

request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR CERTAIN COMMITTEES AND THEIR SUBCOMMITTEES TO SIT TODAY DURING 5-MINUTE RULE

Mr. PORTER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the following committees and their subcommittees be permitted to sit today while the House is meeting in the Committee of the Whole House under the 5-minute rule: The Committee on Commerce, the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, the Committee on International Relations, the Committee on National Security, the Committee on Resources, and the Committee on Small Business.

It is my understanding that the minority has been consulted and that there is no objection to these requests.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PORTER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 2127, Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1996, and that I may include extraneous material along with tables and charts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 208 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House on the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2127.

□ 1029

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of 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 with Mr. WALKER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Wednesday, August 2, 1995, title II had been designated.

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

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

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

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

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, the total discretionary funding for the Departments of Health and Human Services declines by \$1 billion from \$29.2 billion to \$28.2 billion, or 3.5 percent. Mandatory spending, on the other hand, increases from \$152 billion to \$170 billion.

One of the committee's top priorities is funding for biomedical research. The bill provides \$11.9 billion for the National Institutes of Health, which is an increase of \$642 million, or 5.7 percent.

The committee believes strongly we should permit scientists to determine the funding priorities at NIH rather than Members of Congress. As a result, the committee has not earmarked funds for specific diseases or directed NIH to fund particular research mechanisms. These decisions should be, and are under the bill, left to scientists.

Another high priority in the health and human services section of the bill is support of preventive health programs. Funding is maintained for the Centers for Disease Control and prevention programs supporting increases for a broad range of prevention programs and funding many others at last year's levels. Increases are provided for childhood immunization, breast and cervical cancer screening, sexually transmitted diseases, chronic and environmental disease, and infectious disease.

The committee has also adopted a strategy of preserving funding for the large block grants which permit States flexibility to provide a broad range of services or to reduce or eliminate funding for the smaller categorical programs which must be used for very specific purposes and constituencies.

For example, the bill preserves funding at the 1995 levels for the substance abuse and mental health services block grants, the preventive health services block grant, the community services block grant, and the child care and development block grant. The bill level funds the title X family planning program at \$193 million. Ryan White AIDS treatment programs are level funded, with the exception of title I assistance to cities, which is increased by \$23 million in recognition of the new cities coming on board in 1996.

Funding for health professions training is maintained at the 1995 funding level and is provided in one consolidated line item, pending reauthorization of various training programs.

The core programs addressing rural health care needs are protected. The National Health Service Corps is level funded at \$120 million, as is the Rural

Outreach Grants Program at \$26 million; \$10 million in continuation costs is provided for rural hospital transition grants.

In addition to supporting ongoing programs to address violence against women, such as the Family Violence Program, the bill provides an additional \$39.9 million for violence against women programs specifically authorized in the crime bill.

Funding for the Agency for Health Care Policy and Research declines by 21 percent, to \$125 million, and the bill abolishes the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Health, with its allocation of 14 deputy assistant secretaries and 6 special assistants at grade 15 or above, and transfers some of its core functions to the Office of the Secretary of Health and Human Services.

Funding for the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program is eliminated because the original justifications for this program at the Federal level no longer exists.

The bill does make a very small reduction in Head Start funding of \$137 million, or 3.9 percent from last year, but even with this small reduction, Head Start is still funded at over \$3.3 billion for fiscal year 1996.

We reduce in the bill Federal administrative costs by cutting overall administrative budgets by 7.5 percent and congressional and public affairs offices by 10 percent. The bill changes current law by 10 percent.

The bill changes current law by providing States with the option of providing Medicaid funding for abortion in cases of rape or incest. It also prohibits use of Federal funds to discriminate against medical schools who do not include abortion training as part of their overall Ob/Gyn training, and bans human embryo research by NIH.

All of these provisions are the subject of possible amendments today.

I believe that this section of the bill reflects a thoughtful approach to the funding for the Department of Health and Human Services.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 8 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, yesterday we talked about the implications of this bill for working Americans. Today we are moving to the portion of the bill that attacks our most vulnerable citizens.

This is really the second stage of a three-stage attack on the elderly, on disabled, and poor Americans.

Last week, this House adopted legislation which will substantially increase the rent that low-income elderly will pay to live in section 8 housing and other federally subsidized housing. In September we will be considering legislation that will radically scale back the options of senior citizens on Medicare and will substantially increase their out-of-pocket expenses, and today we are attacking vulnerable Americans on another front in this bill.

This bill kills the program that helps pay winter fuel bills and summer air-

conditioning costs when the alternative is that their heat and electricity will be cut off, 6 million American families, 80 percent of whom make less than \$10,000 a year, we are going to kill that program.

The bill will dramatically cut back opportunities for part-time community service work for programs like Green Thumb. We are cutting Federal support for senior center activities, RSVP programs, senior aides, foster grandparents. We are even cutting elderly nutrition programs, and so we are at midstream in a process that hits the same group of people, older Americans living on \$8,000 to \$10,000 a year or less, and we are hitting them over and over and over again.

The problem is that right now people are living on the edge. They cannot take one hit much less three, and so I think you have a right to ask who is going to pick up the slack.

In some cases, no question, maybe their kids may be able to step in. In those cases, we will be shifting the burden right back on to working Americans. In other cases, there may be some local help. But given the cuts that we are already making in aid to schools and other areas, that is not very likely.

So, in many cases, we are simply looking at the prospect of many of these people falling through the cracks or being tossed out the window, and if you think it is hyperbole, listen to what the Wall Street Journal reported last November when it said, "More than two decades after the creation of a Federal law aimed at providing free meals to anyone over 60, several million older Americans are going hungry and their numbers are growing steadily. The Federal food programs cannot keep up with the Nation's rapidly graying population. For the first time, we have growing waiting lists," it quotes a Federal official as saying. "The level of malnutrition is only increasing." This was not in a left-wing newspaper. This was in the Wall Street Journal.

Or take a look at this New York Times headline and the story. The story read, "A gray-haired man in a blue Yankee cap lifts the lid off of a garbage bin next to a supermarket. Peering inside, he pulls out a tray of mushrooms still wrapped in plastic, slips it surreptitiously into a small gym bag, as shoppers stroll in front of the supermarket. Elderly people go almost unnoticed as they scavenge for food in garbage bins just around the corner." These are not homeless people. They are not entirely destitute. But they are driven to the unappealing and even humiliating task of foraging through trash by a disturbing combination of immediate financial need and more general fear of the future.

This picture, while I know it does not show up very well, shows older Americans searching for food outside of a supermarket in a dumpster—in a dumpster. We have come to this.

We are going to be providing a big capital gains tax cut. We are going to be eliminating the minimum corporate tax that the high-flying, truly needy corporations of this country now pay but will not be paying under the new tax bill. So that again you have a laundry list of large corporations ranging from AT&T down through you name it, who will wind up not paying taxes, again, just like they did not pay taxes between 1982 and 1995 even though they made \$60 billion in profits.

□ 1040

We are going to be doing all of that and paying for it by taking jobs away from our seniors and by taking literally food out of the mouths of not just kids, but out of our low-income elderly.

Mr. Chairman, it is really hard to put this bill in context because there is really no precedent for what is being done. We are witnessing an attempt to implement policies that are radically out of the mainstream.

Take, for instance, the foster grandparents program. It is hard to find anybody who is familiar with that program who does not think it is one of the best things that has ever happened to this country.

It takes low-income elderly, gives them a minimum wage for providing care and companionship to young kids 20 hours a week. These are kids in foster care or State institutions. Some are very severely retarded, they are autistic; they are kids who would not receive love or attention from any other source.

Some people thought the Reagan administration was pretty hard-hearted, particularly when it came to the disadvantaged and to programs to help them, but I would like to read something.

Mr. Chairman, let me read this quote: "It is really hard to say who benefits more in this program, the child or the foster grandparent. What of the children in the program? They have been abandoned, forgotten, the victims of pernicious neglect. They range in age from infancy to 21 years. The fact is, it is doubly beneficial. That is one reason why the cost of the program is so worthwhile."

You know who said that? Not some left-wing socialist. Nancy Reagan. That is who said that. Yet, you are going to gut those programs.

Mr. Chairman, I would simply say, I know that there are going to be some amendments offered today to try to make a token apology to the seniors and the vulnerable in this country by restoring a few pennies in the almost \$10 billion savaging that you are doing these populations, and I guess there is no harm in bringing up those amendments. It is a little conscience money that you are going to provide so you can take back home and tell your constituents, you care at least a little bit.

All I would say is that regardless of how many fig leaves you pass on this

floor today, you cannot fix up this bill, and those little conscience amendments still do not remove the obligation for people of both parties to keep our bipartisan commitment to these programs for the vulnerable.

Some of these programs were started on a bipartisan basis by people like Mel Laird and Gaylord Nelson, two bipartisan Wisconsin products. We ought not abandon these programs or the people who are helped by them. I urge you, no matter what happens on amendments today, vote this turkey down.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Chairman, I would simply say that the overall cut in the Department of Health and Human Services in the discretionary funds is 3.5 percent. Of that, a portion is in salaries and expenses that are cut by 7.5 percent. The overall cut in services is perhaps under 3 percent, and most of the spending in this section of the bill is mandatory spending that will continue regardless of what is contained in the bill. I think the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] greatly, greatly overstates the effect of what the bill does.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Chairman, this bill is an integral part of our effort to balance the budget, the moral and economic challenge of our time. This bill meets its share of the burden and therefore deserves every Member's support. These are the tough choices we are having to make to balance this budget.

These are the specifics that follow after the budget that we approved earlier this year, and we have prioritized what we consider the most important areas, funded those, and said, wait a minute, do we need to fund everything just because it has been in the budget for years and years and years?

Mr. Chairman, this bill was not undertaken in a haphazard or malicious way. We went about this very thoughtfully and determined our priorities. We have over 1,200 programs under our jurisdiction in this subcommittee and for each one, we asked a simple question: Is this Federal undertaking absolutely critical or can it be reformed or eliminated? Some programs which were not found to be Federal concerns were eliminated, while others were deemed essential and received increases.

By setting priorities, we eliminated programs that do not work and strengthened ones that do. Spending taxpayer dollars on useless programs is not compassion. Balancing the budget and setting priorities is real and true compassion. There are many programs which we found to be essential.

Some of these include the five prevention programs within the Centers for Disease Control which all received increases above their 1995 funding levels. The first is the breast and cervical cancer screening program. The subcommittee's recommended increase of

\$25 million, which goes from \$100 to \$125 million, will provide enough funding to permit the expansion of this program into all States, thereby allowing greater access for low-income, high-risk women to receive screening and referral services for the detection of breast and cervical cancer at earlier and more treatable stages.

The prevention program of infectious disease received over a 20-percent increase. This additional funding is intended to provide sorely needed resources to the CDC for addressing such monumental problems as the ebola virus and E. coli which we have all heard so much about lately.

Additionally, the bill increases funds for chronic and environmental disease prevention and sexually transmitted disease prevention by \$15 million. This will permit enhancement of programs such as diabetes control and education, cancer registries, birth defects, disabilities, and other diseases.

Finally, the subcommittee provides additional protection for our most important resource: Children. The Childhood Immunization Program has gone from \$465 million to \$475, a \$10 million increase, which will permit the CDC to purchase more vaccines, expand clinic hours, and provide increased outreach opportunities ensuring vaccination for previously unreachable children.

Mr. Chairman, this bill does fund those items in which the Federal Government has a legitimate and necessary role. AIDS prevention has gone from \$569 million to \$595 million. The Ryan White Program, the AIDS Treatment Program, goes from \$633 million to \$656 million. Overall, the bill increases funding for prevention programs by \$63 million. This is \$63 million which will go toward assisting low-income women and children to achieve better health care and \$63 million which will go toward securing the safety of our Nation by protecting us from infectious diseases.

A further example of setting priorities is the proposed increase in funding for the National Institutes of Health, a real treasure to this country. The majority party realizes that even when resources are necessarily restricted, it is important to continue to fund and support those programs which are critical for future development.

It is estimated that the advances derived from the National Institutes of Health research save \$69 billion annually in medical care costs. Additionally, federally supported biomedical research creates high-skilled jobs and supports the biomedical industry generating a positive balance of trade for our country.

I do not believe the importance of biomedical research can be understated. And for those reasons, this bill increases the overall spending for the National Institutes of Health by \$642 million, a 5.7-percent increase. Let me repeat that. The National Institutes of Health has an increase in spending of \$642 million, or 5.7 percent. This trans-

lates into millions of new research dollars for finding a cure for cancer or AIDS, as well as additional millions for battling the debilitating diseases such as hemophilia and cerebral palsy.

Mr. Chairman, it is time for this Congress to make some tough choices. For too long we have allowed programs which do not provide any tangible or national benefit to receive precious Federal dollars. We cannot increase NIH and prevention spending unless we are willing to make cuts somewhere else. If we are to ensure the relative prosperity of future generations, we have to stick to our funding levels and make the decisions based on a program's relative worth.

Mr. Chairman, President Clinton's 1996 proposed funding for NIH was at \$11.3 billion, \$165 million below what we are proposing to spend on NIH. We are proposing to spend, in this bill, \$165 billion more than President Clinton even requested.

The center of our debate today is where are our priorities, what programs can we point to that have a direct benefit on society and have had a success in health care?

These are the tough choices we have to make, but we have to remember the bottom line is we must balance this budget over the next 7 years. That is what is important for our children and grandchildren in this country, is to get on that glidepath to a balanced budget. That is what is going to give the benefits that we need for the standard of living, the quality of life that affects all Americans. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO].

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this bill. This is a mean-spirited attack on the elderly, working families, and our Nation's children. Nowhere is this assault more evident, than with the bill's total elimination of the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program, which provides life saving assistance to low-income families and seniors.

It is an outrage that this Congress would take the heat away from our seniors to give a cool \$20,000 tax break to the Nation's most wealthy.

The draconian and heartless action of the committee to eliminate all funding for the Low income Home Energy Assistance Program jeopardizes the health and safety of millions of Americans who rely on these funds to heat and cool their homes.

In my home State of Connecticut, nearly 70,000 households benefit from \$27 million in home energy assistance. In my district alone, nearly 13,000 households benefit.

Marie Brown of Wallingford is one of the many people in my district who depend on energy assistance to heat her home in the winter. It gets very cold in Connecticut. Marie's \$500 a month budget isn't enough to pay her home heating bills after she has paid rent, medical costs and other expenses.

Marie calls home energy assistance "a blessing," and says that "this is the best thing they have ever done, especially for the elderly." Eliminating energy assistance would force Marie and other seniors on fixed incomes make choices they shouldn't have to make—choices between home heating and necessities such as food or medicine.

If energy assistance is eliminated, what are we going to say to Marie Brown and the millions of families who depend on this program?

I do not want to tell them that to ensure people have adequate shelter is no longer a priority for Congress and that tax breaks for the Nation's wealthy are a more pressing concern. I will not carry that message.

It is unconscionable that low-income seniors and working families in extreme need would be swept aside so that Republicans can offer the wealthy an unnecessary tax break.

Just last month, the Nation experienced an unusually harsh heat wave, which caused the deaths of 400 people in Chicago. The Governor of Illinois was able to offer the citizens of his State emergency energy assistance to prevent future fatalities. Under this bill, Governors across the Nation would not have those emergency resources, and just possibly more men and women would die. Energy assistance is truly life-saving assistance and we have an obligation to provide it to people in need.

I urge my colleagues to stand by working families and the elderly. Support amendments to restore energy assistance to millions of seniors and working families, whose survival should be our No. 1 priority.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. OLVER].

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I want to play directly to the comments made by the minority Member who is in control of the time at the moment. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. MILLER] just a few minutes ago said that the bill that is before us represents the Republican controlled Committee on Appropriations majority's careful and thoughtful consideration of priorities; and, No. 2, the elimination of spending Federal dollars on useless programs.

Mr. Chairman, let us look at one of those programs. The Republican controlled Committee on Appropriations has completely eliminated the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program, the so-called LIHEAP Program, completely eliminated that.

Mr. Chairman, that program serves almost 6 million families around this country. Usually it is thought about as a program that covers people who have problems with the cold from the Rocky Mountains east to the eastern seaboard along the northern tier, but as the gentlewoman from Connecticut just pointed out, emergencies this summer in Chicago where there were more than 400 dead and emergencies over the Southern Plains and in the Southwest

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

□ 1100

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

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

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

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

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

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