

this bill. I strenuously opposed the Blute amendment which would have cut NIH by \$235 million.

I am also pleased that this House voted to restore funding for family planning programs. For over 25 years, title X funding has served as a cost effective and vital source of essential health care and family planning services for low-income women. At a time when we are working to reduce unintended pregnancy in America, we should be making birth control more accessible, not less. In addition, we should not penalize community health centers that help these women combat low-birth weights and inadequate nutrition. The reality is that this cut was aimed directly at Planned Parenthood, which the radical right has targeted.

I also approve of increases in breast and cervical cancer screening programs under the Centers for Disease Control, the Jobs Corps, special education programs and vocational rehabilitation services. In fact, I am an original cosponsor of legislation to meet this goal.

However, this legislation contains too many provisions which I believe are terribly misguided and completely unacceptable. For example, the summer jobs program, which provides 6,000 Houston area youngsters with jobs this past summer is eliminated under the Republican proposal. Texas will lose \$66 million in funds for this program next year, and as a result, thousands more young people will be on the streets next summer. More importantly, these teens will lose an opportunity to receive valuable on-the-job training. Texas will also lose 22 percent in vital funds for school-to-work programs to help provide the transition from high school to high wage, highly skilled jobs. This program, which many community colleges in the 25th district utilize, helps train an able work force for the future.

Other programs slated for severe cuts include adult and youth job training programs which are cut 20 percent and the dislocated workers assistance programs which are cut by 30 percent. Any American who loses their job can expect to receive 30 percent less assistance than they may have otherwise anticipated. In southeast Texas, thousands of people in the oil and gas industry have lost their jobs and rely on this safety net to help them back on their feet.

The National Labor Relations Board and the Occupational Safety and Health Administration are significantly cut that they will face serious difficulties in protecting American workers. For example, the National Institutes of Occupational and Safety Health is cut by \$32 million—this cut eliminates all training assistance, including safety training for hundreds of nurses and doctors at the University of Texas Health Sciences Center at Texas Medical Center in the 25th district.

The bill would repeal the Executive order banning the permanent replacement of striking workers. Under this provision, workers would lose a fundamental right to collective bargaining. Additionally, the legislation would alter the functions of the NLRB heretofore without precedent by requiring unanimous decisions. The cumulative effect of these initiatives is to deny American workers with equal rights under job security and safety laws.

I am deeply opposed to one provision which is part of a stealth campaign to take away a woman's right to choose. While this bill allows the use of State Medicaid funds for an abor-

tion when the life of the mother is at risk, it prohibits the use of such funds to pay for an abortion for women who are victims of rape and incest.

I am also opposed to a provision in the bill which allows institutions to bypass the accreditation process if the standards include training in abortion procedures. The Accreditation Council for Graduate Medical Education [ACGME] is a private medical accreditation body responsible for establishing medical standards for more than 7,400 residency programs in this Nation. Under ACGME requirements, no institution or individual is required to participate in abortion training. Any program or resident with a moral or religious objection is exempted.

Congress has never before sought to override private education standards, let alone standards for training in medicine. Those who would take away a woman's right to choose have now turned their assault on both medical schools and doctors.

Some of the most egregious cuts in this bill, however, come in the area of education. Even Republicans would agree that education is the key to opportunity and success in our growing world economy. This bill cuts education programs in the billions of dollars. That is wrong.

In addition to cutting Head Start for our Nation's youngest children by \$3.4 billion, this bill dramatically reduces funding for elementary, secondary, and post-secondary education. Title I compensatory education grants in the bill are cut 17 percent by \$1.2 billion. Harris and Fort Bend counties, which I represent, would lose close to \$15 million in funding to help children improve their reading and math skills, especially in disadvantaged communities.

The bill also proposes the elimination of Goals 2000, which is a voluntary program to help students improve their academic performance. Goals 2000 provides school districts with funds to bring technology like computers to the classroom, to increase teacher training, and to encourage parents to be actively involved in their children's education. Only yesterday, Texas received over \$29 million in Goals 2000 grants to assist in the implementation of our State's education reform initiative which passed the State legislature earlier this year. Without this funding, we will lose an opportunity to build on the progress we have already made in Texas.

For college students, the Republicans have cut student loans and aid by \$9.5 billion. They have eliminated the in-school interest subsidy for Perkins loans, which help millions of Americans attend college. On average, a Texas college student can expect to pay \$5,000 more for college—and they'll start paying before they have even attended a class or moved into their dorm room. At Rice University, which is located in my district, 82 percent of all undergraduates receive student aid—that's 2,170 students who will most likely have to pay more for their education.

One other irresponsible provision in this bill prohibits any recipient of a Federal grant from spending grant funds on political advocacy. This provision is not about lobbying Congress as the Republicans would have us believe, it is about giving nonprofit organizations and individuals the right to express their opinions. This would gag such institutions as AARP, the Red Cross, and the Presbyterian Church, of which I am a member. At the same time, any

Government contractor would still be free to subsidize their lobbying activities with Federal funds. This provision is a threat to free speech.

In the final analysis, while this bill would sufficiently fund programs which are of great national importance, in particular, the national Institutes of Health, when weighed against all of the egregious provisions affecting education, job training, choice, student loans, and free speech, I cannot support it as currently drafted. I urge its defeat while looking forward to preserving what is right about this bill and correcting what is wrong. That is our charge.

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

SPEECH OF

HON. ENID G. WALDHOLTZ

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1995

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

Mrs. WALDHOLTZ. Mr. Chairman, I am voting against the Kolbe-Lowey-Morella amendment to strike language in the Labor-HHS-Education appropriations bill allowing States to eliminate Medicaid funding for abortions for rape and incest because I believe that decisions on the use of State funds should be left to State governments.

However, I also firmly believe that women who are faced with deciding whether to end a pregnancy that is the product of rape or incest should not be forced to base their decision on their ability to pay.

Accordingly, while I respect and acknowledge the right of States to determine how to spend their funds, without Federal mandates, I strongly urge the State of Utah and other States to provide funding for abortions for victims of rape and incest who cannot afford to pay for themselves.

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

SPEECH OF

HON. VIC FAZIO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1995

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

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the

gentle lady from Hawaii, Congresswoman MINK, which would strike the provision of this bill prohibiting enforcement of title IX requirements with respect to gender equity in intercollegiate athletic programs.

Enforcement of title IX—with respect to athletics—ensures that our sons and daughters have an equal chance to take part in sports while they are in school. It is that simple. This enforcement takes into consideration the fact that different sports have unique differences that are justifiable—that some aspects of athletics programs do not have to be the same for men and women. The key is that the needs of male and female athletes are being met equally.

But the language in this bill would halt title IX enforcement. The net effect would be that intercollegiate athletic opportunities for female students—hampered as they already are—would be limited even more.

I know that today, nearly three decades after my own college athletic experiences, all of my daughters—each one of them a better athlete than her father—have been denied the access that I had to college sports. Women in college today still do not have the access and opportunity that men do. But title IX enforcement ensures that young women like my daughters would not be denied the same opportunity as their male counterparts to compete in college athletics.

All of our children should have an equal opportunity to participate in intercollegiate sports. I therefore urge my colleagues to support Congresswoman MINK's amendment, which would ensure that we continue to work toward guaranteeing that our sons and our daughters have their athletic interests and abilities encouraged and supported.

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

SPEECH OF

HON. FRANK PALLONE, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

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. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Bateman Saxton Edwards amendment to restore \$22 million to the Impact Aid Program. This program, which suffered a 15 percent cut in funding in fiscal year 1995 is scheduled for another \$83 million in cuts this year. Together these figures translate to a drastic 2-year reduction of 26 percent for Federal impact aid.

The reason why this reduction is particularly drastic is quite simple. Impact aid is a program that provides for the education of the children of our military personnel and children on Indian reserves. Education programs run on federally owned property are, due to a lack of funds caused by an inability to collect State or

local taxes, highly dependent on Federal funding. Without that assistance, the quality of education available for these children is certain to deteriorate.

I ask you, Mr. Chairman, do you think it is fair some children in our country should be offered a lower standard of educational training just because they happen to live on federal land? It seems clear to me that as it is the Federal Government who owns the land on which these children live, the Federal Government should be obligated, just as State and local municipalities are, to provide adequate educational services for children.

Mr. Chairman, what would you suggest I tell the military children of the Earle Naval Weapons Station in Tinton Falls and Fort Monmouth in Eatontown when I go back to New Jersey and they wonder why the resources for their education have been reduced? Indeed, how do I explain to their parents that their child's school day may have to be reduced because the government, though able to pay them to fight for their country, does not have enough money to educate their children? These are questions, Mr. Chairman, that they should not have to ask and I should not have to answer.

While I support efforts to balance the Federal budget, I believe attempting to do so by gutting valuable education programs like impact aid is unequivocally a step in the wrong direction. With the Department of Education projecting that 89 percent of the jobs being created in the United States will require post-secondary training, it is clear that cutting education programs jeopardize the well-being of our children and, ultimately, the economic growth of our Nation.

We must not allow the Federal Government to shirk its responsibilities to itself, and to our children. I urge my colleagues to act responsibly and vote "yes" on this amendment.

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

SPEECH OF

HON. JOSÉ E. SERRANO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1995

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

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, the committee's draconian cuts to education programs represent a fundamental shift in our Nation's priorities. Less than 1 year after the passage of Goals 2000, President Clinton's ambitious plan to prepare our children for the 21st century, the Republican majority stands poised to initiate a massive rollback in funds for programs which benefit our most precious resource—our children. There can be no higher priority than their education and training for the future.

The more than \$1 billion cut in title I, the program which serves our poorest children,

the 59 percent cut to safe and drug-free schools, and the 75 percent cut to bilingual education, when combined with cuts at the State and local levels, will have disastrous consequences for our Nation's already overburdened and understaffed school systems.

In New York City, these cuts will result in nearly 42,000 fewer children receiving title I services, 9,000 fewer students in bilingual education programs, and the loss of nearly 3,000 teachers.

Other Members have spoken eloquently about the cuts to education programs. I would like to speak for a moment about the cuts to bilingual education programs. I find these cuts particularly troubling because the need for the services those programs provide is ever-increasing. The number of limited English proficient children is expected to increase to nearly 3.5 million by the year 2000. Studies have shown that language-minority students take several years to fully master academic English. Bilingual education allows these children to keep up with their peers in math and science courses, while simultaneously mastering the English language. These programs have been proven effective at reducing dropout rates, which for Hispanic children are more than 50 percent.

This bill eliminates funds for nearly 200 programs, including literacy training, student aid, and graduate fellowships. We cannot hope to remain competitive in the global marketplace if we do not provide for the education and training of all of our citizens, not just those who can pay their own way.

This shift in our priorities is unacceptable. I do not believe that the way to solve our fiscal problems is to shortchange our citizens and mortgage our children's future. I strongly urge the defeat of this bill.

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

SPEECH OF

HON. CORRINE BROWN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1995

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

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I stand in strong support of Ms. Lowey's amendment. Medicaid funds must pay for abortion in the case of rape or incest. Surely, our society is not so mean and brutal that it would force poor women to give birth against their will—especially in the case of rape or incest. Abortion is not a crime in this country. The law is clear on this matter. But you would not know this by the extremist, radical, right-wing proposals being attached to appropriations bills. Unfortunately, the radical religious right has driven terror in the hearts of this country over the issue of abortion.