Members in this body to send home dollars so that they can get reelected over and over, and take that power away and give it back to the people, and that is the difference of opinion.

We are not killing education. We are giving the power of the people and the States the power to control their own destiny and take the money and the power away from Washington, DC. That is the total difference.

Now the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] said that, if it had not been for the National Defense Education Act, he would not be here. Many of us wish in that case that it had never existed. Mr. Chairman, I am joking. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] is a good friend.

But in the grant that the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY] worked hard on, those are good grants out of the Federal Government.

Education is financed by 95 percent in the States. We only fund about 5 percent, and we are destroying it? No, what we are doing is saying we need to turn that 5 percent, get most of it back into the classroom, eliminate the bureaucracy in Washington, limit the bureaucracy in the States, and get more of the money down into the classroom.

That is not a concept that should be beyond the Members over here, but yet they want to hang on to the power, the power to get reelected.

And I look at the Pell grants, and the history and look at the number of dollars that have been taken from the GI bill. We did not have the bureaucracy we had when the GI bill was stated. Most of it went directly down to those people that loaned it, and, Mr. Chairman, when my colleagues think about cutting education they should take a look and mention the school lunch. The school lunch program is set to feed those kids that need it, 185 percent below poverty level, and the gentleman from Texas fails to see that solution also. Why should the Government, why should they have the power to send dollars to feed my daughters? They do not need the money, but yet they want the exclusive right to control all the dollars.

That is wrong, Mr. Chairman, and that is the difference between the philosophies. Let us take care of the people that really need it, and let us take the power away from the Federal Government. I am trying to take my own power away, and my colleagues', and treat that power and get it to the kids and to the families. That is the difference of opinion. We are not cutting education. My colleagues are stopping education from growing because of the big-government Clinton politics that their side supports.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, beginning with Thomas Jefferson and throughout the ensuing two centuries this Nation has followed a grand and productive tradition of the local, State, and Federal education partnership. Today with shame the U.S. House of Representatives sounds an unprecedented retreat on that centuries-old commitment to America's students, and this amendment describes why.

Three years ago this Congress passed, and President Bush thankfully signed, the Middle Income Student Assistance Act, of which I was the sponsor. Today with shame the House of Representatives reneges on that commitment.

Perkins student loans are particularly valuable to middle-income college students and their families, and with shame this House is about to vote to cut 157,000 middle-income students off of that assistance. I say to my colleague, those aren't bureaucrats, Mr. CONNINGHAM. Those are middle-income students, American citizens. Today the House changes in the Pell grant program will deny 220,000 middle-income students a Pell grant. Those aren't bureaucrats. Those are your kids.

AmeriCorps accepts middle-income people, as it should, and they can earn \$9,000 in college stipends. Shamefully that program was eliminated by the Republican majority law week.

These efforts of the new majority in this House aimed at America's middle-

income struggling parents and students are shameful, and they are unnecessary, and they are imprudent, and they are unwise, and worse, my colleagues, they will end up increasing the Federal deficit in just the next decade. That is the shame.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. REED].

Mr. REED. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY].

Mr. Chairman, the legislation before us will impose severe cuts on educational assistance, and it will deny millions of Americans the chance to go to college, and this is an opportunity that is increasingly elusive for middle-income Americans, and I would like to illustrate the effect of these cuts by introducing my colleagues to a young lady. Her name is Jenifer. She is from Hockum, WA. She is one of eight children, the first in her family to go to college. Jenifer lives on her own. She supports herself, and indeed she helps her family with their expenses. Her father is a logger, and he makes about \$28,000 a year. She has to pay a tuition of about \$11,600 a year. She commutes 60 miles a day to school. She works 30 hours a week in her hometown, and she works an additional 15 to 20 hours at her college, and when she graduates she wants to become a teacher. Jenifer currently receives Federal financial assistance in the form of Pell grants, Perkins loans, State student senate grants, all of which are reduced or eliminated under this legislation. Under this bill she would most likely lose her SSIG grant and her Pell grant, and the amount of her Perkins loan would either be reduced, at best, or eliminated. This adds up for her education to an additional \$2,000 to \$3,000 in added costs, and I ask my Republican colleagues where is she going to get this money? She cannot possibly work any longer. She already commutes 60 miles a day to school, but I tell my colleagues what I think is likely to happen.

□ 1530

She very well might be forced to drop out and to compromise her chance for a college education. She represents exactly the type of young person we should support, but instead this legislation is taking away that support.

We must continue to support higher education through these programs. We must continue to provide people a chance to achieve the American dream. Let us not take that dream away by passing this legislation. Let us reinforce and reinvent the future of this country.

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

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

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, it has been a long day or two on this bill. Every time I walk into the Chamber I hear some of the most incredible stuff imaginable. The world is truly coming to an end, according to the other side. We are renegeing on our commitments, whether you are talking about violence against women, which has nothing to do with this section of the bill but I know is a primary source of concern for the gentlewoman from New York who spoke earlier on that.

We are spending more on this bill than has ever been spent on that program. Speaking of spending more than ever—\$278 billion—is what this bill would spend—\$278 billion on health, education, labor issues, and workfare issues—\$270 billion—more than we spent on defense of the Nation.

Now, \$7 billion of that would be spent directly on education assistance for people who do not have any money, \$7 billion. As I said earlier, you remember Everett Dirksen's comment that a billion dollars here and a billion dollars there and pretty soon you are speaking of real money, \$7 billion is a lot of money. Not only is it a lot of money, but the fact is it breaks down into some 240 separate programs, each with its own constituency, each with its own bureaucracy, each overlapping, each spending money unnecessarily.

I heard the gentleman who preceded me say unnecessary cuts. I would say there is unnecessary spending because we are spending money on bureaucracies that compete with each other to shovel out money. But whose money is it? The money belongs to the American taxpayer. As long as these people can stand there and say how much they are doing for people in America, using money from the American taxpayer, as long as they can write the checks, as long as they can pass out the credit card, they are happy. They do not want to streamline Government. They do not want to cut back. They do not want to make it more efficient. And then they have the gall, the audacity, the effrontery to stand in this well and say how badly we are cutting.

Let me show you how we are cutting. Here is a good example. We have heard Pell grants talked about for the last several minutes. This bill supports student assistance by providing the largest maximum Pell grant award in history, \$2,440 per student. Now, that is the largest amount ever in the history of the Pell grant system, \$2,440 per student.

So are we cutting back? Oh my goodness, we are giving more money to the students than ever before. In the work study program it is fully funded at last year's level, \$617 million. The program provides grants to 3,700 schools to provide work study opportunities for 713,000 students who receive \$1,092 per year.

The Federal supplemental education opportunities grants program provides \$583 million, and the Trio program provides \$463 million, which benefits mi-

nority and disadvantaged students. They are both preserved at last year's spending levels. Let me repeat that for those that missed it, last year's spending levels.

There is \$6 billion left in the Perkins loan program, which we heard so much about. If schools manage their portfolios, do not permit defaults and continue their current contributions, that account could actually grow so not a single student will go without aid as a result of these actions.

Now they say the sky is falling, the world is coming to an end, but not a single student will go without aid as a result of these actions. I urge the adoption of this bill.

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

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

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

Mr. Chairman, this bill signals the beginning of the end of the Federal Government having any responsibility whatsoever, in helping middle income and low income students get a college education.

Mr. Chairman, I know first hand the importance of education, because, 27 years ago, I was a single, working mother receiving no child support.

I was forced to go on welfare, even though I was working, in order to give my three small children the health care, child care, and food they needed.

Fortunately, I had advantages that many mothers on welfare do not. You see, I had an education. I had some college and I had good job skills.

But, just because I made it off welfare, I will never, not for 1 minute, think that so can others with fewer advantages—those with less education, or no education at all. That is why, for the life of me, I cannot understand why some Members who used student aid, the G.I. bill, as a ladder to make a better life for themselves now want to pull that ladder up behind them.

This righteous attitude of "I did it, so why can't you" has no place in this body. It has no place because it leads to elitist and dangerous policy like the drastic cuts in student loans we are considering today.

These cuts make it clear that the Gingrich Republicans would rather invest in a tax break for the fat cats, then student loans for low and middle income families.

Mr. friends, I could go on and on about the other faults of this bill, but they are much too numerous to mention.

But, one thing is for sure. This bill will go down in history as a declaration of war on our children, our working families, and seniors.

I urge all Americans who care about the education of their children to tell their Representatives to oppose this bill.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING], the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time just to make two observations. One I made yesterday when the gentleman from Ohio offered his amendment where I indicated that he was buying 40 minutes of time, but he was not buying any education or any training.

I have to say the same is true, of course, in this amendment, where we are buying 40 minutes of time or how much ever time it is but only buying \$600,000 worth of outlays in money.

The second observation I want to make, two or three speakers ago made the statement that we are cutting out the Perkins loan, and I want to make very sure that nobody goes home with that thought in mind, because, of course, the \$6 billion in the revolving fund is still there. The encouragement is to make sure that you collect it so it can revolve so more students can use it.

So we are not cutting out the Perkins loan, as a matter of fact. What we are doing is allowing the \$6 billion in the revolving fund to continue. I wanted to make those two observations to bring a little reality to the debate.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GREEN].

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague for yielding me the 1½ minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the value of a college education is unquestioned in our society yet the Republican majority has decided that a college education should only be granted to those with enough cash to pay up front. By reducing the funding available to the Federal student loan program, 5 million undergraduate students will see increased costs for their college education. Again, the Republicans are asking a generation of Americans who did not run up our debt to pay the cost of reducing the deficit.

The message is simple. If your parents are wealthy, you can expect the finest education anywhere in the world. However, if you are from a working class family you can expect to work harder, make less, and have no hope of a college education unless you can manage to work full-time while you go to school just to pay the interest on your college debt.

This is the most profound attack on the American dream in over 20 years. By eliminating the opportunity of a college education, the Republicans are sentencing millions of young Americans to the McJob market: low pay, no benefits, no potential for growth.

In essence, the cuts in higher education equal an attack on the standard of living for every American. A less

educated society demands less in the terms of salary and cheap labor results in mega-profits. We are no longer in the era of sending jobs overseas for cheap labor, the Republicans are attempting to grow their own cheap labor right here in the United States by ensuring that the children of the well-off get educated and the children off the middle class and working class become the cheap labor force of the future.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan [Ms. RIVERS].

Ms. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, in 1935 Thomas Wolfe said, America, it is a fabulous country. It is the only country where miracles not only happen but they happen all the time.

Well, Mr. Chairman, I have lived an American miracle. I began my adult life as a mother at 18, mother of two by 21, and my husband and I struggled with the problems that ordinary people all over this country are facing. We know first hand what it is like to be in a job market without any real skills, to go without health insurance, to have a table full of bills that add up to more money than there is in the checkbook. Yet today I have both undergraduate and law degrees, and I have had the opportunity to serve my community at all levels in government.

What happened? Hard work and lots of it. But hard work was not enough for me or for many other people in this country. Without the helping hand of student loans and grants, my college education would have been out of my reach. My husband and I could not afford it. My parents were not in a position to help me. My father was a mailman, my mother was a homemaker, ordinary people without resources to contribute to my education. Financial aid was the key to my success.

Of course now, as a Member of Congress, I can easily pay for my children's education. In fact, all 435 Members of this body can pony up the money necessary for college tuition. In fact, these cuts we are discussing will not hurt the children of the people who are vigorously defending them.

It is also interesting to note that many of the individuals who support these cuts took help from these very programs when they were on the way up. What hypocrisy. I guess it is easy to pull up the ladder of success once you and your children are safely on top.

But what about students like me, the children of mailmen, of autoworkers, of waitresses, of cabbies, of ordinary people all over this country who want so very much for those kids?

Mr. Chairman, we must keep the doors of educational opportunity open. Miracles are waiting to happen.

□ 1545

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

Mr. Chairman, let me just say I have to marvel at some of the comments

coming from the other side of the aisle. One would think that we have in fact defunded or we are proposing to eliminate funding for worthy and needy college bound students, when nothing could be further from the truth. What we are actually talking about here is increasing access for needy young people in America to a college education.

Now, the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. PORTER stood just a moment ago and explained I thought very thoroughly, very patiently, that we are increasing in this bill funding for the Pell Grant Program. In fact, we are providing the largest maximum Pell grants in the history of the country, \$2,440 per student.

We are also in this bill making sure, of course, that the Perkins Loan Program, the revolving loan program, continues in existence. That program has \$6 billion in assets already in it. Assuming that the default rate stays at a reasonable level, that program should continue for a considerable length of time, in fact in perpetuity. Loans are made by the schools participating in this program. and, frankly, we have over 2,000 schools participating in the Perkins program today.

All we are doing here in response to the amendment of the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY] is, frankly, acceding to a budget recommendation made by the administration, which proposed to eliminate the capital contribution to the Perkins Loan Program.

We also want to stress, again, Mr. Chairman, that we have attempted to be responsive in the preparation of this particular bill. Chairman PORTER cited earlier that the bill fully funds the supplemental education opportunities grants at the President's budget request and at the 1995 level. The bill also fully funds the work study program at the President's request and the 1995 level. The bill fully funds the TRIO program, which is designed to assist minority and disadvantaged students, at the President's request and the 1995 level.

Taken together, that adds up to over \$7 billion in student assistance. It is all grant assistance, not loans, that have to be repaid. We can stand today and say to our Democratic colleagues that in fact we have made a good faith effort here to increase access to a college education. We have provided again the largest maximum increase in Pell grants in history, and, frankly, the gentlewoman's amendment should be defeated in the face of this overwhelming evidence that no needy, qualified young person who is college bound is going to go without Federal assistance should they qualify.

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

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DEFAZIO].

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, the chairman of the full committee got before us and he gave us some mind-boggling numbers. Let us reduce it to something a little more understandable. There are a few people who did not make it into his scale. There are 2,600 young people in the State of Oregon getting State student grants this year who will not get those grants next year because we are zeroing out that program. That is 2,600 Oregonians.

That is mirrored time and time again around the country. State student incentive grants are gone. They are zeroed out. They can go over and apply for the increased Pell grants. We heard a lot about the increased Pell grants. It is partially true. They are increasing the amount of the grant, but there are an estimated 221,000 students who would be eligible under this year's income guidelines, middle-income kids, who will not be eligible under their new guidelines.

So yes, those lucky few who still get the grants will get a little bit more, but 221,000 middle-income American kids, scholastically qualified to go to college, will not get help with Pell grants next year because of changes they are making in the program. Seven hundred fifty-seven thousand Perkins loan kids are put at risk because of the changes we are making in the program.

I got student loans, many of you got student loans. Let us remember back to those distant days. There are others here who are much more wealthy, they never needed student loans. Try and have a little compassion. Try and understand the plight of the average American family. I know it is hard when you are at \$133,600 a year and you live in the cocoon of Washington, DC to understand average American families. But just try. They need this help so their kids can do a little better, like we did.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from New York is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, yes, in the words of the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM], there really is a difference in philosophy, and nothing has made it clearer than the debate we have seen over this amendment, and in fact through the entire bill. We have heard people say "Cut the bureaucrats."

Mr. Chairman, we are cutting kids; we are not cutting bureaucrats. These are loans to middle-income kids, families who are striving, who are working hard to find the American dream. We are not cutting bureaucrats. Let us tell it to Denise, let us tell it to Sebastian in my district, let us tell it to the million or more youngsters who are not getting a student loan as a result of our actions today. And the best is yet to come, because we have seen promises in the budget, in the reconciliation bill of the leadership, that would cut

even more deeply into student loan programs.

We are talking about the American dream. We are talking about investing in our youngsters. We are talking about giving youngsters the opportunity to get that education, to work hard, so they can be something.

Government should not be a handout, government should be a hand up. I cannot think of any program that fulfills that philosophy. Oh, yes, the distinguished chairman of the committee said that we have the gall, the audacity, to fight for these programs. Yes, we have the gall, yes, we have the audacity, to stand up for working families, to stand up for their children, to stand up for the future of our country.

Let us be sure that our student loan program is protected. Let us be sure that we continue to establish our priorities and invest in our young people and our future.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, in response to the comments by the gentleman from Oregon, I would just like the gentleman to know that not everyone on this side of the aisle is completely heartless and insensitive. I am currently supporting my 19, soon-to-be-20-year-old son, who is attending a vocational education program in the Washington metropolitan area, so I think I know a little bit about the kind of financial commitment it takes to help support a dependent child obtain a career education.

Second, Mr. Chairman, I simply would like to say that, again, in cutting the State student incentive grant program, in eliminating the capital contribution to the Perkins program, we have adopted proposals made by the President and his administration to terminate those two particular programs.

Overall, Mr. Chairman, in this bill, the funding in this bill, coupled with student loan entitlements, will make available to students \$35 billion in student financial assistance in 1996. We think that demonstrates strong support for student aid. I urge Members to oppose the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY].

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, pursuant to an agreement with the majority, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment, because there could not possibly be enough resources allocated in this bill to make up for the cuts.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, this bill contains legislative provisions concerning the new direct student loan program that would severely damage the Department of

Education's ability to manage that program effectively; and that constitutes blatant protection for special interests at the taxpayers' expense.

The bill cuts student loan administrative funds from \$550 million to \$320 million, and reserves half of that for the guarantee agencies. Since the guarantee agencies were projected to receive only \$156 million based on this year's ACA formula and next year's projected loan volume, they are guaranteed a \$4 million increase by this bill, and it could be more. Meanwhile, funds available for the Department are cut from \$394 to \$160 million. That's a cut of \$234 million, or 60 percent. The Department says it could easily live with a \$100 million cut, and perhaps it could absorb somewhat more. But a 60 percent cut is nothing more than a clear attempt to totally gut the administration of direct loans. This is a stealth attack on that program carried out in this appropriations bill where it does not belong, before the proper authorizing committee has considered the issue.

Now when we are cutting everything else, why on Earth are we guaranteeing an increase of at least \$4 million, and possibly much more, for these guarantee agencies? Is this the Guarantee Agency Protection Act? This is ridiculous.

Chairman PORTER argued in his "Dear Colleague" letter yesterday that guaranteed loans, with 69 percent of the total loan volume, would be managed with only half of the administrative funds, namely this \$160 million reserved for the guarantee agencies. I respect my colleague so highly that I know he has been terribly misled by someone, for he would never knowingly put out such total claptrap. Here is what guarantee agencies get in addition to the \$160 million in administrative cost allowance. They get a 1 percent fee from borrowers, totalling about \$170 million next year. By the way, that is not scored by CBO as a cost of guaranteed loans, even though the Federal Government gets to keep that amount on direct loans. They get the interest on their \$1.8 billion of taxpayer-provided reserve funds. At 6 percent, that would be about \$108 million. That's also not scored as a cost of guaranteed loans, even though the taxpayers could take back that entire \$1.8 billion under 100 percent direct lending. They get to keep 27 percent of whatever they collect on loans after they have gone into default. That's about \$300 million a year. By the way, it also gives them an incentive to allow loans to go into default. Finally, they make untold profits as secondary market players by arbitraging with tax free bonds at cost to the taxpayers of \$2.3 billion over 5 years, also not scored as a cost of guaranteed loans even though it would not happen with direct loans.

All told, the guarantee agencies support their 8,000 employees with revenues of about \$638 million plus their arbitraging profits. Actually, 5,000 em-

ployees are supported by the \$638 million, an average of \$127,600 per employee. But these agencies aren't the servicers of most guaranteed loans at all. The lenders do that using part of the interest paid by students. These agencies are nothing but middlemen who would be completely unnecessary under direct lending. Their entire \$638 million plus cost could be wiped out. So, the claim that \$160 million of their funds represents the total cost of administering guaranteed loans is an outrageous distortion.

Now let's look at the Department's funds. Of the \$394 million the Department was to get next year, it says \$200 million was for the guaranteed loan program—to administer the default payment system, the loan application and management system, and the collection system. By the way, the recent CBO scoring actually counted that money as a cost of direct loans rather than of guaranteed loans—an inexcusable plain error.

Now, if the department has only \$160 million to administer both guaranteed and direct loans, including the entire cost of direct loans—even the servicing—there's no way that can be done without gutting direct loans. That's the real purpose of these provisions, and we should not be fighting that battle on this bill.

The second purpose is to protect the guarantee agencies. If that's not obvious from the provision increasing their ACA to \$160 million, it's obvious from the provision preventing the Secretary from taking back any of their reserve funds. With direct lending growing, we will not need as many guarantee agencies. Why prevent us from taking back the reserves when any of them go out of business? This is blatant special interest protection, and we should be ashamed to be putting it in this bill.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New Jersey, [Mr. ANDREWS] and I were going to offer an amendment to eliminate these terrible provisions. Because he cannot be here today, and because we have not had enough time to educate the Members about these issues, I will not offer that amendment. But I do urge the committee to reconsider this issue, and change these provisions in conference.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time simply to try to tie up some loose ends on the last discussion. By all means, cut the deficit. By all means, for the 105th time we say: "We agree, cut duplicative programs and cut waste." But you cannot have it both ways. You cannot say to the American people, "Oh, we are going to have sweeping change throughout this country," and then say, "Oh, but, by the way, do not worry about it, folks; nobody will feel anything when we make these major cuts."

The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations says let

us quit taking money from the taxpayers. The fact is that the education programs we have been describing have been our Nation's effort to give money back to those working taxpayers. Evidently our friends on the majority side do not want to do that, at least not as much as we used to. Instead, they want to give billions of dollars back to the truly needy corporations of this world, everybody from AT&T, Texaco, International Minerals, Xerox, Union Camp, Panhandle, Grace, you name it. They want to give them back billions of dollars, because they want to eliminate the corporate minimum tax. Even though companies make billions of dollars in profits, they do not pay zip in taxes. So you put corporations ahead of students and working families. I do not think that makes much sense.

We are also told, "Oh, we are increasing opportunity." Very interesting. The last time I looked, the discretionary funds in this bill went from \$72 billion last year to \$62 billion this year. That is a \$10 billion reduction. In addition to that, in the reconciliation bill which you intend to do, it is to take away another \$10 billion in student aid and raise the cost to the average student getting help under these programs by 20 percent over their lifetime.

You say, "Oh, we didn't cut Pell." Thank God for small favors. But the fact is that the Pell program under this budget is still in real dollar terms \$300 below where it was in 1991.

The reason we are upset with these reductions in education is because this is what has happened in the budget since 1980. In 1980, what we spent on our budget on investment, and I mean investment in kids by way of education, investment in infrastructure by way of decent roads and bridges, investment in science so we could make the economy grow and create better opportunity for everybody, investment was 16 cents out of every budget dollar in 1980, before Ronald Reagan walked into the White House.

□ 1600

By 1992 it had been cut down to 9 percent. That is about a 40-percent reduction as the share of our national budget. That is a mistake. We are eating our own seed corn. When you deny student loans to kids, that is exactly what you are doing. It is penny-wise and pound-foolish, and it is cruel to boot. We urge Members to vote no on this bill.

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to engage in a colloquy with the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS].

Mr. Chairman, last year I introduced H.R. 1337, legislation which provided competitive grants for public secondary schools wishing to increase their academic year.

Mr. Chairman, on this floor we debate the question of funding in education. It is, of course, not only a question of funds. Our students can do no

more than we challenge them to do. America has the shortest school day and the shortest school year in the industrialized world. The language that was included in the elementary and secondary schools reauthorization bill provided for a Federal program to allow school districts to begin experimenting with a longer school year.

That legislation included an explicit authorization for \$90 million for fiscal year 1995 and such sums as may have been necessary in the ensuing 4 years to begin experimentation with a longer school year.

In title II of the bill we are currently debating, \$842 million is authorized for school improvement programs. While I regret the Committee on Appropriations was unable to specifically allocate money for this program, I would like to make it clear that this is not a reflection of a lack of support for the authorization that this Congress voted upon last year but, rather, a simple reflection of the reality of difficult fiscal constraints that the committee currently faces.

Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that efforts are under way in the other body to include a limited appropriation which would enable this program to commence. Should this occur, it is my hope that the House conferees, on a bipartisan basis, will consider the importance of extending the school year, as evidenced by last year's authorization, and carefully consider appropriating a limited amount of funds.

Mr. Chairman, in my own district in the community in which I live, in Englewood, NJ, we have begun exactly this program. We have found that during the summer months much of what students learned in the preceding year is lost. Indeed, studies have found that up to a third of the new school year is lost simply refreshing students about what they forgot from previous instruction.

I believe that experimentation to extend this year and, indeed, to lengthen the day would do a great deal as, unfortunately, our German and Japanese competitors have already found, to improve instruction.

I would like, Mr. Chairman, like to include in the RECORD the authorizing language from last year and a full statement of my own in support of a longer school year.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Longer School Day Program.

While we have spent a good deal of time over the past few years debating the quality of what we teach in the schools, we have paid little attention to the far simpler question of whether we are spending enough time teaching. I was pleased when Congress finally gave serious consideration to lengthening the school year in the United States so that our students can compete on equal footing with their counterparts in other countries.

In 1991, Congress authorized the National Education Commission on Time and Learning to conduct a comprehensive review of the relationship between time and learning in the Nation's schools. The report released last year

confirms that the United States will not maintain its economic superiority unless we provide our children with a competitive education by reforming the structure of or school year.

The report specifically cites that the current American educational system consists of 6 hour days where students spend less than half of their school day studying core academic subjects. It also notes that in order to graduate from high school, the United States currently requires a 180-day school year. In contrast, our counterparts in Germany have a 210-day schedule and Japan imposes a 240-day school year.

The International Educational Association conducted a study which compared the academic skills of the top 1 percent of all 12th graders. Those from the United States ranked dead last. Their study also found that among 15 developed and less developed countries, students from the United States scored at or near the bottom in the areas of Advanced Algebra, Functions/Calculus and Geometry.

These numbers show how woefully inadequate our school system is in preparing our children to compete in the global economy. American students quite simply are not learning what they should be. The Longer School Year program would establish a grant program for public secondary schools who increase the academic day to 7 hours and the school year to 200 days.

A longer school day and school year clearly makes sense in a society where in 90 percent of the two-parent families, both parents work. Keeping kids off the streets and in schools should be an especially welcome relief to parents who cannot afford after-school day care or summer camp. Schools also provide a safe haven for students who come from disintegrated families, are malnourished, or are susceptible to drug abuse and violence.

At a time when international tests are showing American students scoring well below students from other countries; a time when corporate leaders are beginning to complain about a lack of skilled workers; and a time when we are clearly falling behind our economic rivals in the world marketplace, we must question whether we are doing kids a favor by granting them a long summer vacation.

My program would establish competitive grants for public secondary schools wishing to increase their academic day to at least 7 hours and their school year to at least 200 days. We are unquestionably doing our children a disservice by not requiring more time in school. It is time for Congress to send out a positive message to our Nation's youth.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS].

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding and commend him for his efforts. I can personally say, as a former school board member in my home communities and two-term school board president, that two essential reforms, based on my experience, would be the gentleman's efforts to lengthen the school day and also efforts in local communities across the country to reduce class size. So I thank the gentleman for bringing this program to my attention and to the attention of the chairman, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER], and the other members of the subcommittee. Again, I commend the gentleman

for his longstanding commitment to this issue.

I can tell the gentleman that the committee's decision not to specifically allocate funds for this program is not an indication of a lack of support for its merits. Should the other body appropriate money for this program, the gentleman has my assurance and the assurance of Chairman PORTER and the other conferees that we will give the program every consideration that it deserves.

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his support, for his words and, of course, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER], my friend.

I believe that, if the other body were to decide to invest these sums, it would be an important statement to local communities. All of our States and communities differ. A longer school day or year might make sense in some States more than in others. But it is an experiment that is worth pursuing, as indeed this Congress voted on a bipartisan basis in the authorization bill.

I thank the gentleman again for his comments.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BARRETT], my good friend and colleague.

Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, I was tied up in some meetings today and was unable to be on the floor during debate on title II of H.R. 2127. I had hoped to be able to have a few minutes to discuss some concerns that I had about the funding provided in the bill for some of the various programs that address the health care delivery needs of rural America.

I would like to associate myself with some of the comments that were made earlier by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ROBERTS] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM] and some of my other rural colleagues.

I have a statement to submit for the RECORD expressing my particular concern about the funding which is eliminated for the Office of Rural Health Policy and a letter addressing the importance of that funding from Dr. Keith Mueller of the University of Nebraska Medical Center.

Mr. Chairman, I insert those materials in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to express to Chairman PORTER and the rest of the House my concern about one area of funding eliminated by this bill—that for the Federal Office of Rural Health Policy.

The Appropriations Committee stripped the Office of Rural Health Policy of \$9.4 million, essentially its entire budget. Supposedly, we are told, the office may continue to exist because the salaries for its staff are funded under another line item. But no one can tell me that an office without programs to administer is going to survive, and that means rural health care takes another shot in the back of the head.

The \$9.4 million for the ORHP is a mere drop in the bucket of this \$256 billion bill. That funding can easily be found, but those of us concerned about the ongoing struggle of rural health care are hampered in offering amendments to restore that funding—we run up against the hurdles of dealing with unauthorized programs on appropriations bills and into the brick wall of this very urban-dominated House.

Attempts to assure me that the functions of the ORHP are duplicative and its programs will be picked up elsewhere are, in reality, no assurance whatsoever. The office was established for the very reason that those other programs for years and years ignored and overlooked the needs of the rural health care.

Let me share with my colleagues comments from one of the leading experts of rural health care, Dr. Keith Mueller, who has been a constant and reliable source of information for this Congress in recent years because of the research programs he oversees at the University of Nebraska Medical Center, some of which admittedly, are a result of federal funding.

Dr. Mueller writes:

I sympathize with the imperative to eliminate unnecessary bureaucracies, but the ORHP does not fall into that classification. Contrary to the perception stated in [the report], the ORHP does much more than support state bureaucracies. Less than one full time equivalent position is devoted to the important task of assistance to state offices of rural health. The more important roles of ORHP are direct assistance to rural communities (telemedicine [for example]), developing a rural health agenda, maintaining resources for rural health analysis, monitoring regulatory activities to assess rural impact, and providing policy relevant research to a wide audience. The loss of these functions of the ORHP would be a tremendous loss to rural America.

At the proper time, Mr. Chairman, I will ask that Dr. Mueller's entire letter be included in the RECORD.

This money has a tangible and important impact on improving and maintaining access to health care for more than one-fourth of this country's population. That's a fair return on our tax dollars, and it should meet the test of programs worth retaining.

If today we can't get the amendment passed to restore ORHP funding, we will turn to the other body for help, and I want to urge Chairman PORTER to then look on this funding favorably in conference.

UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA,
MEDICAL CENTER,
Omaha, NE, July 25, 1995.

Hon. BILL BARRETT,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BARRETT: I am writing to ask you to consider supporting the Gunderson/Poshard amendment to restore funding for the Federal Office of Rural Health Policy. The programs of ORHP benefit rural America in many ways, including direct benefits to Nebraska.

I sympathize with the imperative to eliminate unnecessary bureaucracies, but the ORHP does not fall into that classification. Contrary to the perception stated in the Chairman's mark of the budget resolution in the House, the ORHP does much more than support state bureaucracies. Less than one full time equivalent position is devoted to the important task of assistance to state offices of rural health. The much more important roles of ORHP are direct assistance to

rural communities (telemedicine), developing a rural health agenda (National Advisory Committee), maintaining resources for rural health analysis (national clearinghouse), monitoring regulatory activities to assess rural impacts, and providing policy relevant research to a wide audience (rural health research centers). The loss of these functions of the ORHP would be a tremendous loss to rural America.

The ORHP has been responsible for a special grants program to assist rural health care providers and communities in developing telemedicine systems. The grants awarded thus far include one in Kearney, Nebraska. The grants make it possible for rural providers to initiate telemedicine systems now rather than wait for urban-based systems to possibly extend such services, and terms of use, later. The ORHP provides technical assistance to grantees, and has been instrumental in advancing our knowledge of how to use this technology effectively.

The National Advisory Committee on Rural Health, staffed by the ORHP, has produced annual reports that identify critical issues in rural health that are affected by federal policies. The most recent report focused on potential changes in Medicare policies, especially reimbursement for health providers. The Committee helps researchers and policy makers alike anticipate need for further analysis and policy development. Another valuable resource is the Rural Health Clearinghouse, which provides information to rural health providers, researchers, and community leaders in an on-line modality. The cornerstone of the ORHP programs, in my view, is the research center program. The ORHP provides modest support to develop and sustain rural health research centers. The ORHP also helps those centers develop research agendas and produce reports that are written for the policy maker audience. Those reports address pressing policy issues with research results that can help improve policy. A few examples are:

"The National Health Service Corps: Rural Physician Service and Retention," University of Washington, WAMI Rural Health Research Center

"The Feasibility of Health Care Cooperatives in Rural America: Learning from the Past to Prepare for the Future," University of North Carolina (UNC) Rural Health Research Program

"A Predictive Model for Retention of Rural Nurses," University of North Dakota Rural Health Research Center

"Access of Rural Medicaid Beneficiaries to Mental Health Services," Maine Rural Health Research Center

"Health Care Reform for Rural Medicaid: Finding Solutions with Limited Resources," New York Rural Health Research Center

"A DRG-Based Service Limitation System for Rural Primary Care Hospitals," Minnesota Rural Health Research Center.

The University of Nebraska Center for Rural Health Research received ORHP support for two years under this program, extended with special awards for two years to produce a series of *Policy Briefs* that critique health reform proposals from a rural perspective. We would compete for the next cycle of center support from ORHP if this program continues. The ORHP has supported, through the budget for the Maine Center, some of the work of the Rural Health Delivery Expert Panel of the Rural Policy Research Institute, on which I serve.

I cannot imagine how rural health would continue to have a voice within the Department of Health and Human Services without the ORHP. This Office is a true success story, developing programs that make important contributions directly to rural citizens and directly to you and others who

must make important policy decisions. Please support the Gunderson/Poshard amendment to restore funding. Even with rural programs, there are lower priorities than this Office. I would be pleased to comment further or answer any questions. Thank you.

Sincerely,

KEITH J. MUELLER,

Professor and Director, Nebraska Center for Rural Health Research.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say in response to the comments made by the distinguished ranking member earlier, I would just like to point out for the other Members that approximately 30 percent of the spending cuts that were made to the various programs under the jurisdiction of the Labor-HHS-Education Appropriations Subcommittee were made in fact in the context of the emergency supplemental appropriations and rescissions package. I think it is important to note that for the record since that legislation has now become law with the bipartisan support of both bodies, both Houses of the Congress and, of course, the President's cooperation and signature.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CUNNINGHAM

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CUNNINGHAM: Page 42, beginning on line 13, strike "That notwithstanding" and all that follows through the comma on line 20.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of August 2, 1995, the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] and a Member opposed will each be recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be recognized in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] will be recognized for 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that Members on the other side of the aisle do have some legitimate issues. One of the issues, in my opinion, is that while we attempt to move this money back to the States that I know an example in the State of California, the devastating defense cuts have cost us nearly a million jobs. We have little things called gnat catchers and spotted owls that have affected those positions. We have had natural disasters, and the people in the State of California, on a State level and a Federal level, are taxed at pretty much an extreme rate.

It is very difficult to pass a school bond to build a school or to provide for that instruction.

When we affect education, we also affect, because it is forward-funded, not

only the funds in the future but the funds that go down right now.

We have to provide a transition for those. This particular amendment helps that. It also sets the stage for a direction where we can reallocate and put a little different priority and put some of those dollars back into education. The amendment improves the Labor-HHS-Education appropriations bill that deletes legislation language in the bill that prohibits impact aid funding to schools for what they call military B kids.

Impact aid, for the Members, if you are a military recipient of funds and you register, say, in the State of Illinois and you move to the State of California, you still pay your State taxes. You shop at the commissary; you shop at the exchange. All those taxes go not to the State where your children go to school. You impact that school, but they do not get any money back for it. So what we are doing is shifting the money.

All this amendment does is, in the current language it restricts it only to impact aid. Impact aid students are those students that live on base with their parents. But the majority of Members, both Republicans and Democrats that represent districts, those military families live off base and do not qualify for that funding. This amendment eliminates that.

Second, it sets the stage. I have got two of my colleagues that, one is the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CHRISTENSEN], the other one is the gentleman from Texas [Mr. EDWARDS], from the other side of the aisle, who have been bulldogs on this issue. They have fought tooth, hook, and nail to preserve something that is very important, not just in their districts but around this country.

What it does, it is also going to allow us later on in an amendment to put over \$18 million in authority into BA. We are going to put \$15 million more back into Eisenhower grants for teacher training. We are asking our teachers to increase it. We are also going to put another \$100 million in BA into the vocational education programs.

This amendment does not affect it, but it is part of a series of amendments that we are going to offer to try and help the gentleman with some of his reservations and put the money back into education. Mr. CHRISTENSEN and Mr. EDWARDS have been tigers in this field. I want to commend Members from both sides of the aisle in helping us with this.

What it is going to do is allow us to take that impact of those students and put some of it back in.

I would also like to thank my colleague from California, Mr. RIGGS, who has also been fighting not only on impact aid but these other areas to fight for that.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS].

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to engage in a brief colloquy to clarify

one particular point with the gentleman regarding his amendment.

I would like to clarify that his amendment does not affect the hold harmless prohibition in the bill?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, this amendment has zero effect, no effect on hold harmless.

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

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I will not eat up the whole 10 minutes. I think this is an important piece of legislation. I think it is a piece of legislation that Members on both sides of the aisle will support or can support by taking some of those dollars and allowing the impact of military families on the school systems to help relieve those school systems and also help the teacher training and also come back and help the vocational education program.

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

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

Let me simply say that I do not want to make a Federal case out of this. Again, while I have misgivings about it, I will not push it to a roll call.

Let me simply explain to the Members of the House the situation we are in. It appears that at this point that what the gentleman is asking will in fact result in a negligible impact on a lot of districts. We are not quite certain, frankly, because we do not yet have an official computer run from the agency or CBO or anybody else.

The problem is that, at least I feel that there is a much bigger impact on the local school districts with A's than there is with B's, because you have a double loss of property tax base with the folks involved.

I also would point out that whether or not this turns out to be a reasonable balance depends upon a further contribution from the defense bill. And while I expect that that is going to occur, we do not have any official certainty that it is going to occur.

Mr. Chairman, I am minimally enthused about the gentleman's amendment, to put it politely, for the moment. But as I say, while I have misgivings about it, I am not going to push it to a vote. I understand the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] is going to accept it.

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

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the minority ranking member for yielding.

I would like, if I could, to have a discussion with the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM], who has worked very hard, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BATEMAN], the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CHRISTENSEN], and others of us, trying to find money for impact aid.

I do want to be clear. This amendment does not add a single dollar to the impact aid program that has not

already been appropriated in the defense appropriations bill or elsewhere. If that is correct, I must say I am personally disappointed, because at one point I thought there was an understanding that some of this money was going to be directed to impact aid. And if it has not, we keep going on promises made and yet no action seems to occur to find any new dollars for impact aid.

□ 1615

If I am wrong, I stand corrected, but to be clear, this amendment does not add any new appropriations to impact aid; is that correct?

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

Mr. EDWARDS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I fully understand the frustration of the gentleman from Texas. I also have gone through a lot of frustration on this particular issue.

The reason that I brought up the impact later on and what we are going to do is, first of all, this amendment does not add direct dollars, but it gives the flexibility to move. If the gentleman's particular district has impacted A's or B's, it gives it that flexibility, and all this initial stage is doing is trying to remove it.

The second aspect of it, the \$35 million from the defense authorization bill, I have been guaranteed, I would say to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], that this is going to happen and it is going to go into the general fund.

Mr. Chairman, I am also supporting an amendment of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. EDWARDS] later on, from other sources to impact, to put the \$23 million into that fund also. It is kind of a series of packages, but I also understand the gentleman's reservations.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I appreciate the good intentions and I hope something will come about, but as of now, this bill cuts impact aid to military children's education by over \$40 million.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds to say that the gentleman indicates that he is guaranteed that the \$35 million in the defense bill will materialize. That requires a little matter of having to pass the House, pass the Senate, go into conference; and frankly, at this point, I do not know if the defense bill is going to be finished before we leave here for the August recess.

The gentleman may have a greater comfort level in the security of that guarantee than I have.

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

Mr. Chairman, I recognize the problem. The way this House works sometimes boggles all of us. As far as the scoring, when they did away with the old system and they went to the A system only, the formula was a little different. We are going to make sure in

the future legislation that the formulas agree, so that we do have strong confidence that it is a positive impact.

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

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I apologize for not being able to be on the floor for the discussion. I strongly support the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I think that everyone should understand that I probably have more impacted schools and students than many in the House. I have a vital personal interest in the Impact Aid Program.

I believe that when we finish our work on this bill, we will have achieved 95 percent of last year's funding level for Impact Aid. I believe we will have protected severely impacted schools in an ironclad way, and I believe that the Senate mark on Impact Aid will be at about 98 percent of last year's level.

Mr. Chairman, we have a very good chance of ending up with very little reduction in the program at a time when cuts are being made in many other areas. I believe we have done the best possible job that we can do on this. I will certainly be putting it at a high priority in conference, Mr. Chairman, and I think everyone will be pretty well satisfied, when we get finished, that the job has been done properly.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, the reason for part of that is, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. EDWARDS], the gentleman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK], the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CHRISTENSEN], and the coalition that is supportive of this issue. I would like to personally thank them in public.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. EDWARDS].

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] for his comments and commitments to impact aid. I know he has a genuine interest in that effort and has worked tirelessly on behalf of the program.

Mr. Chairman, I do want to make the record clear to people throughout this country and to Members of Congress that, after speeches on the floor by the majority leader several months ago and several other Members of the majority party, this bill, as of today, cuts \$47 million out of education funds for the children of military families, children whose parents may be serving overseas, children who may not see their parents months on end.

Mr. Chairman, I hope to have the chance to continue to work with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] and the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM], but I do not mind saying I am disappointed that, as of today, this bill cuts \$47 million out of that terribly important education program.

Mr. Chairman, children whose parents have been willing to put on the uniform and fight for our country deserve the commitment of this Congress.

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

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY], the Speaker, and I have met and they have promised me their commitment to this. This whole package is part of those pledges that you talked about and that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] spoke of.

I do not think the gentleman from Illinois can do any more for us. I wish we could do more, and in the future, I promise to work with the gentleman to even make it "more better," as they say.

Mr. Chairman, I also understand the gentleman's concerns. The gentleman has my tireless pledge to make sure that that happens, and I have the pledge of the Speaker and the majority leader to help do that.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to title III?

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to engage the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER], my subcommittee chairman, in a brief colloquy with regard to continued funding for the National Education Goals Panel.

Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman from Illinois knows, we have received a very recent communication dated, actually, August 1, a letter from a bipartisan group of six State Governors, to the gentleman from Illinois and the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON].

Mr. Chairman, I briefly would like to read this letter for the record. It says:

Following the historic 1989 education summit in Charlottesville, Virginia, the Governors and President Bush agreed on education goals for the Nation and created the National Education Goals Panel as an accountability mechanism to monitor and report on the Nation's progress towards achieving the goals. We believe that the panel continues to play a significant role in assisting States as they work to improve educational performance for all students.

The Goals Panel members have recently initiated new efforts to collect and distribute information on the development of world class academic standards and assessment of student achievement at the State level. This kind of information will fill an essential need for State policymakers.

While we recognize the difficult decisions that you face, we strongly urge you to continue funding for the National Education Goals Panel in the appropriations process."

The letter is signed by Governors Bayh of Indiana; Hunt of North Carolina; Romer of Colorado; Engler of Michigan; Rowland of Connecticut; and Whitman of New Jersey.

Mr. Chairman, as you know, and as the concern of the Governors indicates, our bill presently eliminates funding

for the National Education Goals Panel. We have acknowledged the letter from the Governors today, and the important role, as they suggest, that the national Education Goals Panel plays in helping States develop and implement academic standards within their own States.

The Goals Panel is made up primarily of Governors and State legislators for the primary purpose of helping States determine how to best implement academic standards based on the needs of their students.

Mr. Chairman, I ask the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] whether he will be able to commit to restoring funds for the National Education Goals Panel in conference and work with me as, a fellow conferee, to get the Senate to restore these funds?

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would yield, I received a call from Gov. Tommy Thompson of Wisconsin, the State neighboring my State of Illinois, and had a discussion about the panel. I will do the best I possibly can to restore funds for the National Education Goals Panel in the conference.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. CASTLE], our friend and colleague and the former Governor of Delaware.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Chairman, I will be brief, but I could not support this colloquy more, and all Members should.

Mr. Chairman, this panel has ultimately set goals for America which are extraordinary. The Governors support it. It is across all of the States. Just because there has been some confusion about what is in the goals, it does not mean that the panel should not continue to exist.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the tremendous effort by the gentleman from California. I am sure that every single Governor in the country and every child in America does as well.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, we look forward to working with the governors and the National Education Goals Panel as we prepare our education reform block grant bill in the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities.

Mr. Chairman, I include the letter and newspaper editorial for the RECORD:

AUGUST 1, 1995.

Hon. BOB LIVINGSTON,
Chair, Committee on Appropriations,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN LIVINGSTON: Following the historic 1989 education summit in Charlottesville, the Governors and President

Bush agreed on education goals for the nation and created the National Education Goals Panel as an accountability mechanism to monitor and report on the nation's progress toward achieving the goals. We believe that the Panel continues to play a significant role in assisting states as they work to improve educational performance for all students.

The Goals Panel members have recently initiated new efforts to collect and distribute information on the development of world class academic standards and the assessment of student achievement at the state level. This kind of information will fill an essential need for state policymakers.

While we recognize the difficult decisions that you will face, we strongly urge you to continue funding for the National Education Goals Panel in the appropriations process.

Sincerely,

Gov. EVAN BAYH,
State of Indiana.
Gov. JAMES B. HUNT JR.,
State of North Carolina.
Gov. ROY ROMER,
State of Colorado.
Gov. JOHN ENGLER,
State of Michigan.
Gov. JOHN G. ROWLAND,
State of Connecticut.
Gov. CHRISTINE T.
WHITEMAN,
State of New Jersey.

JUST PLAIN DUMB

(By David S. Broder)

BURLINGTON, VT.—Louis V. Gerstner Jr., the chairman of IBM and the man who has engineered its recent turnaround, had a message for the nation's governors when he appeared before their annual summer meeting here this week. Warning that real reform requires resources, Gerstner said, "True change agents put their money where their mouth is."

That message has broad application, not only to the governors but to the self-styled revolutionaries in Washington, who often appear to be letting their budgetary goals predetermine the way they are reshaping programs and agencies.

But there is particular pertinence for one small program that has been a bipartisan project of the governors and now is threatened by small-minded economizers in Congress.

"A decade ago, farsighted governors of both parties including both Bill Clinton of Arkansas and his would-be 1985 Republican opponent, Lamar Alexander of Tennessee, launched a program to raise the achievement standards in American schools. Their "national goals" effort was embraced by President Bush in 1989 at his "education summit in Charlottesville, Va. Last year, it was written into "Goals 2000" legislation by Congress with strong support from President Clinton.

A small but critical piece of the law was the creation of the National Education Goals Panel to ride herd on the project.

Now the House Republicans have moved to kill the entire Goals 2000 program, including the \$2.7 million for the goals panel. Even before they heard Gerstner, the governors were saying that strangling this effort is dumb.

That is the view not just of long-time education advocates such as North Carolina's Jim Hunt and Colorado's Roy Romer, both Democrats, but of conservative reformers such as Wisconsin's Tommy Thompson and Michigan's John Engler, both Republicans.

Thompson told me that because so few of the governors who met with Bush in 1989 to launch this campaign are still around, and because few businessmen are as committed to the cause of Gerstner, "we need to jumpstart this effort again."

Thompson and Romer both acknowledge that whether they like it or not, the federal grants to states for Goals 2000 programs are likely victims of the budget-cutters. But the goals panel is, in Thompson's words, "the catalyst" and the forum that is needed to keep the effort going.

The governors' original notion was a simple one. In a competitive world, the quality of the education America's youngsters receive is the prime determinant of the nation's future well-being. So they set out goals for themselves. Among others, they said, by 2000, all children would start school ready to learn and at least 90 percent of them would finish high school. Every graduate would have demonstrated competence in nine basic subjects.

No one could argue with the goals. But by setting their deadline so far in the future, Gerstner said, the governors "left a little bit too much . . . cover" for themselves. And, he pointedly said, "Goals aren't worth a damn if you don't measure every day" how near or far the schools are from achieving them.

Last week, in a report that was as direct as Gerstner's speech, the American Federation of Teachers (AFT) documented how far we are from being able to measure that progress.

While every state but Iowa has begun to develop tougher academic standards for its students, only 13 states have standards that are "clear and specific enough" to guide curriculum development. While 33 states have or are developing student assessments geared to those standards, only seven states require high school seniors to meet the standards set for 10th-, 11th- or 12th-graders in order to graduate.

The public has become skeptical about education "reforms" that are designed to provide comfort for teachers or students, instead of ensuring that knowledge and skills are actually acquired. This effort falls into the latter category.

The AFT wants an end to platitudes, instead of saying that fifth-graders "should be able to use basic science concepts to help understand various kinds of scientific information," as one state does, the model should be another state's requirement that those 10-year-olds "should be able to describe the basic processes of photosynthesis and respiration and their importance to life."

That same kind of rigor is what the governors are seeking—and what the goals panel is all about.

Killing it would be one of the dam-best things Congress could do.

NOTICE

Incomplete record of House proceedings. Except for concluding business which follows, today's House proceedings will be continued in the next issue of the Record.