

Union, reported that that Committee, having 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, had come to no resolution thereon.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3396, DEFENSE OF MARRIAGE ACT

Mr. MCINNIS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104-666) on the resolution (H. Res. 474) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3396) to define and protect the institution of marriage, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 3755 and include extraneous and tabular material 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 RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1997

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 472 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 3755.

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. 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, with Mr. WALKER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] has 43 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] has 39½ minutes remaining.

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

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

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

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I would call the attention of the Members to the charts beside me. First, a chart depicting the expenditures of the

U.S. Government in 1962, Jack Kennedy's heyday, when the Federal Government in that fiscal year spent \$106.8 billion with a very minor deficit. The deficit today runs around \$150 billion.

It was a different day, a different era. Half of that was defense, which is depicted in the lower yellow portion of the pie, and roughly one-sixth of the budget, a little bit more than one-sixth, is the nondefense discretionary portion, which includes the programs funded in this bill.

□ 1900

The blue portion refers to the entitlements, which at that time consisted of Social Security and welfare and various other mandatory spending programs. The red is interest on the debt, which then was a "big" \$7 billion.

Times have changed, Mr. Chairman. Today—for fiscal 1997—the chart looks entirely different. More than half is blue, the mandatory portion of the budget, which is now Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, welfare and other mandatory programs. The total amount now that we propose to spend is \$1.6 trillion compared to \$106 billion in fiscal 1962.

Today we spend 15 times more than we spent back in Jack Kennedy's day. As I say, half of it is for mandatory spending. We raise most of the money, and we transfer it to other people. We tax the American people and pass it on to the next guy.

The discretionary portion looks entirely different. Before, half of the whole budget was defense; now it is only one-sixth. But the other sixth, or the other half of the third, represents discretionary spending which is now about \$269 billion, and a good portion of what is in this bill makes up that amount.

Actually some of what is in this bill is also funded in the blue, or the mandatory portion, but what is significant about this chart is the red. The significant of the red on this chart is the fact that it has grown disproportionate to the entire pie, which itself has grown by 15 times since 1962. The red represents the interest on the debt.

Within the next year or so the red, the interest that we pay on the debt, the borrowing of \$100 billion, \$200 billion, \$300 billion a year over the last many years, is now rapidly approaching the same amount of money and soon will, exceed what we spend on the defense of this Nation, our first priority under the Constitution of the United States.

So I have heard various Members from the other side of the aisle troop down here and say we have to take care of the little children, the infirm, the elderly, we have to take care of the disabled and people who cannot help themselves, and my answer is if we do not get a handle on this problem, all of those people along with every one of us is in deep trouble.

The interest on the debt is the first thing the Government must pay. Oth-

erwise we default. If we do not want to default, we have to pay the interest on the debt even before we worry about the security of our Nation and of every man woman and child in this Nation.

If we do not get that interest on the debt under control, if we do not get this borrowing in control, that tendency that has caused us to borrow up to \$100, \$200, to \$300 billion a year, because we are spending that much more than we receive every single year with the exception of perhaps 3 years since World War II, frankly, the red color on the chart will encompass everything else, and we will not be able to afford anything else.

So I would say take care of the little children first by balancing our books. Now, the other side will say, well, we are balancing them on the backs of the children. I say that is not true. The fact is we are making significant savings. In fiscal year 1995 we saved a net of \$16 billion, in fiscal year 1996 a net of an additional \$20 billion. In fiscal year 1997, which we are in now, it will be another 15 to \$20 billion. Minimum, a net savings to the American taxpayer of \$53 billion under what was appropriated by the Democrats when they had control last in the Congress.

If we look at President Clinton's budget compared to where he would take us had he had a Democratic Congress, we are saving around \$80 billion, all of that out of the discretionary spending. That savings is achieved by cutting everything fairly and equitably.

Is it out of education? No. First of all, the Federal Government only spends roughly 5 percent of the entire education budget. This is the chart showing what the United States spends on education. State and local governments spend 95 percent; the Federal Government puts up an additional 5 percent.

Mr. Chairman, I want to point out that despite the fact that we have heard this hue and cry about cutting the people that are least able, total nondefense discretionary spending is going up. The fact is, yes, we are eliminating duplicative programs. We have cut unnecessary programs. We have already eliminated a number of programs; gone from 655 in 1995, to 515 in 1996, and to 464 in 1997, in this bill.

At the same time the savings generated by these eliminations are, in fact, going to the States in the form of block grants, block grants for States and localities to spend the money as they please. Community service block grants has gone up from \$390 to \$490 million. For child care and development programs, it has gone up from \$935 to \$950 million. For social services block grant, it has gone up from \$2.4 to \$2.5 billion. And for maternal and child block grants, it has gone up by \$3 million from \$678 to \$681 million. We are spending more, not less, on block grants.

Student aid is going up. The student aid has increased. Maximum Pell

grants are going up per person, per individual recipient. The overall student aid has gone up. The TRIO Program has gone up. For the very most disadvantaged people spending has gone up. Work-study spending has gone up. So has spending for various other programs.

It has already been pointed out title I grants to the States are kept even. We have been hearing there are cuts in these programs. Head Start is staying even. We are not cutting these things. There has been a lot of rhetoric, a lot of political breast beating about how these programs are being cut. They are not being cut. They are staying even.

The point is we can go ahead and spend all the money and worry about mañana if we would like to, but the poorest of the poor will suffer the most. The people on pensions will suffer the most. The people trying to plan for their children's education by borrowing to get them in college or borrowing money to buy a house or to buy a car will pay most as long as the Government continues to borrow to make up for the deficit that it has created by spending more money than it receives year after year after year.

When are we going to bring some common sense to the system? Well, I will tell my friends, we have begun, and we are not balancing the books on the backs of the poor and the disadvantaged; we are putting this country back on an even keel in an orderly fashion. If we have our way, within 6 years we will have a balanced budget. If we do not have our way, if the other side has their way, this country is going broke.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, let me simply respond to the gentleman who just spoke by saying the following: On defense, the difference between now and Jack Kennedy's time is that when Jack Kennedy was President we were in the beginning of the Vietnam war, we had a raging hot cold war, and the Soviet Union was in its heyday. That is a little different than the situation is today.

With respect to interest on the debt, I would simply suggest that that interest on the national debt is not out of control because we are overinvesting in education. In fact, under this bill and under the Republican budget over the next 5 years, we will see a per pupil reduction in the Federal investment of almost 20 percent.

On the Pell grant front, which is the main program that helps kids go to college, in 1976 that program covered about 48 percent of the cost of going to college. Today it covers only about 20 percent of the cost. Federal support for education as a percentage of what local school districts provide has shrunk from 5.6 percent just 2 years ago when the Republicans took control of this place to about 4.7 percent under this bill. That is almost a 20-percent reduction. At the same time, the States' share of meeting the cost of public ele-

mentary and secondary education at the local level has declined from 50 to 45 percent. So we are seeing both at the State level and at the Federal level a real reduction in deliverable program levels to support education.

I would simply add one additional note. I find it quaint that when the gentleman defends this bill he says "We are not cutting anything, we are just holding it level," which denies the fact that because we have inflation and we also have an increasing student population, which means, again, that in deliverable aid to each student we are having a real reduction each year.

I find it interesting that somehow this is not a cut when we are talking about education, but last month, on page 2 of the document that the gentleman's committee reported, the Department of Defense appropriation bill for 1997, what they pointed out is that they provided a \$3.7 billion increase in raw dollars above 1996, but they described it as a \$4.4 billion reduction because it did not meet the cost of inflation.

So somehow when we talk about defense, then we are supposed to take into account the ravages of inflation and add to spending; with you, when we are counting what we provide for aid to kids, we are not supposed to do the same thing. That seems to me a very quaint accounting system, especially if we are concerned about making investments in protecting the country's future.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES].

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], the distinguished ranking member of the subcommittee, for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 3755, the bill setting the fiscal year 1997 appropriations levels for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Service, Education, and related agencies.

As a member of the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and as the ranking member of the VA-HUD Subcommittee, I know first hand how difficult it is to craft a bill that truly responds to the needs of the American people. So, first, I want to take this opportunity to commend the chairman of our subcommittee, the distinguished gentleman from Illinois, Mr. JOHN EDWARD PORTER, and our distinguished ranking member, Mr. DAVID OBEY, of Wisconsin, for their hard work and doing what they could to craft such a bill within the subcommittee's inadequate allocation.

While there are some things that we can be especially pleased with in this bill, there are a number of others where we should be extremely concerned. For example, we can be pleased about the fact that the bill includes an \$820 million increase for furthering biomedical research and restoring the infrastructure at the National Institutes

of Health; a \$75 million increase to further disease prevention and health promotion activities at the Centers for Disease Control; a \$37 million increase to expand higher education opportunities for disadvantaged students under the Trio programs; a \$45 million increase for Job Corps; and a \$33 million increase in health professions training to ensure a cadre of health care providers to meet the Nation's health care needs especially in urban and rural underserved areas.

While we can be pleased with these investments, we must be equally disturbed by the major shortfalls in H.R. 3755 which threaten the quality of life for the most vulnerable among us. For example, the bill eliminates funding for the Healthy Start Program. This is a program which is designed to improve the Nation's infant mortality rate. It is appalling that the United States, ranking 22d, in fact has the worse infant mortality rate among industrialized countries. The Healthy Start demonstration projects have proven their effectiveness in reducing infant mortality.

As such, I cannot understand how my colleagues on the other side of the aisle can label themselves as "pro-lifers" and then zero out funding for this highly successful pro-life program—which is designed to save the lives of babies. Now is the time to provide the resources needed to begin to implement and to apply the Healthy Start Program's lessons learned to other communities that have a dramatically high rate of infant mortality. For the sake of families across this country—we now know what works—let's use it.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 3755 falls seriously short on addressing the needs of our Nation's youth. Funding for the Summer Jobs Program is \$171 million short of the amount needed to just support the same number of summer jobs as in fiscal year 1996. As a result, nearly 80,000 kids who need and want to work would be denied that critical opportunity.

Out-of-school youth are hit even harder, as the bill virtually ignores their employment training needs at a time when we know that education and skills matter most in today's job market. The Youth Employment Training Program was gutted in the past rescission and appropriations cycle, and is now flat funded at \$127 million.

Substance abuse treatment is cut by over \$38 million. With respect to at-risk youth alone, 5 million individuals will be denied the substance abuse prevention services they desperately need.

The dramatically high rate of unemployment among out-of-school youth and the high rate of teen pregnancy are two of the most significant problems confronting this country, consuming scarce resources, and compromising our youth's future. We can and must do something to effectively address each of these ongoing problems. They are too costly in terms of human capital and monetary expenses to ignore.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 3755 also fails our Nation's school children, jeopardizing their academic future. At a time when school enrollments are on the rise, and are in fact the highest in history, the bill freezes funding for teaching assistance in basic reading and math under the title I Grants to Local Education Agencies Program. Funding for Safe and Drug Free Schools is cut \$25 million below the current funding level despite the increase of crime and violence in our Nation's schools. Funding for training and advisory services associated with carrying out title IV of the Civil Rights Act is not only frozen, but is also 48 percent below the President's fiscal year 1997 budget request. In addition, no funding is provided for the Women's Educational Equity Program. These two programs are critical to ensuring educational equity for minorities and women.

The bill also eliminates funding for Goals 2000, which is designed to assist and provide communities critical resources needed to raise education standards and children's academic achievement. Funding for these five programs alone falls nearly a billion dollars below the President's fiscal year 1997 funding request level, and \$375 million below the current funding level.

The bill also threaten's seniors' quality of life by short funding low-income home energy assistance, the Administration on Aging, and the National Senior Volunteer Corps. Funding provided for these three programs alone falls over a billion dollars short of the administration's request.

At a time when we speak of the critical need to insure personal responsibility, H.R. 3755 is weak on addressing the needs of families. Funding for the mandatory Social Services Block Grant Program and the child care development block grant are \$320 million and \$98 million respectively short of the administration's request. These resources are desperately needed by working poor families who not only need to work but equally important want to continue working. In addition, funding for the Centers for Disease Control's National Center for Injury Prevention and Control Program is cut \$2.6 million. These funds are critical to further research on the prevention and control of fires, poisonings, and violence including homicide, suicide, and domestic violence. Programs under the auspices of the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration are also especially hard hit by H.R. 3755. The over \$38 million cut in substance abuse treatment is compounded by the fact that funding for treatment was gutted 60 percent in fiscal year 1996, and that for treatment demonstrations was cut 57 percent. As a result of the dire funding situation, with respect to at-risk youth alone, 5 million individuals will be denied the substance abuse prevention services they desperately need. In total, funding for these four programs alone is \$670 million below

the administration's request, and over \$70 million below the current funding level.

Mr. Chairman, each and every day, parents across this country continue to raise their children telling them to get a good education, work hard, and play by the rules, and you will succeed. H.R. 3755 denies these kids access to many of the most critical tools they need to succeed. I strongly urge my colleagues to vote "no" on H.R. 3755 in its current form.

□ 1915

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WICKER], a very valuable member of our subcommittee.

Mr. WICKER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER], the chairman of the subcommittee, for yielding time.

Mr. Chairman, this is a very important debate. This bill is a very important part of our effort to balance the budget for this Nation. If the President of the United States had his way with this appropriation, we would spend an extra 12 percent on this bill. We would spend an extra \$7.8 billion in 1 year alone if the President had his way on this bill.

On the other hand, the bill that we have before us is level-funded from last year's appropriation. So the first question we have to ask ourselves is: Do we level-fund for the next fiscal year in the context of a balanced budget, or do we spend an extra \$7.8 billion? I come down on the side of balancing the budget.

The second question we ask ourselves tonight is: Are we making an adequate investment in these very important programs, and in particular I would ask, are we making an adequate investment in education? I would submit to my colleagues that under this bill we are making substantial additional expenditures in education.

Mr. Chairman, this first chart I have gives a history of Head Start funding. It shows that under this appropriation bill we will appropriate an additional \$31 million for Head Start in fiscal year 1997. It also shows that in the last 7 years alone Head Start expenditures have increased by 132 percent. This is at a time when enrollment in this program has not increased by nearly that percent.

Now, the second chart I have is simply an account of Pell grant maximum awards, and my colleagues can see that the maximum award for 1996 is \$2,470. Under this bill it will go up to \$2,500.

Other increases in this bill are the Job Corps program, a \$45 million increase; the work-study program, an increase of \$68 million; impact aid, an increase of \$68 million. We have also level-funded important programs such as job training, the Safe and Drug-Free Schools State grants, and Title I funding for the disadvantaged.

It is very, very easy to be for a balanced budget back in our districts in

an election year, but it is hard work to actually get to a balanced budget. It is hard to actually plug in those numbers that will reduce the deficit, when we consider them item by item by item.

I would respond briefly to the comments of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER], my dear friend. His quarrel is with the overall budget plan which includes tax relief. There are many colleagues on the other side of the aisle who object to the budget allocation. They said, "We did not vote for these tax cuts and we should not be bound by the budget plan."

Mr. Chairman, we have to make judgment calls, and if I have to make a judgment call on the side of the hard working taxpayer, I will do that. If I can put another \$1,000 in the take-home pay of a young family making \$25,000 or \$30,000 and still level-fund these very important programs, I will do that.

This is a choice of another \$7.8 billion in spending or a balanced budget. Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to choose a balanced budget and vote for the bill.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. LOWEY].

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, first I want to thank the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] for his leadership for funding for the National Institutes of Health. This bill provides for a 6 percent increase which I wholeheartedly support. This increase will enable important research to continue in the area of breast cancer, diabetes, Alzheimer's disease, AIDS and many others.

The bill also increases funds to train child welfare workers to better care for abused and neglected youngsters. In addition, I thank the chairman for working with me to prevent cuts in public television funding, and I also thank him for continuing to work with me to fully fund domestic violence programs.

However, Mr. Chairman, I rise to state my deep concern with this bill. This bill has always been called the people's bill. But again, for the second year in a row, this bill falls short of meeting the needs of the people of this Nation: our schoolchildren, college students, elderly, and hard-working men and women across the country.

Unfortunately, this bill represents a serious reduction in our Nation's investment in education. While the draconian cuts above \$4 billion proposed by the majority party of last year have not been repeated, the bill still fails to make the necessary investment in our Nation's schools.

It was the proposed \$4 billion in education cuts, coupled with steep reductions in job training and worker protection, which led to two government shutdowns and an 18-month stalemate over the budget. Finally, the majority retreated from their extreme position and 90 percent of the cuts in education, 60 percent of the cuts in job training,

and 75 percent of the cuts in worker protection programs were restored.

But the bill before us today takes us down the same path as last year. Under this bill, the Federal Government is further shirking its responsibilities to our local schools. In the 1994-95 school year, when Democrats were still in control of the Congress, the Federal Government contributed 5.6 percent of State and local expenditures for education. Under the bill before us today, the Federal contribution to local schools is down to only 4.7 percent.

This bill also shortchanges students in colleges, universities, community colleges and training programs across our Nation.

By the year 2002, an additional 1.5 million students will be enrolled in college. This is an increase of almost 10 percent in student enrollment. The cost of a college education is increasing faster than the rate of inflation. Unfortunately, this bill does not take into account increased college enrollment or increased college tuition.

The Pell Program is the cornerstone of Federal college assistance, providing aid to 4 million needy students. Pell recipients are not well-off, and more than 90 percent of the aid goes to students from families and incomes below \$30,000. The Pell Program is one of the few sources of grant aid still available. Pell helps to cut down on the crushing college debt burden assumed by so many students and their families today.

But in the bill before us today, the maximum Pell grant is \$2,500, only \$30 above last year. This \$30 increase in the Pell grant would buy a single college textbook. The Pell funding in this bill is simply inadequate to meet the costs of higher education today.

The bill is also inadequate when it comes to the Perkins Program. The bill provides no capital contributions to the Perkins Program. Three-quarters of a million low income students depend on the Perkins Program. In my state of New York, Perkins provided low-interest loans to nearly 60,000 deserving students.

In addition, the bill before us today completely eliminates the SSIG Program. In fiscal year 1995, SSIG was funded at over \$60 million. Last year we funded SSIG at \$31.3 million, but only after a long and protracted fight over funding priorities. If we added a modest \$31.3 million to the SSIG Program, we could provide aid to 105,000 students and generate over \$100 million in State students aid funds.

The bill also fails to fund the President's important teen pregnancy initiative, provides no funding for school infrastructure, and eliminates the Women's Educational Equity Act.

The bill was flawed from the start because it was a direct outgrowth of mixed-up Republican priorities. Like last year, the House gave the Pentagon billions more than Pentagon requested. This year the House voted to give the Pentagon \$11 billion more than it re-

quested. This is wrong, Mr. Chairman. It is shortsighted. We cannot afford to keep shortchanging the important priorities of this Nation.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 seconds.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to point out that under Republicans in the last 2 years we have raised maximum Pell grants by \$160, and under the last 4 years of Democratic administrations, the gentlewoman from New York might realize that they cut maximum Pell grants by \$60.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE], a member of the full committee.

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

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I want to begin by commending the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER], the chairman of the Subcommittee on Labor, HHS, and Education, for the very hard work he has done, he and his staff, on this bill, putting together a very tough bill under very tough circumstances. Mr. Chairman, I think they put together a very workable appropriation for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, ensuring that the medical needs and the education needs of the young and the old are met, and that we feed not only the body but the mind and the soul.

But I stand here today mostly not in my capacity as a member of the Committee on Appropriations, but as a member of the Committee on the Budget where some of these overall priorities are being established, because this bill that we are looking at today incorporates the goals and the promises that the Republican Congress made to provide our children with a better future.

Mr. Chairman, simply stated, the best thing we can do for our children is to balance the budget. If we do not get runaway Federal spending under control, we are not going to have any money for college loans in the future; we will not have money for Head Start; we are not going to have any money for children's health programs.

Through all of our history, each succeeding generation has always enjoyed the promise of having a better life and standard of living for themselves than the previous generation, but compare what Government spending has been between 1962 and 1997.

This chart here shows the amount of money that was spent on discretionary nondefense spending in 1962 was enormous, more than half of the total Federal budget, and when we add the other part of the yellow in there, almost all of the budget was in discretionary spending. Look at how that has dropped by the year 1997, so discretionary nondefense spending is down here to a much smaller part of the pie. Whereas it was once 50 percent, today it is less than 20 percent on those same kinds of programs.

The kinds of programs that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] and his subcommittee have to deal with are being squeezed down by the entitlement programs, Medicare, Medicaid, Welfare, and Social Security. They are consuming an ever larger portion of the total Federal expenditure. When in 1962 they consumed 25 percent of Federal expenditures, today by comparison they consume 50 percent of those expenditures.

We made, in the Committee on the Budget, a promise to cut Federal spending, to decrease taxes, to balance the budget. With a balanced budget we are going to give families lower car payments. We are going to give them lower student loans and lower house payments for their mortgages, and therefore they will have more money in their pocket.

Once again, if we do not balance the budget, the people we are hurting are our children and our grandchildren.

The President and some of those on the other side of the aisle would have us believe that the budget resolution in this appropriation bill is going to strip away valuable services, including education and health care for the elderly, women and children. This is simply not true. Under the budget conference agreement, and this bill fulfills that agreement, spending for education and job training increases from \$47.8 billion in 1996 to \$50.4 billion in 2002.

□ 1930

That is a \$3 billion increase. Anybody outside Washington, Mr. Chairman, understands that that kind of spending, a \$3 billion increase, is just that, it is an increase. So we are not talking about cuts. We are talking about increases. It is the other side that wants to talk about cuts.

We know that money does not necessarily mean better education. We have a lot more bureaucracy in Washington with the Department of Education, when we do not have better education, not necessarily. So we need to be sure that we target the money that we do have available to those things that are absolutely vital and absolutely critical. This bill does that in health and human services, in education. I strongly urge that we support the passage of this legislation.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BONILLA], a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

I am going to lay a guilt trip on some of my colleagues who are considering at this time voting against this bill, because if they are for children and if they are for education and if they are for an improved health care system, they want to vote for this bill. Otherwise, frankly, I do not know how my colleagues who are considering voting against this bill can sleep at night.

Examples: We are increasing Job Corps funding in this country that

would allow nine new Job Corps centers to be built by June of 1998, \$45 million more for Job Corps this bill contains that we had in the last bill. So if Members want to support young people who are trying to get a second chance in communities across this country, they are going to vote for the bill. Otherwise, I do not know how they can live with their guilt of abandoning these young people who desperately need this money.

The same could be said for the Centers for Disease Control. We are increasing funding for them \$75 million over fiscal year 1996. How can my colleagues live with themselves if they consider voting against this bill and abandoning the good work that is done at the Centers for Disease Control.

Breast cancer screening increased by 8 percent. How could we live with ourselves if we vote against this bill when it provides increased funding for this most important cause? Community and migrant health care centers, again very necessary in many of our rural and poor areas of this country. How can Members vote against this bill and abandon the people who need this service so desperately in our communities?

Pell grants. We have been talking about that for awhile now. We are increasing funding for Pell grants, when under previous leadership of the other party, Pell grants were actually cut. How can my colleagues live with themselves if they consider voting no on this bill that provides more money for Pell grants?

The TRIO Program, that is an extremely important program for this country. We are providing \$37 million more money for TRIO programs in this country. Think about the young people that come from families that have never had an opportunity before to go to college, families around this country that have been struggling, they are finally getting an opportunity to send someone to college in their family, and TRIO is going to give them an opportunity. How can we live with ourselves if we vote against this bill that provides more money for TRIO?

The bill also contains additional money for health care professions, young people from disadvantaged areas in this country who are wanting to study to become nurses and dental hygienists in low-income areas, that provide health care in low-income areas, rural areas that oftentimes do not have health care that is necessary in their areas, this is going to provide \$31 million more in funding for health care professions.

I ask my colleagues, how can they live with themselves if they consider voting no on this bill?

Please consider voting yes on this bill. We are all in this together. We want to help children, education and health care in this country. I ask Members to support us in passage of this bill.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI].

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], ranking member, for yielding me this time and commend him for his leadership, especially now, in defining the problems in this bill.

I also commend our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER], for his efforts to do the best he could with inadequate resources.

I rise in strong opposition to this bill as reported for many reasons. The bill is simply underfunded by 7.8 billion, or 11 percent, below the President's request. President Clinton demonstrated that there are ways to balance the Federal budget while at the same time investing in health and education of our people, especially our children. Indeed we will never balance the budget unless we make these investments in our children.

This bill falls short because it follows the flawed budget blueprint adopted by the Republican majority. There are three reasons, there are many reasons, but I put forth three reasons to vote against this bill: cuts in education, cuts in education, cuts in education.

Our colleagues on the Republican side get up and say that the Federal role in educating our children is only 5 percent. Indeed, under this bill we would not even be able to live up to that 5 percent. My democratic colleagues have addressed the education cuts over and over again in this debate, so I will turn to some of the cuts that affect American workers.

Mr. Chairman, during the committee's deliberations, I presented an amendment addressing a number of the concerns about protecting American workers. Under the rule I was not able to offer that amendment as presented. I would like, however, to outline my concerns with the bill with regard to vital worker protection programs.

In this bill, the Republican majority has declared war on the American worker. As the national debate continues over our commitment to American children, their education, their health and well-being, we must also address the economic well-being of their families. Over the last 2 years, primarily through the appropriations process, the 104th Republican controlled Congress has reversed decades of progress on job training, education, pensions and worker protections. This is particularly alarming when American workers and their families are menaced by trade, downsizing, technological downsizing, and other layoffs.

This year the Labor-HHS-Education appropriations bill makes further cuts to important initiatives for America's 923 million working men and women in 6,000,000 workplaces across the country. These initiatives promote workplace health and safety, ensure pension security, and ensure that employees have fair wages and working conditions, and indeed even limits their ability to begin to bargain collectively. Indeed they even prohibit voluntarily guide-

lines for ergonomics, that is, repetitive motion injuries, which are the fastest growing health problem in our workplace.

I want to refer my colleagues to this chart on the war on American workers. Safety and health enforcement in this bill is cut by 13 percent below the President's request, 9 percent below last year what is required to maintain last year's levels.

It even prohibits the new OSHA initiative and assistance to small businesses enabling them to reduce workplace accidents and fatalities.

Mine safety: The cut of 6 percent below the President's request for mine safety will mean no funds to acquire new mine safety equipment and a reduction of mine safety inspection.

Pensions: On pension protection, a cut of 22 percent below the President's request, 6 percent below current services. No funds are provided for three of the administration's pension priority protection initiatives, pension education and participants assistance, the electronic filing initiative, and the 401(k) enforcement initiative.

This is in addition to last year's Budget Reconciliation Act, which turned back the clock on protection of pension plans. Fortunately, the bill was vetoed by the President, but it would have threatened the security of pensions in 6000 pension plans.

Employment standards, the Employment Standards Administration, ESA, makes sure that ordinary Americans get a fair shake at the workplace. The enforcement of child labor laws, sweatshops, fair wage laws and fair hour laws are critical to American workers.

Funding for ESA is cut by 6 percent and is 15 percent below the President's request. As a result, reductions will have to be made in efforts to eradicate garment sweatshops and protect workers' newly won family and medical leave.

Collective bargaining, the National Labor Relations Board investigates and prosecutes unfair labor practices. It is being cut substantially, minus 20 percent, \$36 million in this bill. Dislocated workers cut by 15 percent. Over 2½ million American workers lose their jobs each year due to global competition, et cetera, and will not receive assistance.

There are 81,000 fewer laid-off workers being served.

American workers are the engine of our economy. They deserve to be treated with dignity and respect. They also deserve a safe workplace. Despite our budget challenges, we should not retreat on worker protection. This is the wrong place and the wrong time to cut back. American workers and their families deserve better.

With that, I commend the chairman for doing the best he could with what little he had. I hope that in this battle of priorities, our national value system will say we need more for children, more for American workers, more investment in the future of our country.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS], a valued member of the subcommittee.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his outstanding leadership on this very important piece of legislation. Just so this does not turn into too much of a he-said, she-said type of debate on this floor this evening, I would like to point out to my colleague, the gentlewoman from San Francisco, that we were able to team up in this legislation to address a very high priority for us, for our districts, and our constituents; that is to say, funding for AIDS research, prevention and treatment programs.

I wish that we could at least have the intellectual honesty to come down to the floor and acknowledge what we would like about the legislation before engaging in the partisan bashing of what we do not like about the legislation. That would be for me a very refreshing approach, I think to discussing and debating legislative issues on the House floor.

Second, I also want to point out that the bill funds the Ryan White Care Act at the House and Senate approved funding levels. So I thank both of those items are very welcome news to northern California and to those other parts of the country which have been experiencing and attempting to cope with the AIDS epidemic.

I also want to commend the subcommittee chairman for increasing funding for Head Start. I recognize that there are problems with this program regarding the lack of accountability and the lack of demonstrated results on a long-term or longitudinal basis which I hope we can address again through a serious and honest bipartisan debate. But I think it is important, since I happen to be an advocate of universal early childhood education, to continue our funding support of Head Start.

With that, I also want to point out, as previous speakers before me have on this floor, that this bill, the 1997 appropriations bill for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services and Education increases—I did not say decrease or cut—increases by 2.4 billion, to a total of 40.7 billion, Federal taxpayer assistance for higher education in this country. So another way of putting that is, we continue to make student aid a top priority of this Congress. And we increase funding for all of the major student aid programs as the chairman and other Members have pointed out.

Let me use this chart very quickly to make my point. We increase funding for Pell grants by \$5.3 billion, we increase it to a \$5.3 billion level. As the previous speakers have pointed out, the maximum Pell grant is raised to \$2500 from \$2470 last year. This will be the highest maximum ever provided in this country. That does not sound to me like a Republican majority, a Republican controlled Congress drastically cutting education funding.

Work study, the second most important Federal higher education program, is also increased by \$68 million, and that is higher than the President's request. So come down to the floor and talk about the draconian and drastic and dire proposed cuts in the President's budget if you want to use this same rhetoric.

Lastly, the TRIO Program is increased to \$500 million. This is a very important program for outreach to minority Americans. So please, do not come down here and contend that we are cutting student financial aid. This is a good spending bill. It is good policy and it increases aid for students.

□ 1945

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Oregon [Mr. BLUMENAUER].

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I have been listening to the debate here this evening and have been troubled by the perverse logic that this small, but important, 5 percent of the Nation's educational expenditure is dismissed. It is dismissed by people who obviously have not been talking to the struggling school boards, teachers and principals who are trying to make do, particularly in areas like this bill that would provide less per pupil at a time when many communities are struggling with growth, as has been documented by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

But most of my concern, I guess, is focused on the dismissal of the critical partnerships with State and local government. Every Member of this Chamber has benefited in the Nation's prosperity in the 25 years after World War II due in no small measure to Federal educational investment and unprecedented partnerships with local schools. Everyone benefited from that. This bill would turn its back, and I use just one example:

The bipartisan effort, the Goals 2000 to promote educational reform that has made a great deal of difference in my State increasing academic standards for students, bringing technology into classrooms, fostering an increased relationship between schools and higher education, and developing those public private partnerships between schools and employers that people talk so much about; this has been done in my State using this. And somehow we could not find less than 1 quarter of 1 percent in this bill to fund Education 2000. It is a tragic mistake. It is shortsighted and counterproductive.

Yes, it is difficult to balance the budget, but the issue is one of priority.

I just want to say that turning our back on the Federal partnership and investment, ignoring our past suc-

cesses, our current obligations and our children's future is no way to achieve that goal of a balanced budget.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. DICKEY], an able and valued member of the subcommittee.

Mr. DICKEY. Mr. Chairman, during the War of 1812 this building was surrounded by the British. In fact, the British came in and tried to burn it. There is evidence of that as we go about this wonderful structure. What we have now, though, is an enemy, not something that is tangible, but something that we are faced with and we might get into, and that is indulgent spending.

Our Nation is spending money, this Congress is spending money, that we do not have. We are spending money of our children and our grandchildren, and what is immoral about that is it is without their permission, and this is why this bill that we have here today is so important, that we are trying to balance the budget for the sake of our Nation and, particularly, our children and our grandchildren.

On this Committee on Appropriations, this is my first term, and I was told that it was a very prestigious committee and it is one that one can go on and gain a lot of friends. But there are not a whole lot of constituents that come in and say, please, cut my program. And so we have had the job of looking at the responsibility that we have, the moral responsibility that we have, of cutting the budget and saving this country from the enemy that is from within, and we have had to say "no." We have had to say "no" to program after program after program, and it has been tough, but we have wanted to cut spending first.

The sad thing is that we have not been able to do it with the very people who could help us the most. The architects and the caretakers of all of these spending programs that started roughly in 1964 are here today, and they could point out the waste, fraud and abuse that we have and help us, in a patriotic fashion, work together to try to balance the budget.

No. What they are doing is taking cheap shots, throwing hand grenades and trying just to get by this 1996 election. Where they could be helping us, where they could be taking some responsibility for what has happened, they are not doing it. They are saying this is cruel, this is wrong; they are bringing emotional arguments to bear so we will back down off our promise to the American people. But in 1994 we said, no, we wanted to balance the budget, and we were going to take the tough cuts.

Let me give my colleagues an example of one instance, just one agency, and that is the NLRB, the National Labor Relations Board. This board administers a program that has 1,934 employees, 500 in Washington, and the balance in field offices. It has 792 lawyers. It has 52 field offices, three in Los

Angeles alone. It has an annual rent of \$8 million. We have been through the second year now of trying to ask them to help us and come on our side and bring us some semblance of reasonableness to this budget.

We have cut this budget by 15 percent not because we know how to do it, not because they have helped us do it, but they have stonewalled and said, no, we want an 8.3 percent increase, we do not want to participate to help our children and our grandchildren, and this is what we are trying to do, and that is the reason why I am supporting this bill and going to vote for it.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. WYNN].

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise this evening to oppose this bill. Education is the key to the American dream and the key to global competitiveness for jobs, and this bill is inadequate, woefully inadequate to meet our young people's educational needs. Overall in this budget education is cut 7 percent below 1995 levels, 7 percent below 1995 levels, while enrollment is projected to increase by 7 percent over the next 6 years. In my State of Maryland alone enrollment has increased 12 percent between 1990 and 1995.

This bill is inadequate. It provides \$7.8 billion less than the President requested.

Now, I have to tell my colleagues I am amazed when I hear Republicans puff out their chest and say, well, we only pay 5 percent of the cost of education anyway coming from the Federal Treasury. That is not something to be proud of. I dare say most taxpayers would like to see more Federal aid for education.

Now, do not be fooled. Less Federal aid means only one thing: Higher State and local taxes, higher property taxes at the local level. Less Federal aid means larger classes, less equipment and materials, and poorer classes. And I assure my colleagues that the taxpayers in poorer States and counties would like to see more Federal aid for education.

Now my colleagues have heard several of our colleagues stand up here piously and say, but we have to balance the budget. Let me give my colleagues the truth about this. They are providing \$7.8 billion less than the President asked for for education, but they are providing \$11 billion more than the Defense Department asked for for defense.

Mr. Chairman, I would just add that they have cut the Goals 2000 Program, which provides local assistance. They have cut safe and drug-free schools, but they say they want to fight drugs. They cut \$25 million out of safe and drug-free schools, and they cut Healthy Start, which is designed to save kids. In Baltimore and my State, infant mortality under Healthy Start was reduced by 31 percent. This is an important program.

Mr. Chairman, I think this is a bad bill.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Nevada [Mrs. VUCANOVICH], a member of the full committee.

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, many years ago a song stated that "Diamonds are a girl's best friend". Today, women are seeking more from life—they are looking for good health, safe communities and a future for their children. I can tell my colleagues in this regard, H.R. 3755 is truly a precious gem.

In this bill this Congress has not only talked about helping American women and their families, but it has really done it. More money has been put into the National Institutes of Health for research of heart disease, diabetes, AIDS, and cancer.

Of particular significance to me as a breast cancer survivor, and to the thousands of women who have been diagnosed with this disease, is funding under the National Cancer Institute. An increase of \$6 million is provided, bringing funding level totals to \$409 million to be used for breast cancer research next year. I want to personally thank my colleagues for their support of this research, and especially thank the chairman of the subcommittee and the staff. More than 46,000 American women will die from this devastating disease this year. Let me repeat—46,000 women. We are coming close to understanding this disease so that a cure may be found, and this money is sorely needed.

This Congress knows that in order to treat breast cancer and cervical cancer, women must first detect the cancer. That is why an additional \$10 million has been provided for the breast and cervical cancer screening program. This program helps ensure that low-income women get the information and assistance they need to maintain good health—so that they may spend a life together with their families.

My friends, every day on the news we hear about the crimes in our streets—but what about the crimes in our homes? Every day thousands of women must face horror right in their own homes, with no one to protect them. While Congress cannot eliminate domestic violence, it can provide women with the means to get help. We in this Republican Congress have made a commitment to helping these unfortunate women. H.R. 3755 contains \$25 million for battered women's shelters; \$2 million for runaway youth prevention; \$400,000 to operate the domestic violence hotline; and \$5 million for domestic violence community demonstrations. And since violent crimes happen outside the home, as well as inside, this Congress has included \$28.6 million for rape services and prevention block grants to the States, which can better serve these women.

Mr. Chairman, this Congress is compassionate and this Congress is listening. More than that, this Congress is

doing something. We do not take our women for granted, we do something for them. Mr. Chairman, diamonds are no longer a girl's best friend, the 104th Congress is. I congratulate the chairman of the subcommittee and his staff for putting together a good bill. I urge all of my colleagues to show their friendship toward women by voting for this important bill.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD].

(Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to stand in opposition to this bill because of the elimination of the Goals 2000 Program.

I applaud Mr. PORTER for his efforts. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 3755 for several reasons: Freezing summer youth jobs programs, eliminating healthy start, and abortion family limits.

Perhaps the most pressing reason, however, is the elimination of funding for the Goals 2000 Program.

As a former teacher and a person who still cares passionately about the education of our youth, I am appalled by this political attack on the future of our Nation.

Mr. Chairman, the United States is currently ranked third in the world in terms of the reading skills of our youth.

While this may be admirable to some, I would in fact argue that we need to do better.

Given the global economy into which our children will soon be entering, and the need for the United States to remain competitive in this new international arena, it is imperative that we offer them the best education possible.

In order to help prepare our children for the future, the Congress passed, in 1993, the Goals 2000 legislation.

Unfortunately, since that time, the purposes behind Goals 2000, and the methodology involved in its implementation, have been grossly distorted.

To set the record straight, Goals 2000 is a framework to help States develop a curriculum for their public school students to help them gain the knowledge and learn the skills that will be necessary for us as a nation to remain competitive.

Goals 2000 was developed to enable us to deal with the almost 15,000 public school districts in our Nation which are charged with educating and preparing the 50+ million public school children who will be looking for help and guidance as they face the future.

It may interest my colleagues to know that approximately 5.2 million of these over 50+ million public school students reside in my home State of California.

It is in my home State in fact that our Governor, who by the way is a member of the other party, has included in his latest budget a request for funding to increase the quality of public education and decrease the class size of public school.

While I do not agree with our Governor on everything, I do agree that we need to put public education at the top of our priority list.

We need to stay competitive, and we need to educate our children. If we are sincere

about changing behavior in our urban children, if we are sincere about giving them a fighting chance to move from the bowels of despair Goals 2000 is one of the many tools which we can and should use in their fight for the future.

I therefore object strongly to this bill, and I hope that the other body shows more foresight when they consider this legislation.

I thank the gentleman again for this time and I urge my colleagues, in the strongest terms possible, to oppose this bill.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. PAYNE].

Mr. PAYNE of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I am deeply concerned about this appropriations bill and what it does to education. I supported the coalition budget which would have balanced our budget in 2002, and provided more—not less—money for education.

It is our duty to ensure that every American child has access to education and training needed to be productive citizens. This freezing of education funds and particularly the defunding of Goals 2000 undermines our ability to honor this commitment.

Goals 2000 was created in my district in Charlottesville, VA in 1992 when President Bush and our Nation's governors conducted an education summit to determine what we could do as a nation to be more competitive in a global economy.

Goals 2000 is an effective investment in our children's future. It is fiscally responsible. Perhaps most importantly, Goals 2000 is needed by our Nation's schools.

Goals 2000 provides money for computers, microscopes, and library books. As honorary chairman of Pittsylvania County Goals 2000, I know first hand the vital aid it gives to schools—particularly in rural areas, such as my own.

We owe it to our children, ourselves, and future generations to provide adequate funding for education and to restore funding for Goals 2000.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. BUNN], a valued Member of our full committee.

(Mr. BUNN of Oregon asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

□ 2000

Mr. BUNN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, let me start my remarks by saying that I appreciate all the hard work the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] has put into this package. Funding for crucial health care programs was increased over last year and I fully support those efforts. However, I think we could have done more for higher education.

We can all argue the merits of Federal education funding versus State education funding, but maintaining access to higher education is a crucial role of the Federal Government. We need to ensure that our students who have the ability can continue to attend the best higher education facilities in

the world. If we continue to decrease our commitment to higher education students, our schools will decline and our colleges and universities will be for the rich, not the best and brightest.

This bill eliminates the State student incentive program. This bill eliminates capital contributions to the Perkins loan program. This bill increases the maximum Pell grant by a little over 1 percent, not even keeping up with inflation. We need to do better, and I think we can.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON].

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member for yielding this time to me, and I want to commend all of those involved in this important issue of providing education and other resources for our Nation.

Mr. Chairman, although there are many features of this bill that are better than last year, there are far many more features of this bill that we find unacceptable. I only want to use my time to highlight two of those, and perhaps not emphasize as much as my other colleagues have about education, but education indeed is important, and we have not invested enough in education.

Also, the other issue that we have not invested anything whatsoever in is teenage pregnancy. Teenage pregnancy is a hot subject now; we talk about that, but we have the dubious distinction of leading the world in this area. No other industrialized nation with a standard of living comparable to the United States has a problem of this dimension.

Each year approximately 1 million teenagers become pregnant. Teenage pregnancy significantly affects the health of teenagers, as well as their economic and educational future. Once a teenager becomes pregnant there is no good solution. The best solution indeed is to prevent the pregnancy in the first place.

Teenagers having kids, we talk about that. In fact, many of our Members here on the floor say we can no longer afford that. Demagoguery is very easy. Meaningful action means deeds are difficult. We have provided no funding whatsoever. The President asked for \$30 million for the teenage pregnancy prevention initiative, and not one cent was provided, when we know it costs this Nation about \$6.9 billion in the costs of providing for teenage pregnancy and their children. This would have been less than one-half of 1 percent. Again, voting for teenage pregnancy would indeed have enabled our young people to improve their health and education and economic opportunity for our Nation's youth.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, our investment in education is indeed our investment in our future. Many organizations, our colleagues, and millions of citizens say we should invest more in education, not less.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gen-

tleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM], the chairman of the Subcommittee on Early Childhood, Youth and Families of the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the gentlewoman who just spoke: Education is the future of this country. I do not think there is demagoguery. I think there is an honest debate here on policy, whether we want the Federal Government to be able to have the control to spend the dollars in education, or we want people in States to control that. I think that is a legitimate debate. That is what is before us today. I do not think there is demagoguery. I think people truly believe. I believe that those that believe that a socialistic model for the poor is better are wrong. That is what I would like to speak about tonight.

Mr. Chairman, my friend who spoke in the well a minute ago said he wishes there were more dollars in the Federal education system than just 5 percent. I believe that is not demagoguery, I believe he believes that. We, however, believe that people can control their dollars more and spend it on their children than the Federal Government can. They can get a bigger bang for the dollar than the Federal Government can with its big bureaucracy.

Yes, only 5 percent of education funding comes from the Federal Government. In some cases, as little as 23 cents on a dollar, 23 cents on a dollar, gets back into the classroom in many areas. That is wrong, Mr. Chairman. That is a waste. That is cutting education. And I propose that the liberal Democrats that are trying to save education have done it a great harm and have actually cut education. When we only get 23 cents on the dollar back into the classroom, that is cutting education. We are proposing to turn that around.

How? First of all, that 5 percent of education funding, we have found there are 760 education programs. Think about the bureaucracies, think about the overhead that takes. We eliminated over 187 programs. We believe, yes, that medical research, the Government has a direct function in. Those savings ought to go to that. We believe that Pell grants for the poor are important and a priority. We took the savings from that and put it into the Pell grants. We increased student loans by \$3 billion.

Yes, even though the dollars come to the Federal Government and are returned at a low rate, those are priorities, and I think most taxpayers do not discern those dollars because they go to help the poor and the children. But we do believe that the Federal waste in the programs is not the way to go.

Let me give an example. Some of my colleagues truly believe, they are not demagoguing, they believe in Goals 2000. But as the chairman of the committee, let me tell the Members about Goals 2000. There are 45 instances in Goals

2000 that says States that mandate, it says States will. They say it is only voluntary. It is only voluntary if you do not want the money.

Let us take one of those 45 instances. My wife is a principal. You have to take all of the requirements from Goals 2000, internalize it, have a board that literally looks and sees how to run Goals 2000. They report to the principal. The principal reports to the superintendent. Then all of that paperwork goes to Sacramento, to our State Department of Education. Think of the bureaucracy in the State that has to take the flow of all the schools in the State of California. Think of that paperwork flow and all that wasted energy. Then guess what they do? They have to send it back here to River City, in Washington, DC, to another big bureaucracy.

That is wasteful, Mr. Chairman. In many cases they have to hire grant writers to apply for Goals 2000 money. The small schools in many cases never get a dime, and some that do, the cost of the grant writer, either in the little funding they get or the cost to exercise Goals 2000, is more than the grant that they get. That is cutting education, Mr. Chairman.

What we do is give the money to the State and say, listen, if you want to do a George Bush Goals 2000, let the State do it. We think Goals 2000, by setting local standards, local goals with teachers and parents and children and administrators is good. But what the real policy fight is about is if the Federal Government can manage all of that, if the Federal Government can control the dollars.

Where do they get those dollars? They keep saying the President's request. Does he get that money from God? No. He gets it from the same working families that he returns it to, at 23 cents on a dollar. Yet he wants more money to spend.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for support of this bill.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland [Mr. CUMMINGS].

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

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for yielding me time to rise in opposition to this year's spending bill for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education.

This measure provides inadequate funding for many of our vital programs that have proven to be beneficial to individual families, our communities and our nation as a whole.

I am deeply dismayed that this measure has taken a "meat" to the Healthy Start Program. H.R. 3755 radically eliminates all funding for this program that is saving lives across the country.

Historically, my congressional district of Baltimore has experienced an exceedingly high rate of infant mortal-

ity. Many high risk areas in the city had twice the national average of infant deaths.

However with the implementation of the Healthy Start Program in 1993, Baltimore has severely reduced the number of babies born with low birth weights, and dramatically reduced the number of infant mortalities. Ours, is truly a success story.

The Baltimore Healthy Start Program is one of the most successful programs in the entire country. We have targeted the program's services to the poorest areas of the city which are at the highest risk. Baltimore's neighborhood Healthy Start program has currently serviced about 2,000 women.

The staff is mostly comprised of community residents who have been hired and trained through the program—thereby providing important employment opportunities to the community.

The staff in conjunction with the mayor's office, and the surrounding community are committed to ensuring that all babies have a strong and healthy beginning by providing important prenatal care to high risk mothers who need it most.

Mr. Chairman, I am certainly shocked that this body would attempt to pass a measure that eliminates this vital program which has proven and tangible results.

I am shocked that this body would take away the one opportunity to give our poorest and most vulnerable citizens the gift of life.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAZIO].

Mr. LAZIO of New York. Mr. Chairman, I want to begin by thanking and congratulating the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER], for what has been a remarkable job, given the conflicting desires that exist in trying to manage a bill as large as this Labor-HHS appropriations bill. He has done, as I say, a magnificent job. He has one of the toughest jobs on Capital Hill.

I want to talk to Members a bit about one program, one very important program that is in this bill that has received an historic increase, the Community Service Block Grant Program. This is a program that the President recommended no increase in. It is a program that receives in this bill a 27-percent or \$100 million increase. We have never in the history of funding the community service block grants ever received an increase as large as this. It is deserved, because it encapsulates everything we are trying to do in terms of an important antipoverty program. It is one of the premier antipoverty programs within the Federal arsenal.

It is important and significant and worthy of additional funding because it does all the things we say we want to do. It leverages public dollars. Over \$1 billion in non-Federal spending will exist because of the spending in the community service block grants. It en-

ures that there is volunteer activity. There is almost 20 million hours of volunteer activity as a result of the community service block grant programs and the community action programs that are part of the network through the community service block grants. It is a program that targets the neediest, the low-income, the people who are struggling. It facilitates nutrition programs. It helps seniors. It deals with the retired programs. It ensures that there are training programs that go forward.

Part of the money is used to ensure that there is comprehensive collaboration so money is not wasted in duplicative efforts. Only 5 percent of the money can be spent by the States. The rest of it goes down and gets to the intended targets. Get down there it does. It is a program with proven results.

This does not create bureaucracies, it empowers people. Let us save people first, and if we do it right, we will save money in the same process. In 1981, Mr. Chairman, there were over 1,000 Federal employees that helped administer this program. Do Members know how many exist right now to administer this program? Five hundred, 400, 300, 100, 50, 25? Forty-five Federal employees now administer a program that was once run by over 1,000 Federal employees. That means more money gets to the grass roots. It means more money is being used to help people at the bottom rung of the economic ladder.

It is a program that has gotten the attention of people who are deeply concerned in poverty programs and not interested in building more bureaucracies. It has gotten the attention of people who are interested in measuring results, not inputs. It has gotten the attention and support of people who are not interested in creating more patronage, but people who are interested in creating more empowerment and more opportunities for the lowest income people, lowest income Americans among us. There were over 1,000 community action agencies throughout our Nation. Over 98 percent of the counties throughout our Nation receive some form of this block grant. It goes primarily to not-for-profits, people who have dedicated their lives to ensure that they help the neediest among us.

This is a vision that we have of anti-poverty programs, not to throw more spending. Again I want to commend the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER], for funding a very important anti-poverty program in the most significant and historic way.

□ 2015

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO].

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

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, almost all of the money in this bill that is being expended is for good purposes.

The problem is not with what is in the bill, it is what is not in the bill, what is out of it. I am glad we are able to do something on community service, put \$100 million in, but we take \$1 billion out of LIHEAP. I am glad we are able to provide some money for education, but when someone says the Federal Government is the program, is the sum and total program for higher education, that is it. The nonprofits and others are running out.

But the real problem is that beneath the veneer of fighting for fiscal discipline and budget balance, the policy path evoked by this measure will build upon the distorted priorities of the 1996 Republican appropriation effort, in sum, adding to the human deficit in this Nation, a human deficit which is borne by those with less power, the children, the working poor, the students, and those who struggle to achieve the promise of America. The opportunity to get ahead.

Investment in people is our best American investment. It pays the greatest dividends. Yet this measure in the Republican-led House has repeatedly broken faith with our children, our workers, and, in reality, our American future. I urge my colleagues to oppose this measure for that reason.

As a teacher, as a science educator, I understand. In my district, 25 percent of the kids are Southeast Asians. They need the bilingual education. They need the help so that they can achieve the type of success and the American dream that has been the promise, the renewed promise, of this Nation. But we cannot do it because we have put 7, 8, 9, \$10 billion more into Pentagon spending, because we need to have tax breaks.

What is wrong with this measure is that the money is going in other directions where it is not needed. I think it is more justified here. And if it is efficiencies and new definitions and all the other rhetoric that is going on here today in terms of what we are going to do, the fact is, the bottom line is the States are not capable of the miracle of loaves and fishes. So if we do not give them the dollars, we are going to hurt the people that we purport to be helping in this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to the fiscal year 1997 Labor, Health and Human Services, Education appropriations bill being considered today.

Investments in education, whether in our children or workers, determine a nation's standard of living and a country's ability to be competitive in the global marketplace. This legislation, like last year's spending bill, targets labor, education and job training programs for the most severe funding cuts. These types of programs, which invest in America's working families and children should not and must not be undermined.

This legislation reduces funding for elementary and secondary education programs such as Title I, Safe and Drug Free Schools and bilingual education. The cut in title I funding is in addition to the funding freeze the program endured last year, which translated into a real

cut for growing school districts. Title I provides students who are falling behind their classmates additional academic help. In my district in St. Paul, MN, the title I program cannot currently reach every student who needs such assistance. Reducing funding for this program would cause even more students to fall behind in their studies, and this type of policy has consequences that reach far beyond these students' school years into their post-academic lives. We cannot ignore some students, inhibiting their success, simply because they have difficulty learning.

In the same regard, we also cannot ignore that today's school environment is becoming more violent and dangerous in many, especially but not solely urban, areas. The Safe and Drug Free Schools Program is one initiative, run in virtually every school district in the nation, working to fight that trend. However, the program after protracted debate over a 57 percent cut was finally level funded in last year's Republican budget, and the bill we are debating today proposes to reduce funding for this program by again \$25 million in fiscal year 1997. This means that in fiscal year 1997, the Safe and Drug Free Schools Program will be funded at a level below its allocation in fiscal year 1995, at a time when the need for such drug, alcohol and violence preventative programs are dramatically increasing!

One other population of students who will be hurt by this legislation is immigrant children. Funding for bilingual and immigrant education programs is set to be reduced by 11 percent in this spending bill. Multiethnic communities and schools will be hit especially hard since these schools must continue providing such services with less Federal help. Investing in the education of these children is important. These children should not be left out in the cold regarding educational opportunity, unable to improve their lives and become productive members of our society.

The bill also takes aim at higher education, increasing funding for some student aid programs while eliminating or sparsely funding others. The measure modestly increases the maximum Pell grant award by \$30; not enough for a book much less inflation but this bill does increase funding for the Work-Study Program. However, at the same time, the bill reduces Perkins Loan funding by 82 percent and eliminates the State Student Incentive Grant Program altogether. In a time when the cost of a higher education is skyrocketing, the need for such a degree is growing, and parents are less able to help with such expenses, we cannot afford to pull the financial rug out from under our Nation's students.

The Federal Government is the lifeline of higher education funding, States and nonprofits are stretched to the limit, yet this Congress proposes to do less compounding and cutting off opportunity for 100,000 students.

Today's workers could also lose the ability to acquire additional education and job training under this bill due to the lack of sufficient funding for such programs and services. This measure freezes spending on such programs at the fiscal year 1996 level. Our Nation benefits greatly from developing the skills and abilities of future generations of workers and allowing those workers to update that knowledge and skill. No amount of infrastructure, technology, or opportunity will help our Nation's workers and future workers if they are unable to meet the challenges of the world of work.

Another drastic provision in this measure is the reduction in funding for the Occupational Safety and Health Administration [OSHA] by \$6 million from the fiscal year 1996 level in this Republican spending bill. This funding is vital to workers, whose lives, health and safety are literally at risk on the job. Each year, thousands of workers are killed on the job and millions suffer disability related injuries. The National Safety Council estimates that work-related accidents and deaths cost the Nation over \$100 billion every year. Cutting the budget of the principal public entity OSHA, that attempts to reduce that figure and increase workplace safety not only is a slap in the face to every American worker who puts their health and safety on the line, but also does not make fiscal sense. Furthermore, the National Labor Relations Board [NLRB] is targeted for a 15 percent cut when combined with funding cuts from last year. This proposed reduction would cripple the NLRB's ability to adjudicate labor disputes and appears to be yet another slap at working people who seek equitable wages and work conditions based upon worker rights promised in Federal law.

I agree that we should work toward a balanced Federal budget, but there are many ways to achieve such a balance than abandoning the investments that America has long made in its working families. Not all of the cuts need to be made from people programs and surely the ideological mindset that guides these cuts cannot be glossed over by the rhetoric of budget balancing. The Pentagon, space programs, corporate welfare and natural resource giveaway are just some of the many Federal programs that should also be subject to fiscal discipline and tough choices. The price for reducing investments in America's people should not be new tax breaks for corporations and investors or increasing the defense budget to a greater level than that Department even requested. But this 104th Congress has acted repeatedly to insulate from shared sacrifice this laundry list of special interests and placed foremost for cuts the vital programs that affect health, education, job training, and the environment.

This Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Appropriations measure for fiscal year 1997 continues the assault on working Americans and families that was so vigorously waged last year. I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this measure and return our Nation to one that values all of its people.

Beneath the veneer of fighting for fiscal discipline and budget balance, the policy path evoked by this measure will build upon the distorted priorities of the 1996 Republican appropriation effort, in sum, adding to the human deficit in this Nation.

A human deficit which is borne by those with less power, the children, the working poor, the students and those who struggle to achieve the promise of America; the opportunity to get ahead. Investment in people is our best American investment; it pays the greatest dividends yet this measure and the Republican-led House has repeatedly broke faith with our children, our workers, in reality our American future.

I oppose and urge Members to oppose this appropriation measure.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. MALONEY].

(Mrs. MALONEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this bill.

As ranking member OBEY said, "This bill puts forth systematic disinvestment in education, health, seniors, children, women, and the list goes on. Specifically, I would like to talk about the disastrous effects of zero funding the Healthy Start Infant Mortality Prevention Program.

By eliminating funding for Healthy Start, this bill abandons America's children.

In New York City, Healthy Start has saved lives.

From 1990 to 1994, over 70,000 women and infants have benefited from this program; the infant mortality rate dropped by 38 percent; the rate of late or no prenatal care fell 32 percent; and the number of low birth-weight babies went down.

We also know that Healthy Start is responsible for saving precious Medicaid dollars by producing healthier babies.

Mr. Chairman, if we refuse basic health care to our newborns, what kind of priorities have we set?

If we turn our backs on young mothers-to-be what kind of example have we set?

If we don't prove that we care about giving every newborn baby the opportunity to have a Healthy Start, what kind of nation are we?

Mr. Chairman, totally defunding Healthy Start is a sad example of a tragic reversal of priorities.

No one should support this bill.

The Labor/HHS bill cuts any specified funding for the Long-Term Care Ombudsman Program, which funds each State office that trains volunteers who serve as watchdogs over nursing home abuses and serve as advocates for nursing home patients.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to stand up for the rights of seniors who live in America's nursing homes.

Today, the war on America's seniors continues as the Long-Term Care Ombudsman Program faces elimination by this Congress.

Mr. Chairman, New York State's network of 51 countywide ombudsman offices have a trained team of over 500 volunteers who protect seniors who are being abused, neglected, and mistreated in nursing homes in this State alone.

Long before this program was created in 1987, we saw rampant abuses in nursing homes—including patients being tied to their beds, drugged, and worse.

By creating the Long-Term Care Ombudsman Program, many of these problems were corrected, but we still have more work to do.

In total last year, New York's team of nursing home watchdogs handled over 10,000 complaints from nursing home residents and their advocates—at least 2,000 of them in New York City.

For those residents of long-term care facilities who have no one to protect them from mistreatment, the Long-Term Care Ombudsman is their only hope.

To eliminate funding for this important program in gross negligence on the part of this Congress.

As responsible legislators, we must provide a voice to those who are silenced by abusive conditions in our States' nursing homes.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

The gentlewoman from New York and the gentleman from Maryland before her both have mentioned the Healthy Start program, and I want to respond to that, because they are correct, it has shown itself through demonstration to be a very good program.

The difficulty, Mr. Chairman, is that this was a program proposed by and started by the Bush administration in fiscal year 1991, funded by Congress with the clear understanding that it would be a 5-year demonstration, including evaluation, with the last year of funding to be fiscal year 1996.

We believe that the program has proved itself very adequately. The difficulty is that it should not continue as a demonstration program where it is not made available generally. Under the original conception of the program, it was to be a 5-year demonstration. That period has expired. It is time that we either fund this as a general program available broadly across the country or not fund it at all.

I think that the points made about the program are very good ones. What we have to do is come to grips with which way we are going to go on that. We cannot do this in the appropriations process.

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

Mr. OLVER. I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, I guess I would just ask rhetorically to the chairman of the subcommittee from Illinois, under those circumstances, why did they not make it a general program and put money in for making it a general program? I will yield time for that answer if there is any left when I get finished.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this bill. I could find compelling reason to oppose many features of the bill but I want to confine my comments to the field of education.

Mr. Chairman, once again this body is jeopardizing our children's future. So far the 104th Congress has cut \$1.1 billion from education. This proposal cuts \$400 million more. When do we say enough is enough?

Eliminating the Goals 2000 education reform, which this bill does, when academically our students lag behind virtually all our industrialized competitors, is foolish. Cutting \$25 million from safe and drug free schools, which this bill does, is bad judgment. And cutting funds for reading and math assistance for students who just happen to live in desperately poor school districts, which this bill does, is without compassion as well as violates our national security.

Balancing the budget is everybody's goal but slashing education is, in my view, simply wrong. I urge my col-

leagues to reassess our priorities and put education first, ahead of tax cuts for the already well-off, ahead of unrequested defense spending, ahead of corporate welfare. Thereby, I urge a "no" vote on the bill.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I would inquire how much time is remaining on each side.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] has 5 minutes remaining, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] has 6 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Illinois has the right to close.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE].

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank ranking member OBEY for this opportunity to really offer an apology to the American people. I was hoping that as we looked at a bill that had the opportunity to really change the direction of this country, to focus on the front end and not the back end, if you will, this bill has missed its opportunity and I rose to the floor to say this is not the "3 strikes bill and you're out," it is the "multistrike bill and we're all out," primarily because you do not know where to start in the cuts that have come about that would help people to rise out of their condition and become independent.

We have heard so much about welfare reform and the dominance of this country in having people extend their hand to get a handout. This labor-HHS bill could have given people an opportunity never to look back and to become independent, particularly when we look at the President's youth employment training program. When we go throughout this Nation, aside from those who are attempting to get a higher education, there are those youth who have been lost between the cracks of either not finishing high school or finishing high school and being undertrained for jobs in this community. This program would have allowed us to train youth to become available and well trained for the jobs that America has to offer. This money now has been gutted. And so we are not investing in the front end, we are looking to the back end when ultimately maybe these youth will wind up being incarcerated.

The youth summer jobs program has no growth in it, although I am gratified we have saved it, this program that helps to employ some 4,000 youth in the city of Houston had to be cut. Many parents came to me and said, "What are we going to do in training our youngsters to know what work is all about?" And then unfortunately with a Nation that has one of the highest infant mortality rates in the western world, we cut the Healthy Start Program. There we go again with no investment in the front end, waiting on the back end results of low birth weight opportunities.

I would simply ask my colleagues to review this legislation and this appropriation bill, go to the front end and invest and not wait for the back end. Defeat this legislation so that we can treat Americans right.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to express my opposition to this legislation. I am afraid that, in its current form, this bill does not do enough to protect the quality of life for our most vulnerable citizens. This bill funds a great number of the programs and services that are relied upon by our Nation's families—our children, women, and senior citizens. I do not believe that these are the programs that we should be drastically cutting in our efforts to balance the budget. We must maintain our commitment to protect children and families, to support education and training, and to continue programs such as head start, healthy start, substance abuse prevention and treatment, and summer jobs.

#### LABOR PROGRAMS

This bill seriously jeopardizes worker protection by dramatically cutting programs that promote workplace safety and health, and pension security. Funding is cut by \$129 million below the President's request and \$83 million below the amount needed to maintain last year's operating level. The Pension and Welfare Benefit Administration is provided with only \$65.8 million, which is a \$1.3 million cut from the current funding level and \$19.7 million below the President's request.

One of the best known worker protection agencies is the Occupational Safety and Health Administration [OSHA], is cut by over \$6 million. This bill would specifically reduce Federal enforcement of workplace safety by \$4,765,000. OSHA enforces this Nation's labor protection laws and as a law enforcement authority it may not be popular with the law breakers, but for those they serve and protect everyday do not want this Congress under valuing their life or health.

When my colleagues speak so passionately about the American taxpayer, there are speaking about people that the Department of Labor should be in the business of protecting and whose pension plans should be assured of solvency when they are needed. That is the least the working American taxpayer should expect from the 104th Congress.

This bill would also zero out funding for the President's new youth employment training program, the Opportunity Areas for Out-of-School Youth. The President only requested \$250 million to help address the special employment training problems faced by many of our Nation's youth.

This legislation will once again shortchange our youth through the underfunding of the Youth Summer Jobs Program for fiscal year 1997. The \$625 million appropriated is the same level funded for this fiscal year. At this level of funding only 442,000 youth can be served while those in need number over 600,000.

#### HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES DEPARTMENT

This bill would eliminate funding for the healthy start program, which is designed to reduce the Nation's high infant mortality rate. Now is not the time to dismantle this critical life saving program. The United States has the highest infant mortality rate of 22 industrialized nations. Furthermore, while low birthweight babies represent 7 percent of all births, they account for 57 percent of the cost of care for all newborns. Long term health care costs for a low birth weight baby can reach \$500 thousand, while prenatal care to prevent low birth weight costs as little as \$750.00. Clearly, we must continue this important program.

I am concerned that this bill includes less funding for the Centers for Disease Control's National Center of Injury Prevention and Control. This important program focuses on motor vehicle accidents, falls, fires, poisoning, drowning and violence including homicide, suicide and domestic violence.

Similarly, the bill provides less funding for the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration. The amount (\$1.85 billion) is an aggregated cut of \$33.9 million below the current funding level and is \$248 million below the administration's request. The \$38.4 million fiscal year 1997 funding cut for substance abuse treatment is compounded by the fact that funding for treatment was gutted 60 percent, or \$148 million in fiscal year 1996. As a result of this decrease in funding, 5 million at-risk youth will be denied the substance abuse prevention services they need.

The \$3.6 billion provided for the Head Start Program is \$381 million less than the administration's request. This program currently serves less than half of the estimated 2 million children eligible for head start services. At the level provided in this bill up to 15 thousand head start slots would be eliminated next year.

This bill provides only \$900 million for the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program [LIHEAP], which provides assistance to low-income households in meeting the costs of home energy. This is \$100 million less than the administration's request. Furthermore, the bill does not appropriate any of the \$1 billion requested for fiscal year 1998. The advance appropriation is critical to States' budgeting and planning and allows them the time necessary to determine the program eligibility rules.

This bill includes a large cut in funding for the Administration on Aging, including the elimination of all funds for aging research, training and special projects which will hamper local communities' ability to improve, develop and test innovative solutions. Similarly, the amount of funding provided for the Social Services Block Grant is still \$320 million below the entitlement level of \$2.8 billion required by current law, and requested by the administration. For States that do not provide additional funding for social services, the impact will be especially severe as this program, includes support for protective services for children and adults, home-based care, and child care.

This bill does not include the \$30 million the administration requested for a concentrated

teen pregnancy initiative, which would have been invested in comprehensive interventions to provide opportunities for young people to take responsibility, increase their life skills and to become contributing members of society. The U.S. has the highest rate of teen pregnancy of any industrialized country. Addressing this problem is key to reforming the Nation's welfare system.

I am pleased that this bill increases funding for the National Institutes of Health, however the \$1.4 billion provided for AIDS is provided at the institute level rather than in a single appropriation to the Office of AIDS Research as requested by the administration and as consistent with the NIH Revitalization Act.

#### EDUCATION

The bill does nothing to address what nearly everyone agrees is our most important task—educating our children. Funding for Goals 2000 is eliminated. The program is currently \$350 million and the President requested \$491 million for Goals 2000 in fiscal year 1997. This program strives to raise academic standards and encourage students to work hard to meet them. Now it not the time to scale back on improving education standards for children across the Nation.

This bill freezes Title 1 grants to local education agencies at \$6.73 billion. This means that given inflation and increased operating costs, fewer funds will be available to provide students the assistance they need in basic reading and math skills. Title 1 currently provides supplemental funding to 50 thousand schools serving nearly 7 million disadvantaged students nationwide. Under Title 1, disadvantaged students are provided the assistance they need to achieve the same high standards as other children.

This bill cuts the Safe and Drug Free School Program by \$25 million compared with fiscal year 1996 and \$99 million less than requested by President Clinton. In this time of increased crime, violence, and drug abuse, we must help our schools become safe havens where children can learn and study free from the dangers of these afflictions.

For college students, the bill eliminates aid for the Federal Perkins Loan capital contribution account. In fiscal year 1996, \$93.3 million was provided for this program. In almost every other educational program—Adult and Vocational education, Special Education Grants for Children with Disabilities, Bilingual and Immigrant education, Pell Grants, Charter Schools and many others—the funding levels in this bill are far below the level requested by President Clinton.

The priorities of this bill are out of line with common sense. All participants agree that balancing the budget is a goal that we all share. However, we must also invest in our children and their future. There is no use in passing on a balanced budget to our children if we deprive them of the education that is necessary in order for them to take the mantle of leadership.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON].

(Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend Chairman PORTER for the outstanding job he did with this piece of legislation. Make no mistake about it, people on both sides of the aisle here have the same ultimate purpose. We want to help kids. We want to make sure kids have a chance to go to college. We want to help protect our workers. We want to make sure that education is a key priority. We agree on that. My personal experience as someone who went to school on a student loan and could not have gone otherwise, as someone who taught in a public school for 7 years and in an urban depressed school district and as someone who ran a Federal title I program for 3 years, I think I know something about some of the programs we are talking about.

There is a key difference, Mr. Chairman, between what the administration wants and what this Congress wants. The difference is that the administration wants to empower the bureaucracy and we want to empower people. It is very simple and very fundamental. We heard in the debate on the other side from our more liberal friends that there is no help for job training, for housing assistance, for energy assistance, for child care, for homeless shelters, for health care for the poor and for housing rehab, to name a few. What they did not say, Mr. Chairman, is that this bill increases the community service block grant by the single largest amount in the program's history since 1981, \$100 million, Mr. Chairman. Where is the rhetoric coming from the other side in the largest single increase in this program's history? And where is the acknowledgment, Mr. Chairman, on the other side that this will allow us to assist 2.1 million more people than we assisted last year to a total of 10.3 million? And where is the information from the other side about the leveraging of another \$267 million of private sector investment which is what all 1,200 community action agencies across the country do in every one of our Members' districts.

This is a good bill. It is a key difference between what the liberals want and what we want. We want to empower people. We want to empower grassroots decisionmakers. We want to empower those people who are involved in community action agencies like the one I started in my county back in 1979 which has grown to a \$14 million a year agency providing all of these services.

I say vote "yes" for this bill and I thank the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER].

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. KINGSTON], a member of the full committee.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, as I went back through the CONGRESSIONAL

RECORD and looked at what the Democrats had to say about this bill last year, it was just absolutely ridiculous, offbase political rhetoric, just like we are hearing this year: war on children, mindless, mean-spirited package. It is the same old thing. The Democrats want to smoke but they do not want to inhale. They want to cut the budget but not here, not this bill, not now, not this group.

The fact is, my Democrat friends, that money is not always the solution. Just one particular case, one small example: Since 1970 per-student spending in America has increased from \$4,000 to \$7,000 per student. Yet during that same period of time SAT scores have fallen from 937 points in 1972 to 902 points in 1994.

Money, money, money is not always the answer. So let us try to put our investments in programs that work, cut out the Washington bureaucracy, empower the people back home, and pass this bill.

□ 2030

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, I want to make clear we have absolutely no quarrel with the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER]. He has done a fine job under the circumstances, and I honestly believe his heart is in the right place. The problem, frankly, as we see it, is simply that the budget priorities of Speaker GINGRICH and the majority party in this House are simply wrong. They say, oh, it is okay to give \$11 billion more than the President or the Pentagon is asking for the Pentagon; but, oh, by the way, we have got to balance the budget.

So what did they do? They put us on a 6-year track that will knock one million kids off the most important program supported by the Federal Government to teach kids to read and to help them to master science and mathematics. They cut the Eisenhower teacher training program, an immensely popular program with any teacher in any district who is interested in improving his or her ability to convey information to children.

They zero out Perkins loans. They, in fact, in the education area provide over the next 6 years—and this is the first step in that process—they provide 20 percent less in real deliverable program support for education over that time period at the very time when student populations are rising after a long time when those student populations were declining. They say, oh, we must make up for inflation when we appropriate funds to the Pentagon; but, oh, no, there is no need to make up for the cost of inflation when we are dealing with education. I find that separation and logic to be an extremely interesting revelation in terms of the respective priorities of the parties.

The majority party says we should honor work. I agree with that. I worked

hard all my life. So did my kids. So did most other people in this Chamber. But after they say we should honor work, what do they do? They cut the National Labor Relations Board by 15 percent so they limit the ability of that agency in a severe way to protect worker health, to protect worker safety, to protect the integrity of worker pension plans, and to enforce the law that guarantees that workers will be treated fairly and squarely on wages and hours.

They drive a billion-dollar hole through a crucial program that provides assistance to low-income elderly and low-income individuals under the low-income heating assistance program. Then they brag about putting 10 percent of that money back by way of community service block grants.

I take a back seat to no one in my support for community service block grants. For year after year after year on that subcommittee, it was DAVE OBEY who pushed that program against many times almost unanimous opposition on the Republican side of the aisle and some opposition on my own side of the aisle. So I take a back seat to no one in my pleasure that that program is finally getting a justifiable increase. But do not pretend that that tiny increase for that program makes up for the deep-sixing that my colleagues are doing on so many other initiatives to help the very same people that that program is aimed at.

I thank God for small favors, and I thank the subcommittee chairman, but I do not get overly excited about it. I would simply say that this bill, more than any other, as Bill Natcher used to say, this bill more than any other is meant to help meet the needs of workers and people. We should not be squeezing it, as this proposal does.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield my remaining time to the gentleman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA].

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, I really want to acknowledge Chairman PORTER and the members of the subcommittee for their efforts on a very difficult bill. While I have some concerns with some of the programs in terms of the education area, I do appreciate the chairman's work to develop a fair bill that funds so many critical programs. I am strongly supportive of the 6.5 percent increase in overall funding for research at the National Institutes of Health. I know of no Member of Congress with a greater commitment to biomedical research than Chairman PORTER. And as the representative in Congress for the NIH, I greatly appreciate his strong support in protecting the integrity of the NIH professional judgment budget.

I also commend him for his efforts to ensure that Congress does not interfere with funding priorities established by the scientific community. In that regard, the Office of AIDS Research at NIH continues to plan for AIDS research, which is conducted among the

24 institutes, also centers and divisions at NIH. The committee has provided report language that clearly recognizes the integral role which the NIH Office of AIDS Research plays in coordinating AIDS research. I believe there is a critical need for the OAR to have sufficient budgetary authority to effectively manage AIDS research dollars, and I look forward to continuing to work with Chairman PORTER and the committee to see that OAR be granted the budgetary authority it needs to manage the AIDS programs across the NIH. Such authority, which has been strongly endorsed in an external evaluation of the NIH's AIDS program by our Nation's leading scientists, will ensure accountability in spending AIDS research dollars.

I commend the chairman of the committee for including funding increases for AIDS research and prevention and the Ryan White Care Act. I also appreciate the inclusion of report language that I submitted again this year expressing the importance of continued funding for research on microbicides.

Mr. Chairman, I guess there is no more time left, but I want to comment on continued support for the violence against women program and the increased funding for breast and cervical cancer research.

Mr. Chairman, I want to acknowledge Chairman PORTER and the members of the subcommittee for their efforts on a very difficult bill. While I have concerns with the funding levels for education, I do appreciate the chairman's work to develop a fair bill that funds so many critical programs.

I am strongly supportive of the 6.5 percent increase in overall funding for research at the National Institutes of Health. I know of no Member of Congress with a greater commitment to biomedical research than Chairman PORTER, and, as the Representative in Congress for the NIH, I greatly appreciate his strong support in protecting the integrity of the NIH professional judgment budget. I also commend him for his efforts to ensure that Congress does not interfere with funding priorities established by the scientific community.

In that regard, the Office of AIDS Research [OAR] at NIH continues to plan for AIDS research, which is conducted among the 24 institutes, centers, and divisions at NIH. The committee has provided report language, similar to the report language provided in fiscal year 1996, defining the authority of the OAR. While I am pleased that the committee has continued to provide limited transfer authority to the OAR, I remain convinced that AIDS research funding at NIH can best be managed through providing maximum budgetary authority, in the form of a consolidated appropriation, to the OAR.

During the past year, a group of highly respected leaders in the biomedical research community conducted a thorough evaluation of AIDS research funding at NIH. This group, which was chaired by Dr. Arnold Levine of Princeton University, released a report in March 1996, which included recommendations to strengthen the management, oversight, and accountability of AIDS research funding among the 24 institutes, centers, and divisions, involved in AIDS research at NIH.

Dr. Levine's working group has provided specific recommendations regarding scientific priorities and improved coordination of AIDS research activities, and has recommended that Congress provide the OAR with maximum budgetary and management authority.

I believe strongly that Congress has a responsibility to ensure that our biomedical research dollars are being spent in a well-managed, coordinated fashion. Decisions relating to the provision of budget authority to the OAR should be made in the interests of the best possible management of scientific resources. As the committee works to reconcile differences with the other body later this fall, I urge the committee to re-think their position on the level of budgetary and management authority provided to the OAR, and to use the Levine Report, with an eye toward achieving the most effective possible management of AIDS research funding.

I commend the chairman and committee for including funding increases for AIDS research, prevention, and the Ryan White CARE Act. I also appreciate the inclusion of report language I submitted again this year expressing the importance of continued funding for research on microbicides for STD/HIV prevention and the Women's Interagency HIV Study, two research priorities for women in the HIV epidemic.

I am also pleased with the continued support for the Violence Against Women Act programs, and the increased funding for women's health research and services.

As a former teacher, I believe that education must be one of our top priorities. I am concerned that this bill cuts another \$400 million from public education programs.

Violence in our Nation's schools and student drug use are among the top concerns of most Americans. Yet, this legislation cuts \$25 million from the Safe and Drug Free Schools program. The number of students served by the Individuals With Disabilities Act [IDEA] is increasing. Yet, this bill freezes, at last year's level, funding for special education grants to the States. That means that States will get even less Federal assistance with the burgeoning costs of educating children with disabilities.

I also oppose the portion of the bill that prohibits funds from being used to benefit persons not lawfully within the United States. School officials throughout the U.S. would then be required to determine the citizenship status of every student and their parents. This would create a paper nightmare, and would turn local school districts into mini-immigration services.

Most immigrants, documented or not, most likely will remain in the United States. If we do not educate these individuals, they will end up on the streets. Instead of contributing to the tax base of our society, these children would only add to the long-term problems of homelessness and crime.

The future of our country is linked to the quality of education that we afford our children. It is in the national interest to assist States and local governments to provide the best possible education for our Nation's students.

I look forward to working with the chairman to increase funding for these programs in conference, and I appreciate his skill and sensitivity toward meeting the tremendous needs addressed in this critical bill.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

The Chairman, of the Committee of the Whole may postpone until a time during further consideration in the Committee of the Whole a request for a recorded vote on any amendment and may reduce to not less than 5 minutes the time for voting by electronic device on any postponed question that immediately follows another vote by electronic device without intervening business, provided that the time for voting by electronic device on the first in any series of questions shall be not less than 15 minutes.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3744

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, 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, namely:

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING ADMINISTRATION

TRAINING AND EMPLOYMENT SERVICES

For expenses necessary to carry into effect the Job Training Partnership Act, as amended, including the purchase and hire of passenger motor vehicles, the construction, alteration, and repair of buildings and other facilities, and the purchase of real property for training centers as authorized by the Job Training Partnership Act; the Women in Apprenticeship and Nontraditional Occupations Act; the National Skill Standards Act of 1994; and the School-to-Work Opportunities Act; \$4,171,482,000 plus reimbursements, of which \$3,297,011,000 is available for obligation for the period July 1, 1997 through June 30, 1998; of which \$73,861,000 is available for the period July 1, 1997 through June 30, 2000 for necessary expenses of construction, rehabilitation, and acquisition of Job Corps centers; and of which \$175,000,000 shall be available from July 1, 1997 through September 30, 1998, for carrying out activities of the School-to-Work Opportunities Act: *Provided*, That 450,000,000 shall be for carrying out section 401 of the Job Training Partnership Act, \$65,000,000 shall be for carrying out section 402 of such Act, \$7,300,000 shall be for carrying out section 441 of such Act, \$2,530,000 shall be for all activities conducted by and through the National Occupational Information Coordinating Committee under such Act, \$850,000,000 shall be for carrying out title II, part A of such Act, and \$126,672,000 shall be for carrying out title II, part C of such Act: *Provided further*, That no funds from any other appropriation shall be used to provide meal services at or for Job Corps centers: *Provided further*, That funds provided to carry out title III of the Job Training Partnership Act shall not be subject to the limitation contained in subsection (b) of section 315 of such Act; that the waiver allowing a reduction in the cost limitation relating to retraining services described in subsection (a)(2) of such section 315 may be granted with respect to funds from this Act if a substate grantee demonstrates to the Governor that such waiver is appropriate due to the availability of low-cost retraining services, is necessary to facilitate the provision of

needs-related payments to accompany long-term training, or is necessary to facilitate the provision of appropriate basic readjustment services; and that funds provided to carry out the Secretary's discretionary grants under part B of such title III may be used to provide needs-related payments to participants who, in lieu of meeting the requirements relating to enrollment in training under section 314(e) of such Act, are enrolled in training by the end of the sixth week after grant funds have been awarded: *Provided further*, That service delivery areas may transfer funding provided herein under authority of titles II-B and II-C of the Job Training Partnership Act between the programs authorized by those titles of that Act, if such transfer is approved by the Governor: *Provided further*, That service delivery areas and substate areas may transfer funding provided herein under authority of title II-A and title III of the Job Training Partnership Act between the programs authorized by those titles of that Act, if such transfer is approved by the Governor: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, any proceeds from the sale of Job Corps center facilities shall be retained by the Secretary of Labor to carry out the Job Corps program.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. OBEY:

On page 2, line 14, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$5,000,000)".

On page 2, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$5,000,000)".

On page 3, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$5,000,000)".

On page 10, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by \$5,000,000 for sweatshop enforcement in the garment industry)".

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to take my name off the amendment and replace it with the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. VELÁZQUEZ].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin will have to withdraw the amendment and have the gentlewoman offer the amendment on her own.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, we have had a timing problem here.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment so it might be reoffered by the original author, the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. VELÁZQUEZ].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. VELÁZQUEZ

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:

On page 2, line 14, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$5,000,000)".

On page 2, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$5,000,000)".

On page 3, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$5,000,000)".

On page 10, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by \$5,000,000 for sweatshop enforcement in the garment industry)".

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, we cannot pick up a newspaper, turn on the radio or television without seeing the names and faces of celebrities caught using sweatshop labor to produce their signature line of goods. Last month it was Kathie Lee Gifford; then it was Michael Jordan; and next week, it will be someone else. The fact of the matter is, sweatshops are a very serious problem throughout the United States.

As sweatshops have spread like wildfire, Congress has turned a blind eye and ignored this problem. This has caused millions of workers and American businesses to suffer.

My amendment takes the first step to rectify this national disgrace, by restoring funds to the Department of Labor to fight sweatshops, across this country. It provides \$5 million to the Wage and Hour Division, to specifically fight sweatshop violations in the garment industry. To pay for this, we would transfer \$5 million from the Jobs Training Partnership Act, that was funded at \$25 million over its fiscal year 1996 level. Both of these efforts serve to help disadvantaged workers. We must provide these professionals, who are on the front lines of this battle, a fighting chance. In recent years, the Wage and Hour Division has seen its budget slashed, while the number of sweatshops have skyrocketed.

From New York to Los Angeles, all across this country, millions are being exploited by unscrupulous employers. In California and New York, studies have found that over half of all garment factories currently operating are sweatshops. Most shocking of all is how society's most vulnerable—our children—are being abused. How can we permit these people to be treated like this?

My colleagues, fly-by-night kingpins open sweatshops for just a few months and then close without warning. They collect money from manufacturers and pay workers a pittance—if anything at all. Then, as quickly as they appear, they disappear with the cash—only to open again somewhere else under a new name, to start the cycle of despair all over again. They operate a classic shell game, with women, immigrants and children as their pawns. These crooks must be stopped and we must begin by adopting this amendment.

Take a good look at this picture of workers in sweatshops. Note how the workers are hunched over their machines, how dirty and crowded the factory is. In many cases, women and children work behind bars and barbed wire that seem more like a prison than a workplace. I have seen first-hand the suffering these workers are forced to endure. This exploitation has left many maimed, blinded and scarred from a life in these sweatshops.

How would you feel if your child, your mother, or your sister was forced

to work 60 hours a week, and only be paid a couple of dollars an hour? What if they were forced to work in a factory like this—crowded, filthy and with emergency exits that were blocked? What if they told you that they dared not complain for fear of being fired—worse yet, they worked even when sick for fear of losing their job and having no income.

The individuals slaving away in sweatshops are not the only ones forced to suffer. Legitimate American businesses and their employees are also victims, unfairly forced to compete against sweatshops. By allowing sweatshops to operate, in our own backyard, we are allowing the livelihood of many to be stolen. By supporting efforts to combat this problem, we are ensuring a level playing field and simple fairness for our workers and American businesses.

By adopting this amendment, we have a rare opportunity to help workers, businesses, and to support American-made products. This amendment is supported by labor groups, like UNITE, which represent workers. It is supported by business groups, like the National Knitwear and Sportswear Association, which represent manufacturers. This amendment is truly a win-win situation for everyone.

If you think this issue does not affect you or your district, think again. There may be people in this Chamber today that are wearing clothes made in sweatshops. If you shopped in stores like J.C. Penney or Macy's, or purchased a pair of Air Jordans, you are guilty of adding to this problem.

Let's show the American people and the world that Congress is no longer going to turn a blind eye and keep this dirty little secret, here or abroad. I urge you to vote "yes" on this amendment.

□ 2045

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. We believe that this amendment addresses a very serious problem.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, we likewise congratulate the gentlewoman for offering the amendment, and support the amendment on this side.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Velázquez amendment to restore funding to the Department of Labor's wage and hour division and Department of International Labor Affairs. These funds are critical to the Department's ongoing efforts to combat worksite safety and fair labor standards violations, particularly in the garment industry.

Most Americans are aware of the recent news reports documenting sweatshop abuses in foreign nations. We have heard about the rampant wage exploitation of hundreds of thousands of workers—many of whom are children who produce popular American consumer goods and designer products, while laboring under inhumane working conditions.

However, many Americans are not aware of the fact that similar abuses are occurring daily

in places like Los Angeles, New York, Miami, and Texas. The unfortunate reality is that despite our Nation's historic tradition of protecting workers and the voluntary compliance efforts by reputable garment contractors, sweatshop exploitation is a pervasive problem in America. It is estimated that more than 7,000 garment shops nationwide can be classified as sweatshops.

There are numerous examples of the nature and extent of the problem. In August of last year, the raid of a garment sweatshop in El Monte, CA, exposed the working conditions of 70 immigrants enslaved in a factory ringed with razor wire. More recently, a February raid in Irvine, CA, found workers routinely working 12-hour shifts, locked in a windowless room with a single fire escape. In Dallas, a sweep of 11 garment shops found that 82 percent of these businesses were in violation of Federal labor laws. This is nothing less than a national disgrace.

The Department of Labor's wage and hour division and International Labor Affairs Department are important lines of defense against sweatshops. Currently, the wage and hour division is combining an aggressive enforcement strategy with an educational program that encourages retailers, manufacturers, unions, and consumer groups to work in partnership to address the problem. Limited resources, however, have cut the number of investigators at the wage and hour divisions by 18 percent at a time when the workload of the division has expanded to include the monitoring of over 110 million workers in 6.5 million workplaces. The funding reductions contained in this bill hampers their ability to police the garment industry, protect workers, and ensure their workplace safety.

I urge my colleagues to support our efforts to fight sweatshop abuses by voting in favor of the Velázquez amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. VELÁZQUEZ].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

COMMUNITY SERVICE EMPLOYMENT FOR OLDER AMERICANS  
(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

To carry out the activities for national grants or contracts with public agencies and public or private nonprofit organizations under paragraph (1)(A) of section 506(a) of title V of the Older Americans Act of 1965, as amended, or to carry out older worker activities as subsequently authorized, \$242,450,000.

To carry out the activities for grants to States under paragraph (3) of section 506(a) of title V of the Older Americans Act of 1965, as amended, or to carry out older worker activities as subsequently authorized, \$130,550,000.

The funds appropriated under this heading shall be transferred to the Department of Health and Human Services, "Aging Services Programs" following the enactment of legislation authorizing the administration of the program by that Department: *Provided*, That the funds shall be available for obligation for the period July 1, 1997 through June 30, 1998.

FEDERAL UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS AND ALLOWANCES

For payments during the current fiscal year of trade adjustment benefit payments and allowances under part I, and for train-

ing, for allowances for job search and relocation, and for related State administrative expenses under part II, subchapters B and D, chapter 2, title II of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended, \$324,500,000, together with such amounts as may be necessary to be charged to the subsequent appropriation for payments for any period subsequent to September 15 of the current year.

STATE UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE AND EMPLOYMENT SERVICE OPERATIONS

For authorized administrative expenses, \$132,279,000, together with not to exceed \$3,096,111,000 (including not to exceed \$1,653,000 which may be used for amortization payments to States which had independent retirement plans in their State employment service agencies prior to 1980, and including not to exceed \$2,000,000 which may be obligated in contracts with non-State entities for activities such as occupational and test research activities which benefit the Federal-State Employment Service System), which may be expended from the Employment Security Administration account in the Unemployment Trust Fund, and of which the sums available in the allocation for activities authorized by title III of the Social Security Act, as amended (42 U.S.C. 502-504), and the sums available in the allocation for necessary administrative expenses for carrying out 5 U.S.C. 8501-8523, shall be available for obligation by the States through December 31, 1997, except that funds used for automation acquisitions shall be available for obligation by States through September 30, 1999; and of which \$132,279,000, together with not to exceed \$701,369,000 of the amount which may be expended from said trust fund, shall be available for obligation for the period July 1, 1997 through June 30, 1998, to fund activities under the Act of June 6, 1933, as amended, including the cost of penalty mail made available to States in lieu of allotments for such purpose, and of which \$260,573,000 shall be available only to the extent necessary for additional State allocations to administer unemployment compensation laws to finance increases in the number of unemployment insurance claims filed and claims paid or changes in a State law: *Provided*, That to the extent that the Average Weekly Insured Unemployment (AWIU) for fiscal year 1997 is projected by the Department of Labor to exceed 2,828,000 an additional \$28,600,000 shall be available for obligation for every 100,000 increase in the AWIU level (including a pro rata amount for any increment less than 100,000) from the Employment Security Administration Account of the Unemployment Trust Fund: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated in this Act which are used to establish a national one-stop career center network may be obligated in contracts, grants or agreements with non-State entities: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated under this Act for activities authorized under the Wagner-Peyser Act, as amended, and title III of the Social Security Act, may be used by the States to fund integrated Employment Service and Unemployment Insurance automation efforts, notwithstanding cost allocation principles prescribed under Office of Management and Budget Circular A-87.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. STUMP

Mr. STUMP. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STUMP: Page 6, line 5, insert "(reduced by \$3,800,000)" after the first dollar amount.

Page 18, line 15, insert "(increased by \$3,800,000)" after the dollar amount.

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

Mr. STUMP. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment for myself, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY], the ranking member of the Veterans Affairs Committee; the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee; the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BUYER], the chairman of the Subcommittee on Education, Employment and Training; and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MICA], the chairman of the Civil Service Subcommittee.

Our amendment would increase the funds available for administration of the Veterans Employment and Training Service by \$3.8 million.

This increase would be offset by a reduction in funding from the national activities account of the Employment Service.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STUMP. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for yielding and for offering the amendment. We support the amendment very strongly and have no objection to it.

Mr. STUMP. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STUMP. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, we likewise think the amendment of the gentleman is a good one and accept it on this side of the aisle.

Mr. STUMP. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin and thank the chairman.

Mr. Chairman, the Veterans' Affairs Committee has worked hard this Congress to improve the operations of the Veterans Employment and Training Service and employment opportunities for veterans. And one again, we've done it in a bipartisan manner.

We've had great cooperation from the Economic and Educational Opportunities Committee, the Subcommittee on Civil Service, and the Labor Appropriations Subcommittee. This amendment would make a small but important addition to the bipartisan work already accomplished.

Veterans preference and reemployment rights are important benefits. For many veterans, they may be the only benefits ever used.

Simply put, at a time when the Federal government is down sizing, we must ensure that veterans preference laws are followed. These funds would also ensure that veterans reemployment rights are vigorously enforced in both the public and private sectors. This is vital at a time when we rely so heavily on our National Guard and Reserve forces.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment will allow the Veterans Employment and Training Service to meet its expanding enforcement responsibilities, fulfill its Transition Assistance program training requirements, and find thousands more jobs for veterans.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support the Stump amendment.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to support the Stump amendment to increase funding for the Department of Labor's Veterans' Employment and Training Service

[VETS]. Although this amendment would increase the VETS appropriation by only \$3.8 million, this modest amount will significantly enhance the ability of VETS staff to provide employment services to veterans. The amendment would provide an additional \$2.8 million for the veterans administration account. This will bring that account up to the funding level requested by the President. The additional \$1 million will be used to fund new positions for investigators who will ensure that Federal and State governments and private employers meet their responsibilities to veterans.

The Veterans' Employment and Training Service, under the expert leadership of Assistant Secretary Preston Taylor, has done a great job helping veterans find good, permanent employment. VETS staff have also trained hundreds of thousands of separating service members how to make a smooth transition to life in the civilian community and workplace. I appreciate Assistant Secretary Taylor's hard work and commitment, as well as that of his entire staff. The men and women in VETS are dedicated to assisting and supporting our Nation's veterans. Congress must give them the tools they need to accomplish their goals.

I urge my colleagues to support the Stump amendment.

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chairman and colleagues, I rise to express my strong support for the amendment to the Labor/HHS/Education Appropriations bill offered by the Chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee [Mr. STUMP]. Under this provision, \$3.8 million would be added to the funding level for the Department of Labor's Veterans' Employment and Training Service and \$2 million for the Homeless Veterans Reintegration Program.

On June 18, I spoke about my deep distress when the Labor/HHS/Education Appropriations Subcommittee slashed veterans' employment funding by almost \$12 million below the level recommended by President Clinton—far below the level of funding that is needed to place our veterans into permanent, good-paying jobs. I shared with my colleagues the fact that 28,000 fewer veterans would be placed in jobs than proposed in the President's budget. I called attention to the Republicans' recommendation that the transition assistance program be terminated, a successful program that has trained hundreds of thousands of men and women so that they could quickly find good civilian jobs upon leaving the Armed Forces.

Fortunately, most members of the Full Appropriations Committee heard these concerns expressed, not only by me but by many other veterans supporters. An amendment offered by Mr. OBEY to restore most of the funding was approved.

This amendment, which we are now considering, will go a step further and fully restore veterans' employment funding to the level originally requested by the President. I thank the Chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee for this responsible amendment, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. STUMP].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CHRYSLER

Mr. CHRYSLER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CHRYSLER:

Page 6, line 5, after the first dollar amount, insert "(decreased by \$2,399,000)".

Page 38, line 8, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$2,399,000)".

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment. We do not have a copy of the amendment. We were not aware this was going to be offered. I would appreciate it if we can get a copy.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman reserves a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. CHRYSLER. Mr. Chairman, almost 4 million women were physically abused by their husbands or boyfriends in the last year. We owe it to those abused women to take a stand against domestic violence.

Domestic violence accounts for more than one-third of all emergency room visits by women. We owe it to those injured women to take a stand against domestic violence.

Child abuse is fifteen times more likely to occur in families where domestic violence is present. We owe it to those abused children to take a stand against domestic violence.

I appreciate the chairman's work to increase funding for domestic violence programs in the committee bill. Overall, the Violence Against Women Act programs are increased in the appropriations bill by over \$8 million, to a total of \$61 million.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHRYSLER. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, let me say, now that we have a copy of the amendment, I now understand what it is that is being offered and we have no objection to it on this side of the aisle.

I understand that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER], on the majority side, also has no objection to it.

Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of a point of order.

Mr. CHRYSLER. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, within the Violence Against Women Act programs is a special program that is very dear to me and the people of the eighth District of Michigan. I am referring to the battered women's shelter programs administered through the Department of Health and Human Services.

Although the committee has increased the dollars for battered women's shelters, my amendment would give the program an additional \$2.4 million to fully fund the program at the President's request.

In my home town in Michigan, the LACASA women's shelter provides hundreds of abused women and their children shelter, food, and counseling. For many years, my wife Katie and I have worked arm in arm with the dedicated workers and volunteers of LACASA to find the scarce resources to keep their shelter operations continue. I am now in a position to do more as a congressman, and I intend to.

It's time for this abuse to stop. These women and children need our help, and

they need our help now because there is simply no tomorrow for some of them.

Even with the hard work and dedication of groups like LACASA that are working for women around the country, the need for more services and more Federal dollars continues to increase. In Michigan, for instance, the nights of shelter provided each year to abused women has increased 23 percent since 1991.

However, even with these increased services in Michigan, the number of domestic violence victims denied shelter since 1991 has increased 25 percent.

This is one area of service where it seems we cannot do enough. When abused women and children need to get themselves out of terribly abusive relationships, they need to act quickly. We must provide a secure safehouse for battered women and their children. We must provide for them today.

My amendment takes another step forward to provide all the help we can to the women and children who most need it. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support my amendment to fully fund the battered women's shelter programs within the Violence Against Women Act.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHRYSLER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman from Michigan for his leadership and dedication to the prevention of domestic violence, to the providing of help for victims of domestic violence, and particularly his commitment to providing for battered women's shelters. I believe he is showing the kind of leadership that we really need to have in Congress to address this very serious problem, and we strongly support his amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CHRYSLER].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

ADVANCES TO THE UNEMPLOYMENT TRUST FUND AND OTHER FUNDS

For repayable advances to the Unemployment Trust Fund as authorized by sections 905(d) and 1203 of the Social Security Act, as amended, and to the Black Lung Disability Trust Fund as authorized by section 9501(c)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, as amended; and for nonrepayable advances to the Unemployment Trust Fund as authorized by section 8509 of title 5, United States Code, section 104(d) of Public Law 102-164, and section 5 of Public Law 103-6, and to the "Federal unemployment benefits and allowances" account, to remain available until September 30, 1998, \$373,000,000.

In addition, for making repayable advances to the Black Lung Disability Trust Fund in the current fiscal year after September 15, 1997, for costs incurred by the Black Lung Disability Trust Fund in the current fiscal year, such sums as may be necessary.

PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION

For expenses of administering employment and training programs and for carrying out section 908 of the Social Security Act,

\$81,393,000, together with not to exceed \$39,977,000, which may be expended from the Employment Security Administration account in the Unemployment Trust Fund.

PENSION AND WELFARE BENEFITS  
ADMINISTRATION  
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for Pension and Welfare Benefits Administration, \$65,783,000.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. SLAUGHTER

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Ms. SLAUGHTER: In the item relating to "DEPARTMENT OF LABOR—PENSION AND WELFARE BENEFITS ADMINISTRATION—SALARIES AND EXPENSES", after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by \$300,000, which amount shall be for genetic nondiscrimination enforcement activities)."

In the item relating to "DEPARTMENT OF LABOR—BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS—SALARIES AND EXPENSES", after the first dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$300,000)".

Ms. SLAUGHTER (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment designed to take steps toward putting an end to genetic discrimination in health insurance. With progress being made through the human genome project and other genetic research, we are making new discoveries at a startling pace about the genes associated with different disorders.

Indeed, most geneticists say that with the exception of trauma, every disease of the body has a genetic component.

Genes have been located already that are linked to breast cancer, to Alzheimer's disease, Parkinson's disease, basal cell carcinoma, to name just a few. Unfortunately, some insurance companies are already using these medical advances to deny health insurance to consumers.

A woman carrying the BRCA01 breast cancer gene may find her insurer drops her coverage entirely or denies her coverage in the event that she develops breast cancer. In addition, some companies are discriminating against policyholders based on their blood relatives' genetic information. Children are being denied coverage for disorders that their parents develop.

Mr. Chairman, we should put an end to this reprehensible practice. My amendment will provide additional resources in the Department of Labor's Pension Benefits and Welfare Administration, which is responsible for regulating ERISA plans.

I am thoroughly committed to trying to make sure that the antidiscrimination legislation is passed by Congress and PBWA should be prepared to enforce this law when it is.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues in the strongest possible terms to sup-

port this amendment as well as my genetic nondiscrimination bill, H.R. 2748.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the gentleman from Illinois, Chairman PORTER. From the day I arrived in Washington, I have recognized in him a superb public servant, and, frankly, I consider him to be one of my best friends and one of the finest Members of Congress. I thank him for his consideration.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, let me thank the gentlewoman for those very generous and kind words. We certainly think the amendment is a very important one and very strongly support it and thank her for her leadership in offering it.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would simply say that on this side of the aisle we certainly accept the gentlewoman's amendment, and I would like to talk just a moment about it because I have such a deep personal interest in the issue myself.

I think often in the subcommittee a few years ago, when the human genome project just started to be funded, I was often misunderstood when I raised with NIH witnesses my concerns about the fact that science is getting ahead of the state of the law on the issue of genetics. It would be a tragedy if the billions of dollars which taxpayers are seeing invested on their behalf to discover the secrets of the human genetic makeup, if those dollars, instead of winding up producing a net good for the American people, wind up simply producing a greater ability for different powerful parties in this economy to discriminate on the basis of genes which individuals could not order beforehand but were stuck with after they were born.

It seems to me that there has been a very slow reaction to this on the part of both the legal profession and on the part of good segments of the scientific community as well. I very much commend the gentlewoman for her efforts on this. I think it highlights probably the most important fundamental long-term issue associated with this bill, and we very enthusiastically support the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Ms. SLAUGHTER].

The amendment was agreed to.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word. Mr. Chairman, I rise for the purpose of engaging in a colloquy with the gentleman from Illinois, Chairman PORTER.

The gentleman is to be commended for his support on behalf of the Job Corps Program. As he knows, Job Corps has been our Nation's most successful federally funded residential job train-

ing and education program for at-risk youth for over 30 years. Because of its proven record of accomplishment in providing opportunities to disadvantaged youth, it has historically generated strong bipartisan support.

□ 2100

Program year 1995 exemplifies the success of Job Corps with 73 percent of all Job Corps participants either obtaining employment, enrolling in the military, or attending an institute of higher education.

The Labor-HHS appropriations bill before us provides \$1.138 billion for Job Corps. Mr. Chairman, through the leadership of the gentleman from Illinois, Chairman PORTER, Job Corps received an increase of \$35 million over last year's appropriation, which fully funds the operations portion of the program. I commend the gentleman on this accomplishment.

However, I have two concerns. First is the possibility that the Senate may provide a lower operation funding level for Job Corps than the House level. Second, there still exists a \$14.8 million shortfall in the construction and renovation budget for the program. Adequate funding for the repair and rehabilitation of Job Corps campuses is critical for safe training and efficient operations. These campuses serve as a positive alternative to the dangers of street crime and drugs that many of our Nation's young adults face daily.

Mr. Chairman, I would say to Chairman PORTER that, based on previous discussions that we have had, it is clear that the gentleman shares my strong commitment to Job Corps. Therefore, when the bill is sent to conference, I respectfully urge the gentleman to continue to exercise his leadership to ensure that the operation funding levels for Job Corps contained in the House bill are maintained and to support any increase to the construction and renovation budget of the program.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, let me assure the gentlewoman that I am a very strong supporter of the Job Corps Program. I agree with the gentlewoman on its great importance, particularly for the most at-risk youth in our society, and I will clearly work toward a conference agreement that will provide, at the minimum, the House level of funding for the Job Corps and will fight to try that make that level even higher.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

PENSION BENEFIT GUARANTY CORPORATION  
PENSION BENEFIT GUARANTY CORPORATION  
FUND

The Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation is authorized to make such expenditures, including financial assistance authorized by

section 104 of Public Law 96-364, within limits of funds and borrowing authority available to such Corporation, and in accord with law, and to make such contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal year limitations as provided by section 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended (31 U.S.C. 9104), as may be necessary in carrying out the program through September 30, 1997, for such Corporation: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$135,720,000 shall be available for administrative expenses of the Corporation.

EMPLOYMENT STANDARDS ADMINISTRATION  
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for the Employment Standards Administration, including reimbursement to State, Federal, and local agencies and their employees for inspection services rendered, \$258,422,000, together with \$983,000 which may be expended from the Special Fund in accordance with sections 39(c) and 44(j) of the Longshore and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Labor is authorized to accept, retain, and spend, until expended, in the name of the Department of Labor, all sums of money ordered to be paid to the Secretary of Labor, in accordance with the terms of the Consent Judgment in Civil Action No. 91-0027 of the United States District Court for the District of the Northern Mariana Islands (May 21, 1992): *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Labor is authorized to establish and, in accordance with 31 U.S.C. 3302, collect and deposit in the Treasury fees for processing applications and issuing certificates under sections 11(d) and 14 of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended (29 U.S.C. 211(d) and 214) and for processing applications and issuing registrations under Title I of the Migrant and Seasonal Agricultural Worker Protection Act, 29 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.

SPECIAL BENEFITS  
(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the payment of compensation, benefits, and expenses (except administrative expenses) accruing during the current or any prior fiscal year authorized by title 5, chapter 81 of the United States Code; continuation of benefits as provided for under the head "Civilian War Benefits" in the Federal Security Agency Appropriation Act, 1947; the Employees' Compensation Commission Appropriation Act, 1944; and sections 4(c) and 5(f) of the War Claims Act of 1948 (50 U.S.C. App. 2012); and 50 per centum of the additional compensation and benefits required by section 10(h) of the Longshore and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, as amended, \$213,000,000 together with such amounts as may be necessary to be charged to the subsequent year appropriation for the payment of compensation and other benefits for any period subsequent to August 15 of the current year: *Provided*, That such sums as are necessary may be used under section 8104 of title 5, United States Code, by the Secretary to reimburse an employer, who is not the employer at the time of injury, for portions of the salary of a reemployed, disabled beneficiary: *Provided further*, That balances of reimbursements unobligated on September 30, 1996, shall remain available until expended for the payment of compensation, benefits, and expenses: *Provided further*, That in addition there shall be transferred to this appropriation from the Postal Service and from any other corporation or instrumentality required under section 8147(c) of title 5, United States Code, to pay an amount for its fair share of the cost of administration, such sums as the Secretary of Labor determines to be the cost of administration for employees of such fair share entities through Sep-

tember 30, 1997: *Provided further*, That of those funds transferred to this account from the fair share entities to pay the cost of administration, \$11,390,000 shall be made available to the Secretary of Labor for expenditures relating to capital improvements in support of Federal Employees' Compensation Act administration, and the balance of such funds shall be paid into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may require that any person filing a notice of injury or a claim for benefits under Subchapter 5, U.S.C., chapter 81, or under subchapter 33, U.S.C. 901, et seq. (the Longshore and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, as amended), provide as part of such notice and claim, such identifying information (including Social Security account number) as such regulations may prescribe.

BLACK LUNG DISABILITY TRUST FUND  
(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For payments from the Black Lung Disability Trust Fund, \$1,007,644,000, of which \$961,665,000 shall be available until September 30, 1998, for payment of all benefits as authorized by section 9501(d)(1), (2), (4), and (7) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, as amended, and interest on advances as authorized by section 9501(c)(2) of that Act, and of which \$26,071,000 shall be available for transfer to Employment Standards Administration, Salaries and Expenses, \$19,621,000 for transfer to Departmental Management, Salaries and Expenses, and \$287,000 for transfer to Departmental Management, Office of Inspector General, for expenses of operation and administration of the Black Lung Benefits program as authorized by section 9501(d)(5)(A) of that Act: *Provided*, That, in addition, such amounts as may be necessary may be charged to the subsequent year appropriation for the payment of compensation, interest, or other benefits for any period subsequent to August 15 of the current year: *Provided further*, That in addition such amounts shall be paid from this fund into miscellaneous receipts as the Secretary of the Treasury determines to be the administrative expenses of the Department of the Treasury for administering the fund during the current fiscal year, as authorized by section 9501(d)(5)(B) of that Act.

OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH  
ADMINISTRATION  
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for the Occupational Safety and Health Administration, \$297,734,000, including not to exceed \$66,929,000 which shall be the maximum amount available for grants to States under section 23(g) of the Occupational Safety and Health Act, which grants shall be no less than fifty percent of the costs of State occupational safety and health programs required to be incurred under plans approved by the Secretary under section 18 of the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970; and, in addition, notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302, the Occupational Safety and Health Administration may retain up to \$750,000 per fiscal year of training institute course tuition fees, otherwise authorized by law to be collected, and may utilize such sums for occupational safety and health training and education grants: *Provided*, That none of the funds appropriated under this paragraph shall be obligated or expended to prescribe, issue, administer, or enforce any standard, rule, regulation, or order under the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 which is applicable to any person who is engaged in a farming operation which does not maintain a temporary labor camp and employs ten or fewer employees: *Provided further*, That no funds appropriated under this paragraph shall be ob-

ligated or expended to administer or enforce any standard, rule, regulation, or order under the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 with respect to any employer of ten or fewer employees who is included within a category having an occupational injury lost workday case rate, at the most precise Standard Industrial Classification Code for which such data are published, less than the national average rate as such rates are most recently published by the Secretary, acting through the Bureau of Labor Statistics, in accordance with section 24 of that Act (29 U.S.C. 673), except—

(1) to provide, as authorized by such Act, consultation, technical assistance, educational and training services, and to conduct surveys and studies;

(2) to conduct an inspection or investigation in response to an employee complaint, to issue a citation for violations found during such inspection, and to assess a penalty for violations which are not corrected within a reasonable abatement period and for any willful violations found;

(3) to take any action authorized by such Act with respect to imminent dangers;

(4) to take any action authorized by such Act with respect to health hazards;

(5) to take any action authorized by such Act with respect to a report of an employment accident which is fatal to one or more employees or which results in hospitalization of two or more employees, and to take any action pursuant to such investigation authorized by such Act; and

(6) to take any action authorized by such Act with respect to complaints of discrimination against employees for exercising rights under such Act:

*Provided further*, That the foregoing proviso shall not apply to any person who is engaged in a farming operation which does not maintain a temporary labor camp and employs ten or fewer employees.

MINE SAFETY AND HEALTH ADMINISTRATION  
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for the Mine Safety and Health Administration, \$191,810,000, including purchase and bestowal of certificates and trophies in connection with mine rescue and first-aid work, and the hire of passenger motor vehicles; the Secretary is authorized to accept lands, buildings, equipment, and other contributions from public and private sources and to prosecute projects in cooperation with other agencies, Federal, State, or private; the Mine Safety and Health Administration is authorized to promote health and safety education and training in the mining community through cooperative programs with States, industry, and safety associations; and any funds available to the Department may be used, with the approval of the Secretary, to provide for the costs of mine rescue and survival operations in the event of a major disaster: *Provided*, That none of the funds appropriated under this paragraph shall be obligated or expended to carry out section 115 of the Federal Mine Safety and Health Act of 1977 or to carry out that portion of section 104(g)(1) of such Act relating to the enforcement of any training requirements, with respect to shell dredging, or with respect to any sand, gravel, surface stone, surface clay, colloidal phosphate, or surface limestone mine.

BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS  
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for the Bureau of Labor Statistics, including advances or reimbursements to State, Federal, and local agencies and their employees for services rendered, \$302,947,000, of which \$16,145,000 shall be for expenses of revising the Consumer Price Index and shall remain

available until September 30, 1998, together with not to exceed \$52,053,000, which may be expended from the Employment Security Administration account in the Unemployment Trust Fund.

DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT  
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for Departmental Management, including the hire of three sedans, and including up to \$4,271,000 for the President's Committee on Employment of People With Disabilities, \$137,504,000; together with not to exceed \$297,000, which may be expended from the Employment Security Administration account in the Unemployment Trust Fund: *Provided*, That no funds made available by this Act may be used by the Solicitor of Labor to participate in a review in any United States court of appeals of any decision made by the Benefits Review Board under section 21 of the Longshore and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act (33 U.S.C. 921) where such participation is precluded by the decision of the United States Supreme Court in Director, Office of Workers' Compensation Programs v. Newport News Shipbuilding, 115 S. Ct. 1278 (1995).

ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR VETERANS  
EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING

Not to exceed \$178,149,000 may be derived from the Employment Security Administration account in the Unemployment Trust Fund to carry out the provisions of 38 U.S.C. 4100-4110A and 4321-4327, and Public Law 103-353, and which shall be available for obligation by the States through December 31, 1997.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For salaries and expenses of the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, \$42,938,000, together with not to exceed \$3,543,000, which may be expended from the Employment Security Administration account in the Unemployment Trust Fund.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 101. None of the funds appropriated in this title for the Job Corps shall be used to pay the compensation of an individual, either as direct costs or any proration as an indirect cost, at a rate in excess of \$125,000.

SEC. 102. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used by the Occupational Safety and Health Administration directly or through section 23(g) of the Occupational Safety and Health Act for the development, promulgation or issuance of any proposed or final standard or guideline regarding ergonomic protection or recording and reporting occupational injuries and illnesses directly related thereto.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. PELOSI

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Ms. PELOSI: Page 19, strike lines 8 through 15.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BONILLA] will each control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI].

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

Mr. Chairman, my amendment to the Labor-HHS-Education appropriations bill would delete the rider that bans OSHA from protecting workers from musculoskeletal disorders which represent America's fastest growing workplace health problem.

Mr. Chairman, what we are talking about is the legislative rider bans any ergonomic guidelines. Ergonomics is the study of force in motion. What we would like to see the ergonomics look at is how to redesign the workplace so as to put less force on the body. This is the force that is causing so many musculoskeletal disorders and represents the fastest growing workplace health problem, having multiplied sevenfold in the past 10 years. Current estimates range from over 700,000 lost work day injuries to 2.7 million accepted worker's comp claims annually, affecting meat packing, poultry workers, computer programmers, auto workers, and supermarket employees, among others.

Affected workers suffer pain, restricted life activities, lost work time, and often permanent disability. These repetitive motion injuries include carpal tunnel syndrome, of which you may be familiar, Mr. Chairman.

The legislation in this appropriations bill prohibits OSHA from using funds for the development, promulgation, or issuance of any proposed or final standard or voluntary guideline. Mr. Chairman, I repeat, voluntary guideline regarding ergonomic protection or recording or reporting occupational injuries or illnesses directly related to.

This language goes beyond the fiscal year 1996 language to ban OSHA from developing protections or even collecting data on the problem.

Mr. Chairman, worker's compensation costs arising from musculoskeletal disorders amount to an estimated \$20 billion annually, accounting for roughly \$1 of every \$3 employers spend on such claims. Indirect costs such as hiring and training replacement workers add billions of dollars more. Unfortunately, many thousands of U.S. employers are unaware of the extent of this problem.

My amendment would allow OSHA to issue a proposed ergonomic standard. And what that would do is trigger OSHA's open rulemaking process. This process includes both lengthy comment periods and administrative hearings at which witnesses can cross-examine each other, designed to facilitate a thorough public debate to improve the standard and strengthen its scientific basis.

If enacted, the rider in the bill would ban OSHA from even developing such a proposed standard to permit the debate to begin. My amendment will allow the debate to begin.

A no vote on my amendment would preclude OSHA from even gathering the data, as I mentioned, on musculoskeletal disorders. Ignoring the fastest growing workplace health problem will not make it go away. Ironically, the rider's sponsors claim OSHA needs to

improve the science upon which ergonomic protections would be based, but the rider would ban OSHA from gathering the data necessary to meet that need.

A no vote on my amendment would fly in the face of congressional efforts to reform the regulatory process to ensure that regulations are premised on sound science.

Mr. Chairman, I talked earlier about the cost to employers, and many of them would like the protection of guidelines. Even those employers who have recognized the problem are often unaware of the broad range of cost-effective solutions currently available.

Smaller businesses are particularly at a disadvantage since they typically cannot afford to hire safety and health consultants. These employers need help. My amendment would allow OSHA to issue voluntary guidelines to assist employers in controlling the soaring costs associated with musculoskeletal disorders as well as opening up this debate to go further, if it is determined in that open period of public comment.

Recently enacted legislation gives Congress a mechanism for modifying or disapproving Federal regulations through an expedited legislative process. My amendment would allow OSHA to move forward on ergonomics, but would retain this effective means of reviewing OSHA's protective standards before they even take place. This is not disruptive of changes that have occurred in this Congress, Mr. Chairman. In fact, it is in keeping with those changes.

Countless employers have already cut injury rates and saved millions of dollars in workman's compensation costs through simple measures that quickly pay for themselves. A "no" vote on this amendment would preclude OSHA from developing protective standards or even voluntary guidelines based on such cost-effective solutions. These ideas, the initiatives, assist business at the expense of thousands of employers struggling with soaring worker's compensation costs, and to the detriment of millions of American workers.

A yes vote would improve working conditions and safety, would save money for the employers and increase productivity of the American work force. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this amendment.

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

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

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

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Pelosi amendment. What we have here is a basic disagreement among those of us who feel very strongly that the private sector is capable of policing its own work force and its work environment, and those who believe that it cannot be done

without Big Brother stepping in with a whole ton of Federal regulations to tell them how to do it.

The language in the bill as it currently stands would be removed by the amendment proposed now. It is a funding limitation. It is not a legislative rider. Perhaps the gentleman who proposes this amendment is not clear on that particular point. It simply says that the Labor Department and OSHA cannot spend money on developing a ton of bureaucratic rules on ergonomics that would apply equally to businesses like restaurants, like professional athletic teams, like trucking companies, to parcel post carriers.

In other words the Federal Government is now poised and interested in trying to develop a new set of regulations that it would apply uniformly to every small business in America, and it is absolutely absurd to think that OSHA is capable of conducting such research to apply these rules.

Mr. Chairman, let me cite as an example, in the gentleman's own State of California, under a legislative mandate CALOSHA will issue an ergonomic regulation by the end of the year that is estimated to cost Californians \$9.7 billion and cost more than 12,000 jobs, because anyone who has ever been in the private sector, as I have as a manager in a private business, understands that when you get a whole ton of regulations that suddenly come into our office, your productivity is automatically cut back.

The implementation of silly regulations suddenly causes additional costs and in some cases causes tremendous job loss, and that is what we are talking about here. Think about in California what 10 pages has done, as I have cited here, and I have an example here of so far what OSHA has developed on proposed ergonomic standards in the private workplace or small businesses in America across this country.

Mr. Chairman, can you imagine running a restaurant in this country or running any kind of a small business where you are trying to make ends meet, operate on very marginal profits, and suddenly you see this show up at your front door? Who, first of all, is going to be able to understand any of this? How much is it going to cost a small employer in this country to implement such regulations?

Mr. Chairman, I think what people who love big government fail to understand is that there is not a staff of people at every business in this country that is prepared to handle such a load of bureaucracy and rules and regulations just waiting to do that.

If any of my colleagues have ever managed a business or owned a business or worked in the private sector, done real work in this country, they know that everyone there is already interested in doing something, answering the phones, putting together, making a product, delivering a product. This kind of thing, Mr. Chairman, only adds to the burdens that so many people in the private sector have at this point.

Unlike what was pointed out earlier by my colleague from California, the language in the current bill does not prohibit OSHA from continuing to use ergonomics data collected by the Bureau of Labor Statistics and does not prevent research institutions such as the National Institute of Occupational Safety and Health [NIOSH] from collecting scientific research on ergonomics.

Mr. Chairman, OSHA relies on those organizations because it does not conduct its own scientific research. If I could be convinced that suddenly OSHA has qualified doctors and scientists to be able to develop these regulations, but I am not convinced that they are qualified to do this kind of research.

Mr. Chairman, I ask my colleagues to look hard at this amendment. It is something that if my colleagues believe, as I do, that what distinguishes our economy in this world is the private sector and private sector jobs, that is what makes us the greatest economy on Earth.

Why do we want to put this monkey on their back and drive them back into the Stone Age because big labor is interested in promulgating such rules as I am holding in my hand? And this, Mr. Chairman, is only the beginning.

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

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], the ranking member of our committee.

□ 2115

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, this is a funny place. We get elected. We get into our offices out here, and every day we have visitors from home. And sure, some of them are on vacation and some of them are regular working people. But I would venture to say that at least 70 to 75 percent of them are people who are representatives of the business community.

They walk into our offices. They wear suits. They are good people, but they have a distinct economic point of view. And we hear a lot of it when they come and visit us in our offices. They are the people who can afford to come out here and lobby us directly from home.

Then we go home. Often Members go to the Rotary Clubs; they go to business lunches. They talk to people who are also wearing suits then, and they all generally see life from the upper side.

I think we need to get beyond that and we need to think about how the world looks to people who work for a living, whether they wear blue collars or white collars or pink colors, just name it.

I do not know what my colleagues do when they go home, but when I go home I often visit plants. I cannot begin to tell Members how many times I walk through a plant, and I have seen a woman wearing something on her

wrist and I say, what happened? Carpel tunnel syndrome. I hear that time and time again.

Talk to people who have suffered lower back problems. I happen to have an insurance company in my district that is very skilled in the problems of worker compensation. If we talk to people in that field, they will tell us that there are many companies who want to avoid problems but they do not know how. They do not have the expertise to do it. What this amendment says is that it is going to be a long, long time before they learn.

OSHA is the agency which is charged with the responsibility to develop standards to protect the health and the well-being of workers. What the committee bill says is that that agency is not going to be allowed to perform its duty when it comes to just about the most expensive workplace injury problem around today, about a \$20 billion problem, the most reliable estimate. And the gentleman from California [Ms. PELOSI], is trying to correct that problem with her amendment.

I do not see why it is in the public interest for us to say that not only can OSHA not promulgate an official standard, they cannot even begin to develop one. They cannot even go about collecting their own data on the problem.

I do not see how that is in the interest of workers. I certainly do not see how it is in the interest of companies, many of whom do not know what to do to avoid the problem.

Just one example. My grandmother used to work for Pied Piper Shoe Co. a long time ago. One of Pied Piper's competitors was Red Wing Shoe Co. They paid \$4.3 million in worker compensation premiums in 1990. After they implemented an ergonomics program and changed production techniques, that company reduced lost time days by 79 percent. By 1995, premium costs had dropped to an estimated \$1.3 million from the original \$4.3 million. That company knew how to deal with the problem. There are a lot of companies that do not.

The value of allowing OSHA to develop voluntary standards, I emphasize "voluntary," is that that would mean that OSHA could do the work which would enable many other companies who are looking for the right way to attack problems to have some idea of how to do it. A lot of them are small companies. They do not have the ability or the financial ability to hire industrial engineers. This agency can help them do that. But it just seems to me that this Congress is lock, stock and barrel in the hands of people who wear suits 365 days a year. It apparently is not going to get beyond the views of those folks and to take into account the fact that there are many, many millions of Americans who have a right to expect that the Government is going to act on their behalf to see to it that they have the safest working place and the healthiest working place possible under existing circumstances.

That is what the Pelosi amendment tries to do. I think this Congress ought to be ashamed of itself, if it does not adopt this amendment.

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes and 30 seconds to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY], Republican whip.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding time to me, and I appreciate his work in this area.

All I can say is, after the gentleman from Wisconsin's remarks, here we go again. Class warfare, the only argument in favor of the Pelosi-Nadler amendment is that people that wear suits do not understand the working man.

I think we have to first understand that OSHA is not only not equipped to do this scientific gathering or scientific evaluation, nor does it have the authority to do the scientific gathering. What OSHA does is promulgate regulations.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment, and it is really unfortunate that we have to fight this battle all over again. I do not understand why some Members of this body are so willing to allow OSHA to put forth a standard that has absolutely no basis in science. Just last month the American Academy of Orthopedic surgeons issued a report based on a comprehensive study of back injuries. Do you know what its findings were? There is no relationship between back injuries and work. That is not TOM DELAY saying that. That is the American Academy of Orthopedic Surgeons. Earlier this year, the Association of Hand Surgeons determined that there is not enough data available for the Federal Government to move forward with an ergonomic standard.

Further, the National Coalition on Ergonomics reported that OSHA cherry-picked and manipulated the data, which bureaucrats are so prone to do, that it gathered last year in order to put forth its proposal. My point is that there is no consensus in the scientific community over risks and remedies or implementing or failing to implement ergonomic policies.

There is certainly no consensus that a Federal ergonomic standard can actually have any positive impact on the working man or woman in the workplace and the impact on health and safety. Yet OSHA itself admits its draft proposal is likely to be the most expensive, the most far-reaching ever promulgated by this agency.

So by focusing on work spaces and stations, tools and equipment, lighting, typewriter keys and telephones, ergonomics virtually affects every aspect of American businesses large and small. It has been estimated that it could cost American businesses and cost us jobs to the extent of billions of dollars to implement.

The sheer magnitude of the paperwork required would impose an enormous and unnecessary burden. The

number of professions that would be affected is potentially limitless.

A truck driver would be affected since he is exposed to vibrations for an extended period of time, sits in a truck cab, keeps bent wrists on a steering wheel and grips the steering wheel. It has been proposed that every hour that truck driver would have to sit down for 15 minutes because he has had too much vibration. Then there are hair stylists who open and close scissors for hour after hour. What about day care employees who have to lift children all day? Of course, there is the job of the golf pro who has got to swing a club over and over again, the florist who must wrap flower arrangements one after another, and the painter who has got to paint wall after wall.

After identifying an at-risk job, according to OSHA's draft proposal, the employer must control the job. The OSHA does not give any indication how this can be done. It simply mandates that the employers control the job.

If the employer cannot control the job, OSHA could require that the employer eliminate the job. Because of the lack of existing scientific data to support its draft proposal, OSHA has resorted unbelievably to creating its own data. Currently, OSHA requires employers to report work-related injuries and illnesses. In its proposal, OSHA would expand this recordkeeping requirement to include aches and pains which cannot be definitely tied to the workplace on injury and illness logs. The result would be a database of injuries that is outrageously inflated to show a far greater number of truly work-related injuries than there really are.

I cannot condone this kind of activity. The Bonilla amendment rightly prohibits OSHA from continuing to develop an ergonomics standard that involves the imposition of regulations costing billions of dollars on the private sector and a radical new level of government intrusion into the workplaces, work practices without scientific support. The Bonilla language does not prevent the scientific community from developing any necessary data to show a relationship between musculoskeletal disorders in the workplace.

Congress has given the authority to do this kind of research to the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health. Nothing prevents NIOSH from continuing this research. OSHA's mandate is to promulgate work safety standards that are based upon sound science and statistics. Without regard to an ergonomic standards, the debate that should be taking place now is the scientific area, not in the regulatory area. I urge my colleagues to vote against this amendment and in favor of sound science.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I would say the gentleman talks about how it

is okay for NIOSH to do this. I find it very interesting that this committee is short-sheeting NIOSH to the tune of \$32 million because it is transferring to them all of the obligations laid on by the Bureau of Mines programs, but it is not funding those programs.

So the very agency my colleagues say will be allowed to continue is going to have a \$32 million shortfall in their budget.

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER], the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I simply want to say to the gentleman from Wisconsin that we are not short-sheeting NIOSH. As a matter of fact, that shortfall of \$32 million will clearly be made up in conference when we get there. There is no intention to not provide that funding. That was a transfer from the Interior Appropriations Subcommittee, and we simply never came to an agreement about offsets between our two subcommittees.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I would say that that is a nice promise, but the fact is that the bill before us does in fact short-sheet NIOSH by \$32 million. It does not allow NIOSH to meet the obligations that they are supposed to meet by accepting the Bureau of Mines programs.

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

I would like to respond to some of the comments made by my colleagues, in addition to Mr. OBEY's observation about the short-changing of NIOSH in this bill. Last year the proposal by this Republican majority in the Congress on NIOSH was to cut it by 25 percent. The flat funding this year is not in keeping with, does not even keep up with the responsibilities that it has. I do want to call to the attention of our colleagues the packet that our colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BONILLA], held up and said, what would happen if this was laid on business? The fact is, that packet of information, and I question it because there have been no regulations released by OSHA, as that packet indicates, it does not contribute rulemaking or notice of rulemaking. So I think it is a little disingenuous to give the impression to our colleagues that that is a regulation that is being proposed by OSHA that is something that exists.

□ 2130

Second, I say to our colleague from Texas, Mr. DELAY, that part of his work in this Congress was to pass legislation that gives Congress a mechanism for modifying or disapproving Federal regulations through an expedited legislative procedure, and that would, of course, still be allowed under my amendment should he not like the information that the ergonomic studies provide in terms of data on the occurrence of repetitive motion illnesses.

The other point that I want to make is that, of course, this has to be based on science and scientific data. But this is not a one-sided issue. This is to protect businesses. Certainly it is to protect workers as well, and I do not have enough time allocated to me to read the entire statement of Mr. Dear when he came before our committee, but when I get my time again I would like to read from that statement, which talks about the need that some smaller businesses in particular have for the protection that voluntary guidelines and opening up of this debate would provide to them.

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

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, I have no additional speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Chairman, as I mentioned before, in the balance of my time I wanted to make the case that this ergonomic study is to benefit workers and businesses. When I asked the very distinguished director of OSHA, Mr. Dear, to respond as to what the developing of voluntary guidelines and what the government-business response to such voluntary guidelines would be, he responded by saying:

From my own experience in meeting with employers I know that injuries caused by repetitive motion are a serious problem of concerned employers. I have met with one after another after presentation made here on the Hill after the employers have specifically asked me, "Aren't there any guidelines? Couldn't you give me some help?" And I had to say, "Well, I would very much like to, but I cannot."

And that is what this rider in this legislation does. It prevents OSHA from giving any direction whatsoever to small businesses.

Again I say that support for my amendment will protect workers, protect businesses from excessive cost, and increase productivity. I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, what we have here is again a debate between those of us who believe that people who are out in the heartland operating, managing, working for small businesses are pretty smart people and they are what make our economy tick. After all, the small-business community in this country is the backbone of our economy and employs 80 percent of the workers in this country.

On the other side we have those who believe that they cannot police their work force and their work environment effectively without having a big set of Federal regulations handed to them, and Big Brother, after all, is smarter, according to the opposition on this debate, smarter than the people who are the entrepreneurs and those who pursue free enterprise ventures in this country. The bureaucrats are smarter, and the entrepreneurs are too dumb to implement ergonomic standards in their own workplace.

Oftentimes those who are opposed to this issue in the past somehow think that those of us who are trying to stop this regulatory burden on small business are not concerned about worker safety. Nothing could be farther from the truth. I do not understand why Federal bureaucrats and those who advocate big government do not understand that any business owner out there, any manager, is interested in keeping as many workers as they possibly can healthy and productive, on the job every day. When someone gets injured on the job, when they have got to pay Worker's Comp, productivity suffers, the product suffers; the people running the company, oftentimes they would have to make cuts in other areas. No one in this country in the private sector is interested in allowing unhealthy conditions and bad working conditions to exist in the workplace in this country.

And I think oftentimes we get mired in the debate, and some of those on the other side try to make it seem like we do not care about worker safety. We not only care about worker safety, we care about preserving jobs and about keeping the regulatory burden off the small-business community in this country so that they can continue to be more productive and to increase productivity and increase the number of jobs in their communities. That is what we are interested in doing.

Finally, I would like to just point out how voluntary standards that have been referred to here tonight can exist out in the workplace without the Federal Government coming out and saying: "Hey, we have some paperwork here or some kind of new standard that you can voluntarily impose."

We have been around long enough in this country to understand that once something becomes voluntary on paper via the Federal Government and OSHA and regulators, sure enough before too long it becomes a real regulation, and we are trying to stop that from occurring.

A lot of good employers in this country are already developing their own ergonomic standards. When I visited a lot of these good work environments across this country, I am delighted to hear people on the front line talk about the priority at companies these days, about worker safety. Safety, safety, safety is the most important thing now that more employers are recognizing how significant it is to increase their profits and become more productive and to employ more people, because after all, when they have more productivity and more profits, that means more jobs, more expansion and more people able to pursue the American dream in this country.

Once again, in closing on this argument, I want to emphasize that those who vote for the Pelosi-Nadler amendment are voting to burden small business in America with a whole new set of regulations that have no scientific data at all to back it up. We do not be-

lieve at this point that OSHA is made up of scientists, doctors and researchers that are capable of implementing these kind of regulations.

So vote with small business in America. Vote against the Pelosi amendment. I ask all my colleagues to support me in this cause.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 472, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI] will be postponed.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 103. Not to exceed 1 percent of any discretionary funds (pursuant to the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act, as amended) which are appropriated for the current fiscal year for the Department of Labor in this Act may be transferred between appropriations, but no such appropriation shall be increased by more than 3 percent by any such transfer: *Provided*, That the Appropriations Committees of both Houses of Congress are notified at least fifteen days in advance of any transfer.

SEC. 104. Funds shall be available for carrying out title IV-B of the Job Training Partnership Act, notwithstanding section 427(c) of that Act, if a Job Corps center fails to meet national performance standards established by the Secretary.

SEC. 105. No funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this title shall be disbursed without the approval of the Department's Chief Financial Officer or his delegatee.

SEC. 106. (a) GENERAL RULE.—In the administration and enforcement of the child labor provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, employees who are 16 and 17 years of age shall be permitted to load materials, but not operate or unload materials, into scrap paper balers and paper box compactors—

(1) that are safe for 16- and 17-year-old employees loading the scrap paper balers or paper box compactors, and

(2) that cannot operate while being loaded.

(b) DEFINITION.—For purposes of subsection (a), scrap paper balers and paper box compactors shall be considered safe for 16- or 17-year-old employees to load only if—

(1) such scrap paper balers and paper box compactors are in compliance with the current safety standard established by the American National Standards Institute;

(2) such scrap paper balers and paper box compactors include an on-off switch incorporating a keylock or other system and the control of such system is maintained in the custody of employees who are 18 years of age or older;

(3) the on-off switch of such scrap paper balers and paper box compactors is maintained in an off condition when such scrap paper balers and paper box compactors are not in operation; and

(4) the employer of 16- and 17-year-old employees provides notice, and posts a notice, on such scrap paper balers and paper box compactors stating that—

(A) such scrap paper balers and paper box compactors meet the current safety standard established by the American National Standards Institute;

(B) 16- and 17-year-old employees may only load such scrap paper balers and paper box compactors; and

(C) any employee under the age of 18 may not operate or unload such scrap paper balers and paper box compactors:

*Provided*, That this section is not to be construed as affecting the exemption for apprentices and student learners published at 29 Code of Federal Regulations 570.63.

SEC. 107. None of the funds appropriated in this Act may be obligated or expended by the Department of Labor for the purposes of enforcement and the issuance of fines under Hazardous Occupation Order Number 2 (HO 2) with respect to incidental and occasional driving by minors under age 18, unless the Secretary finds that the operation of a motor vehicle is the primary duty of the minor's employment.

This title may be cited as the "Department of Labor Appropriations Act, 1997".

#### TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CAMPBELL) having assumed the chair. Mr. WALKER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having 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, had come to no resolution thereon.

#### TERMINATION OF SUSPENSIONS UNDER FOREIGN RELATIONS AUTHORIZATION ACT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 104-242)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, without objection, referred to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

Pursuant to the authority vested in me by section 902(b)(2) of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1990 and 1991 (Public Law 101-246) ("the Act"), and as President of the United States, I hereby report to the Congress that it is in the national interest of the United States to terminate the suspensions under section 902(a) of the Act with respect to the issuance of licenses for defense article exports to the People's Republic of China and the export of U.S.-origin satellites, insofar as such restrictions pertain to the Globalstar satellite project. License requirements remain in place for these exports and require review and approval on a case-by-case basis by the United States Government.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, July 9, 1996.

#### COMMUNICATION FROM THE CHAIRMAN, COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations:

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,  
Washington, DC, July 10, 1996.

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH,  
Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally, pursuant to Rule L (50) of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that Jim Dyer, currently the staff director of the Appropriations Committee and formerly a staff assistant for Congressman Joseph McDade of Pennsylvania, has been served with a subpoena issued by the U.S. District court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania in the case of *U.S. v. McDade*.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the precedents and privileges of the House.

Sincerely,

BOB LIVINGSTON,  
Chairman.

#### COMMUNICATION FROM THE CHAIRMAN, COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations:

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,  
Washington, DC, July 10, 1996.

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH,  
Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally, pursuant to Rule L (50) of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that Deborah Weatherly, currently a staff assistant of the Appropriations Committee and formerly a staff assistant for Congressman Joseph McDade of Pennsylvania, has been served with a subpoena issued by the U.S. District court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania in the case of *U.S. v. McDade*.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the precedents and privileges of the House.

Sincerely,

BOB LIVINGSTON,  
Chairman.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from the District of Columbia [Ms. NORTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Ms. NORTON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentle-

woman from the State of Washington [Mrs. SMITH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mrs. SMITH of Washington addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

□ 2145

#### PRESIDENT CLINTON'S FAILURE TO SIGN THE WISCONSIN WELFARE REFORM WAIVER

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CAMPBELL). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I rise during special orders to point out that today the countdown is up. Today marks the day that President Clinton should have signed the Wisconsin welfare reform waiver. Why is this important to me as a Californian? Because our Governor and State legislature have also requested from the Federal Government, specifically the Department of Health and Human Services, certain waivers to allow us in California to reform and streamline our welfare service to California residents.

I think we can all remember that a month ago the President said publicly that he approved of the Wisconsin reform plan. He did not just mention his approval of the plan in passing. This is the plan that was originally known as putting families first, or now, as it is known simply in Wisconsin, W2. The President devoted an entire weekend radio address to this subject.

Immediately after, though, he made those remarks his administration, encouraged by their liberal allies here in the Congress, Democratic allies, began to backtrack. Now it appears that the deadline today has come and gone with no waiver for the Wisconsin plan. I cannot really say that that surprises me too much, but I do not want to allow my cynicism to show too much. I actually had some hope that the President might at least in this one instance keep his word to the people of Wisconsin and the country.

He may someday sign this waiver, but not until Wisconsin has had to go through all kinds of contortions at the mercy of the Department of Health and Human Services. Wisconsin's difficulties in obtaining this waiver are not unique. As I mentioned, California and many other States have had to come to Washington, hat in hand, and beg for a waiver to implement their welfare reform plans. Some States, including California, have had to wait months upon months for their waivers to go through.

In fact, again in the case of California, we are still waiting to hear regarding three major welfare reform waiver requests to the Federal Government. The changes that are then required by the Washington bureaucrats have watered down so many of these State plans, of these State waiver requests,