

relief package. We also have already passed 10 of our 13 appropriations bills, with only 3 remaining, this bill, the Labor-HHS appropriations bill, Interior, and the District of Columbia. We would like to finish, in fact, we plan to finish, all three of those bills by the end of next week. Then we will begin to take up conference reports and other bills that are necessary before we end the session for this year. It did take cooperation from all Senators and it took cooperation of the leadership on both sides of the aisle. I hope we can continue that and do the people's business in a way that produces results that will help the quality of life of all Americans.

Mr. President, I yield the floor. I see Senator HARKIN is here. Therefore, the managers of the bill are now ready. I yield the floor.

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR,
HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES,
AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED
AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS
ACT, 1998

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALLARD). The Senate will now proceed to the consideration of S. 1061, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1061) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, we are prepared now to proceed with consideration of the legislation on appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education.

I have just conferred with my distinguished colleague, Senator HARKIN, the ranking Democrat, after having conferred with the majority leader, and it is our plan to complete action on this bill by tomorrow evening, Wednesday evening. That is not to say that the plan will conclusively be fulfilled as of that time, but it is our plan to proceed in that manner.

It would be our hope that we would have a firm idea of all the amendments which would be offered by the end of business today or if not, no later than noon tomorrow, since we are scheduled to have a vote tomorrow morning at 9:30, and as is the custom, Senators will be arriving today. Some are obviously present now, but as our practice has demonstrated in the past, when the rollcall vote is taken, Senators will be present.

We have had some substantial period of time—obviously, slightly more than a month—to prepare for this bill, because the majority leader announced at the conclusion of our session on July 31–August 1, that this would be the first order of business taken up.

I recall the comment of then majority leader Howard Baker on some legis-

lation back in 1982, when we had a tax bill on the floor of the Senate and the question was whether we were going to proceed all night, which Senator Baker was wont to do, or whether we would go into the next morning. I recall Senator Baker said that amendments, like mushrooms, grew overnight, and it was his determination to proceed that evening. I remember there were about 70 amendments pending. Senator Dole was the manager of the bill. It was a tax bill. We proceeded all night and finished action about 6:30 in the morning.

Well, there has been more time than overnight for these amendments, like mushrooms, to grow, but we have a bill here which is very important.

There is a lot of business in the Senate, and speaking from a personal note, we will be moving ahead with hearings on the Governmental Affairs Committee on campaign finance reform, and I serve on that committee. I hope to be finished with this bill by tomorrow night, whatever time it takes to proceed with the other work of the Governmental Affairs Committee.

Mr. HARKIN. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPECTER. My colleague asks me to yield for unanimous consent. I am willing to do that.

Mr. HARKIN. I thank the chairman.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Ellen Murray, Peter Reinecke, and Bev Schroeder be permitted privileges of the floor for the duration of the debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, moving now to consideration of the pending bill, the pending committee report, we have legislation before the Senate for the three departments, the Department of Labor, the Department of Health and Human Services, and the Department of Education for fiscal year 1998, which totals \$79.7 billion in discretionary budget authority. That is a large sum of money. Mandatory spending under this totals \$189.3 billion, which is a decrease of \$15.2 billion from the fiscal year 1997 levels.

We have gone through the budget with great care. We have been fortunate enough to have outstanding staffs, both on the Republican side of the aisle and the Democratic side of the aisle, and we have come forward with these proposals here today. It is my view, Mr. President, that when we have a total Federal budget of \$1.7 trillion, that should provide for the needs of the American people through the Federal Governmental operations, if we assess our priorities in a proper way. We have just seen landmark legislation with the balanced budget legislation, and the tax reduction legislation passed by the Congress before we adjourned on August 1, and signed by the President into law on August 5. It is very important that we do reach that balanced budget. We should not, as a nation, spend beyond our means. I believe it is possible to achieve that goal if we work with a

scalpel and not a meat ax and take care of the important needs for all of America.

We deal here with the subjects of health and education and there are no priorities higher than those two items. The people of America, the people of the United States, should be healthy and there should be educational opportunities so people should have an opportunity to climb the ladder in America.

When I talk of education, I talk from a very keen sense personally of education as an opportunity which I have seen. Both of my parents were immigrants. My father literally walked across Europe from Russia, barely a ruble in his pocket, at the age of 18 in 1911 to make a new life for himself and the family which he hoped to have and did have. My mother, coming with her parents to the United States from a small town on the Russian-Polish border at the age of 5, education was heavily emphasized in the Specter household because our parents had so little of it. My brother, my two sisters, and I have been able to share in the American dream because of that educational opportunity.

As Senator HARKIN and I and our staffs have crafted this legislation, we have done our utmost to provide for that educational opportunity. We have provided for increases in the maximum Pell grant to \$3,000 per year. We have provided for guaranteed student loans. It would be preferable if we could provide scholarships for all young people, and older people who want additional education, but that is not possible in a practical sense, so we have a revolving sum where at least the education can be obtained, even if there are obligations that would have to be paid at a later time.

We have come to this budget with very deep concerns over the issue of health. Regrettably, when the budget resolution was presented to us, there was a cut of some \$100 million on discretionary health spending which required a considerable reallocation of priorities, which Senator HARKIN and I and our subcommittee and then the full committee and our staffs have undertaken. That was especially problematic when it came to the issue of the National Institutes of Health where it was our desire to continue to increase the funding on medical research which has been so marvelous for America and our advances benefiting the entire world.

Early in the 105th session, we passed a sense-of-the-Senate resolution, or a sense-of-the-Senate resolution was introduced and, I believe, passed—we will check the RECORD on that to be sure—to double NIH funding over 5 years. If it wasn't passed, the sense-of-the-Senate resolutions pass pretty easily around here because they talk about our druthers as opposed to our dollars. Then, when we took up the budget resolution, and a sense-of-the-Senate resolution passed to increase NIH funding

by some \$2 billion. Then Senator HARKIN and I offered an amendment to increase it—not a sense-of-the-Senate resolution, but hard dollars of \$1.1 billion. That would have left us with a net of about \$950 million to achieve the 7.5-percent increase Senator HARKIN and I committed to early in the session for the NIH.

When we brought that amendment to the floor, it was roundly defeated 63-37, which was somewhat disappointing. But it was an illustration of what happens in the Senate when you have a sense of the Senate, which is an expression of what you would like to see, or druthers, as opposed to a hard amendment which puts up money. And when we balance the budget, if we put up 7.5 percent, which is \$952 million, we have to have someplace to take it from. When that choice is made, it isn't too easy to get the votes. That amendment went down to defeat, as I said, 63-37. But then we went back to the drawing boards with our sharp pencils—mainly staff's sharp pencils—and figured out a way on the allocation of priorities to find that 7.5 percent, or \$952 million, and we did find it. It was not easy to do, but we thought that that was what ought to be done.

In the United States, it is my view that we have the best health care system in the world, but it continues to need improvement. I personally was the beneficiary of that health care system about 4 years ago when an MRI detected a life-threatening problem that I had, and I was able to get my medical situation corrected. There is nothing like having a problem and using the MRI personally to do a little research to find out about its development. I was surprised to find that it had only been developed in 1984, less than a decade before I found the need to use it.

Within the course of the past week, I had occasion to return to my home State of Kansas for my 50th high school reunion. I probably should not have given the date. I may get leave to amend and revise the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on that. Just kidding. It was my 50th high school reunion. My Aunt Rose Isemberg, in Wichita, who is 85, was the beneficiary of a serious operation and is well on her way to recovery. I focused on that factor and mentioned to my Aunt Rose that in some countries you can't get an operation when you are that old. In some countries you can't get one if you are past 60. So we have a marvelous health system in the United States, but, again, one which needs improvement.

When I returned to my hometown of Russell, KS, to my high school reunion, I was reminiscing with my sister-in-law, Joyce Specter, about the medical care in Russell, KS. My brother had some serious ailments several years ago, and I was with him. Unfortunately, he passed away. Back then, I wanted to talk to Dr. Merkel, and it was 6:45 on a Saturday night. I asked for his home number and I was told, "You can't call Dr. Merkel at home at

6:45 on a Saturday. You will find him in the office."

Notwithstanding our graduations of doctors and medical experts, rural America still doesn't have as much by way of health care providers as rural America needs. So we do have significant improvements to be made in our health system in America. This is something which we have focused on as we have moved ahead in this bill and our efforts to provide health care coverage for all Americans.

Again, on a personal note, I was fascinated to hear of the health coverage offered by Israel, without regard for preexisting conditions or without regard for age—a factor called to my attention by my sister, Hilda Morgenstern, and my brother-in-law, Arthur Morgenstern, who have dual citizenship in the United States and in Israel. There are examples around the world as we try to extend health coverage and services to the 37 to 41 million Americans who are not now covered. It is appropriate to note that in the reconciliation bill we passed, the Balanced Budget Act, we have taken action to provide some \$24 billion to cover America's uninsured children, numbering about 10 million. There is a question, as we work through the program, as to how many of those children we will be able to cover.

Mr. President, during the course of our deliberations, Senator HARKIN and I received requests from Members, totaling more than 700 such requests, for expanded funding for programs within the subcommittee's jurisdiction, and, to the maximum extent possible, we tried to honor those requests. We had very substantial support for increasing the funding for the National Institutes of Health and, as noted, we have done that with an increase of 7.5 percent, some \$952 million. So that now we have nearly \$13.7 billion for the National Institutes of Health, and their achievements have been near miraculous as they have moved ahead with research on breast cancer, ovarian cancer—very serious ailments for women—and prostate cancer for men, Alzheimer's disease—very substantial advances in research there—mental health research, research on heart conditions, and virtually every known ailment that has come within the scope of the National Institutes of Health.

One of the really educational experiences that I personally have had on the job as chairman of the subcommittee is we have received so many requests from so many people around the United States who have ailments that I had never heard about. I do believe that we have a budget which can accommodate research along those lines. If this recommendation is insufficient, I believe the Congress of the United States is prepared, on a priority basis, to allocate whatever it takes on medical research in the United States to do the job. Even with that kind of a funding, there are many applications which are not granted. We have moved ahead

very substantially in the time that I have been in the Senate, whether the chairman was Senator Weicker, later Governor Weicker, or Senator Chiles, later Governor Chiles, or whether Senator HARKIN was chairman, or during my chairmanship.

The committee has placed a very high priority on women's health. The bill provides for increased funding. There will be funding for expanded programs to develop mental health care services for women, to provide moneys for a comprehensive review of the impact of heart disease on women, where in the past less attention was paid to that important item. Women do have different problems, very different from men, when it comes to heart ailments. For so many years, the research had been on men alone. The additional funding will help launch an osteoporosis public education program aimed at teenagers.

In our legislation, we have provided funding for both family planning and for abstinence programs. One of the most controversial issues facing America is the controversy of pro-choice/pro-life. But there is one item that can be generally agreed upon, and that is if we can cut down on premarital sex among teenagers and unintended pregnancies, and the abortions which follow, that is an objective where there is general agreement, and we have produced additional funding here for those programs devoted to abstinence.

One of the items on which we continue to increase funding is our program on Healthy Start. That is an initiative to try to give prenatal care to women and avoid having low-birth-weight babies. I saw my first 1-pound baby at Alma Illery Medical Facility in Pittsburgh more than a decade ago, and I was shocked to see a child no bigger than my hand, which weighed less than a pound. When you have a child with that low birthweight, there are medical problems that last a lifetime and enormous costs to society. Those children frequently cost as much as \$300,000 by the time they are out of the hospital in a few weeks or a few months. Thousands are born each year. It is a multibillion-dollar expense. The program of prenatal care has had great results and is one which we are pushing ahead in the legislation pending.

The issue of AIDS continues to be a matter of overwhelming importance in the United States. Today's front page of the Washington Post is devoted significantly to it. Our bill contains some \$3.265 billion for research, education, prevention, and services, including an \$81 million increase for the Ryan White CARE Program, named after the young man who developed AIDS on a blood transfusion—nothing at fault even remotely there. This issue continues to be of enormous importance in the United States.

Our legislation provides further assistance in funding for substance abuse, both alcohol and drugs, a major problem in our country.

We have taken the initiative with some \$50 million for new programs to assist communities in preventing juvenile crime. That is an issue of great concern in the United States and one which falls partially within the jurisdiction of our subcommittee. It is not inappropriate to note at this time that pending before the Judiciary Committee is extensive legislation on juvenile crime. It is my hope that we will craft a bill, when the issue comes to the floor of the U.S. Senate, which will take into account not only tough measures to try juveniles as adults, where they are, in fact, adults by size or inclination and prior record, but also to work on the literacy training and job training.

Based on the experience I have had on the Judiciary Committee, and before that as district attorney of Philadelphia, it is my view that we can control violent crime in America if we approach it at two levels. One, where we have career criminals, to have life sentences. The armed career criminal bill that I offered, which passed back in 1984, has made a significant effort in that regard. Where you have a career criminal with three or more violent offenses, now, by Federal law, there is a mandatory sentence in the Federal courts of 15 years to life. We have been putting more people in jail, and there has been a decrease in the crime rate. In my judgment, that is attributable to the factor that there are more violent criminals now in prison. The other half of the equation, though, is to provide realistic rehabilitation for those who are not career criminals, where they are going to be released. It is no surprise that if you have a functional illiterate without a trade or skill, a person who goes back onto the street without training, without a job, that person is likely to go through the revolving door and become a recidivist.

That is why one of the first bills I introduced when I came to the Senate, alongside the armed career criminal bill, was legislation for realistic rehabilitation, for job training and literacy training. As we craft that juvenile crime bill, it is my hope that we will have an appropriate balance on the juveniles, on literacy training and job training, because we know that 1 day they are going to be released from jail. A societal option is either to have them as law-abiding citizens, working their way and contributing to society, or becoming criminals. So it is in the interest of law-abiding citizens, as well as the individuals themselves, that appropriate attention be given to literacy training and job training.

Also included in this bill is our allocation of funding for Head Start. Some \$4.3 billion is included here, which is an increase of some \$324 million. We increase the number of children by 36,000, to a total of 836,000, on our planned route to having 1 million covered by Head Start by the year 2002.

Also in our budget is funding to protect women against violence when we

talk about the categories of battered women's shelters, rape prevention, runaway youth prevention, domestic violence community demonstrations, and the domestic violence hotline.

Another important item—controversial, as many are in this bill—is our program on low-income heat and energy fuel assistance. We have maintained funding of some \$1 billion for this winter, and advanced funding of \$1.2 billion for next year's winter program. This is a program which is controversial because in some States the needs are not as great as they are in other States. But what we have essentially for many Americans, especially elderly Americans, is a choice on either heating or eating. With many elderly in the program with annual incomes of \$8,000 or less, they are totally unable to cope without some assistance on fuel costs.

We also have within this bill important programs for the elderly, including community service employment programs, part-time employment opportunities for low-income elderly, home delivered nutrition services, and the National Senior Volunteer Corps.

We have as well school-to-work where there is a transition moving from school to work, coordinated also with the job training programs and Job Corps which provide educational opportunities and vocational training for those young people in our society who may not prefer that to the college education and may be more appropriately directed in that line.

On education, Mr. President, we have moved ahead with an increase of some \$3.1 billion in our discretionary education funds.

I especially commend my distinguished colleague, Senator HARKIN, for his leadership in this very, very important line.

We have had difficulties in bringing this particular bill to the floor in the past. It was not until April 1996 when we were able to—after an amendment offered by Senator HARKIN and myself to increase funding for this subcommittee by \$2.6 billion—move ahead.

I commend the President for his initiatives and priority setting on education, which is, as I noted earlier, a priority second to none for the United States.

In this line, we have special education programs funded at some \$921 million. And I commend the chairman of the Educational Opportunities Committee in the House, my colleague, Bill Goodling from Pennsylvania, and also our colleague, JUDD GREGG of New Hampshire, for their leadership in this item where we are trying to maintain the Federal commitment to special education. We are coming very close to the high marks set in S. 1. Again, it is a matter of establishing priorities, which we have done here.

On our student aid programs, the bill provides some \$8.5 billion, which is an increase of almost \$1 billion—\$997.3

million over last year's appropriations. The Pell grant is going up by some \$300 to a maximum grant of \$3,000. The Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grants Program is increased by some \$51 million.

I go into some detail for at least two reasons, Mr. President. These are important programs, and we are not taking up anybody's time, Senator HARKIN and I being the only two Senators on the floor. I will yield in a few minutes for Senator HARKIN's opening comments.

On job training, we have provided \$5.2 billion for the job training programs, which is more than \$500 million over the 1997 level. That includes increases for Job Corps, adult training, and training for dislocated workers, which is a very, very important problem for Americans, especially in my home State of Pennsylvania where we have seen the demise of the steel industry and the coal industry and the glass industry.

So many of the problems of the dislocated workers are caused by imports which are coming into the United States, which really ought not to be coming into the United States, where we are dealing with concerns on defense policy or on foreign policy. And so many American workers are taking it on the chin. The least we can do is to have retraining for the dislocated workers.

Our bill provides very important funding for worker safety programs in the Department of Labor where we are now providing almost \$1 billion—just \$1 million short; \$999 million—for worker safety programs. This is an increase of some \$37 million above 1997's level for worker safety activities.

Mr. President, I have gone over, believe it or not, just a few of the highlights of this bill, which totals almost \$80 billion. We have in excess of \$11 billion for the Department of Labor, almost \$32 billion for the Department of Health and Human Services, and almost \$30 billion on the Department of Education, coming to a total of almost \$80 billion in discretionary funding.

To repeat, Mr. President, on the schedule, which the majority leader and Senator HARKIN and I have discussed earlier, it would be our plan—our optimistic plan, but our plan nonetheless—to conclude action on this bill by tomorrow night. We would like to have all amendments filed by the close of business today and, in any event, no later than noon tomorrow. All the Senators will be here, as we have every expectation for the vote scheduled at 9:30 tomorrow so that we can make our plans and scheduling for any amendments which may be filed.

At this time, I am pleased to yield to my distinguished colleague, Senator HARKIN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I thank my chairman for his leadership on this plan and for outlining in great detail the various aspects of the bill that he

just covered, in our efforts to craft a truly bipartisan bill to bring to the floor of the Senate.

Mr. President, S. 1061, the Labor, Health and Human Services, Education and related agencies for fiscal year 1998, is now before us.

Again, I want to start by commending our chairman for his skill and his craftsmanship in putting this bill together.

Senator SPECTER has ably balanced the many, often competing requests we have received—as he mentioned, over 700 different types of requests from Senators. It is always a very tough job, and I appreciate how closely he has worked with me and my staff in crafting a truly bipartisan plan.

For example, the bill's broad support was reflected in its unanimous approval by the full Appropriations Committee.

I am especially pleased that the bill provides significant increases in funding for key education programs.

Senator SPECTER quite ably went over those. I will not repeat those again. I will just mention what Senator SPECTER had said in terms of the bill grants—the increase in the stipend from \$2,700 to \$3,000. This will help over 3.6 million low- and moderate-income students in colleges and institutions of higher learning this next year. This is the highest level of Pell grant support.

The bill exceeds the support for education recommended by the bipartisan budget agreement by \$164 million. It includes significant increases for special education and education technology and, in particular, funds to support teacher training. Computers in the classroom are of no value if teachers don't know how to use them effectively.

The mark in the bill puts special emphasis on early intervention. The cornerstone, as we know, for educational success are the first years of a child's life. Recent research on the brain provides irrefutable proof about the dramatic development in children before the age of 3. So we must intensify our efforts to make sure that all children enter school ready to learn. We have begun to lay the foundation in this bill by increasing Head Start funding by \$324 million, and we have doubled the set-aside for early Head Start which serves children up to the age of 3.

This bill also provides an 11-percent increase in funding to \$350 million for the early intervention program for infants and toddlers with disabilities served by part H of the Individuals With Disabilities Education Act.

Again, Mr. President, as we know, it is vital for children without disabilities to have early educational services. We know that it is doubly vital for kids, infants, and toddlers with disabilities to have those early intervention programs before the age of 3.

I am also very pleased that we are able to make a start—not a big one, but at least a start—on the Education Grant Infrastructure Program. I think

we can all agree that the infrastructure needs of our school systems are truly staggering. Most estimates of nationwide school repair and construction costs exceed \$100 billion. Again, clearly, school construction and repair will and should remain primarily a State and local responsibility. Nevertheless, I think there is a limited Federal role here, and it is one would that is connected to the longstanding Federal support for the education of disadvantaged children through the title I program.

I am often asked the question, Mr. President, "Where is it indicated in the Constitution of the United States that education funding must come out of property taxes?" I have here a little pocket copy of the Constitution that I try to carry with me at all times. I find it a very good reference. A lot of times I hold it up, and ask people, "Where? Show me where in the Constitution of the United States, as amended, that it says that education in America is to be funded on the basis of property taxes."

You can read every word in the Constitution of the United States and the Bill of Rights, all the amendments thereto, and you will not find one thing in the Constitution that says how education is to be funded. It doesn't say we have to pay for it through property taxes. But that is sort of the system that evolved in our country over the years. So what we have are these anomalies.

I happen to maintain a residence, as many of my colleagues do, in suburban Virginia, in Fairfax County. To be sure, both of my daughters have gone to public schools in Fairfax County, and I can tell you the schools here are wonderful. They are great schools. That is 12 miles from where we are standing right now.

Five blocks from here, in the District of Columbia, are some of the worst schools in our country. Why is it? Why the difference in 12 miles? Well, it is because in Fairfax County, you have a lot of high-income people who pay a lot of property taxes. And they have great schools. Yet, five blocks from the Capitol, you have very low income with very low property taxes, and no ability to fix up and repair their schools. This is true all over our country.

I refer those who are interested to a book, of course, written by a good friend of mine, Jonathan Kozol, called "Savage Inequalities." It is not a new book. It is at least 10 years old, I guess, by now. That problem is very clearly across America—what it means to be a child lucky enough to be born to moderate to well-to-do parents who live in an area where there are high property taxes and high property values. The schools are good. If you live in an inner city, or sometimes in Appalachia, or rural areas of America where you have low property taxes, you have bad schools.

So homeowners who are living in poor school districts have to carry a much heavier tax burden to raise

school construction funds. Where they have the worst schools, they need the most repairs. Yet, they have the least ability to do so because they have a low tax base.

Homeowners who live in affluent districts, however, have it much easier. So the homeowners who live in the poor areas have a much harder burden to carry in repairing and constructing new schools. And so I have long felt it is, indeed, at least part of the responsibility of the Federal Government to equalize this, to equalize it somewhat.

Now, in States we have acquisition formulas. In my State of Iowa, for example, yes, property taxes are local, but the State recognizes, as many other States have done, that it provides for a lot of inequalities. So the State has stepped in with equalization formulas to try to equalize funding for schools at least in regard to construction and repair for those who are in poor areas and those who are in rich areas, more affluent areas. But, again, we have anomalies existing throughout the country, and so I think the Federal Government could emulate a little bit of what the States have done and have some kind of equalization where we will provide funds for repair and construction of school facilities to those areas with the greatest needs and the fewest local resources.

Now, again, I would not want this money to replace money that is already being provided by the States. We do not want to do that. We do not want to provide money to a low-income school district and the State will say, well, good, we are getting all those Federal dollars; now we don't have to do anything.

Therefore, there must be an effort at equity by the States to continue to have their equalization programs. And I would envision that the rules developed by the Department would take that into account in providing this money that we have for school construction and repair.

A major concern I have about the bill is our inability to more adequately address our health services and training needs while at the same time simultaneously providing generous increases for health research.

Now, again, I will not go into it at length here. I have talked about it many times in the Chamber, and I will talk about it and keep talking about it until we do something about it. And that is the need to provide more money for biomedical research.

As my friend, the chairman, said earlier, a few months ago the Senate went on record 99 to 0 to double NIH funding over the next 5 years. A few weeks after that, Senator SPECTER and I offered an amendment, very modest, to provide about a \$1.1 billion increase out of our pot for increased funding for NIH. And as Senator SPECTER pointed out, that went down almost 2 to 1. We got 37 votes for it.

So it was sort of the will of the Senate. It is our will to provide a doubling

of funding for NIH over 5 years, but there is no money there to back it up.

Now, there are some who say, well, we can take it out of our bill. If we did so, Mr. President, under the constraints of the Balanced Budget Act that we have adopted here, under the constraints of that balanced budget agreement, if we doubled funding for NIH out of the pot of money that we have, there would not be one single penny left for any other discretionary health program.

What does that mean? There would be no Centers for Disease Control. We would have no money for that. We would have no community health centers in any States, no substance abuse programs, no family planning money, no mental health program money from the Federal Government. All of that would be wiped out. And we still would not have enough money to double NIH funding over 5 years. So here we have it, on the one hand, 99 Senators saying we want to double NIH funding, biomedical research funding over 5 years, but we don't have the money to do it—not within our bill we don't, unless those 99 Senators, or at least 51 of those Senators want to cut all of the funding for the Centers for Disease Control and wipe it out, cut out all Ryan White funding, cut out every one of our community health centers in America, and on and on and on. If we do that, we get close. We do not get the double, but we get close.

Obviously, there are not going to be 51 Senators who will vote to cut out the community health centers in America or the Centers for Disease Control. That would be ridiculous. As I have said many times, we have to go outside the discretionary fund that we have for the National Institutes of Health. We have to provide a different source of funding—outside of our appropriations process.

What I have advocated, along with our former colleague, Senator Mark Hatfield—we advocated it at least since 1991, 1992—is setting up a medical research trust fund that would be funded out of the premiums that we pay in for our health insurance coverage.

Again, Mr. President, you and I and all the rest of us here and Americans throughout the country who have insurance programs, we pay in every year and our employer pays in, matches it. It varies how much is matched, but we pay in, both employers and employees pay in for health insurance to the tune of about \$700-some billion a year.

I always ask audiences when I talk about this, do you know how much of that money goes for health research, to find the causes and cures for things like diabetes and Alzheimer's and cancer and AIDS and Parkinson's disease and mental health? How much of that money that you put into your premiums goes to pay for medical research?

The answer is zero. Not one single penny. No corporation in America would try to continue to move along

without putting some money into research. And yet we sort of stagger along in this country every year putting more and more money into health insurance programs to pay for taking care of people with Alzheimer's or with cancer or with Parkinson's disease or with diabetes, et cetera, et cetera. We pay all that money in to take care of those illnesses once they occur, but not one penny is used to find the causes and cures.

It does not seem to make sense. So what Senator Hatfield and I advocated for several years was that just one penny, just one penny out of every dollar that we put into our health insurance programs go to a trust fund.

Think of it like this. We have a highway trust fund. Every time you buy a gallon of gas, some of that money goes into the highway trust fund. It cannot be used for anything else. It must be used for transportation purposes. We have an airport and airways trust fund. When I buy an airplane ticket, some of that goes into the airports and airways trust fund. So it is not new. Well, we have a Social Security trust fund, obviously, but we have a lot of different trust funds to meet what we have determined to be national priorities that otherwise could not get sufficient funding through the appropriations process. And the American people by and large have supported us. Most everyone I know supports the highway trust fund and airways trust fund.

What they do not support is us using the money for something else. But they support us using that trust fund money for highways and for bridges and for airports and for airways because that is what the money was put in there for. And so we have proposed that we set up that trust fund. That one penny a year would provide us a little over a 50-percent increase in funding for NIH. That would get us a long way toward doubling that funding in 5 years.

Now, Senator Hatfield is no longer in the Senate, but my cosponsor on the bill is now my colleague and our esteemed chairman, Senator SPECTER. We are both pushing very hard again to find another source of funding for biomedical research, and I believe the trust fund concept is the way to go. We have hundreds and hundreds of different entities throughout America supporting that concept.

We had a vote in the Senate a few weeks ago on this concept of having this trust fund. I believe we got—we got over 51 votes, I know that, for it, but we needed 60 votes because of a point of order. So over 50 Senators have, indeed, voted at least in concept for setting up this type of a trust fund and funding it this way. I know I can speak for Senator SPECTER in saying we will continue our efforts to enlist the support of other Senators to set up this form of a trust fund. Otherwise, we are simply never going to have the kind of funding for biomedical research that we need. What we are going to do basically is to keep raising insurance

premiums to pay for the illnesses that continue to plague us. But if we put the money into research and find the causes and cures—Mr. President, we all struggle around here trying to figure out what is the long-term solution to the Medicare problem: People living longer, fewer and fewer people paying into the Medicare trust fund. We know we have a problem. We have to do something about it. Every medical expert will tell you, if you want to solve the Medicare problem, find the causes and cures; it is early intervention of illnesses and diseases.

If we, for example, could just delay, delay the onset of Alzheimer's by 5 years, we could have no problem in the Medicare trust fund—just delay it 5 years. That is not to mention actually finding the cure for Alzheimer's. That is not to mention osteoporosis or diabetes that so plagues our culture, or hearing loss or eye loss. All the things that affect us in our older age are now coming back and costing Medicare more and more money because people are living longer.

These are the things we can do to make sure the Medicare trust fund is solvent in the future, but only if we put adequate money into biomedical research.

I said I was not going to talk about it, but once I got on a roll I could not stop myself because I feel so strongly that we really are shortchanging ourselves when we are not putting the money into medical research.

Finally, Mr. President, in our report we have tried to focus the Department of Health and Human Services on the issue of fraud and abuse in Medicare. Speaking of Medicare, a recent inspector general's report found that improper Medicare billing losses could be as high as 17 percent of last year's \$194 billion Medicare budget—17 percent.

Now, again, let me digress here a little bit, Mr. President. A few years ago, when I held the position that Senator SPECTER now holds as chairman of this subcommittee, I asked for a study to be done on losses in Medicare due to waste, fraud, and abuse. Well, we did the study. It came back and said it was as high as maybe 10 to 14 percent. Well, some of those in the system challenged those findings. They said, well, your survey wasn't big enough. You only did one area of the country. You did not sample enough items. And so it was a skewed kind of study—the losses surely are not that big.

Well, I said, OK, fair enough criticism. So then, under the leadership of Senator SPECTER, when we changed hands in the Senate, we went back and we asked them to do another study, nationwide. Several thousand were sampled. Every region was sampled. Guess what happened. The first study came up short. It was not 10 to 14 percent. It was as high as 17 percent of Medicare payments were going out for waste and abuse.

Well, we must make this a priority and address this serious problem. We

have in this bill; we have focused on it. Senator SPECTER has taken the lead.

Let me sum up once again by complimenting our chairman, Senator SPECTER, and his staff and my staff for their work in putting together this legislation. I look forward to a smooth process, hopefully, as Senator SPECTER said, that will enable us to be done by tomorrow.

And I would again just close by referring, as I did earlier, to the Constitution of the United States. Time and again I have had people question why we do what we are doing here in this subcommittee—in health and in human services and in education, labor, all of the various things that we cover here. The National Institutes of Health, what business is that of the Congress? Why are you getting involved in all those things?

Well, you know, it is interesting, Mr. President, that twice in the Constitution of the United States there is mention made of the general welfare of the people of this country—first in the preamble when it says, “We the people of the United States,” and it lays out why we are developing the Constitution, “in order to form a more perfect Union, establish justice, ensure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare”—promote the general welfare—“and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity * * *” Right there in the preamble it says we are doing this because we want to promote the general welfare of the people of this country.

Well, how do you do that? Article I of the Constitution, which lays out the structure of Congress and our responsibility, section 8 of article I lays out what we are supposed to do here, lays out our responsibilities. Congress shall have the power to do all kinds of things—borrow money, regulate commerce, coin money, establish post offices, declare a war, et cetera, et cetera. But, in the first paragraph it says:

The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imports and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States. * * *

Interesting, they put the common defense and the general welfare together. That is our responsibility—article I, section 8. What we are supposed to do in providing for that general welfare obviously changes with times and circumstances. What was providing for the general welfare in the last century certainly is not what we deem to be providing for the general welfare in this century, and certainly it will change in the future. But, nonetheless, I believe that the bill before us meets our constitutional requirement in two ways: First, by promoting the general welfare, and second, by providing for the general welfare through the appropriations process. So, that is our constitutional obligation and I believe that we have done our level best, in a

bipartisan manner, to meet that requirement of article I, section 8 of the Constitution.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SESSIONS). The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, do I understand that there will be a time for general discussion of the spending bill for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education? Am I correct that there is a consent agreement on the time for debate on this legislation before the Senate moves to the Agriculture appropriations bill? Will the Chair clarify that for me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. KENNEDY. When do we move to the Agriculture Appropriations bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. At 2:15 we take up the agricultural appropriations bill.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I support this year's spending bill for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education.

I commend Senator SPECTER and Senator HARKIN for their outstanding job in developing this bipartisan legislation. This bill also reflects President Clinton's priorities in his 1998 budget for strengthening our commitment to education, enhancing the productivity of the Nation's workforce, and improving the health of all Americans.

Clearly there is an urgent need to allocate increased resources to these important investments if the Nation is to maintain its competitive edge in the 21st century.

We need to ensure that millions of children do not fall behind in reading, in math, in science, and technology.

We need to make certain that the rising cost of tuition does not put college education out of the reach for working families.

We need to ensure that the rising demand for job training services is met, as 1.7 million welfare recipients leave the welfare rolls and seek jobs under last year's welfare reform legislation.

We must also recognize the need for increased funding for biomedical research, which holds great promise to cure or prevent so many illnesses and can be an important factor in finding a long-term solution to the fiscal problems facing Medicare.

This year's spending legislation for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education takes an important step toward making these critical investments for our Nation's future.

Most notably, it increases the Pell grant maximum from \$2,700 to \$3,000, which will increase college aid for over 3.6 million low- and middle-income students.

The bill increases Head Start funding by \$324 million over last year's level, which will provide essential preschool services to an additional 36,000 low-income children.

It increases the education technology funding by \$275 million to help teachers learn to use technology effectively and help raise student achievement.

It provides \$40 million for the construction and repair of schools in needy areas. The General Accounting Office has found that a third of the Nation's schools, with 14 million students, have one or more buildings needing extensive repair. This was an concern that was debated and discussed during the consideration of the budget. Great leadership on this issue has been provided by our friend from Illinois, Senator MOSELEY-BRAUN.

The legislation provides \$81 million over last year's level for the Ryan White AIDS Program and \$24 million for the Community and Migrant Health Program.

And it provides \$1.2 billion in fiscal year 1999 for LIHEAP, which will enable this important program to serve thousands of additional senior citizens, the disabled, and working families by providing them with heating and cooling assistance.

Yet the bill falls short in a number of important areas. It fails to provide the additional \$700 million that President Clinton requested to help 218,000 independent students afford a higher education under the Pell Grant Program. We need to make sure that individuals who are moving through the economy are going to be able to upgrade their skills. We know that unlike 30 years ago when an individual had a job and kept that job for his or her entire life, individuals who now enter the job market will probably have seven different jobs over the course of their lives. What we are attempting to do is recognize the importance of making available to these middle-income Americans the opportunities to upgrade their skills and continue their education.

None of us can visit the various community colleges without seeing the dramatic change that has taken place in the ages of many of the students who will be attending. We see the average age increased now to 26 or 27 years of age. These are individuals who are taking advantage of various training programs and educational opportunities to upgrade their skills so they can participate in the new economy. This issue is a high priority of the President, but we have seen the funding for independent students fall short.

No funds were also appropriated this year for the new child literacy program. Low achievement in reading is a national problem that deserves our immediate attention. Children who lack reading skills by the fourth grade are more likely to fall behind and eventually to drop out of school. We have had extensive hearings in the Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee on that particular need. We know the committee has delayed funding for child literacy, and we know that we do not have, at this time, the authorizing legislation needed to ensure that those efforts and those resources would be

carefully targeted to get the most meaningful assistance to children. But we also know that the chairman of our authorizing committee, Senator JEFFORDS, and others—a broad, bipartisan group—are strongly committed toward developing that literacy program. This issue is a national priority, and we should not delay action.

As the ranking member of the Labor and Human Resources Committee, I am strongly committed to seeing that legislation authorizing the child literacy initiative is enacted this year. We cannot stand by and delay the \$260 million needed to implement this important program.

The Appropriations Committee also eliminated the Supplemental State Incentive Grant Program that helped over 1 million students attend college last year. Any of us who have had the chance to talk to students who are using this program know what a difference it makes. I think, given the very modest amount of resources we are talking about—some \$50 million—we ought to be able to continue the Supplemental State Incentive Grant Program.

Both the National Labor Relations Board and the Health Professions Education Program are seriously underfunded in this spending bill. These shortfalls will adversely affect the investigation of unfair labor practices and the access of minority and low-income Americans to health care services.

There is in the country a sense that we have committed large resources for the development of professional education in the area of health care. You can make a case that in certain areas of our country we do have greater numbers of trained professionals in our health care system than are necessary. But what we do not have is the kind of outreach programs which this Health Professions Education Program was meant to have—to ensure that many low-income individuals and minorities would be able to access the education and be able to go and serve in underserved areas of the Nation.

The initial proposal by the administration in the area of health professions was dramatically even below what has been appropriated—or requested for appropriations in the House or the Senate. Both the House and Senate bills have made improvements on the Clinton administration's proposal, and I think that Health Professions Education programs ought to be strengthened in the final legislation.

Also, the appropriations for the National Labor Relations Board will mean that the opportunity for investigations of various unfair labor practices will be unattended. If we are really interested in the continued fairness in the workplace, and when we recognize that, over the past year, hundreds of thousands of workers were short-changed in terms of back pay and other types of unfair practices, we want to make sure their interests are going to be adequately protected.

I commend the Appropriations Committee for its 7.8 percent increase for the National Institutes of Health. But much more funding is needed if the Nation is to continue to make progress in the development of new and more effective treatments for cancer, AIDS, heart disease, and many other serious and debilitating conditions.

Both Senator HARKIN, Senator SPENCER, Senator MACK, and many others have worked tirelessly on behalf of the NIH over the years. I have welcomed the opportunity to join with them and others to try to make sure that the opportunities that are out there now, which are unparalleled in terms of our research history, are taken advantage of in order to make an important difference in terms of the health of our fellow citizens and American families; but also in terms of reducing the burden of health care for those families, and also to the States and the Federal Government.

Increased funding for biomedical research will reap other rewards as well. It will encourage more of the best and brightest of America's college graduates to make their careers in scientific research. It will provide benefits to the larger economy as scientific advances move from the laboratory into the private sector, creating new businesses and job opportunities for many individuals.

Equally important is a recent study by researchers at Duke University that indicates expanded funding for NIH can help keep Medicare solvent for the long term. Currently, the very ill account for the overwhelming majority of Medicare costs. If we invest in biomedical research to make senior citizens healthier, we can save enormous sums, protect Medicare for future generations, and prevent many of the illnesses of old age.

Mr. President, yesterday the Nation saluted its working families on Labor Day. This year's spending bill pays tribute to these families by making a downpayment on important education, labor, and health programs.

More still needs to be done. Legislation still can be approved, but it should not be weighted down with poison pill amendments, as was the case in the 104th Congress when language was offered which would have prohibited Medicaid funding of abortions, and it would have barred OSHA from considering new ergonomic rules. The bill represents a careful bipartisan compromise, and I strongly support its adoption.

I mentioned, Mr. President, in my comments, the provisions on the increase in the Pell Grant Program and education technology. We find a number of States are moving ahead in voluntary ways, such as Massachusetts, to make sure that all of their schools are actually going to be tied into the Internet system. A combination of the excellent cooperation between the software council in my State of Massachusetts and the labor unions resulted in

every school in the State tied into the Internet system. They have laid 50 miles of cable in Boston alone, which was the result of voluntary contributions of labor in wiring those schools and voluntary contributions from the various industries in providing the software.

What we need to do is make sure we not only have the education technology, but have trained educators who are going to be using technology in various ways that are going to enhance education. There are important resources in this bill for that program.

The Head Start Program, which under the more recent authorization will help expectant mothers in parenting skills as well as reaching down into the early childhood years. Still, there is enormous need for the expansion of that program which is so important.

Years ago, we felt that the principal advantage of Head Start was just to equip children with confidence-building measures, so as they entered education in kindergarten and the first grade, they would be able to move ahead in learning. Now we are finding out that they are in a position in the very early years—2 years old, 3 years old, 4 years old—to actually learn something. That is what the most recent research is showing, and we need to make sure we are going to be able to reach out to many of the disadvantaged children, the poorest children who do not have the opportunities for the development of that kind of early start and give some help and assistance for them.

School construction and repair work has been an issue that has, in recent times, come before us. I can mention in terms of Boston, New Bedford, Fall River, Lowell, Lawrence, and Springfield—and the list goes on—the number of schools that are closed every day in major cities during the wintertime because of poor repairs and temperatures. The need for school repairs are so important.

Local school districts are doing something, and we have a modest Federal program, as has been outlined, to begin to show that such an initiative is enormously important. If children go to schools that are deteriorating and dilapidated, you are sending a message to the children—maybe it is a subliminal message, but a message nonetheless—that even though as political leaders we are making speeches about the importance of children and the importance of education, the children see that education is not the priority of a State, a community, or the Nation as it should be. This is a modest effort to address this important issue.

There is support of the Ryan White bill and community and migrant health, which is important in reaching out to so many people. And the LIHEAP program which is a tried and tested program which is absolutely essential for so many of our elderly who live in the colder climates.

Independent students, as I mentioned, is a key element and needs support. I believe students—young, middle age, and older—who are going back to upgrade their skills at community colleges should be able to get some help and assistance under the various education programs. The importance of this was understood in the budget agreement. I know both Senators SPECTER and HARKIN understand the importance of these programs. Still, this is an area that we need to give, I think, some attention to as we go on into the conference.

We will have some opportunity to debate child literacy as we move ahead. The real question is in timing. I think all of us here understand the importance of the enhancement of the literacy program. There are many excellent programs that are taking place now, and we want to continue to make progress. We are not making progress nationwide, and this is an area of enormous importance.

Again, with NIH and health professions education, the appropriations exceed what was initially proposed by the administration. The House has a more favorable funding level. This program is very, very important in creating opportunities for people to go into the health professions who will go out and serve in many different parts of our communities.

Mr. President, again, I express strong support for the job that was done, and I commend our committee for those areas where they have, I think, made a very, very important commitment of scarce resources. We understand that there will be at least an expectation that as we move into the conference, there may be additional resources that will be available that could be used for funding some of these areas where there is an important need.

I look forward, as this debate takes place, to try to see if we cannot find either offsets to enhance these programs that are a priority or at least to work with the committee to see if out of the conference we cannot get greater attention.

I thank the Chair and yield the floor. Mr. SPECTER addressed the Chair. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. SPECTER. I thank the Chair. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Jim Sourwine and Mr. Jack Chow, detailees to this committee, be granted the privilege of the floor during the consideration of this bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I had referred earlier to the allocation of funding of the various Departments in fiscal year 1998 for the current bill, and the specific breakdown is as follows: Labor, \$11 billion; Health and Human Services, \$31.9 billion; Education, \$29.3 billion; and related agencies, \$7.5 billion; with the total being \$79.7 billion.

There is a long list of related agencies made a part of this bill, but illustrative of those agencies are agencies such as the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, Federal Mediation Conciliation Service, the Federal Mine Safety and Health Review Commission, the National Labor Relations Board, the Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission, the Railroad Retirement Board. Those are illustrative of the agencies covered by the bill. I make that delineation to give those watching on C-SPAN 2 a fuller picture of what this bill covers, and for the RECORD.

Earlier I had referred to certain consolidations and eliminations of programs which Senator HARKIN and I have worked on for fiscal year 1994 through fiscal year 1997. There are a total of 134 programs, according to information provided by staff, totaling \$1,471,405,000. I ask unanimous consent that the programs in the various departments and the amount of savings be printed in the RECORD, with this information being provided by staff, as I say, totaling 134 programs and almost \$1.5 billion.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROGRAM TERMINATIONS

	FY '95 origi- nally en- acted	FY '95 post re- scission	FY '96	FY '97
LABOR				
Youth Fair Chance	24,785	0	0	0
Rural Concentrated Employment	3,861	0	0	0
JTPA Capacity Building	6,000	0	0	0
Natl Commission Empl. Policy	2,223	0	0	0
Veterans' Homeless Programs	5,011	0	0	0
Natl Center for the Workplace	1,113	0	0	0
Glass Ceiling Commission	738	738	142	0
Office of the American Workplace	7,415	7,082	0	0
HHS				
HRSA:				
HPSL Recap.	8,020	8,020	0	0
Trauma Care	4,793	293	0	0
SAMHSA				
CMHS:				
Clinical Training/AIDS Training	5,394	5,379	0	0
Community Support Demos	24,184	24,147	0	0
Homeless Service Demos	21,227	21,205	0	0
AIDS Demos	1,487	1,485	0	0
CSAT:				
Target Cities	35,520	35,520	0	0
Pregnant/Postpartum Women	54,228	54,228	0	0
Campus Program	0	0	0	0
Criminal Justice Programs	37,502	37,502	0	0
Critical Populations	23,561	23,561	0	0
Comprehensive Comm. Treatment ...	27,277	27,073	0	0
Training	5,590	5,590	0	0
AIDS Training	2,787	2,787	0	0
AIDS Linkage	7,739	7,739	0	0
AIDS Outreach	7,500	7,500	0	0
Treatment Capacity Expansion	6,701	6,701	0	0
CSAP:				
Pregnant Women & Infants	22,501	22,501	0	0
Other Programs	6,643	6,318	0	0
Community Partnerships	114,741	114,741	0	0
Prevention/Ed Dissemination	13,465	13,465	0	0
Training	16,049	16,049	0	0
B and F	0	0	0	0
Assistant Secretary:				
Natl. Vaccine Program	1,000	988	0	0
Health Care Reform Data	2,760	1,344	0	0
Streamlining Costs	1,500	1,500	0	0
Health Service Management	17,801	18,432	0	0
Natl. AIDS Program Office	1,750	1,730	0	0
HCFA:				
Essential Access Comm. Hosp.	3,500	2,000	0	0
New Rural Health Grants	1,737	0	0	0
Rural Hosp. Transition Demos	17,621	17,621	13,089	0
ACF:				
Civics & English Ed Grants	6,000	4,000	0	0
Children & Families Services:				
Comp. Child Develop. Cntrs	0	0	0	0
Child Devel. Assoc. Scholarship	1,372	1,372	0	0
Runaway Youth-Drugs	14,466	14,466	0	0
Youth Gang Substance Abuse	10,520	10,520	0	0
Child Abuse Challenge Grants	0	0	0	0

PROGRAM TERMINATIONS—Continued

	FY '95 origi- nally en- acted	FY '95 post re- scission	FY '96	FY '97
ABCAN	288	288	0	0
Dependent Care Plan. & Dev.	12,823	12,823	0	0
Emerg. Protection Grants	0	0	0	0
Child Welfare Rsch	6,395	6,395	0	0
Family Support Centers	7,371	7,371	0	0
Community Services:				
Homeless Service Grants	19,752	19,752	0	0
Rural Housing	2,927	0	0	0
Farmworker Assistance	3,084	0	0	0
Demonstration Partnerships	7,977	601	0	0
Violent Crime Reduction Progs.:				
Youth Education Demo	0	0	400	0
Administration on Aging:				
Federal Council on Aging	176	176	0	0
White House Conf. on Aging	3,000	3,000	0	0
SSA Notch Commission	0	0	0	0
ED				
Education Reform:				
Goals 2000, National Programs	21,530	0	0	0
School to Work, National Progs	6,875	6,875	0	0
Ed for the Disadvantaged: State				
School Improvement	27,560	27,560	0	0
School Improvement:				
Safe/Drug Free-Postsecondary	0	0	0	0
Safe/Drug Free-National Progs	25,000	25,000	0	0
Safe/Drug Free-Safe Schools	0	0	0	0
Law Related Education	5,899	0	0	0
Christa McAuliffe	1,946	1,946	0	0
Women's Ed Equity	3,967	3,967	0	0
Dropout Prevention Demos	28,000	0	0	0
Genl Assist-Virgin Islands	0	0	0	0
Territorial Teacher Training	0	0	0	0
Follow Through	0	0	0	0
Training Early Child Ed Violence	13,875	0	0	0
FamilyComm. Endeavor Schls	11,100	0	0	0
Indian Education:				
Special Progs Indian Children	14,342	12,342	0	0
Special Progs Adult Indians	5,420	5,420	0	0
Indian Ed Natl Activities	125	125	0	0
Bilingual/Immigrant Ed:				
Bilingual Ed Support Services	14,330	14,330	0	0
Bilingual Ed Prof Development	24,866	25,180	0	0
Special Institutions:				
NTID-Endowment Grants	336	336	0	0
NTID-Construction	150	150	0	0
Gallaudet Endowment grants	1,000	1,000	0	0
Gallaudet Construction	0	0	0	0
Voc Ed:				
Comm. Based Orgs	9,479	0	0	0
Consumer Homemaking Ed	34,409	0	0	0
State Councils	8,848	8,848	0	0
Natl Programs, Demos	20,684	0	0	0
Natl Programs, Data systems	6,000	4,250	0	0
Bilingual Vocational Training	0	0	0	0
Adult Ed Evaluation/Tech Assist	3,900	3,900	0	0
State Lit Resource Cntrs	7,787	0	0	0
Workplace Lit Partnerships	18,736	12,736	0	0
Lit Training for Homeless Adults	9,498	0	0	0
Student Financial Assist: State				
Postsec. Review	20,000	0	0	0
HIGHER ED				
Aid for Institutional Develop:				
Endowment Grants	6,045	6,045	0	0
HBCU-Set Aside	2,015	2,015	0	0
Evaluation	1,000	1,000	0	0
Endowment Challenge Grants	8,060	8,060	0	0
Native Hawaiian/Alaska Arts	1,000	0	0	0
Eisenhower Leadership	4,000	1,080	0	0
Innovative Proj. Comm. Serv/	1,423	1,423	0	0
Cooperative Ed	6,927	6,927	0	0
Law School Clinical Experience	14,920	0	0	0
Financial Aid Database	496	0	0	0
Assistance to Guam	0	0	0	0
Natl Science Scholars	6,424	3,303	0	0
Natl Acad Science-Space/Tech	2,000	0	0	0
Douglas Teacher Scholarships	14,599	299	0	0
Olympic Scholarships	1,000	0	0	0
Teacher Corps	1,875	0	0	0
Women/Minority Graduate Ed	0	0	0	0
Harris Fellowships	20,244	10,144	0	0
Javits Fellowships	7,787	0	0	0
Faculty Develop. Fellowships	3,732	0	0	0
School, Coll, Univ Partnerships	3,893	3,893	0	0
Legal Training for Disadvantage	2,964	2,964	0	0
Howard University:				
Howard U Research	4,614	4,614	0	0
Howard U Construction	5,000	5,000	0	0
Regular Program	3,530	3,530	0	0
Clinical Law Center	5,500	5,500	0	0
College Housing Acad. Fac. Loans:				
National Diffusion Network	14,480	11,780	0	0
Ed Tech-Natl Activities	13,000	13,000	0	0
Loan Subsidies	168	0	0	0
OERI:				
Natl Brd Prof. Teach. Standards	0	0	0	0
Fund for Improve of Schools	0	0	0	0
Blue Ribbon Schools	0	0	0	0
Libraries:				
College Library Tech	0	0	0	0
Research Libraries	0	0	0	0
Literacy	8,026	8,026	0	0
Departmental Management:				
HBCU Capital Financing Brd	74	74	0	0
Natl Brd-FIPSE	128	128	0	0
RELATED AGENCIES				
CNCS:				
Vista Literacy	5,024	5,024	0	0

PROGRAM TERMINATIONS—Continued

	FY '95 origi- nally en- acted	FY '95 post re- scission	FY '96	FY '97
Senior Demo Program	1,000	1,000	0	0
Natl Ed Standards/Improvement	2,000	2,000	0	0
RRB Special Management Fund	659	659	659	0

OPEN HOUSE TOWN MEETINGS

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, in the absence of any other Senator on the floor at the present time, I will utilize this occasion to discuss the open house town meetings which I held during the course of the past recess in August to share with my colleagues and those who may be watching on C-SPAN 2 some of the observations that I found in traveling in my State of Pennsylvania and in meeting with my citizens.

I make it a point to have meetings in every one of the Pennsylvania counties as often as I can, and by the end of September, by the end of this month, I will have covered all of my 67 counties, something that I find very, very valuable.

What I do as a matter of format—and I think this is similar to what many Senators do—is I make a very brief statement, as to what we have done, and then I throw the floor open for questions. Usually I get somewhere in the range of 15 to 20 questions. Regrettably, our mail allocation has been cut down. In prior years, it had been possible to send mail to our entire counties. That mail allocation has been reduced so that it is not possible to send mail to all of the counties. This is something which I think the Senate ought to give serious consideration to revising. I believe that we ought to be frugal when it comes to mailings which do have some political import, but where a Senator himself or herself goes out into a community to appear to make a presentation and respond to questions, I think that is the very essence of our democratic process. To the extent that the mail notifies people in a very direct way of the presence of a Senator coming into the community, my sense is that is well worth doing.

The dominant theme that I found in traveling through Pennsylvania, Mr. President, was a dissatisfaction or a distrust of government. There is great cynicism in America today about what is going on in Washington, DC. It is my sense that unless you go out and actually talk to the people—and not just in shopping centers and not just casually, as we have our social contacts during the course of a recess period—that there is not a full understanding as to how much apathy, cynicism and outright distrust of our Government there is. I noted the Washington Post, on the 29th of August, just a few days ago, had on its front page a survey which noted “three out of four say they do not trust the Government or its leaders to do what is right.”

My own findings would confirm that, as I have been in many open house

town meetings during the course of the past month and throughout the past year. At one of my open house town meetings, one of the citizens was wearing a cap that had the word “militia” printed on it. There are many people in the militia in the United States today. How many exactly, we do not know.

In my capacity as chairman of the Judiciary Subcommittee on Terrorism, we had hearings concerning militias during the 104th Congress. We had Colonel Olson from the Michigan militia come in and speak in very unflattering terms about the Congress of the United States.

There have been estimates into the millions as to how many militia members there are.

And in one of my open house town meetings, the word “revolution” was used in expressing very grave disagreement with what the Government was doing, on this occasion the importation of sludge from New York and New Jersey to fill abandoned mines in Pennsylvania. And there is great concern in my State, as there is I think in this country generally, about limitations on so-called second amendment rights, and great distrust as to what the Government is doing.

During the course of the past month, Ruby Ridge was again in the news with a report by the Department of Justice. The report stated that there would not be any prosecutions as to the investigation which had been conducted by the Department of Justice. This investigation lasted almost 2 years after it was initiated in the fall of 1995, a period of time which I think is unwarranted on the facts as I know them.

I have had discussions with both the Attorney General and the U.S. attorney in charge of that investigation and will talk about that in some greater detail. After the Department of Justice report was issued, the prosecuting attorney in Boundary County, ID, returned an indictment against Special Agent Lon Horiuchi of the FBI on the charge of involuntary manslaughter on the killing of Mrs. Vicki Weaver which occurred in that confrontation back on August 21, 1992.

The DA for Boundary County returned the indictment of murder in the first degree against Mr. Kevin Harris for the killing of Deputy Marshal William Degan. The incidents which we have seen in Waco and in Ruby Ridge have fanned, I think, really great distrust for the Government, something which we are going to have to address in greater detail.

In my personal opinion, the Congress has not yet had appropriate oversight hearings on Waco, notwithstanding the fact that we have done something there. I think we have made a start on Ruby Ridge when the subcommittee which I chaired back in September and October of 1995, with 14 days of hearings, heard from about 60 witnesses and published a 150-page report. I intend to talk about that in greater detail on the floor of the Senate when we have some time, perhaps yet this afternoon.

But I do want to comment about the grave concerns which I have found in my State about distrusting the Government and how the Ruby Ridge subject came up because it was very much in the news during the weeks of mid-August, August 13, 14, and 15, Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday. And I was in western and central Pennsylvania, August 20, 21, and 22 when I was again doing open house town meetings.

I also found great concern in the open house town meetings I conducted about the way campaigns are financed. And I believe that the hearings we have had before the Governmental Affairs Committee during the month of July have resonated more in America than many people believed. It is unfortunate, I think, that there has not been more television coverage because that is the way the American people get most of their information these days.

Only Fox has carried them live, the Fox cable channel. And CNN has covered to a slight extent, and C-SPAN has not covered them live but has replayed them. And there are many people who watch C-SPAN. Insomniacs are people who watch during the late hours of the night. You can probably catch the Governmental Affairs hearings if you watch at about 3 a.m. to see what is going on. But I found that many people have been watching them and were very concerned about what is going on.

My view is that we ought to have campaign finance reform. And I voted for cloture last year to bring the legislation offered by Senator MCCAIN and Senator FEINGOLD to the floor. I believe that there is a difficulty with that particular piece of legislation on calling for television stations to give free time because I think that is a taking of property without compensation required by the fifth amendment of the U.S. Constitution.

But I have been working on legislation, some of which has been motivated by what I have seen in the Governmental Affairs hearing. I intend to talk about that as well, perhaps later this afternoon if there are no other Senators on the floor who come to offer amendments.

I have also heard, Mr. President, considerable concern about what is happening with Social Security and Medicare. And regrettably there has been a practice of using those issues for campaign purposes, something done by both political parties. I do not suggest blame in what has been done in the campaign sense. But I think we would be better advised if we tailored our representations a little closer to what the facts are.

But these open house town meetings are populated very significantly by our senior citizens who have more time to come to the open house town meetings. And perhaps there is greater interest among senior citizens in what is going on in Government because of Social Security and Medicare.

But people are questioning whether Social Security is really secure. And