

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

SPEECH OF

**HON. GLENN POSHARD**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, August 2, 1995*

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I strongly oppose this bill and urge its defeat.

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

SPEECH OF  
**HON. NORMAN Y. MINETA**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1995

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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