

Nebraska	184 million
Nevada	124 million
New Hampshire	137 million
New Jersey	837 million
New Mexico	250 million
New York	2.9 billion
North Carolina	651 million
North Dakota	116 million
Ohio	1.4 billion
Oklahoma	437 million
Oregon	385 million
Pennsylvania	1.7 billion
Rhode Island	174 million
South Carolina	503 million
South Dakota	121 million
Tennessee	607 million
Texas	2.5 billion
Utah	215 million
Vermont	108 million
Virginia	610 million
Washington	635 million
West Virginia	316 million
Wisconsin	581 million
Wyoming	88 million
Washington, DC	179 million
All Other	1.9 billion
Total	\$36 billion

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

SPEECH OF

HON. JERROLD NADLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1995

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the mean-spirited provision in this bill that would cut funding for senior meals programs.

For a very small Federal investment, senior means programs provide immeasurable nutritional and social benefits for seniors nationwide. For many seniors, federally funded nutritional programs are their only source of hot, nutritious meals. For others, a daily visit to the lunch program at the local senior center reduces the isolation often associated with our later years. These are benefits that cannot be measured.

I have, in my office, hundreds of truly heartfelt letters from seniors expressing how much these programs mean to them. One of my constituents writes:

I am unable to cook for myself being infirm. The Meals on Wheels is the only hot meal I eat daily. I am 91 years old. Before I retired at the age of 58, I worked as a flower maker. I went blind. I live on a fixed income and the healthy lunches provided help me get through the month. These meals make my life worth living. I could not manage without the Meals on Wheels program.

Such sentiments are echoed in the hundreds of letters I have received from seniors opposed to cuts in congregate and home-delivered senior meals programs. We cannot turn our backs on seniors who rely on these

programs. I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing these cuts.

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

SPEECH OF

HON. CARDISS COLLINS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1995

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

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise in defense of title IX and to oppose the language in H.R. 2127 that prevents the Department of Education from enforcing title IX's gender equity requirements for women in college athletics. To me, this language represents an attack on title IX and an effort to ensure that it is not enforced. We should strike this language from H.R. 2127 completely, as Representative PATSY MINK sought to do.

Members trying to undermine title IX will argue that it is an unfair quota system that hurts men's sports teams. This is simply not true, not even close. In fact, it is athletic directors and coaches who regularly establish quotas at colleges and universities. They decide, often arbitrarily, how many men and women get to play sports and how many men and women will receive athletic scholarships. Almost always, this means that women get sloppy seconds and women's sports teams get a small portion of the school's athletic and scholarship budgets.

Today, the number of girls and young women participating in sports is increasing in leaps and bounds. Vast numbers of girls and young women are now playing sports with the same enthusiasm that generations of boys and young men have shown. They play all kinds of sports, and they play them well. Whether title IX has been responsible for generating this enthusiasm, or instead, has been a force to make schools react this interest is irrelevant. What is relevant is that women want the same opportunities as men and title IX guarantees them that right. H.R. 2127's sneak attack on title IX is unfair and unjustified and should be defeated.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the work that Representative NANCY JOHNSON has done in trying to improve H.R. 2127's title IX language and Representative DENNIS HASTERT's good faith efforts to find compromise language. However, I am convinced that we should support title IX and I will continue to make sure that title IX is defended and upheld.

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH
AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDU-
CATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES
APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

SPEECH OF

HON. VIC FAZIO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1995

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

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, this is a terribly unjust piece of legislation that targets the most vulnerable members of our society. Many of the most onerous aspects of this bill—particularly cuts in programs that help working families—have been highlighted by my colleagues on the floor today.

Unfortunately for all of us, the Devil is also in the details.

The same Republican majority that promised to relieve us of burdensome Federal regulations is now advancing regulatory requirements that jeopardize academic freedom and freedom of expression.

Contained in this bill is a provision that would radically limit the constitutionally protected free speech of Federal grant recipients.

This "Orwellian" provision will have a chilling effect on political discourse, and prevent legitimate organizations—including universities and nonprofit groups—from participating in the democratic process.

Unless we reject this language and repudiate this bill, these organizations will be unable to express their views on those Federal issues in which they have a vested interest.

Instead, they would find themselves subject to substantial regulatory requirements and intrusive and burdensome restrictions—subject to the impossibly complex web of regulations necessary to enforce this provision.

These requirements range from the reasonable to the outright ludicrous. For example, grant recipients, not the Federal Government, would be required to shoulder the burden of proof regarding compliance with the limits imposed by this bill.

Innocent until proven guilty. Forget it. The bedrock principles of the Bill of Rights are thrown right out the window.

The personal disclosure requirements are particularly grievous. Employees will be so busy calculating time spent on political activities, providing the names and i.d. numbers of those involved, and listing the types of activities undertaken, and reporting all this to the Census Bureau, that they won't possibly find the time to do anything else.

Has the right of the individual to express his or her political beliefs and opinions become a danger rather than a privilege? Have we truly realized Orwell's dark, totalitarian vision? Do we have the courage to reject this disturbing, dangerous provision?

This restriction raises a host of other, nettlesome questions related to financial liability, and it does not adequately guard against the potential harassment and intimidation of legitimate organizations.

Let's go after the bad apples in the grant community, but reject the wholly invasive and suffocating approach presented in this bill. Let's demonstrate our good sense and reason and repeal this bold, beyond-the-pale attempt to micromanage the grant community and inhibit our basic civil rights.

Support the Skaggs amendment.

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

SPEECH OF

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1995

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

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, generation after generation of children have been told that a college education is the key to the American dream. Well, perhaps we were wrong, or perhaps it is that we did not realize that that advice is outdated. Just look at what the majority is doing to financial aid. Then, my colleagues you determine what is the best advice you have for America's over 6 million college students who must depend on financial aid to attend college.

The \$158 million cut in Perkins loans would eliminate support to approximately 150,000 needy college students. The elimination of funding for the State Student Incentive Grant Program, means that over 200,000 college students would be denied the financial assistance they need. And, if this injury is not enough, the Republicans are working to derail the direct student loan program.

I guess my colleagues would tell these students that the States will pitch in, well the students and the States are too smart to fall for that one. In fact, 18 percent of the States expect to have to eliminate their need-based student aid program, and 82 percent expect to be forced to reduce the number and amount of awards.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge my colleagues not to derail our young people's future, vote "no" against H.R. 2127.

INTRODUCTION OF THE SUB-
STANCE ABUSE AND MENTAL
HEALTH PERFORMANCE PART-
NERSHIP ACT OF 1995

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 4, 1995

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, today, my colleague Mr. WAXMAN and I are introducing, at the request of the administration, the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Performance Partnership Act of 1995.

The proposal involves a consolidation of categorical grants into two partnerships, one for mental health and one for substance abuse. The performance partnership grant establishes a new framework for cooperation between the Federal Government and the States. Instead of using an application process partnership grants would be based on a negotiated multi-year agreement between States and the secretary of HHS, which would define objectives and ways to achieve specific health outcomes.

This proposal offers an alternative that avoids both the downsides of pure block grants—which were well documented in a February 1985 GAO study—and those of categorical grants, including multiple grant applications, spending restrictions and set-asides, and overlapping data requirements and reports. Grants such as those proposed in this bill could streamline or eliminate such requirements. Under this approach, States would have increased flexibility to set priorities and objectives and determine the means to address them.

The administration is making a serious attempt to propose a system that avoids the pitfalls of pure block grants while reducing undesirable and burdensome aspects of some categorical grants. The proposal deserves consideration, as one approach to a decision about the best way to reauthorize certain important programs of the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration [SAMHSA].

OPPOSITION TO FDA COMMISSIONER DAVID KESSLER'S MOVE TO REGULATE TOBACCO PRODUCTS

HON. BART GORDON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 4, 1995

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my opposition to Food and Drug Administration [FDA] Commissioner David Kessler's unilateral move to regulate tobacco products. Thirteen Federal agencies already regulate the growth, manufacture, and use of tobacco.

The President has said he wants to address the underage use of tobacco. Everyone is in agreement with this goal. But the answer is not FDA regulation. Instead, the President should use the tools he already has at his disposal.

Congress has already spoken on the matter of youth access to tobacco products. The Alcohol, Drug, and Mental Health Administration Act of 1992 [ADAMHA], is the best mechanism to restrict minors' access to tobacco.

The President should direct HHS to release the final ADAMHA regulations and allow the program to work. The statute was signed into law by President Bush. Draft implementing regulations were not promulgated until August 1993. It is now August 4, 1995, and HHS has yet to release the final regulations. All 50 states have put laws on the books prohibiting the sale of tobacco products to minors and ADAMHA is the vehicle to enforce these laws and discourage youth smoking. Clearly the answer to is not FDA regulation.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage the President to take a very positive step toward restricting

youth access to tobacco by releasing the final ADAMHA regulations. Congress has spoken on this issue and now it is time to implement the Federal policy set out in ADAMHA.

COMMENDING SANFORD
RUBENSTEIN

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 4, 1995

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to rise for the purpose of commending Sanford A. Rubenstein for his work as a delegate to the 1995 White House Conference on Small Business. This conference provided the forum to formulate a small business policy agenda for the 21st century. The conference discussed the most critical issues facing small business, including the need for access to capital, regulatory reform, and pro-growth tax policies. The recommendations of this conference will form the basis for important new legislation which will be considered by the Congress and the President. My thanks to Sanford A. Rubenstein for his dedication and hard work in making the 1995 White House Conference on Small Business the best ever.

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

SPEECH OF

HON. BARBARA B. KENNELLY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1995

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

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Lowey amendment to restore needed funding to the Perkins Loan Program.

Supporters of this bill say that the extreme budget cuts it contains are necessary to ensure a bright future for our Nation's young people. I share the commitment to deficit reduction, but I have to wonder what kind of future our children will have if they can't afford a college education.

Student loans help prepare a new generation of scientists, teachers, doctors, entrepreneurs, and, yes, elected leaders. Many of us in this body would not be here were it not for the college education we received through student loans.

Student loans give young men and women born into poverty the means to become productive members of society. Too many lower-income families strive to send their children to college but are forced to choose between paying tuition and paying for basic necessities.

We've heard so much rhetoric in this body about personal responsibility—about making people pull themselves up by their bootstraps.