

produce a bill that is much better than last year's legislation; I believe that it still falls short of the important needs of our children and schools.

Let me first commend the efforts of the subcommittee for their efforts in the field of health research. Given the many funding restrictions, I am pleased that the National Institutes of Health have received an increase of 6.9 percent. NIH is the world's leading biomedical research institution and funding such research is today's investment in America's future.

However, I am troubled by the cuts the bill makes to the education budget. These cuts fall below the level necessary to keep up with inflation and projected future growth. Moreover, such decreases would result in a total cut to education programs of 7 percent below the fiscal year 1995 levels at the same time that school enrollment is projected to increase by 7 percent. Similarly, Perkins loans and State student incentive grants are eliminated, affecting over 220,000 college students. Goals 2000 education reform and Eisenhower teacher training grants are also eliminated.

The bill provides \$475 million less for title I funding than the president requested; \$307 million less for special education; and \$729 million less for student financial assistance. Funding for Safe and Drug Free Schools is cut \$25 million below last year's level, and bilingual education is cut \$11 million below last year's amount.

These proposed cuts in education funding run the risk of creating a real crisis in education for the Nation's children. State and local governments already face difficult challenges in educating our children given the growing demands placed on schools at a time of constrained budgets and aging facilities.

I believe that these cuts are dangerously short-sighted. Funding education programs and initiatives should be one of the top priorities in creating a better future, both for the Nation and for individual families everywhere. Indeed, a better educated citizenry and workforce are critical to competing in the changing global economy and in maintaining a strong democracy.

In addition to the cuts in education, the bill also contains unnecessarily harsh cuts in programs needed to enforce labor, wage, and health standards for American workers. For example, the bill provides \$43 million less than the President requested for OSHA, and \$46 million less for enforcement of employment standards, including wage and hour standards. Funds for the National Labor Relations Board are cut \$25 million or 15 percent below last year's level.

The American worker has been under attack since the first day of this Congress. These men and women are the engine of our economy and they deserve to be treated with dignity and respect. They also deserve a safe workplace. I am very pleased that the amendment offered by my colleague from California, Mrs. PELOSI, was accepted by the House. This important amendment deleted a rider that would have banned OSHA from protecting workers from musculoskeletal disorders, which represent America's fastest growing workplace health problem. In spite of our budget constraints, we must not retreat from worker protection laws that have benefited thousands of American workers.

As I stated at the outset, this bill is much improved over last year's Labor-HHS bill.

However, critical funding deficiencies remain and I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this bill.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. CHARLES E. SCHUMER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 12, 1996

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to vote on the final passage of H.R. 3005, Securities Amendments of 1996, when the yeas and nays were ordered on June 19, 1996. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on the bill.

NATIONAL PARKS CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS ACT OF 1996

HON. JIM KOLBE

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 12, 1996

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, this week I introduced legislation that would help alleviate the enormous \$4.5 billion backlog of capital needs in America's national parks. I believe this is a problem that demands the immediate attention of Congress, even as we seek to balance the Federal budget and struggle to reduce the Nation's staggering \$5.2 trillion debt. Congress has increased funding for national parks in fiscal year 1997, but the need is growing much faster. Park utilization is rising rapidly, and infrastructure needs replacement. We cannot expect appropriated funds to meet all of these needs. The time has come for us to explore more creative solutions to this vexing problem.

One thing Congress can do is to make it possible for substantial funds to be raised in the private sector for parks. The bill I am introducing today does just that. It provides an innovative mechanism for the public to invest directly in the preservation and enhancement of our national parks.

Specifically, my bill enables private, nonprofit organizations associated with the National Park Service to issue taxable capital development bonds that would be paid for by park entrance fees, that are not to exceed \$2 per visitor. Money collected in a particular park will be used to secure bonds that fund improvements in that park. I think the preceding statement is the cornerstone of this legislation and it bears repeating. Money collected in a particular park will be used to secure bonds that fund improvements in that park. Any national park with capital needs in excess of \$5 million will be eligible to participate in the revenue bonds program.

I believe park officials will enthusiastically embrace this program, and the Director of the National Park Service has already informed me that he is excited about the prospects of this legislation. After all, the needs are real, immediate, and nationwide. Moreover, my bill offers a practical solution to a serious dilemma. Rangers at Grand Canyon National Park, for example, are obliged to live in squalid conditions because funds have not been available to build sufficient housing. Saguaro National Park has an estimated \$10 million backlog in infrastructure needs, while Rocky

Mountain National Park has deferred \$50 million in needed improvements.

Yellowstone National Park has had to close a major campground and two museums for lack of funds, and this year, Great Smoky Mountains National Park shut down 10 campgrounds and adjoining picnic areas. The national cemetery at Vicksburg National Military Park has been forced to defer \$6 million in restoration and stabilization work, while Shenandoah National Park reports a \$12 million backlog in facility maintenance.

My legislation is similar to a bill recently introduced by my distinguished colleague and friend, Senator JOHN MCCAIN. It allows private, nonprofit groups to enter into partnership agreements with individual parks and the Secretary of the Interior, to act as authorized organizations for the benefit of the parks they serve. These organizations will work with park superintendents to prepare lists of capital improvement projects that are to be financed by taxable capital development bonds. These nonprofit groups, also, would be authorized to issue and manage such bonds on behalf of the parks.

My bill adds a stipulation that no part of the bond proceeds, except interest, may be used to defray administrative costs. Bond holders and the visiting public will be assured that every dollar raised will actually be spent on in-park improvements. Also, the bill will allow memoranda of agreement between nonprofit entities and the National Park Service to be modified in the event funding priorities change. Perhaps most importantly, bonds issued by the nonprofit associations will be backed by the full faith and credit of the U.S. Government in the event that Congress should remove the authority to assess the \$2 entrance fee.

Mr. Speaker, in these fiscally austere times, we simply must become more creative in finding ways to address the needs of our National Park System. The concept of issuing revenue bonds to fund capital improvements is not new. Private industry, municipalities, and other sectors of local government have used revenue bonds for decades and with great success. We can successfully apply this approach to fund capital development needs in our national parks, as well.

My bill also encourages real, beneficial partnerships between the Federal Government and the private sector. Many groups, like the National Park Foundation, the Fish and Wildlife Foundation, and the nearly 70 cooperating associations that presently serve the National Park Service, already provide invaluable financial support to the National Park Service. Their success proves that public-private partnerships can and do in fact work for the benefit of our public institutions. My legislation will greatly expand the ability of these organizations to aid the parks we cherish, and I believe they are ready and eager to rise to the challenge.

Some have suggested that we should allow corporations to become commercial sponsors of the National Park Service. Indeed, legislation to this effect has been introduced in the Senate, and some park supporters have voiced qualified support for the proposal. But I, for one, take a dim view of the prospect that we should commercialize America's crown jewels—our precious national parks—in order to save them.

Mr. Speaker, my friend Senator JOHN MCCAIN recently noted that "Americans are

eager to invest in our Nation's natural heritage." I agree. The American people don't want to see their national parks succumb to the ravages of time and use. But neither are they willing to see the integrity of the parks compromised by commercial exploitation. Let's give the National Park Service the same financial opportunities that our schools and community water systems currently possess—the ability to utilize capital development bonds. I encourage my colleagues to support this legislation.

A NATURAL DISASTER PROTECTION PARTNERSHIP ACT

HON. E. CLAY SHAW, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 12, 1996

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of a Natural Disaster Protection Partnership Act. This legislation was introduced by the late, distinguished Member of this body who we now greatly miss, Mr. Emerson. It is imperative that we take Mr. Emerson's lead and continue to work for the passage of this disaster plan into law. Without a natural disaster protection partnership plan, this country will face a severe financial crisis.

As a Representative from Florida, I am very concerned with the destruction caused by natural forces such as hurricanes and tornadoes. Last year was one of the most active hurricane seasons ever. The destruction caused by these hurricanes is tremendous, as can be seen by Andrew and Opal. Moreover, extensive damage is seen every year by other types of natural disasters such as earthquakes in California and floods in the Plains States.

As a result of the rising costs of these natural disasters, consumers in these disaster prone areas face difficulty obtaining affordable homeowner's insurance. Moreover, taxpayers have been forced to spend \$45 billion in 6 years for these disasters because homeowners and States have been unprepared to handle these catastrophes. Clearly, we must act now before FEMA's funds are depleted and homeowners cannot purchase insurance to protect them from these disasters.

In light of Hurricane Bertha, which is threatening the southeastern coast, we must pass a disaster plan that mitigates physical damage, provides insurance protection for homeowners and businesses and reduces Federal disaster costs. I encourage each of you to contact Chairman BOEHLERT and express your support for passing this legislation this year.

SUPPORTING THE NATURAL DISASTER PROTECTION PARTNERSHIP ACT

HON. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 12, 1996

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my Florida colleagues in supporting H.R. 1856, the Natural Disaster Protection Partnership Act. As the east coast battens down the hatches to brace for Hurricane Bertha, the time is ripe for passing legislation de-

signed to promote a responsible Federal disaster policy.

Last Congress, in the aftermath of the Northridge, CA, earthquake, the bipartisan House leadership appointed a task force on disasters on which I was proud to serve. As part of this task force, we met with various experts on disaster management policy, and through the leadership of Bill Emerson, we were able to turn many of this task force's recommendations into legislative language in the form of H.R. 1856, the Natural Disaster Protection Partnership Act.

I believe all of us here today recognize the need for an efficient, effective Federal disaster policy. There is no doubt that we must assist victims when a disaster strikes, but business as usual just isn't acceptable now as our enormous Federal deficit continues to grow. Those of us in Florida who survived Hurricane Andrew know firsthand how destructive the forces of nature can be, and how costly. Hurricane Andrew, at the time the task force was formed, had the illustrious honor at roughly \$20 billion of being the costliest federally declared natural disaster of all time in the United States.

By emphasizing personal responsibility through private insurance, promoting sensible, cost-effective disaster loss mitigation programs and encouraging the creation of a privately-funded pooling mechanism that allows for the spreading of disaster risk and minimizes the liability of the Federal Government, we can lessen the costs incurred by the Federal Government and in turn the individual taxpayer.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the Natural disaster Protection Act and helping the Federal Government achieve a sound national disaster policy that can help prevent loss of life and personal injury as well as reduce costs.

ELECTRONIC FREEDOM OF INFORMATION AMENDMENTS OF 1996

HON. RANDY TATE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 12, 1996

Mr. TATE. Mr. Speaker, in commemoration of the 30th anniversary of the Freedom of Information Act [FOIA], joined by my colleagues on the Government Management, Information and Technology Subcommittee, including Chairman STEVE HORN, Ranking Minority Member CAROLYN MALONEY, and Representative COLLIN PETERSON, today I introduce the Electronic Freedom of Information Amendments of 1996.

The Freedom of Information Act [FOIA] was enacted in 1966 in order to provide the public with a presumptive and clear right of access to government information. In the 30 years since the implementation of the original Freedom of Information Act, our Nation has witnessed enormous technological advances. The laptop computer, cellular phone, fax, and Internet are just a few of the technological achievements that have brought us into the information age.

The Electronic Freedom of Information Amendments of 1996 [EFOIA] makes it clear that FOIA applies to Government records in any form, including electronic records, while increasing on-line access to Government information. This legislation successfully harnesses

the benefits of computer technology and, with common-sense reforms, delivers to the public increased Government efficiency, accessibility, and responsiveness.

The Freedom of Information Act turns 30 this year—it is time to bring the law into the modern information age, using cutting edge technology to deliver cutting edge service to the American people. We in Congress, as their public servants, should aspire to nothing less. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support enactment of this bipartisan and important legislation this year.

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1997

SPEECH OF

HON. KEN BENTSEN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 1996

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3755) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1997, and for other purposes:

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the fiscal year 1997 Labor-HHS appropriations bill. While it is much improved over last year's bill, this legislation does not meet the needs of millions of Americans who rely on this funding for education, job training, workplace safety, and family planning.

On the positive side, I am pleased that this legislation increases funding for health research at the National Institutes of Health and related agencies. This bill provides \$12.7 billion for the NIH, an increase of 7 percent over fiscal year 1996. This investment in medical research is cost-effective and will help improve our Nation's health. As a result of this research new medical treatments will be discovered that will lower health care costs and improve the lives of patients with AIDS, cancer, heart disease, Alzheimer's, and other illness. As the representative for Texas Medical Center, I am keenly aware of the tremendous advances being made by medical researchers and of the funding pressures researchers face for the health of our Nation and for the good of our economy, a strong NIH budget is one investment we must continue to make even as we seek to balance the Federal budget.

But the rest of this bill fails to set the right priorities, especially in the area of education. Our constituents do not want this Congress to cut funding for education. In the Houston area, cuts of over \$475 million in title I compensatory education for economically disadvantaged children will hurt every one of our school districts, including Fort Bend, Houston, Pasadena, and Goose Creek. These cuts could result in fewer teachers, larger classes and higher local property taxes.

Furthermore, cuts in bilingual education and the Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program will dramatically hurt the ability of schools to provide adequate education for thousands of Hispanic-Americans and to meet the safety needs