

of all Houston area students. The complete elimination of the Goals 2000 and Eisenhower Professional Development Programs will also prevent schools from incorporation innovative, locally developed teaching techniques into the classroom.

This bill also dramatically cuts Student Financing Aid Programs. Too many Americans are already struggling because of the high cost of higher education. As American workers face increased foreign competition, higher education is more necessary than ever before. Over 82 percent of undergraduates at Houston's Rice University, one of the premier universities in the United States, receive financial aid by cutting Perkins loans and eliminating State student incentive grants, we are sending a message to America's youth that higher education will be harder to afford. That is wrong.

This legislation also reflects the Republican leadership's disdain for American workers. It recklessly and foolishly cuts the Occupational Safety and Health Administration budget by 13 percent and the National Labor Relations Board by 20 percent.

The two agencies responsible for ensuring worker's safety and rights are singled out for dramatic and unnecessary cuts. The Republican leadership places unnecessary restrictions on both OSHA and the NLRB on how the perform their mission.

Finally, I would like to point out that members of this Congress once again have attempted to gut our Nation's Family Planning Program. Title X provides essential health care services for thousands of low-income women each year. Without family planning, American women would not have access to the safety medical care possible, and I am pleased that the Congress rejected any attempt to limit or eliminate this vital program.

In summary, I urge my colleagues to oppose this misguided legislation because of its dramatic effects on the America's working families. It does not meet the needs of millions of Americans who rely on funding for education, job training, workplace safety, and family planning, and should be rejected.

LET US EXTEND MFN FOR CHINA

HON. JACK FIELDS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 12, 1996

Mr. FIELDS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am here today to endorse the extension of most-favored-nation trading status with China. I believe that only by doing so can the United States play a role in promoting democracy, individual freedom, and free market economics in China. Extending MFN for China is in the mutual interest of China and the United States.

Most favored nation [MFN] is merely a term used to indicate the standard or general tariff treatment the United States extends to virtually all countries in return for reciprocal tariff treatment for American exports.

Currently our fifth largest trading partner, China accounts for \$12 billion in annual American exports. Our farmers, industrial equipment producers, high technology firms, and others all export American goods to China. Last year, the United States sold China 10

percent of our wheat and corn, 40 percent of our fertilizer, \$270 million in heating and cooling equipment, \$330 million in industrial machinery, \$710 million in telecommunications equipment, and \$1.2 billion in civilian aircraft.

Manufacturing these goods has created over 200,000 high-skill and high-wage American jobs. In Texas alone, foreign trade has produced more than 45,000 such jobs. If we fail to extend MFN to China, the United States will lose the reciprocity that MFN status makes possible. This would increase tariffs paid by American firms selling their products in China from an average rate of 5 percent to an average rate of 50 percent, and in some cases 100 percent. As a result, American exports to China would be dramatically reduced, many of the 200,000 American jobs could be lost to overseas competitors, and imports from China—including footwear, toys, and apparel—would become more expensive for American consumers.

China's economy is expanding at an astounding rate. It is estimated that by the year 2002 China will have the largest economy in the world and will continue to be a major importer of American products. The World Bank projects that China will spend \$750 billion on infrastructure in the next decade. If the United States scales back its trade relations with China, American firms will not be in a position to participate in this rapidly expanding Chinese economy in the years ahead. Europe and Asia will enjoy unrestricted access to the rapidly growing Chinese market, putting the United States at a competitive disadvantage.

I recently traveled to China and witnessed firsthand the positive impact the information age is having on the Chinese people and the Chinese government. China is predicted to become the largest market for American exports of telecommunications equipment in the next decade. Not only are the economic implications behind this new openness important, but the social ramifications as well. China's increasing desire for high technology products and information will be mutually beneficial to both the United States and China economically, politically, and socially.

Human rights and democracy are not promoted or enhanced by shutting off the flow of technology and information. Open, fair, and competitive trade is the most effective means by which the United States can play a role in enhancing the economic and political well-being of the Chinese people.

MFN should not be an issue the Congress addresses on an annual basis. This trade status has been extended to virtually every nation around the world. In order to strengthen Sino-American trade relationships, the United States should treat China no better—but certainly no worse—than we treat our other trading partners.

Congress should end the practice of linking human rights conditions in China to the issue of MFN status for China. The United States maintains mutually beneficial economic relationships with many countries around the world with which we have political or cultural differences. These differences should be addressed in the diplomatic arena, not by taking actions likely to trigger a trade war between two great trading partners.

For all these reasons, it is imperative that the United States maintain MFN trade relations with China now and in the years to come. The revocation of China's MFN status

is not in the best interest of the United States. Mr. Chairman, let us do what is best for American and Chinese workers, democracy in China, and free trade. Let us extend MFN for China.

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

SPEECH OF

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

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:

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak in opposition to the Istook amendment.

Title X is the only Federal program that prevents unintended pregnancy and reduces the need for abortion. In my State alone, 300,000 women and teens rely on title X for their only reproductive health care.

The radical right is once again putting politics ahead of people by attempting to require young people to obtain their parents' consent for family planning and other health care services. This requirement will cause many teens to delay, or, worse yet, avoid seeking essential health care services—placing their health, future fertility, and even their lives at risk.

I agree that ideally, teens should be encouraged to talk to their parents about all health care decisions, including those of reproductive health. But, we don't live in an ideal world, and millions of teens don't live in ideal families. Study after study has shown that when parental consent is mandated by law, adolescents will delay or avoid seeking needed care.

How can anyone oppose such an essential program? Whose best interests are being served? Certainly not those of American teenagers, families, and women.

Once again, the new majority has put the radical right's agenda ahead of good government.

Consent to give teens the right to make good health decisions, and the right to basic health care services. Oppose the Istook amendment.

LET'S MOVE FORWARD WITH THE PORTABILITY BILL

HON. J. DENNIS HASTERT

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 12, 1996

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Speaker, allow me to quote from an article in this past Tuesday's Washington Post: Senator Kennedy told his health care aide, "My political sense is that Clinton gets something—if the health reform bill is enacted—but Dole does, too." His aide replied, "If it fails * * * it helps us more than

them, because we can credibly blame them for killing it."

It's clear that the liberals in the other body would rather use health care reform as a political finger-pointing game than give the American people portability, or give the self-employed 80 percent deductibility on their health insurance. The big-government liberals would rather play politics than vigorously attack the waste and fraud in our health care system.

Yesterday, the Republican Leader in the other body again tried to appoint conferees for the health reform bill. And again, the liberal Democrat leadership blocked him.

Mr. Speaker, this has to stop. It's time to stop playing politics with the American people's health—let's move forward with the portability bill.

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

SPEECH OF

HON. ROSA L. DeLAURO

OF CONNECTICUT

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:

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Lowey-Morella amendment to provide \$2 million in funding for the women's Educational Equity Act. The funding was eliminated under this bill and must be restored.

The Women's Economic Equity Act was established in 1974 to help achieve educational equity for women and girls. Since that time the act has funded research, development, and the dissemination of curricular materials, training programs, guidance and testing materials—all to combat inequitable educational practices.

Here are some facts:

Boys often demand and receive more teacher attention than girls; they are praised more and challenged more by their teachers.

According to the Department of Education, boys outscore girls in math, science, and history by their senior year.

This is unfair and this money must be restored.

I urge all my colleagues to support and pass the Lowey-Morella amendment.

THE IMPORTANCE OF NATURAL
DISASTER ASSISTANCE

HON. MICHAEL BILIRAKIS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 12, 1996

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express the importance of natural disaster assistance. Our dear friend, Mr. Emerson intro-

duced the Natural Disaster Protection partnership Act the Congress, and I am pleased to be one of 267 cosponsors. This much needed legislation will provide for an expanded Federal program of hazard mitigation, relief, and insurance against the risk of catastrophic natural disasters.

To understand the importance of this legislation, one need only be reminded of the devastating effects of Hurricane Andrew that struck Florida in 1992 and Hurricane Hugo in 1989. In Florida, many insurance companies are canceling insurance policies.

Currently, Hurricane Bertha continues its uncertain path along the eastern seaboard. Hopefully, Hurricane Bertha will not cause any damage and dissipate at sea.

While we here in the United States are fortunate that Hurricane Bertha has not yet made landfall, I want to highlight the importance and need for the Natural Disaster Partnership Act.

H.R. 1856 will promote stability in the insurance industry, encourage personal responsibility, and reduce Federal disaster relief costs. I urge my colleagues to ensure passage of this important bill.

GAMING AND COLORADO'S
ECONOMY

HON. WAYNE ALLARD

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 12, 1996

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, as Congress continues to research and debate the impacts of gaming, I believe that this report, published by Colorado's Office of State Planning and Budgeting, may be a helpful resource for members.

ISSUE BRIEF: GAMING IMPACTS THE COLORADO
ECONOMY

Demands on Colorado's general fund, the tax money that pays the state's bills, increase each year, primarily from the areas of K-12 education, higher education, human services, public safety and capital construction. The state coffers are filled by a variety of taxes and fees, including individual and corporate income taxes, sales and use taxes, insurance and excise taxes, and interest earnings. State lawmakers and government budget officers try to stretch the general fund as far as possible to maximize services, and they also look for creative ways to raise additional revenues. The gaming industry has been tapped in many states, including Colorado, and each year it contributes a larger amount to the general fund. How this industry began and has grown illustrate clearly that gaming, when allowed to expand even under tightly controlled regulations, is an ongoing source of state revenue. During the last five fiscal years, revenues from the gaming industry have steadily increased, demonstrating a trend expected to continue.

IDENTIFYING A NEW REVENUE SOURCE

Movies about the Old West have left most viewers with vivid impressions of raucous poker games in dusty, smoke-filled saloons. Slick gun-totin' professional gamblers were often paired with innocent greenhorns fresh off the trail. Saloon proprietors were only too glad to help empty their pockets of any money, providing liquor by the bottle, a room and a bath, entertainment, and, of course, gambling.

Gradually, after statehood was attained, Colorado citizens had a state constitution

and volumes of statutes as the basis for their legal systems. Permissive attitudes that had existed in the wide-open towns gave way to tighter control. Opinions regarding gambling obviously changed, because prohibitions against such activities were written into the criminal code in 1913. The legislative declaration states, "the policy of the general assembly, recognizing the close relationship between professional gambling and other organized crime, (is) to restrain all persons from seeking profit from gambling activities in this state . . . from patronizing such activities . . . to safeguard the public against the evils inducted by common gamblers and common gambling houses . . ." (Source: Colorado Revised Statutes, 18-10-101)

Prohibiting gambling was thereby deemed good public policy, holding firm until 1949 when the Colorado Racing Commission was created. In recent years, the gaming industry has been expanded into other areas—bingo and raffle, lottery and lotto, and limited stakes gaming. In fiscal year 1995, the four gaming sources provided nearly \$152 million in revenue.

RACING

Members of the General assembly began to relax the prohibitions against gaming in 1949 when the Colorado Racing Commission was established. A portion of the legislative declaration reads, ". . . for the purpose of promoting racing and the recreational, entertainment, and commercial benefits to be derived therefrom; to raise revenue for the general fund . . ." (Source: Colorado Revised Statutes, 12-60-100.2)

The Racing Commission and the Division of Racing Events are located within the Department of Revenue. The commission's five members are appointed by the Governor and confirmed by the state Senate. They serve staggered terms and represent designated geographical areas and political parties. In addition, the statute specifies that one of the five members must be a practicing veterinarian and two must have racing industry experience. Duties of the commissioners range from promoting the health and safety of the animals to setting racing calendars. They also oversee the division's professional staff, which includes veterinarians, security personnel and other racing officials. The commissioners license racetrack owners and operators and hold them to rigid safety standards for spectators and sanitation guidelines for animals.

In 1995, Colorado had seven tracks with approved race dates. Four of the tracks feature greyhounds, one is a major horse track, and the remaining two are fair circuit horse tracks. The dog tracks operate in either the north or the south circuit, located either above or below "a latitudinal line drawn through the location of the Douglas County courthouse in the town of Castle Rock as of June 6, 1991." [Colorado Revised Statutes, 12-60-701(2)(a)] In-state and out-of-state simulcast racing is legal in Colorado, and off-track betting (OTB) is also available in four licensed locations, three in the Denver area and one in Black Hawk. No one under age 18 is allowed to purchase or redeem any parimutuel ticket.

During the 1995 racing season, 322,614 people visited Colorado's horse tracks, with an average daily attendance, including off-track betting, of 1,204. Total attendance at the dog tracks was 1,190,237 during the same period, with a daily average, including off-track betting, of 1,653. In 1995, the gross amount wagered, known as the "handle," was just over \$257 million, with the average daily handle hitting \$260,232, a 21.6% increase over 1994's average daily handle. Occupational licenses and other fees added another \$130,095.