

*To the Congress of the United States:*

As required by 42 U.S.C. 1863(j)(1), I am pleased to submit to the Congress a report of the National Science Board entitled, "Science and Engineering Indicators—2000." This report represents the fourteenth in a series examining key aspects of the status of American science and engineering in a global environment.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON,  
THE WHITE HOUSE, June 8, 2000.

#### 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. 4577, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

#### DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 518 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 4577.

The Chair designates the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER) as chairman of the Committee of the Whole, and requests the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PEASE) to assume the chair temporarily.

1228

#### 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 consideration of the bill (H.R. 4577) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Service, and Education, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes, with Mr. PEASE (Chairman pro tempore) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER).

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

Mr. Chairman, before I begin the general debate, I want to acknowledge the wonderful work of our staff on our subcommittee. Tony McCann, the clerk and chief of staff has done a magnificent job for this subcommittee for the entire 6 years that I have been privileged to chair it; and he has been very

ably assisted by a wonderful staff: Carol Murphy, Susan Firth, Geoff Kenyon, Tom Kelly, and Francine Salvador on our side and Mark Mioduski and Cheryl Smith on the minority side.

1230

Every one of them is an expert. We rely greatly upon their counsel and advice, and we are fortunate to have professionals of this standard as our staff.

I also want to thank the associate staff of the subcommittee. They work very hard for each of the Members; and I want to thank my staff, particularly Katharine Fisher, my administrative assistant, and Spencer Perlman, my legislative director.

Let me add that it has been a tremendous privilege for me to serve for the last 21 years on the Committee on Appropriations and on this subcommittee, and it has been wonderful to be able to serve as one of the subcommittee chairmen under our full committee chairman, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG). He does a magnificent job for our country, for this House of Representatives, and for our committee; and it has been an absolute joy to be a subcommittee chairman under his leadership.

Let me also say that it has been a great privilege for me to serve with my colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY). We work very well and closely together. People may not believe that after the debate we will probably have today; but we do. And I have learned a great deal from him. He is a very senior Member of the House, has been on this committee, interestingly enough, many years longer than I have; and I think our relationship is a very solid and good one. Both of us realize that, in the end, the process leads us to finding common ground and to making the right decisions for our country and for the programs that are under the jurisdiction of the subcommittee.

Each of the subcommittee members, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BONILLA), the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ISTOOK), the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER), the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. DICKEY), the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER), the gentleman from Kentucky (Mrs. NORTHUP), and the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM), on our side; the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), of course; the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER); the gentleman from California (Ms. PELOSI); the gentleman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY); the gentleman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO); and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. JACKSON) on the minority side, they spend countless hours in hearings that last far longer than any other subcommittee. They are all very, very dedicated and hard-working Members that give a great deal of their time and effort to this process; and I want to thank each one of them. It has been for me a great privilege to have Members like this

serving on this subcommittee, and I know that they will provide the institutional knowledge that will carry it forward long after I have departed.

Let me also add that we work very, very closely with the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING). He has provided the kind of leadership in the authorization of many of the programs that our subcommittee funds, and he has been the kind of authorizing chairman that appropriators salute because he has taken on the job of reauthorizing almost all of the education and some of the labor law that needs reauthorizing. He has not shirked one bit from that responsibility and has done a terrific job of reflecting the kind of philosophy that we believe gets results for people.

That is, after all, what this bill and what all of our bills are all about, getting results for the American people. The entire tenor of Congress during the last 5 or 6 or 8 years has changed, as we look very hard at every single program to see whether it really works to changes people's lives and to do the right thing in terms of the expenditure of money and getting results.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the committee bill, despite what we may hear from now on, increases discretionary spending by \$2.4 billion over last year. It contains a few cuts. A number of programs are level funded, but many are increased. The bill provides increased spending of \$2.4 billion to 98.6 billion and a total of \$342 billion overall.

The President, of course, requested \$106.2 billion. That is easy to do when he is not responsible for the bottom line. With the extra funds, the President proposed dozens of new programs, many of them duplicative; hastily conceived, in our judgment; and aimed more at constituencies than at true national policy.

Within our funding level, determined by a budget resolution adopted by the majority of both Houses of the Congress and that we have to live by, I have attempted to support high-priority programs while restraining the growth of other lower-priority programs. We did not fund any of the dozens of new small untested programs proposed by the President, almost all of which were unauthorized.

We did fund the Job Corps at \$1.4 billion, \$7 million above the President's request. We did fund community health centers at \$1.1 billion, \$31 million above the President's request. We funded graduate medical education payments to Children's Hospitals at \$80 million, the request level.

We funded Ricky Ray Hemophilia Relief at \$100 million. Ryan White, under our bill, is increased by \$130 million to \$1.725 billion, \$5.5 million above the President's request.

TRIO was increased by \$115 million, a very important program serving minority youngsters in our society. It is increased by \$115 to \$760 million, \$35 million above the President's request.

Overall, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention is funded at \$368

million above last year's level and \$189 million above the President's request. This level includes both the regular account and the Public Health Emergency Fund. I have specifically included \$145 million, \$8 million above the President's request, for the critical infrastructure needs of the CDC.

Mr. Chairman, I funded the National Institutes of Health at the request level, \$1 billion above last year. I believe this level is not sufficient, but it is all I could manage within our allocation. The bill has been written to assure that a 15 percent increase is part of the conference's consideration.

For child care, the mark includes \$2 billion for fiscal year 2002 for this normally advanced funded program, although there is a sequester in place should we breach the budget resolution. And for fiscal 2001, the mark provides an additional \$400 million as a ramp up to the larger amount for fiscal year 2002. Child care is not shirked. We wish there were more funds; we are doing the best we can within the allocation.

Head Start is funded at \$5.7 billion, a 7.5 percent increase. Education Technology is funded at \$905 million, \$2 million above the President's request and \$139 million above last year. After School centers are increased by almost \$150 million and over a 30 percent increase to \$600 million.

The mark fully funds Impact Aid at \$985 million, a \$75 million increase and \$215 million above the President's request. Special education is increased by \$500 million to \$6.25 billion. Pell Grants are increased by \$200 and SEOG's and work studies are funded at the requested level.

Because of the importance of the Administrative Account for the delivery of Social Security benefits, I have increased this account by almost \$400 million. Most other programs are funded at last year's level.

The bill includes the same language provisions as were included in previous years, including the Hyde language on abortions. It includes prohibition on needle exchange programs, national testing and embryo research, the same as last year. It includes the same language as last year on Title X, Family Planning, compliance with State laws and family involvement.

It includes new language requiring filters on computers purchased with Federal funds to assure they cannot be used to access child pornography, obscene material, and other material harmful to children on the Internet.

For 4 of the last 5 years this bill has been enacted without a normal conference because it failed to pass either the House or the Senate. Mr. Chairman, this is a failure of democracy which we should never allow to happen. This bill should be shaped by the entire body on the House floor. I am very pleased that this year the bill is coming to the floor early; that the body will have a chance to shape the bill in the way they wish to see it leave this

body. I believe that we should never again allow the enactment of this or any other bill shaped in the normal process by the Members in open debate on the House floor under an open rule.

I believe this bill does a very good job of funding high priorities for this country. Yes, we do not have an allocation as large as we might like, but we are operating under a budget resolution adopted by the majority of this House. And we are doing the best that we can to provide for the high-priority programs to serve people most at risk, to serve our children, to serve our elderly populations; and I believe that we have done the best we possibly can with the money that we have available.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 9 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, before I begin, I would like to make a few comments on the stewardship of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER).

As he has indicated, he has served this House and his district and this country ably and with great distinction and great honor in all of the years that I have known him. He is truly a quality person, he is truly a quality legislator, he is infinitely fair, and I think he has more integrity than 90 percent of the Members I have ever served with.

I would say that in a legislative body I understand that political conflict and intellectual conflict can be pretty intense. When we engage in that conflict, we take a good measure of both our allies and our adversaries. I am proud of the relationship that I have had with a variety of subcommittee chairs, full committee chairs, and ranking minority members in the years I have been in this place.

I treasure the relationship that I had with Mickey Edwards when he ran the Republican side on the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs; and I chaired it. I treasure the relationship I had with Bob Livingston, both when he served as chairman of the committee and as my ranking member on foreign operations. I cherish the relationship I have with the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), the chairman of the committee, and I especially cherish the relationship that I have with the gentleman from Illinois. He is one of those persons of unquestioned integrity who always, in my view, does what he believes is the right thing for the country; and I do not think there is any higher compliment that can be paid any Member. We are all going to miss him, and I think the majority party has been well served, as has the country, by his stewardship.

What I say about this bill has nothing whatsoever to do with my respect and affection for the gentleman from Illinois. What I say about this bill is required because of my love of this country and my passion for what I believe this country ought to do to ex-

pand opportunities for all people in this society, not just the fortunate.

This chart shows what is at the guts of the problem with this bill today because the majority party, in its budget resolution, has determined that it is going to, in piecemeal fashion, push through this House tax bill after tax bill which, when they are all added up together, will wind up, over a 10-year period, costing us over \$700 billion in lost revenue. Seventy-three percent of the tax cuts will go to that 1 percent that represents the wealthiest 1 percent of people in this society. Seventy-three percent will go to that one person. Twenty-seven percent will be to the other 99 percent.

1245

That is not my idea of a square deal.

They will bring to the floor tomorrow a bill which, when fully operative, will provide tax cuts of \$50 billion a year; and that will occur by relieving the estate tax on the wealthiest 2 percent of people in this society who are left to pay that tax. For that \$50 billion going to the fat cats in this country, we could provide health care for every single uninsured American.

So that is one option. Do you want to put the \$50 billion in Mr. Moneybag's pocket, or do you want to put it in the pocket of every American unserved by health care? That is one choice.

Another choice you could make is to respond to the fact that our high school enrollment is going to be going up between this year and the end of the decade. Between this year and the end of the decade, we are going to be adding about a million and a half more students in high school. We are not doing enough to respond to that challenge.

Another thing we could do is to recognize that our higher education enrollment will be going up by almost 1.5 million people over the same 10 years. And we are not doing enough to deal with that.

Pell Grants. Pell Grants used to make up almost two-thirds of the cost of going to college in a public 4-year institution. Today they make up about a third. We could be doing something about that. But, instead, the money is going to be committed for these very large tax cuts.

Now, I have no problem with tax cuts targeted to small farmers who need them, small businessmen who need them, middle-class taxpayers. But this bill, in the end, cuts 36 education programs below the President's request. It cuts 24 programs to protect workers and train workers below the President's request. It cuts 18 health programs below the President's request.

Now, they will say, oh, these are not cuts, they are increases from the base. The fact is, this bill is frozen in time because it does not respond to the growing costs, growing pressures in our society, even though we have moved from an era of large deficits to large surpluses. And so it is simply a question of where you think we ought to

put our resources, and it is an honest difference of opinion.

The folks on this side of the aisle put as their first priority providing over \$700 billion in tax cuts. We have put as our first priority investing that money in Social Security and Medicare and education, in health care, in job training, in basic science to keep this economy going and to build opportunity.

As great as this country is, it can be better. But to be better, we have to continue to make the right kind of public investments that have gotten us this glorious economic recovery.

We are not going to do it under this bill. We are not going to do it under the science bill that came out of committee yesterday. We not going to do it out of the agriculture bill. At least not now.

We will do it eventually. We will do it in September, because in September we will get to the get-real time part of this session, and that is when the majority will finally face up to the fact that this bill and most of the others are not going to be signed by the President of the United States unless additional resources are put in it. And if you say, "Oh, they are not offset, you are just trying to spend money," every single one of the amendments that we want the committee to adopt can be paid for if the majority simply cuts back on the size of its tax package by about 20 percent.

That is all it would take. It would still leave you room for significant tax cuts, and we will have one on the floor tomorrow that will demonstrate that, but it will not provide tax cuts that are so large that you get in the way of either deficit reduction or making the needed investments we need to make on our people.

So that is what is at stake on this bill. I would urge Members at the end of the day to vote no because it simply does not measure up to what America is all about.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire of the Chair how much time remains on each side.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER) has 18½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) has 21 minutes remaining.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. GRANGER).

(Ms. GRANGER asked for and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Appropriations bill. This legislation includes substantial increases for many important health, education, and job training programs.

I also want to commend the gentleman from Illinois (Chairman PORTER) for the work he has done. I want to especially thank him for his commitment to increased funding for the National Institutes of Health. I am

proud to be a member of the Committee on Appropriations and a Congress that have made quality health care a priority.

From 1995 to 2001, Republicans have increased NIH funding by an average of 11 percent per year, 15 percent per year in the last 3 years.

I am also pleased to say we have provided a 33 percent increase in the amount of awards. This funding boosts hope and opportunity for patients across this Nation. With this money, we will continue to lead the world in our quest for cures for Alzheimer's, Parkinson's, diabetes, cancer, and other diseases that wreck families and cause loss of quality of life for our citizens.

Mr. Chairman, as a woman, a mother, and a member of the Committee on Appropriations, I am pleased to be a part of this historic NIH increase. I think this is an important day for patients and, also, quality of care.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER).

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

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, at a time over the last few days when we have listened to such prominent leaders in our business community like Bill Gates at Microsoft and Andrew Groves at Intel and Carly Fiorina at Hewlett-Packard say that we need to do more in terms of quality in education, we need to do more in terms of new ideas, we need to do more in terms of technology, we need to do more in terms of training our teachers to learn how to use the technology. This bill does less.

At a time when we are facing a new economy with new challenges in the digital divide with some of our students, if they are black or Hispanic, not having equal access with this digital divide to the latest technology, we are doing less at a time when, according to the Wall Street Journal a few weeks ago, schools are turning to temp agencies for substitute teachers, and it quotes the Kelly Services going out into the community to put substitute teachers into our schools.

Now, I think the quality of teaching is the single biggest need in this country because we will need 2 million new teachers, but we have to make sure the current teachers can teach with the challenges of the technology that are before them. Temp agencies might be able to do some good things, but I am not sure that one of their strengths is putting qualified teachers in our schools.

So what I would hope in this bill that I would recommend at this point a no vote on is that it falls short, particularly in the Title I area, where I offered an amendment on the authorization process to increase Title I by \$1.5 billion, 39 Republicans voted with that amendment. This bill does not reflect that increase to \$9.8 billion for Title I kids.

So the Title I program does not come up to the funding that we even authorized with bipartisan support for some of the poorest of the poor children in some of the poorest school districts in the country.

The second major reason to vote against this bill is the lack of professional development. Now, with the Teacher Empowerment Act not being authorized and with the Eisenhower Program not being funded in this bill, we have a huge gaping hole on one of the biggest needs in America today, and that is making sure we have quality teachers who can work with the technology, work with overcrowded schools, work in overcrowded classrooms, and teach effectively to 20 or 25 or 28 or 30 kids.

So Title I is underfunded for the poorest schools. Professional development, there is a huge gaping hole in this bill without an authorization process taking place. When we need to do more, we are doing less in education. I would encourage a no vote.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. TIAHRT), a member of the full Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Illinois (Chairman PORTER) for the opportunity to speak in favor of this bill.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) said earlier that we have this tax cut and if we did not have this tax cut we could spend more money on education.

Well, there is a difference in philosophy here. We have overpaid the cost of government. I do believe that the taxpayers deserve a break. We could spend more, but let us look at what is included in this bill.

In this bill, we have an overall increase of 7.6 percent. That exceeds inflation. But a portion of this is mandatory, and we have to increase it a certain amount. But if we look at the discretionary portion that we have the opportunity to either increase or decrease, the discretionary portion is increasing nearly 15 percent.

Pell Grants, for example, are going from \$2,300 in 1994 to \$3,500 in this bill. It is over a 50-percent increase since 1994.

We are doing some wonderful things in this bill. I think the body ought to take that into consideration. The priorities may be different, but it is a good bill and I urge its passage.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY).

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this bill, but I do so with great sadness because I have such great respect for my friend, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER), our chairman, who has been such an extraordinary leader in this House from his commitment and his passion to the NIH budget, to his initiative to produce better health outcomes for our kids, to

increasing resources for the world-class CDC.

The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER) represents the very best of this institution. His integrity, his commitment, his passion to do the right thing is an example for this institution and for this great Nation of ours. Without him, we will be a lesser House. But I have such great confidence that the gentleman will continue to make a major contribution in the field of his choice and to this great Nation. We are really going to miss him. He is a friend. He is a great colleague. I have the greatest respect for him.

1300

I also wish, quite frankly, that our colleagues had seen their way to giving him a more fitting allocation in his final year. I serve on this subcommittee with such pride. It was the committee I chose. I wanted it so badly because of all the good things that this committee does. I believe so strongly that the Federal Government must be a partner in meeting the need to educate, keep healthy, protect the safety of our children, our workers, and our families. The chairman has made it very clear that he is not satisfied with the allocation our subcommittee has received, and I am ready to work with him and my colleagues to improve this bill so that at the end of the process we can pass a bill that we can be very, very proud of.

But I also stand with the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) who has passionately and consistently made the case for a true appropriations process and for a real Labor-HHS bill. Americans deserve that and so does this House. This is the first time that I can recall that we have had a debate on a Labor-HHS bill since 1997. Unfortunately, we have not made much progress by bringing the bill to the floor. Members on both sides of the aisle have already conceded that the House bill is going nowhere. It is almost \$3 billion below the President's request for the Department of Education, \$1.7 billion below the President's request for the Department of Labor, \$1.1 billion below the President's request for the Department of Health and Human Services. The bill did not even make it out of subcommittee without the White House issuing a veto threat.

The bill contains major reductions in the President's budget for education, health care, and worker safety and training. It sidesteps once again our national crisis in school modernization. In the end, the bill before us is about \$6 billion below the President's request and close to \$8 billion below the Senate's level. Our Nation is growing. We have pressing needs in education, health, and training. Yet there are no funds provided to continue the class size reduction that the President has requested that will place 100,000 new teachers in our schools. There are, as I said, no funds to renovate the

schools so they can perform urgently needed safety and health repairs.

\$1 billion is cut from teacher quality improvement and recruiting efforts. There are no funds to increase our effort to keep women safe during pregnancy, despite the terrible rate of maternal mortality and morbidity in this country. It level funds our critical domestic violence shelters program and the Hotline service. Compared to the President's request, the bill is a 40% cut in after-school programs, one of my top priorities, and a \$600 million cut in Head Start. Despite the troubling trends of violence and alienation among our young people, no funds are provided for elementary school counselors.

We have the resources now to address the changing needs of our workers, in the Internet economy, and of our students—many of whom are adults trying to build up their skills. We have the resources now to prepare a secure and healthier retirement for our seniors, and fund the world-class health prevention research that the United States is known for—but this bill does not take advantage of the extraordinary opportunity this tremendous economy has provided us. That's why I oppose this bill, and why I urge my colleagues to defeat it.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER), a member of the subcommittee who does a wonderful job for his constituents in Florida.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. It has indeed been a pleasure for the past 6 years to serve with such a distinguished Member who, unfortunately, is leaving us. One thing I do agree with my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, that we all feel very strong about the wonderful job and the leadership he has provided this committee over the years. It has been a real special honor for me to have that opportunity.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this year's bill. One of the things I am most proud of in my service here is we have finally reached a day of having a balanced budget and a surplus. It is hard work to have a surplus in government. We have to have some real goals and be committed to a balanced budget concept. But now that we have a surplus, it seems so easy to say, let's spend more money, let's spend more money.

Yes, there are some good things that we spend money on. A few decades ago, Everett Dirksen used to say, "A billion here, a billion there, we're talking about real money pretty soon." This bill is \$2.4 billion more in discretionary spending than last year. That is real money. There is an increase in spending in this bill. To say, oh, my gosh, the sky is falling, all these Chicken Little stories that things are falling apart. Hey, there is more money in this bill. We are funding the highest priority programs.

One of the programs that I think, as the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER) does, too, the crown jewel of the government is the National Institutes of Health, cancer research, Alzheimer's research, diabetes research, AIDS re-

search; and thank goodness, under the gentleman from Illinois' leadership we have had a great increase in that spending.

Look at this chart. Look at how it has grown back from when the Democrats controlled Congress. Now under Republican leadership, look at the rate of growth. Look at that growth rating that has been going on since the Republicans took over. We need to be proud of that, because that is a high priority. As a fiscal conservative and one that has a good record of saying we have got to restrain spending, I believe basic research is one area we should put our resources in and can be proud of that because that is something we should continue to support. This is a good bill. I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI).

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished ranking member for yielding me this time and for his extraordinary leadership on establishing budget priorities for our country which are in keeping with our national values.

Mr. Chairman, in reviewing this bill that is before us today, I am reminded of the story of someone who said how come so many good mathematicians come out of MIT, and the answer is, because so many good mathematicians go into MIT. Why is this a very bad bill? Because very bad budget considerations went into this bill.

This is a bad bill. Compared to the President's budget, it would cut \$2.9 billion from education services, cut \$1.7 billion from labor with cuts to workforce development and safety investments, and cut more than \$1 billion from critical health programs. This is a bad bill also because it eliminates and cuts services for America's senior citizens and their families.

And why? Why are we forced to vote on this bad bill? We are forced to vote on this bad bill because Republican House leadership passed a bad budget resolution that puts tax cuts for the wealthiest Americans above investments to promote America's education, workforce and health services. Their \$175 billion tax cut exceeds the projected budget surplus and requires deep cuts in nondefense discretionary appropriations. The result was a Republican-designed budget resolution that was so bad that even the Republican chairman of this subcommittee opposed it.

And soon we will be voting on a measure to repeal the estate tax. Within 24 hours, we will be cutting education and we will be repealing the estate tax. How could that be a proper statement of our national priorities? Repealing the estate tax will provide over \$50 billion to the wealthiest 2 percent of taxpayers. How much is enough? When will Republicans be satisfied with the amount of money they have given to the wealthy and turn their attention to the majority of

Americans who want a good education, a strong workforce, and a healthy future?

I do not know if we will have an opportunity to offer amendments today. That is why I had hoped that the rule would go down because it did not protect the rights of the minority to offer amendments to this bill. One that I had in the full committee which failed would have added \$1.7 billion to the National Institutes of Health which we cannot afford because the Republicans insist on giving a tax cut to 2 percent of the wealthiest Americans.

I urge my colleagues to vote no on this bill.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ISTOOK), a member of our subcommittee.

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the time from the gentleman from Illinois. The gentleman from Illinois has done great, thankless work for so many years in trying to craft together one of the most controversial bills that comes before us each and every year. You could not find a finer gentleman whether you agree or disagree with him on different issues. He has handled himself very well and deserves our appreciation for that.

Mr. Chairman, this bill at the same time represents some of the best things and some of the worst things in this Congress. I appreciate the bipartisan cooperation working with the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) on a couple of things that are in this bill. To say that when the Federal Government is purchasing computers that go in public schools and we are spending hundreds of millions of dollars for that, that we want to make sure that filters are on that so that they are not being exposed to Internet pornography through a computer paid for by taxpayers, that is a bipartisan effort. That is in here. That is good.

We also have in here an expansion of the Federal programs trying to promote abstinence among teenagers. If you want to reduce out-of-wedlock pregnancies and births, tell kids that they ought to be waiting until marriage. We have had hundreds of millions of dollars, billions of dollars in Federal money teaching a so-called safe sex message. It is about time we start promoting a message that promotes our values and the right decisions. That is in here, thanks to bipartisan support.

Yet we hear people say, well, this bill is not spending enough. This bill is spending \$12 billion more in optional spending than last year. I heard one speaker talk about a figure of a 15 percent increase. Yet some people say, oh, you're cutting this and you're cutting that, you're cutting things. Come on. Get real. If you want to say it is below the President's request, that is fine. That is honest. But to say that it is cutting, no, that is not.

Mr. Chairman, this bill deserves our support. It spends more than many of

us want to spend but for goodness sakes, do not claim it spends less.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, this Republican bill puts irresponsible tax breaks before critical funding for education. We need to invest in our schools so that our children receive the best education in the world and are prepared for working in a 21st century economy. We must expect the best from our schools, then give them the tools that they need to succeed. Smaller classes help students to get individualized attention, discipline, and the instruction that they need. But the Republican bill repeals efforts to hire new teachers to reduce those class sizes and will not make classrooms the places where our students can learn and our teachers can teach.

The most important thing that we can do for our children's education is to make sure that teachers are highly qualified in their subjects and well trained in new technology. Yet this Republican bill cuts teacher training and recruitment by \$1 billion. The bill cuts reading instruction and tutoring for 100,000 children and math improvement programs for another 650,000 youngsters. It cuts after-school programs by 40 percent; programs that serve 1.6 million children in more than 3,000 schools across this country.

By denying a \$1.3 billion in funding for local school districts to make urgent and needed repairs to school buildings, this bill denies 5,000 school districts the leverage that they need to fix leaky roofs, upgrade plumbing and bring schools into compliance with local safety codes. It cuts Head Start funding by \$400 million, denying more than 50,000 low-income children critical Head Start funding. And it eliminates college preparation for more than 640,000 high school seniors.

Budgets are not numbers on a page. We bring to life our values and our priorities through our budgets and the bills that we pass in this people's House. This Republican leadership bill denies the opportunity to make sure our youngsters get the very, very best start in life. It does not reflect our values. It does not reflect our priorities as a Nation. It does not give education the proper place that it deserves in our society, that is, as a great equalizer to make sure that youngsters no matter where they come from, no matter what their background is, no matter what their gender is, be able to achieve according to the talents that they have been given by God in this country.

It is a bad bill. We ought to turn it down.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Kentucky (Mrs. NORTHUP), a valued member of our subcommittee.

Mrs. NORTHUP. Mr. Chairman, first of all, I want to say that as a mother

of six children, the issues of health and education are near and dear to all of our hearts, especially as we look at our children and the challenges they face. I want to thank the chairman for the leadership of this committee that addresses what the needs are of children and educational systems and health across this country. He has been supportive, he has been encouraging, and his manner of balancing the differing opinions have been really very inspirational.

1315

Mr. Chairman, I think of the story of the child who had a \$5 allowance and came in to see his dad and said, Dad, I really need a raise in my allowance. Can I have \$10? The father said no, but I will give you a \$7 allowance. He said, well, why are you cutting my allowance?

This is what we see on the other side. People who think an increase is a decrease. When they talk about the quality of schools, I can tell my colleagues that there must have been a few classrooms across this country that they attended where the difference between addition and subtraction was not made clear.

In this bill, we are adding money to education. But really, the bill and the debate here is very much at the crux of the difference between the minority party and the majority party. The fact is, we are listening to our schools. Our schools reflect what the challenges are that each school faces.

It is no wonder that some people come to this Congress and say, we need to build more school buildings. Others say we need more teachers. Other say we need to be able to raise our teachers' salaries so that we attract more quality students into our classrooms. Other people come to Congress and say, no, we need to invest in technology. Because in every community, the challenges are different, what States have invested in already are different. Some States have made a tremendous investment in school buildings. But they are eager to raise the salary of their teachers so that they attract high-quality teachers.

Mr. Chairman, we believe that the money should go back to the schools, back to the communities where they decide what the critical needs are. I thank the Chairman for a bill that reflects their needs.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

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

I too congratulate the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER) for his leadership of this committee, but this bill does not represent the gentleman's leadership; and it ought not to be hung around his neck, because if he were in charge, this would not be his bill. These would not be his figures. This would not represent the depth of his

priorities. So let us not delude ourselves, I say to my friends.

Newt Gingrich stood on this floor, and he talked to the perfectionist caucus on the Republican side of the aisle; and he pointed out that the American public sent a President, House Members, and Senate Members, and the real problem with why we have gridlock in Washington and why we have the absurd charade through which we are now going, and undercutting the American people's priorities, not just our priorities, is because there is one group that does not agree with most of the other groups; and it is, I say to my friends, the Republican Conference within the House of Representatives.

Mr. Chairman, we have had a number of people stand up here and say oh, what you Democrats want to do. Do you not want the American public to know that what we want to do, our colleagues in the United States Senate have already done in their committee? Their figures are more than our figures, I say to my colleagues, not less. They too believe that our Republican colleagues are undercutting America's children and America's families and America's health; they too, our Republican colleagues in the Senate, not just those on this side of the aisle that you would like to say oh, look at how awful they are, and then show your charts about your spending. It is interesting, the red lines they put up showing more spending. What a different story you tell at home about how you are cutting spending. My colleagues cannot have it both ways. But they try; but they try.

For instance, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) got up here and said this is a 14.6 percent increase. Hooley, hooley. It is a 3.8 percent increase. Why? Because last year, my Republican colleagues played games and they pretended the 302(b) numbers were at \$84 million, their figures. But guess what? They then added on a lot of money after that so the real spending was \$96 billion. But it did not count on the 302(b)s.

Now, why are we here? The American public must wonder, why are we having this debate? Because we are discussing priorities.

I am going to offer an amendment and talk about how many children and families are adversely affected by this bill as opposed to the priorities we are offering and the priorities they put forward across the Capitol in the United States Senate. But we are here because we are deciding between those large tax cuts that my colleagues do not like us to talk about. They lament and say, oh, these numbers are not good; but we had to do this because the budget makes us do it.

However, nobody made us adopt the budget. Nobody made us adopt the large tax cuts for the wealthiest Americans that are going to shortchange children and families. I tell my friend from North Carolina, nobody made us do that. We did it ourselves. Not with my vote, but it was done. And as a re-

sult, we are going to talk about the number of children and families that will not be served, but that the Senate wants to serve on both sides of the aisle and that we want to serve. I hope my Republican colleagues will support my amendment.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN PRO TEMPORE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Members are reminded that they are to refrain from characterizing positions taken by Members in the other body.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BONILLA), a senior member of the subcommittee.

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

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, first, for a moment, a word about the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER), a member of this body who has the unmatched sense of caring, fairness and wisdom that will, when he is gone, be very difficult shoes to fill. He set an example here that I think has been respected for many years; and I think it is difficult for those who are trying to be critical of what this bill is representing this time to be critical of the gentleman from Illinois and his subcommittee. Because we all know, everybody in this body understands, on both the Democrat and Republican side, that he is truly a man who comes to work every day with a sense of caring for the people of this country and tries to do the right thing day in and day out without any political factors included.

I say to the gentleman that he is a person who all of us respect tremendously in this body; and he will be sorely missed, and we will work hard to pass this last and final bill that he has put out of the subcommittee of which I have been a part of for my eighth year now and have learned so much under the gentleman's leadership; and I look forward to carrying on its legacies at some time in the future as a continuing member of this subcommittee.

It is very difficult, I am sure, for a lot of the critics to step up here and say this is a bad bill and act like Chicken Little as though the sky is falling for supporting such a bill, because this is the People's bill. We have more money in this bill for such programs as education programs like TRIO, increasing that program by \$115 million, \$35 million more than the President requested; community health centers increased by \$81 million, which is even \$31 million more than the President requested; health professions up by \$69 million, \$113 million more than the President requested; biomedical research dollars, also a tremendous increase to 6 percent, we are trying to get it even higher, but on track. We are doubling the biomedical research funds for over a period of 5 years.

Mr. Chairman, this is a good bill. This is a bill that provides a lot of

services for a lot of people out there. Anyone who stands up and tries to oppose this bill should understand they are opposing people programs, education, biomedical research, all of these good programs that make a true difference in the community. We will also hear more today about a provision in this bill that saves the private sector from an onerous OSHA regulation involving ergonomics.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge all of my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 4577, the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services and Education Appropriations Act.

It seems that year after year, this bill attracts more and more rhetoric about how it will devastate American families, American workers, the elderly. . . . you name it. The truth is this bill is the People's bill and it will help the American people.

This bill provides vital funding for important labor, health and education programs while maintaining the fiscal responsibility that the American people demand of us. We have made some tough decisions and have funded high priorities.

The other side claims that we have cut health care, cut education, cut job training. Since when is a \$4 billion increase a cut? Let me set the record straight.

The bill increases funding for the community health centers program by \$81 million, \$31 million more than the President requested. This means that more uninsured Americans will have access to high quality health care in their communities.

The bill increases funding for the health professions programs by \$69 million, \$113 million more than the President requested. These programs provide vital training for health care professionals, many of whom go on to provide care to patients in medically underserved areas. The President's budget zeroed out funding for primary care physicians, dentists and gerontologists—denying opportunities to those students and denying health care to patients.

The bill increases funding for the TRIO programs by \$115 million, \$35 million more than the President requested. The TRIO program works to help low-income complete high school and go on to college.

These are just a few examples of the priorities placed in this bill. As the American people watch this debate, I trust that they will listen to the sincerity of our efforts to try to help Americans in every neighborhood, in every city, in every state.

I urge my colleagues to stop the rhetoric and pass this bill.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. JACKSON).

(Mr. JACKSON of Illinois asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I want to start by saying that I appreciate the hard work that the distinguished chairman, ranking member, and other members of the subcommittee and subcommittee staff have done to get us here today.

The Labor-H mark is woefully inadequate to address the profound needs of

the country, because this bill's allocation is economically short-sighted. For some in America, the economy is booming and unemployment is at its lowest rate in the last 30 years; yet the economy is not booming for all Americans. In the Chicago metropolitan area, congressional districts on the North side of Chicago like the chairman's have more jobs than people. In my district, there are more people than jobs. Hence, the chairman and his political party who are Republicans want less government and less taxes.

I am a Democrat who is progressive and, in the absence of a private sector in my congressional district, I need more government services; my constituents need them, to make a difference in the shortfalls in their lives. For example, in the last several years, the number of people in this country who are uninsured and underinsured has increased by several million in the Chicago metropolitan area that primarily finds itself on the South Side and the south suburbs that I represent. This bill could have provided an opportunity for us to leverage the benefits of this booming economy so that no American is left behind.

I appreciate all of the competing interests that must be balanced in this bill. Unfortunately, the mark has been dealt by the chairman a bad hand and he has been given an allocation that cannot adequately improve the lives of all Americans.

In title I of this bill, this mark cuts \$322 million of the President's request for youth programs serving 72,000 fewer at-risk youth, compared to the fiscal year 2000 level when the House cut \$75 million, serving 34,000 fewer youth. As a result, efforts to ensure that today's youth have 21st century skills for 21st century jobs and can compete successfully in the growing economy will be thwarted, hurting not only young people, but also employers and the economy.

The funding of four programs that are of particular interest to me are grossly underfunded. The mark slashes the youth opportunities initiative grants by over 50 percent. The mark cuts summer jobs and year-round job training for 12,575 disadvantaged youth. Over half of these jobs go to 15- and 14-year-olds who generally are not employed by the private sector.

This mark cuts funding for the President's proposed reintegration of services for 15,300 young offenders. With approximately 500,000 people leaving prison each year, the Nation needs to provide positive alternatives and opportunities for unemployment to these individuals.

The mark rejects expansion of the safe schools, healthy schools initiative. These programs, Mr. Chairman, are in serious trouble. At the very least, this bill should work to protect the most vulnerable in our society.

REJECTS EXPANSION OF THE SAFE SCHOOLS/HEALTHY STUDENTS INITIATIVE

The House zeros out the President's request to provide \$40 million to enable DOL to

join the existing DOJ, ED, HHS partnership in supporting community-wide programs to prevent youth violence and drug abuse, and to expand the effort to address out-of-school youth. Without these funds, no new communities can join this very successful effort.

These programs are in serious trouble. At the very least this bill should work to protect the most vulnerable in our society. The cuts to these programs below the President's recommended budget and the FY 2000 levels will produce tragic results for this nation's most vulnerable youth.

This bill could have provided an opportunity for us to leverage the benefits of this booming economy so that no American is left behind. I appreciate all of the competing interests that must be balanced in this bill. Unfortunately the Chairman has been dealt a bad hand and he has been given an allocation that cannot adequately improve the lives of all Americans.

In Title I of this bill, this mark cuts \$322 million out of the President's request for youth programs, serving 72,000 fewer at-risk youth. Compared to the FY 2000 level, the House cuts \$75 million, serving 34,000 fewer youth. As a result, efforts to insure that today's youth have 21st century skills for 21st century jobs and can compete successfully in the growing economy will be thwarted, hurting not only young people, but also employers and the economy. The funding for four programs of particular interest to me are grossly underfunded.

SLASHES THE YOUTH OPPORTUNITIES INITIATIVES BY OVER 50 PERCENT

Congress provided funds for the first 2 years of a 5 year commitment by the President to increase the long-term employment and educational attainment of youth living in 36 of the Nation's poorest urban neighborhoods and rural areas. The House mark cuts \$200 million out of the President's \$375 million request, eliminating the proposed expansion to 20 new communities and potentially reducing third year grants to the existing 36 communities. This will deny 40,000 of some of the most disadvantaged youth a bridge to the skills and opportunities of our strong economy and alternatives to welfare and crime—including 15,000 youth in the existing projects. The demand for these funds is high—over 160 communities sought these limited resources and developed the broad partnerships and comprehensive plans as part of last year's grant process. These deserving communities and their young people will not get a second chance.

CUTS SUMMER JOBS AND YEAR-ROUND TRAINING FOR 12,575 DISADVANTAGED YOUTH

For Youth Activities (the program that combines Summer Jobs and Year-Round Youth), the House mark provides only \$1.001 billion, a decrease of \$21 million, or 2% below the President's request level. This action reduces the estimated number of low income youth for FY 2001 in this program by 12,575 below the request. These cuts will compound the difficulties communities are experiencing this summer due to the structural changes in the program required by the Workforce Investment Act. This important program provides the first work experience for many at-risk youth, offering an important first step that can lead to a life of self-sufficiency and independence. Over half of these jobs go to 14–15 year olds who generally are not employed by the private sector.

CUTS FUNDING FOR THE PRESIDENT'S PROPOSED RE-INTEGRATION SERVICES FOR 15,300 YOUNG OFFENDERS

The House mark rejects the President's \$61 million increase for a \$75 million initiative to bring young offenders into the workplace through job training, placement, and support services, and by creating new partnerships between the criminal justice system and the WIA workforce development system. With the approximately 500,000 people leaving prison each year, the Nation needs to provide positive alternatives and opportunities for employment of these individuals, which will also strengthen the future of our communities. With the strong economy, this is an excellent time to address their re-entry into the job market. Raising their employment rates can decrease recidivism, reduce long-term costs to society, and increase the pool of available workers.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON).

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise to announce my intent to vote for this bill and to thank the chairman for including report language encouraging the National Institutes of Health to fund appropriate research to further explore the findings of Dr. Wakefield at the Royal Free Hospital in London on the safety and possible side effects of the MMR vaccine.

As a physician myself, I consider maintaining the safety and public confidence in our vaccine program to be of vital importance to the health of America's children; and I applaud the chairman, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER), for his interest in this area. I am looking forward to working with him in the months ahead on this issue, and I too congratulate him on his years of service to his constituents and this body.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HAYES).

1330

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me. I thank the chairman for all his efforts and for a great bill.

Mr. Chairman, we are going to spend over \$342 billion on this bill. That is a lot of money in anybody's circles. I particularly appreciate the increase in impact aid for our school system, in Fayetteville and Cumberland County, North Carolina.

It is very simple, the issue is trust. Mr. Chairman, I would say to my friends on the other side and my chairman, do we trust our parents and our citizens to spend their money more wisely, or do we trust government to take the money from our hard-working citizens and then let government make the decisions on how that money is going to be spent?

I think our parents, our teachers, and our local citizens can do a better job using their money to make the choices on how to raise, educate, and empower their children.

Again, I support the bill.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BARRETT).

Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to discuss a program that has been left out of the Labor-HHS-Education bill as it is currently drafted, the Rural Education Initiative Act, which I introduced and which the House passed as part of H.R. 2 last October.

The Rural Education Initiative Act provides small rural school districts with additional funds and flexibility to help meet their unique challenges posed by the most current Federal formula grant programs. It would affect about 39 States, has wide bipartisan support, and it has been endorsed by over 80 education organizations.

I am fully aware that enacting the Initiative Act would require authorizing on an appropriations bill, and I hope the ESEA will be reauthorized and we will not have to ask the appropriators for their support. If ESEA is not reauthorized, there are a lot of small rural schools out there that cannot wait another year for Congress to act. They need the flexibility and they need the assistance now.

Although I choose not to offer an amendment at this time, Mr. Chairman, I hope that as we continue through the process Members would consider adding the provisions of the Act to the bill.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BALLENGER).

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to praise the increased funding for the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, IDEA. This bill provides over \$6 billion in funding for IDEA for fiscal year 2012. This is a \$500 million increase in funding from last year, \$210 million more than the President requested.

Congress finally comes one step closer to honoring the commitment made to the States and local school districts 24 years ago. In 1975, Congress promised to contribute 40 percent of the average per pupil cost to assist States and local schools. This chart shows the funding first by the Democrats, very slowly, and later by the Republicans, and we can see we are trying, so \$500 million is a good beginning.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Missouri (Mrs. EMERSON).

Mrs. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Illinois (Chairman PORTER) for all the work he has done on this bill with the types of constraints we have this year. I think it is a shame that in his last year here in Congress we could not have made it easier for him, but I think he has worked real hard to fund important programs to improve the education, health, and well-being of all Americans.

I commend him very much for the hard work that he has done to double NIH over the 5 years, increase funding

for graduate medical education for children's hospitals, and in strengthening our Nation's community health centers.

From one who represents a very poor area, a very rural area, the fact that he has been able to increase our community health centers by \$81.3 million is a huge boost to those people who are underserved in my area, who do not have access to affordable health care, and every dollar that we spend on community health centers will help the insured have much more health care than they presently have.

I also want to just mention quickly the \$200 million increase for impact aid funding. These help reimburse our localities for revenues lost. I can tell the Members, with so much public land in my district, this is going to be a very big boost.

I would ask my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW).

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

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me. I, too, want to congratulate the chairman on a very fine bill.

As the chairman of the Subcommittee on Social Security, I would like to discuss the provisions of H.R. 4577 that fund the social security programs.

Social security touches nearly every American family. In 1999, the Social Security Administration paid social security and SSI benefits to more than 50 million beneficiaries. Without a doubt, continuing to provide timely, accurate benefits and world class service will remain Social Security's number one mission in the years ahead.

This mission will become more complicated as the huge Baby Boom generation enters its peak disability years and then reaches retirement age starting in 2008. By 2010 Social Security retirement benefit claims are expected to rise by 16 percent and disability claims by 47 percent. For an agency facing a wave of retirements by its own workers and high expectations from customers, that's a great challenge.

This is no idle concern. Although Social Security is widely regarded as among the best-administered federal programs, the need to improve public service was highlighted in a recent report by the bipartisan Social Security Advisory Board.

This report concluded "there is a significant gap between the level of services that the public needs and that which the Agency is providing. Moreover, this gap could grow to far larger proportions in the long term if it is not adequately addressed."

That's why I'm pleased that the amount of funding provided for the Social Security Administration is very close to the Administration's request. The Commissioner requested, and was denied, a further \$200 million increase by the President.

Through this bill, the Social Security Administration's funding has increased by nearly half

a billion dollars compared to last year. That's a 7 percent increase, substantial by most standards as we try to adhere to our overall spending blueprint.

I, for one, am quite willing to add resources to the Social Security Administration to provide better service, increase productivity, combat waste, fraud, and abuse, and further modernize technology at the agency. House floor action is just the first step. The Senate expects to approve funding at a level slightly higher but close to ours. We will then have the opportunity to work with the Administration to arrive at agreeable funding levels.

Unfortunately, this agency finds itself in the midst of a very unusual set of budgetary rules. Its administrative expenses paid directly from payroll tax receipts, all benefits are considered mandatory expenses, yet due to complex and unclear scoring rules the costs to run this agency are counted as part of the discretionary spending cap.

With budget surpluses both in the Social Security and non-Social Security categories, it is time for Congress to clarify these antiquated and haphazardly drawn budget rules so the Social Security Administration can effectively prepare for the service delivery challenges of the baby boom retirement. Workers who finance this vital program with their hard-earned wages will expect nothing less.

In the coming days, I will introduce legislation which frees the Social Security Administration from these outdated scorekeeping rules to ensure workers and their families receive the public service they paid for and so well deserve.

Earlier this year, I had the opportunity to testify before the Labor-HHS Subcommittee regarding to show my commitment to the goal of doubling funding for the National Institutes of Health. The breath-taking pace of NIH-sponsored research being conducted by scientists nationwide is only dwarfed by the tremendous amount of very promising research that is not yet funded.

I strongly support the \$20.8B in funding for NIH, a \$2.7B increase over the current year.

I would also like to briefly highlight my support for several specific areas of NIH research funded in this bill for Alzheimer's Disease, Cancer, Alpha 1 (alpha-1-proteinase inhibitor deficiency) and Polycystic Kidney Disease (PKD).

I also support H.R. 4577 because it contains \$70.4B in funding for Medicare and \$93.5B for the federal share of Medicaid. Make no mistake about it—this Congress is keeping our promise to provide health care to the most vulnerable Americans—seniors, women and children.

And speaking of our children, there is no more important issue than education. I am proud that H.R. 4577 contains an increase of \$1.65B for education programs. Roughly \$40B will be dedicated to the education of our children next year and this education funding deserves our strong support. Let me say that I believe we all wish that we could provide a larger increase for education programs, however, we also have a fiduciary responsibility to our children and grandchildren, and this bill does a good job of balancing each of these important priorities.

In closing, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 4577. It is a good bill put together by an excellent Chairman, Mr. PORTER. I thank Mr. PORTER for his exemplary tenure, and wish him the best in his retirement.

Mr. Chairman, we plan to offer some legislation in the next few days which will help us as the baby boomers get into this very important retirement program.

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

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) is recognized for 3½ minutes.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I just want to use this time to respond to a couple of claims made by our friends on the other side.

One of the speakers said they have had a big increase in the National Institutes of Health budget. What they are trying to do is have it both ways. This bill pretends that it is appropriating \$2.7 billion in additional money for the National Institutes of Health, but it has language tucked into the bill which says that only \$1 billion of that can be spent. I do not regard that as real money.

The gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ISTOOK) indicated that this bill is \$12 billion above last year. That is because they are pretending that last year's bill cost \$85 billion, when in fact it cost \$96 billion. They hid billions of dollars in spending last year. In fact, when we take a look at all appropriation bills last year, they hid more than \$45 billion, so they are pretending that we are above a let's-pretend level of last year, which is \$45 billion higher than they are continuing to admit.

On Pell grants, they brag about what they are doing for Pell grants. What a double game their party has played on that issue. Last year they passed an authorizing bill telling the country they were going to raise Pell grants by \$400 for the maximum grant. They then proceeded to cut that back to \$175 in the appropriation bill they passed just 2 months later.

Their presidential candidate came to my State. I want to read from this quote. The headline says, "Bush averse to more college grant funding." Here is what it says from the Eau Claire Leader Telegram:

Texas Governor George W. Bush gave strong indications Thursday he is not inclined to increase Federal spending to give more grants for students to go to college. Bush, who attended both Yale and Harvard, conceded that some people have complained that those loans carry a repayment burden. "Too bad," he said. "That is what a loan is." Then he went on to say, "There is a lot of money available to students and families who are willing to go out and look for it. Some of you are just going to have to pay it back. That is just the way it is."

That attitude just does not reveal what he thinks about student aid. It shows that we have Richie Rich not understanding how the other half lives and not bothering to find out. I would suggest that we can do a little better than this bill is doing on Pell grants.

Then we are told what a wonderful deal this bill is on special education for

disabled children. I want to point out, this bar graph shows that just 36 days ago this House passed legislation, the IDEA Full Funding Act, which said we were going to put \$7 billion into that program. What are they putting in? \$5.5 billion. I do not regard that as full funding, and I do not regard that as fulfilling their promise.

I guess the only points we are making is that when we get down to the bottom line, there are three basic differences between them and us. They think we ought to spend \$3 billion less on education than we do, they think we ought to spend \$1.7 billion less on worker protection and \$1 billion less on health care.

We respectfully disagree. That is why we are going to vote no.

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

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER) is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, for 40 years the minority party controlled the House of Representatives, and most of that time the Senate as well. For all of those years, for 30 of those years, at least, they ran one deficit after another, some of them approaching \$300 billion a year.

In the 5 years that the majority party has controlled the House of Representatives and the Senate, we have reduced the deficits to zero. We now run surpluses, and we are engaged in arguments as to how that money should best be spent.

I believe very strongly we should commit to doubling the funding for the National Institutes of Health over 5 years, and we have provided 15 percent for the last 2 years. We intend and will do our best to provide an additional 15 percent this year to get us to that ultimate doubling in the 5-year period on a compounding basis.

It is fascinating to me that the minority wants to make an issue of that. We agree on it. The only difference is we are having to operate within the constraints of a budget resolution, and it is very easy to criticize when there are no constraints whatsoever.

Special education is a great case in point. When they controlled the Chamber, they got it up to 6 percent. In the last 5 years, we have it up to 13 percent. We have increased funding for special education by \$3 billion over that time period, and are doing a much better job toward getting us towards that goal of 40 percent, where we ought to be, than has ever been done before. Yet, no credit is given by our colleagues on the other side of the aisle.

I believe within the constraints of fiscal responsibility we are doing the best that we can to address the needs of people of this country. I recommend Members to support this bill very strongly.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, tomorrow, the leadership of this House will ask us to support

an estate tax cut that benefits fewer than two percent of Americans. You might ask—how much will it cost to give a tax break to this tiny fraction of Americans? The answer is \$104 billion over ten years, and an explosion of \$50 billion per year after that.

Today, the leadership of this House gives us the choice between special education children and our neediest children receiving Title I assistance, the children of the armed services, families who need child care and college students who need Pell Grants.

Why must we rob Peter to pay Paul? Why do we have to choose today between our children with special needs and Ryan White AIDS funding? Or the Centers for Disease Control? Or mental health block grants? Or after-school funding?

Because the leadership of this House would prefer to spend \$104 billion giving tax cuts to the estates of the wealthiest one of every 1,000 people who die.

But what about special education? The bill in front of us includes \$6.6 billion in funding for special education, \$514 million over last year's funding but far short of the \$16 billion plus we need to fulfill the longstanding federal commitment to our most vulnerable children.

This \$104 billion tax cut could fully fund the federal government's share of special education costs for six and a half years. This seems strange, because today we in the House will vote again and again to add needed money to special education, but our only choice is to divert it from other programs that benefit people who don't have K Street lobbyists—our kids.

Mr. Chairman, I unequivocally support increasing funding for special education—I have supported it again and again on the floor of this House. In fact, I cosponsored my colleague Mr. VITTER's bill that would fully fund special education in two years.

But it is clear to me, as it should be clear to the American people, that funding special education is unfortunately not the real priority of the leadership of this House.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, my goal in Congress is the promotion of livable communities; communities that are safe, healthy and economically secure. By definition, livable communities must have a top-notch school system and must protect the physical and mental well-being of children, adults and seniors. The annual Labor, Health and Human Services and Education Appropriations bills form the primary Federal contribution to meet these critical needs.

Unfortunately, this year's Labor, Health and Education bill (H.R. 4577) falls short and I must oppose it. H.R. 4577 cuts from the President's budget \$1 billion in teacher quality and improvement programs and \$38 million that would have ensured 1.6 million elderly and disabled Americans receive quality nursing care. The bill also leaves out \$1.5 billion in payments for the education of disabled children, money that the House of Representatives has indicated, by vote, should be provided to local school districts. The list goes on.

I am extremely discouraged that H.R. 4577 underfunds health and education programs

while at the same time Congress is setting a course for a broken budget. Overall FY 2001 spending will certainly mark an increase over FY 2000 spending. With a \$21 billion increase in defense spending for FY 2001, it is not hard to guess the priorities of this Congress. We are preparing to spend \$60 billion over the next 15 years on a national missile defense system that will not work, but spending little in today's bill to ensure our children will grow up prepared to work.

Tomorrow, the House takes up an estate bill that offers enormous benefits to a few hundred of the wealthiest people in America, whose billions in unrealized capital gains will pass to their heirs without ever having been taxed. When fully realized, these estate tax changes will drain \$50 billion a year from the Treasury. I am a champion of providing targeted estate tax relief to family farms and businesses, which we can do for relatively few dollars. But instead of a targeted estate tax bill, one that would leave enough revenue to insure the 11 million American children who go without health coverage or help seniors buy prescription drugs, Congress is racing to pass a fiscally irresponsible tax cut for those who need it least.

Mr. Chairman, I realize that H.R. 4577 is, and should be, a work in progress. Unfortunately, not enough progress has been made. I am voting "no" with the knowledge that H.R. 4577 will be back in the House at a later date and call on my colleagues to rethink our funding priorities.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to speak against this ill-conceived legislation that hurts working American families.

This legislation will prevent the Department of Labor from issuing common-sense, scientifically-based workplace safety standards.

These reasonable standards will ensure that workplace safety guidelines are in place to prevent increasingly common workplace injuries.

More than 647,000 Americans suffer serious injuries and illnesses due to musculo-skeletal disorders each year.

These injuries are currently costing businesses \$15 to \$20 billion annually in workers' compensation costs.

Tragically, these injuries disproportionately affect women workers.

Although women make up 46 percent of the workforce and 33 percent of those injured, 63 percent of repetitive motion injuries happen to women.

Women experience 70 percent of carpal tunnel syndrome injuries that result in lost work time.

This is unacceptable and we must act now to prevent these injuries.

Americans who are willing to work hard each day to support themselves and their families deserve reasonable standards to prevent workplace injuries.

Many of the workers who will be covered by these common sense guidelines often work more than one job just to make ends meet.

They work long hours loading trucks, moving boxes, and delivering packages.

Their jobs aren't easy, but they are willing to show up every day and do their best.

The last thing these hard-working Americans want is to get hurt. These sensible standards will keep them on the job and prevent costly workplace injuries.

Opponents of these common-sense guidelines claim that they will "regulate every ache and pain in the workplace".

This is simply not true. These standards will only ensure that companies make someone responsible for ergonomic standards and that employees are not afraid to report these injuries. This is hardly an overwhelming request. Let's eliminate this language today and give hard-working Americans the chance to avoid these career threatening injuries.

I would also like to register my support for the additional resources requested by the Administration for the National Labor Relations Board and OSHA.

These agencies are doing everything possible to improve the health and safety of the workplace. We should support their efforts.

I urge all of my colleagues to stand with hard-working Americans and to oppose this harmful legislation.

Mr. REYES. Mr. Chairman. I stand in strong opposition to the passage of the 2001 Labor, HHS, and Education Appropriations bill because it severely cuts programs that are extremely important to the education of our children and because it hurts displaced workers. I urge my colleagues to oppose it.

The first problem with this GOP bill is that it severely shortchanges education—by \$3.5 BILLION. This bill would end our commitment to hire 100,000 new teachers and to reduce class sizes. I am concerned by the fact that this bill would eliminate Head Start for some 53,000 children and cut \$1.3 BILLION for urgent repairs to schools across the country. These are critical issues for my district and for many districts across the country. This bill will also eliminate school counselors serving 100,000 children. This action will deprive schools of the professionals they need to identify and help troubled children.

This bill also does considerable injustice to Bilingual and Immigrant Education. The amount included in the bill for programs addressing these issues is \$54 million below the budget request. The professional development of our bilingual education teachers is critically important. The Labor, HHS, and Education bill in its current form provides an amount that is \$28.5 million below the budget request for the important programs of Bilingual Education Professional Development. The grants that are provided for the development of our teachers in bilingual education are needed to increase the pool of trained teachers and strengthen the skills of teachers who provide instruction to students who have limited English proficiency. These funds support the training and retraining of bilingual teachers. The disparities in minority education will be increased if this bill is passed.

Secondly, this bill severely shortchanges programs that assist displaced workers. This is a major issue for my constituents in El Paso, as I know that it is for many of you in your home districts.

In El Paso and in other areas along the U.S./Mexico border, NAFTA has created many displaced workers, and this bill does an injustice to programs that could help them. For example, the bill cuts assistance to over 215,000 dislocated workers and it cuts the dislocated worker program by \$207 million below the 2000 level. These cuts will make it more difficult for these workers to find jobs. This bill also cuts adult job training for almost 40,000 adults. The cuts in adult training programs

equal \$93 million or 10 percent below the request and 2000 levels.

Finally, this bill provides only \$9.6 million for employment assistance to another class of displaced workers: Our homeless veterans. There are over a quarter million homeless veterans in this country, and the provisions in this bill will deny employment assistance to thousands of these Americans who have faithfully served their country. This is unacceptable.

The root of these problems is that in order to pay for the proposed Republican trillion-dollar tax breaks for the wealthiest Americans, we are attacking programs that are needed to educate our children and to assist displaced workers. Again, I stand in strong opposition to passage, and I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill.

Ms. SANCHEZ. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to this bill.

The bill before the House is very damaging to our nation's schools.

It is simply unconscionable to cut education funding at a time when school enrollment is exploding. In my own district, in Orange County, I have seen the effect that the years and overcrowding have taken on our schools and the safety of those within them.

I remind my colleagues that Americans have told us—time and time again—that education should be at the top of our nation's list of priorities. No education matter can be more important than keeping our schools safe.

This bill backs down on our promise to hire new teachers to keep classes small. When classes are too large, teachers can't watch for the warning signs of impending trouble.

This bill refuses to help schools with emergency safety repairs to their buildings. School officials can't focus on safety when they're worried about leaking roofs and rotting pipes.

And I remind my colleagues that this bill even cuts school counselors serving 100,000 children. We know we need trained professionals to help keep our schools safe, yet this legislation cuts funding for school counselors.

With this bill, we'll lose after-school care, teacher training, assistance for low-income communities, and Head Start programs. It endangers our communities and our schools, rather than improve them or make them safer.

I will vote against this bill, because I believe that failing to invest in our children is not in our nation's best interests.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the Labor, Health and Human Services and Education appropriations bill.

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Chairman, thanks to research done through the National Institutes of Health, the United States is the world leader in biomedical research. I wish to express my support for funding of the NIH in this Labor, Health & Human Services and Education Appropriation bill. As we all know we are working towards doubling the NIH budget in five years. Although funding in this bill is not sufficient to continue that effort, but I know Chairman YOUNG and subcommittee Chairman PORTER will be working towards that goal as they work to finalize this bill, so I will be voting for the bill.

The benefits derived from biomedical research have led to medical breakthroughs that not only save lives, but have dramatically increased the quality of life for disease sufferers by decreasing levels of disability and reducing pain and suffering. We have proven that diseases can be detected, managed, eliminated

and prevented more effectively through new medical procedures and therapies. Nearly completed research on the deciphering the human genome will literally transform the practice of medicine.

Despite these extraordinary advances that have made to fight disease over the past century, serious health challenges still exist. Chronic diseases such as diabetes, Parkinson's, Alzheimer's, heart disease, cancer and stroke still pose enormous social and economic burdens to families throughout the world. Researchers in the United States, working through the NIH, are on the verge of finding cures for many diseases that still affect millions of people, but the key is funding to unlock the knowledge we need to find these cures.

The economic costs of illness in the United States alone are approximately three trillion dollars annually. This represents 31% of the nation's Gross Domestic Product. While this research has spawned the biotechnology revolution, the future of that industry is dependent upon the continued advances in biomedical research by the NIH. It is estimated that an investment of one billion dollars in NIH research saves approximately forty billion dollars in future health care costs. One single breakthrough can lead to spectacular financial savings for American families who face the burden of increasing health care costs.

While past accomplishments are helping to find cures for the major illnesses of today, we must also look to the future challenges and benefits that increased funding for biomedical research will provide. It is estimated that by 2025, one out of every five Americans will be over the age of 65. Because most of the chronic diseases and disabilities we face are associated with aging, it is vital that we double our research efforts. We must make the investment in research now to plan for the anticipated increase in the population of older Americans and to contain health care costs. In addition, the cost of illness threatens to rise because these diseases are constantly evolving to combat our own advances. Dangerous bacteria are growing more resistant to every new round of antibiotics that our researchers can discover. We must keep increasing funding for NIH to keep pace with the evolving face of disease.

Medical research represents the single most effective weapon we have to combat healthcare challenges today and in the future. We must build on the tremendous advances we have made in conquering and preventing disease by accelerating the momentum behind our medical research efforts. Therefore, increasing the funding for the National Institutes of Health should remain a top Congressional priority.

Two years ago, Congress pledged to double the NIH budget over a five year period. Since then, Congress has increased the NIH budget by 15% each of the last two years. It is now time for Congress to take the third step by providing another 15% increase, continuing us on that path. This requires a \$2.7 billion increase, which would bring the NIH budget to \$20.5 billion in FY 2001. We must stay on track to double the NIH budget by 2003. This is an investment that will dramatically improve the lives of countless Americans now and for years to come.

Through this third down payment towards doubling the NIH budget, we look forward to

enhanced research in some of the areas that have been presented at briefings to the Congressional Biomedical Research Caucus, which I co-chair. In fact, the increased investments that have recently been made are already leading to fundamental breakthroughs in the fight against disease. One exciting illustration of the results of this new research comes from recent progress on the development of new "gene-chip" technologies, which can be used to generate genetic fingerprints that measure what genes are turned on or turned off in certain types of cancers. In the past year, American scientists have used gene chip technology to discover that several cancers that were once indistinguishable with standard diagnostic methods can now be distinguished by their genetic fingerprints. In one striking case, a type of cancer with highly variable outcomes has suddenly been recognized to be two different diseases. One type is aggressive and quickly fatal, the other is slower with a likelihood of longer survival. Thus, it may now be possible to identify patients with these two types of cancer and treat them differently with more appropriate therapies.

Similarly, substantial new investments in biological computing and a new area called bioinformatics are catalyzing the fusion of clinical medicine, genetics, and information science. This important work will help us understand how each of our unique genetic constitutions predisposes us to different diseases and clinical outcomes.

A final example comes from new investment in bioengineering. Important new understanding of organ physiology, and cell growth is emerging rapidly. In the coming years, we expect that new research in these areas, stimulated by increased funding, will lead to the construction of new heart, liver, and pancreatic tissue for those who wait for transplants or tissue-based therapy.

I will support this bill with the knowledge that this Congress will do everything in its power to continue the effort to double the investment in the NIH over the next five years.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Chairman, they say that in politics, where you stand depends on where you sit. But the Labor-HHS-Education Appropriations bill the Republican leadership has brought to the floor looks bad from every seat in the House.

The bill fails our kids. It would undo the progress we've made toward improving the quality of education for every child by eliminating funding for the President's plan to hire 100,000 teachers, a plan we made a bipartisan down payment on last year. It would also force our children and teachers to continue working in overcrowded schools with leaky roofs and crumbling buildings, because this bill provides no funding for the President's school construction initiative. Finally, it provides ten percent less funding than the President requested for Head Start, guaranteeing that we will not be able to provide preschool education to all children who need it.

The bill fails families. The Baby Boomers are often called the "sandwich generation" because they often have to care for their children and their elderly parents. This bill fails those caregivers at both ends. It denies funding for the Family Caregiver Program, which provides support for 250,000 Americans who care for elderly or disabled relatives at home. It also cuts in half the President's increase in funding for child care, which will prevent 80,000 eligible families from getting help with child care.

The bill fails senior citizens. This bill shortchanges important senior programs like Meals-on-Wheels. It also shows the Republican Party's true colors on Medicare and Social Security by slashing funding for the Social Security Administration and the Health Care Financing Administration. Those agencies make sure seniors get their Social Security checks on time and receive the health care they're entitled to. Cutting the budgets of agencies that do this important work puts all seniors at risk.

The bill fails workers. This bill would, for the sixth year in a row, delay a Department of Labor regulation which would help to prevent 300,000 workers from being injured at work. Neither does it provide enough funding to operate the Unemployment Insurance program, which protects workers who lose their jobs. It cuts funding for worker training programs that help people get better-paying jobs with benefits.

The bill fails millions of Americans who suffer from deadly diseases. Over the past 3 years, Congress has made three installments on a bipartisan promise to double funding for the National Institutes of Health (NIH), the primary source of medical research in the United States. This year's increase is only six percent, far less than the fifteen percent increase needed to reach our goal in five years.

Finally, the bill fails the taxpayers. Over the past few years, the Department of Health and Human Services had dramatically reduced fraud and waste in the Medicare program. This bill slashes funding for HHS' anti-fraud activities.

The supreme irony here is that while the Republican Party is denying necessary funding for education, medical research and seniors, they plan to bring a tax bill to the Floor tomorrow that showers hundreds of billions of dollars in tax cuts on the very richest people in America. What does this say about the Majority's priorities.

This bill fails kids, families, seniors, workers, and taxpayers. It does not deserve the support of the House, and I urge its defeat.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Chairman, the Republican leadership has once again succeeded in bringing to the floor a Labor, Health and Education Appropriations bill designed to please only themselves and their right-wing friends. H.R. 4577 fails to make needed investments in public education and the domestic workforce, and, as the result, would undermine American competitiveness in the 21st century. This bill has already received what has now become its customary and well-deserved veto threat from the Clinton administration. It is clearly going nowhere, and should be soundly defeated.

This bill was doomed from its inception, because the economic premise upon which it is based is flawed. Earlier this year, before the appropriations process began, the Republican leadership decided to resume its efforts to push for big tax cuts for the rich. They attached hundreds of billions of dollars of these tax cuts to the minimum wage bill and the budget resolution. This decision to squander the surplus, rather than invest it, severely reduced the funds available to meet many of our Nation's critical needs.

Overall, the bill provides \$2.9 billion less than the President request for the Department of Education, and \$1.7 billion less for the Department of Labor. As the result, education,

job training, workplace safety, and other programs are either frozen or cut, significantly reducing the level of services that can be provided.

For example, the bill would slash Title I funding, forcing school districts to cut back on assistance to disadvantaged students. The Clinton/Clay class size reduction initiative is gutted, leaving school districts without the resources to hire and train 20,000 more top-quality teachers. Adequate funding is denied for after-school and summer programs intended to improve student achievement and reduce juvenile crime. And no funds are provided to renovate crumbling and unsafe schools.

At the same time efforts are ongoing in the Congress to erase limits on the immigration of foreign workers to fill high-tech jobs, this bill would make steep cuts in the funding of training programs aimed at helping domestic workers fill them and other positions. Dislocated workers and at-risk youth are particularly hard hit by these cuts, even though they are the ones most in need of skills training. By failing to adequately invest in our own workforce, the Republican leadership is jeopardizing American competitiveness and prosperity.

This bill also jeopardizes worker health and safety by shortchanging OSHA and blocking issuance of the ergonomics rule intended to prevent about 300,000 workplace injuries a year. The Wilson amendment would add insult to injury by cutting \$25 million more from OSHA.

Mr. Chairman, this appropriation bill is a disaster. It fails to adequately invest in education, and in the development and security of the Nation's workforce. I urge a no vote on H.R. 4577.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. All time has expired. Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

The amendments printed in Part A of House Report 106-657 are adopted.

The amendment printed in Part B of the report may be offered only by a Member designated in the report and only at the appropriate point in the reading of the bill, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chair may accord priority in recognition to a Member offering an amendment that he has printed in the designated place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Those amendments will be considered read.

The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may postpone a request for a recorded vote on any amendment, and may reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the time for voting on any postponed question that immediately follows another vote, provided that the time for voting on the first question shall be a minimum of 15 minutes.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 4577

*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, 2001, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING ADMINISTRATION  
TRAINING AND EMPLOYMENT SERVICES

For necessary expenses of the Workforce Investment Act, 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 Workforce Investment Act; the Women in Apprenticeship and Nontraditional Occupations Act; and the National Skill Standards Act of 1994; \$2,552,495,000 plus reimbursements, of which \$1,340,155,000 is available for obligation for the period July 1, 2001 through June 30, 2002; of which \$1,175,965,000 is available for obligation for the period April 1, 2001 through June 30, 2002, including \$1,000,965,000 to carry out chapter 4 of the Workforce Investment Act and \$175,000,000 to carry out section 169 of such Act; and of which \$20,375,000 is available for the period July 1, 2001 through June 30, 2004 for necessary expenses of construction, rehabilitation, and acquisition of Job Corps centers: *Provided*, That \$9,098,000 shall be for carrying out section 172 of the Workforce Investment Act, and \$3,500,000 shall be for carrying out the National Skills Standards Act of 1994: *Provided further*, That no funds from any other appropriation shall be used to provide meal services at or for Job Corps centers.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. JACKSON OF ILLINOIS

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JACKSON of Illinois:

Page 2, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by \$1,026,078,000)".

Page 2, line 14, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by \$572,578,000)".

Page 2, line 16, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by \$453,500,000)".

Page 2, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by \$253,500,000)".

Page 2, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by \$200,000,000)".

Page 3, line 4, insert before the period the following:

: *Provided further*, That funds provided to carry out section 171(d) of the Workforce Investment Act may be used for demonstration projects that provide assistance to new entrants in the workforce and incumbent workers

Page 4, line 16, after the first dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by \$154,000,000)".

Page 4, line 16, after the second dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by \$50,000,000)".

Page 5, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by \$154,000,000)".

Page 5, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by \$50,000,000)".

Page 16, beginning on line 21, strike "up to \$7,241,000 for the President's Committee on Employment of People With Disabilities, and including".

Page 16, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by \$14,361,000)".

Page 18, line 14, after the first dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by \$5,364,000)".

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER) reserves a point of order on the amendment.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I have a sound and sensible amendment that adds \$1.25 billion to skills programs at the Department of Labor.

Specifically, this amendment adds \$93 million to restore the President's request for adult skills training.

It adds \$389 million to restore the President's request for dislocated worker assistance.

It adds \$200 million to restore the President's request for youth opportunity grants.

It adds \$254 million to restore cuts in the summer jobs program resulting from the implementation of the Workforce Investment Act.

It adds \$61 million to restore the President's request for reintegration of youth.

It adds \$30 million to restore the President's request for incumbent workers, \$50 million to restore the President's request for employment services, \$154 million to restore the President's request for one-stop career centers.

It adds \$5 million to restore the President's request for homeless veterans, and it adds an additional \$14 million to restore the President's request for disability initiatives.

At the dawn of a new century, Mr. Chairman, America must close the skill gaps and open the doors of opportunity.

1345

This amendment invests in skills training that America's workers need to compete and succeed in the new economy. Some have argued that since the economy is so strong, we can afford not to invest in skills training programs.

I would argue that we cannot afford not to invest in skills training programs. An essential ingredient to sustaining the strong economy is to provide the skilled workers that businesses need. As Robert Kuttner, the BusinessWeek economist stated in his May 15, 2000 column, "what's holding back even faster economic growth is the low skill levels of millions of potential workers."

This strong economy gives us the rare opportunity to bring skills and jobs to individuals and communities that have for too long been left behind.

The demand for skilled workers means that the 13 million Americans in the untapped pools of potential, young people, displaced workers, individuals with disabilities, veterans and people who want to get off of welfare, have a chance to get and keep good, family-supporting jobs.

Since January 1993, the unemployment rate has fallen 7.3 percent to 3.9 percent, its lowest level in 30 years. Over 21 million new jobs have been created. Employment-population rates are at record highs.

Yet, all have not prospered. Many Americans are being left behind. Pockets of extremely high unemployment, pools of untapped, underutilized workers exist; and the risk of becoming a dislocated worker remains high.

In April 2000, there existed 13 million untapped and underutilized Americans: 5.2 million who are unemployed, 4.4 million who are out of the labor force but want to work, and 3.0 million who work part time but want to work full time.

The booming economy has led employers to say that their growing inability to find skilled workers that they need has generated upward pressure on wages, translating into higher consumer prices.

Concern is mounting that the broad-based skills shortages are putting our boom in jeopardy. Furthermore, it is inconsistent for Congress to disinvest in American workers at the very same time that we are debating the expansion of the H1-B visa program to offer job opportunities to foreign workers.

The workers we need to keep our economy growing are right here. They are in our cities and in our rural areas. They simply need us to invest more in skills training, as the President proposed, not less, as the House bill proposes.

This Congress passed bipartisan legislation in 1998, the Workforce Investment Act, to establish a workforce system, with One-Stop Career Centers as its cornerstone, that would provide employers with skilled workers they need and provide information and assistance for jobs and people seeking those jobs.

This is the first year of implementation of the new system and the House bill will gut the investments critical to implementation of WINA as envisioned by Congress and the administration.

This amendment, Mr. Chairman, very specifically places top priority on developing the skills of American workers, raising the participation of people with disabilities, strengthening the skills of youth and former welfare recipients, providing income support and training for dislocated workers, reintegrating ex offenders into the mainstream, and removing barriers, for example, childcare, that make it difficult to hold a job.

The bill before us today puts our expansion in jeopardy and will prevent

unprecedented prosperity from being even more broadly shared.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge my colleagues to support this amendment. We have never been at a more crucial time for investing in the skills of all Americans. If we do not take advantage of the opportunities this economy is providing right now, not next week, but right now, then we will, indeed, undermine our own potential as a Nation.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Does the gentleman from Illinois insist on his point of order?

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve my point of order.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman continues to reserve his point of order.

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

Mr. Chairman, the minority has talked about cuts in many places in the bill. Where there is cuts is in the Department of Labor and several of the programs are actual cuts from the previous year. For example, in adult job training there is a cut from \$950 million to \$857 million. For dislocated worker assistance, there is a cut from \$1.58 billion to \$1.382 billion. For youth opportunity grants, there is a grant from \$250 million to \$175 million. Those are the major accounts that are cut in the Department of Labor appropriation.

If I understand correctly, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. JACKSON) is offering amendments to add \$1.25 billion back to the bill. The gentleman does not offer any offset and it's simply an addition of funds that would put his amendment beyond the budget resolution.

The subcommittee, in recommending funding for adult training, youth training now including summer jobs and for dislocated workers, we recommended \$3.2 billion in the bill. That is a reduction, as I say, of \$300 million for these programs.

In addition, we recommended funding for youth opportunities grants \$75 million less than the year 2000, as I have stated, and less than the President's request.

These levels are recommended because of limited budget resources and, particularly, Mr. Chairman, because of the state of the economy.

According to the Department of Labor, in their 1999 annual report, unemployment averaged 4.2 percent in 1999, the lowest rate since 1969, the lowest rate in 20 years. A greater percentage of the population aged 16 and over is employed now than at any other time in U.S. history.

Minorities are making significant gains in employment, with unemployment among African Americans falling to 7.6 percent in May 1999, the lowest rate ever recorded. Hispanic unemployment reaching a record low of 5.9 percent in March of 1999.

The poverty rate has fallen to 12.7 percent in 1999, the lowest rate since 1979. The unemployment rate has been

below 4.2 percent since October of 1999, and payroll employment has grown by 2.3 persons since that time.

In other words, our economy is doing better than ever before, because there are more jobs than ever before. There is less unemployment than ever before. There is less unemployment among minorities in our country than ever before.

The money for job training, for adult job training, for dislocated workers, for youth opportunities, that is important money, but there are fewer people that need to be served in this astounding economy than there have been previously. We believe that there is sufficient money to serve the people that need the funding to provide opportunities for them, and we believe that the cuts therefore, are justified.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Illinois for yielding, and I want to just say at the very outset that I agree with the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) when he says that our chairman, the gentleman from Illinois (Chairman PORTER), if he had been dealt a different hand in the budget debate, in the budget resolution, that we might indeed be looking at stronger investments in this area.

Mr. Chairman, our concern today is something that is consistent with what something the Chairman of the Federal Reserve said, that our ability to sustain the current period of economic growth hinges on continued investment in the skills of American workers.

But the gentleman rightfully acknowledged in title I there are significant cuts; is there anything we might be able to do to improve upon those cuts?

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, obviously, moving the bill at this point is part of a longer process. We will sit down with the Senate that marked up a bill at \$5.5 billion higher than our allocation and perhaps there will be.

But, again, I believe that this is an area, while it is of great importance and is needed, the demand for these funds is lower because of a high employment rate, a very low unemployment rate and even so among minorities.

I certainly intend to do my very best within the funds that we have available ultimately to address these needs, as well as others. I think we have done a proper job in putting this at a fairly low priority because of the strength of our economy in this bill.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER) continue to reserve his point of order?

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve a point of order.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words,

and I rise in support of the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. JACKSON).

It is absolutely true that we have the lowest unemployment rate in generations. It is absolutely true that we have more jobs than ever in this economy, but you have heard the joke where a fellow is watching the politician on the television screen talking about all of the new jobs created, and he turns to his wife and says a lot of jobs are created, and I have got three of them.

There are lots of people who are working at low-paid jobs. Just a couple of months ago I ran into a single mother in Rhinelander, Wisconsin. Her husband had walked out on her, working like crazy at three different jobs trying to keep her head above water and support a child.

With all of the golden glow that we have on our economy, there is not yet enough to reach that woman, and hundreds of thousands just like her all over the country.

Chairman Greenspan of the Federal Reserve said this "the rapidity of innovation and the unpredictability of the directions it may take imply a need for a considerable investment in human capital. Workers in many occupations are being asked to strengthen their cognitive skills, basic credentials by themselves are simply not enough to ensure success in the workplace. Workers must be equipped not simply with technical know-how but also with the ability to create, analyze and transform information and to interact effectively with others. Moreover, that learning will increasingly be a lifelong activity. And it is not enough to create a job market that has enabled those with few skills to finally be able to grasp the first rung of the ladder of achievement.

"More generally, we must ensure that our whole population receives an education that will allow full and continuing participation in this dynamic period of the American economy."

That was said by one of those well-known fiscally irresponsible left-wing radical's, Alan Greenspan.

If you take a look at what this amendment is trying to do, I defy you to tell me it is not needed. This bill eliminates all funding for one stop career centers, America's labor market information system that the administration is trying to promote. It cuts assistance to \$215,000 dislocated workers. It eliminates assistance from 220,000 unemployment insurance claimants. It cuts adult job training for 37,000 adults. It eliminates the President's proposal to assist 80,000 noncustodial parents and low-income parents. It cuts employment assistance to 3,100 homeless veterans, on and on and on and on.

You can use any justification you want to explain the fact that this Congress apparently thinks more of providing tax cuts for the wealthiest 1 percent of people in this country than it does in providing a help up the job lad-

der for the poorest folks in our society or the least lucky in our society. But those are not our set of values on this side of the aisle, and I think the amendment offered by the gentleman demonstrates clearly what a preferable set of values would be.

It just seems to me that if we can afford tomorrow to say to someone who is unfortunate enough to inherit \$5 million, if we can afford to bleed all over the floor for that person, say, oh, you have such a burden, we are going to eliminate your taxes, then it seems to me we ought to be able to provide a few more nickels for people who need to upgrade their job skills.

This bill is clearly not adequate on that score, and I recognize that we are in a Wizard of Oz situation here, an Alice in Wonderland situation, because we may be able to offer an occasional amendment but we will not be able to get a vote on it because the rules preclude us from getting a vote.

This is the only way we have to try to identify what we think are the inadequacies of this bill. And it is the simple question, do you think the economy is going to be helped more by adequately equipping every single American worker or by giving those who already have so much some more? I think the answer to that ought to be obvious.

1400

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER) continue to reserve his point of order?

Mr. PORTER. Yes, Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the point of order.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Again, I would like to remind Congress, for the 20 years I sat here in the minority, we saw job-training programs being proliferated one after another until we got to 166 job-training programs. All of them so small that they were worthless, spread out over every agency downtown, 30 agencies as a matter of fact.

It was not until 1998, as a matter of fact, when we finally got people to stop that nonsense and said, what one has to do now is combine these programs, eliminate the bad programs, keep the good programs, combine them, get them back to the local area where the people know better what jobs are available and what jobs will be available in the future.

I would remind my colleagues that it is not until July 1 of this year when every State must have their workforce boards in place in order to meet the requirements of the Workforce Development Act, too early to call how well we have done because the real blow comes on July 1 when every workforce development board must be in place by those States.

So, again, for all those years, we had a golden opportunity to provide quality job-training programs. But we chose not to think about quality, only about quantity.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODLING. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I was hoping the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Chairman GOODLING) would be able to respond a little more specifically to the amendment and the request that we have in this amendment to add \$93 million to the adult skills training program.

If the gentleman from Pennsylvania would be kind enough to respond to our very simple question to increase the spending in this bill for \$93 million for just one of the programs that I outlined in the title 1 of the bill.

Our goal, Mr. Chairman, is to increase, in light of what Chairman Alan Greenspan indicated that we need to invest more money in underskilled, underutilized workers. I understand the comments of the gentleman from Pennsylvania a few moments ago, but I was hoping that he would respond more specifically to the thrust of this amendment.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, again, if I had all the money in the world, and I were in charge, my goal would be to take the quality programs, make them better, and spend as much money as you must spend in order then to make sure that we close that achievement gap, to make in order that we have improved the life of each American.

But that is not what happened. For all of those years, we spent the money. Title I is a good example, \$140 billion. It did not close the achievement gap one little iota. In fact, it may have even gotten worse, because no one cared whether it was a quality program. They only said more money will do the job. We will cover more children. Again, the disadvantaged suffered.

For all of these years, the only argument I have ever heard on this floor, and will hear it a million times again today, the only argument to conceal the failure of well-meaning programs that no one would allow us to make them work is, oh, a tax cut for the rich. I have heard that over and over and over again.

The problem is we have got to admit, as I told my committee over and over again, we have got to first admit the programs did not work. Then we have to be creative enough to make them work. That is what we have been trying to do in our committee.

I think we are going to have some success. I will not be here to see the success, but I think we have made the progress.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY).

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, I just want the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING) to know there are many of us on this side of the aisle who, for years,

shared his concern. But the issue, in my judgment, is how did we legislate excellence. The gentleman and I know it is very difficult. The challenge is, of course, to fund the programs that do work.

I would like to say, as I will speak later on my own time, that I join with the gentleman in wanting to support these good programs that do work; and I would be delighted to work with him and his successors in figuring out, as I ask every time in every hearing, how do we legislate excellence.

But the answer is not to cut back when there is so many people who need the education, they need the retraining, because not everyone is benefiting from this great economy.

So I am sure my colleagues on this side of the aisle would be delighted to work with the gentleman's successors to make sure that these programs are delivering. That is the challenge to all of us. We do not want to fund everything.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER) wish to continue to reserve the point of order?

Mr. PORTER. Yes, Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve my point of order.

Mrs. THURMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, maybe to add to this debate a little bit, particularly when it was brought up to the issue of local groups that are using these programs and find them to be important in delivery of employment, I just would like to add into this.

I have a letter here from a mayor, Paula DeLaney out of Gainesville. And she writes to me, "Dear Representative Thurman: We have just learned that severe cuts in the Department of Labor's FY 2001 appropriations are under consideration by both the House and Senate, and that these may eliminate or severely reduce funding for One-Stop Career Centers, Adult Employment and Training, Dislocated Workers Programs, and the Youth Opportunities Program. I am writing to tell you of the crucial importance of these threatened programs to Gainesville and to request your help in obtaining the resources needed to sustain our community's workforce investment system." Work force investment system.

She goes on to say, "The impact on Gainesville would include the following should these threatened cuts occur: To eliminate or reduce the One Stop Center Program would deny our local employers a single point of contact to list openings and find skilled workers.

"To cut Adult Employment and Training would deny many of our citizens the ability to obtain skills training needed for today's workplace.

"To reduce the Dislocated Workers Program would cause hardship to those citizens who, through no fault of their own, find themselves unemployed.

"To reduce the Youth Opportunities Program would create the most severe impact of all. While the national unem-

ployment rate has remained low, teenagers still face very high unemployment. Even more significant would be the impact on the future of our African American youth, already documented as disadvantaged in the competition for employment.

"All of these programs are now used to train our workforce and to provide local employers with a pool of skilled workers. I urge you to see that funding for an employment training program is restored. These programs are essential to local governments and to the citizens they serve. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely, Paula M. DeLaney, Mayor."

But even on another note, let me just say, we have had businesses in our offices for the last 6 months telling us they do not have enough workers. The unemployment is so low we do not have workers out there. We are all scrambling up here. How are we going to get high-tech workers? So we have the H1B program so we can bring over 200,000 people.

But you are cutting out of this bill an opportunity for hundreds of thousands of people to have an opportunity to participate. That is just flat wrong. Not to mention what about the nurses, teachers, the shortages that we have all been talking about. Every State legislature in this country is grappling with getting good teachers, nurse shortages, all of these areas that are critical to quality of life of our communities.

Let us not shut down these issues for our communities to succeed and, most importantly, to have a skilled workforce that is desperately needed in a time of low unemployment. I commend the gentleman for bringing this to our attention.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, would the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. THURMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say, look what this Congress did just a few weeks ago in taking the lid off of Social Security income because employers all over the country were telling us there are not enough skilled workers. Look at what we are doing with additional visas to bring these foreign workers into this country because employers are telling us they cannot find enough skilled workers. All you have to do to understand why this amendment is necessary is open your eyes, open your ears, and read your mail.

Mrs. THURMAN. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, we have given hope to employers by having skilled workers. We all will hear from our communities about how important these issues are. Let us not shut out the very same people that you talked about giving these programs to now have gotten them developed, have done a good job, and then pull the rug out from underneath them.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve my point of order.

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number words.

Mr. Chairman, I want to just talk a little bit about some of the priorities that we have put in this bill that are very good that address the very needs that my friends on the other side of the aisle are bringing up.

But first I want to remind this body that, for nearly a generation under Democrats' control, this Congress continued to overspend the amount of money that was coming into the Federal Government. They continued to spend every penny of the Social Security surplus. They continued to spend every penny of the Medicare surplus.

What was the money spent on? It was spent on too many programs that were too inefficient. Instead of stopping and looking at what we were doing to find out what works, what is the best investment in our dollars, we just continued to blindly throw money at the program, at different programs.

I see this continuing now in some of the proposals. I have a chart here that talks about one of the high priorities in this bill. It is a program that works, and it works for the people who are in need of finding good programs or good jobs and in need of getting good skills, and that is the disadvantaged youth in America.

This chart shows that, from fiscal year 1992 through fiscal year 1995, a slight increase in the job corps funding. But under Republican control, we put a priority in job corps funding because it works. It is a substantial investment in this job corps program.

Now, this funding is part of the Federal effort to provide employment assistance to the disadvantaged youths between ages 16 and 24, those people who are just trying to develop their skills, trying to find their place in life. It is accomplished through programs that have a proven track record. Since 1995, over \$300 million has been added to the job corps program, a nearly 30 percent increase over that time.

Now, the investment in the job corps is an investment in a program that has been proven to work for specifically disadvantaged youths. I want to emphasize that point. A recent independent evaluation program found that job corps participation led to an increase in one full school year of time spent in education and training, training that focused on vocational skills.

There was a substantial increase in student attainment of GED and vocational certification, an 11 percent earnings gain for job corps participants, and a reduction of 20 percent in arrests, convictions, and incarcerations of job corps participants.

Under the appropriation, since 1995, 11 job corps centers have been added, including the fiscal year 2001 request before the House. From 1989 to 1995, this period here on the left side of the chart, under the Democratic-controlled House, only four job corps centers were added in the national total.

Now, some of the excuses for this blind deluge of more money into this

bill I think comes from the argument they say that there is this tax cut that has been threatened by the Republicans. Well, we have overpaid the cost of government, and we do want to return that change. When one goes to McDonald's and one orders \$4.50 worth of food, one expects 50 cents of change back.

When one has the price of government being overfunded, the change ought to go back to the taxpayers, those people who work so hard.

Well, we have overpaid the cost of government. There is room for tax relief. Still we are protecting every penny of Social Security surplus, every penny of Medicare surplus. This money that was in the past spent on programs that did not work, we have dedicated this money to Social Security, the surplus from Social Security, dedicated the surplus from Medicare to Medicare. Still there remains money coming in that is over and above the cost of government.

So when we do look at what programs that we are going to fund, we ought to fund those that have a proven track record, eliminate those that are not very efficient and continue.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TIAHRT. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Maybe there is a little misunderstanding of my amendment because it keeps getting couched in Democratic and Republican terms, who controls the House, who does not control the House. I know the gentleman's strong advocacy for youth.

My amendment specifically adds \$200 million to restore the President's request for youth opportunity grants, and it adds an additional \$61 million to restore the President's request for the reintegration of youth into the economic mainstream.

Would the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. TIAHRT) please comment on whether or not he supports that idea in his advocacy for the youth and whether or not he supports my amendment.

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would like to listen, I do support advocating for youth, especially disadvantaged youth, and I think we do so through this bill and the priorities that we have established through the job corps and other areas.

I think the reason that we have brought in other issues is to respond to what has been brought up by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and others.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. TIAHRT) has expired.

(On request of Mr. OBEY, and by unanimous consent, Mr. TIAHRT was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

1415

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

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I would simply like to welcome the gentleman aboard. I know it has been a long road on the road to Damascus, but I have been here long enough to remember when the majority party was singing hosannas because Ronald Reagan was trying to zero out the Job Corps and David Stockman said that it did not work, despite the fact that three studies from his own shop showed that it did. I also recall that just 3 short years ago the majority party tried to cut \$100 million out of the President's request for Job Corps.

So I welcome the conversion. I wish it had come sooner, but Allah be praised; hosanna; thank God; alleluia; welcome aboard.

Mr. TIAHRT. Reclaiming my time. Mr. Chairman, I guess we can expect the gentleman's support for this bill on final passage, now that we have agreed together that we have an emphasis on Job Corps. I thank the gentleman for his vote on this bill.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. JACKSON). He has put forth a number of propositions. Those propositions are that we have an outstanding economy; we have a surplus.

Our colleagues differ on the reason for that. My view is that because of 1990's bill, which they largely voted against, and the 1993 economic program, which every one of them voted against, we have this economy and we have these surpluses. As a matter of fact, as they, I am sure, know, their own CBO just 2 years ago said that the reason we have the surplus is because of the 1993-94 Congress, which, of course, the Democrats controlled. And in the two Congresses subsequent to that, the Republicans added \$12 billion to the debt, while we reduced it \$142 billion. So that is what the Republicans' CBO says.

But that aside, this is a substantive important debate. It is about priorities. And I want to say to my friend, the chairman of the subcommittee, for whom I have, as he knows, unbridled respect and affection, he got up initially in opposition to the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois and said, look, we have the best economy that we have had in a very long period of time. We have 3.9 percent unemployment. And as a result of that, people are employed, people are working, and, therefore, they do not need the services and, therefore, we can cut, as he said, in real terms these programs.

Now, I hope the chairman will listen to me, because while his general proposition may be true, it is not true for one of the specific cuts that I am going to speak on. This bill adds \$14 million back into the bill through this amendment for those with disabilities.

In 1990, in a very bipartisan way, we passed the Americans with Disabilities

Act. George Bush signed that act on July 26, 1990. One of the titles in that bill was to get those with disabilities into the job force so that they could work, so that they could support themselves, so that they would have a substantial measure of self-respect.

As the chairman well knows, there are only 29 percent of those with disabilities who are working in America today. Only 29 percent. Now, that means, without much math, that 71 percent of those with disabilities are not working. It is not 3.9 percent, 14 percent, 18 percent, or 25 percent. It is 71 percent of those with disabilities who are not working. So Secretary Herman suggested to the President that we add some money into this bill, approximately \$21 million, for the purposes of establishing an office that would reach out to those with disabilities, reach out to employers and bring them together so that they could be employed and have, as Mr. Gingrich so often referred to, an opportunity society. Well, it meant, as George Bush said, an opportunity society for those with disabilities.

What the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. JACKSON) is trying to do is to say that Secretary Herman and President Clinton were correct; that we need to make this effort, we need to make sure those with disabilities are brought into the workforce. And I would say to my friend that over three-quarters of those who are not working want to work. They want to work. What this initiative of the President, which the gentleman has cut out of his bill, is trying to do is to help those people work.

We passed a welfare bill. It was controversial, but its premise was that in America if an individual can work, they should work to support themselves and to have a sense of self-worth and good feeling about themselves. We know that that expands the ability of human beings to feel good about themselves and be healthy.

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

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

Mr. PORTER. We are trying to figure out exactly what the gentleman is referring to when he is talking about the disabled in the bill.

Mr. HOYER. The Office on Disabilities is cut \$14 million in the chairman's bill from the President's request of \$21 million or \$23 million.

Mr. PORTER. From the President's request. I see.

Mr. HOYER. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I would say to the gentleman that it is flat funded at \$9 million. But this is a new initiative. So the entire thing is cut. This is a new initiative to switch from the commission into an office. And the premise of Secretary Herman was that we were not succeeding.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING) said, well, if we are succeeding, do away with the program. If we are not succeeding, do away with the program.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. HOYER was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. HOYER. So the Secretary's premise, Mr. Chairman, was to add this money, which the President included in his bill, \$14 million, to reach out to those with disabilities.

When George Bush, Republican President of the United States, signed the disabilities act on July 26, 1990, he said to all those with disabilities in America, 43 million people then, over 50 million now, he said to all those folks that we want to include them in; we want to give them the opportunity to work. But we have not succeeded. Why? Because we have not made the effort.

We passed the bill. Very nice. As the American public knows, to say in a statute rhetoric that they are free or they can work or they are going to be educated is fine, but if we do not work to make that happen and it is not reality, our country loses, and those with disabilities lose.

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

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

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to say to my colleague that, obviously, part of our problem is the allocation that we had to work under. We do consider this to be an important priority; and, of course, we will do our best when we go to conference to try to address this issue.

Mr. HOYER. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I would hope we would, therefore, adopt the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the concern of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. JACKSON) with employment of people, and I find it interesting to hear some descriptions, because I keep hearing from the White House and from the administration talk about the booming American economy. I know we had new figures in Oklahoma that show we have the lowest unemployment, which means the best employment, in decades; under 3 percent.

It may be different in the gentleman's district or in the gentleman's State, but right now businesses all over the country are saying that we have got to give them more visas to bring immigrants in from other countries to do the jobs because there are so many jobs available in the United States of America. And yet it sounds like the gentleman is saying, gosh, we have to help people find work.

If we look at these programs, because I know some are like summer jobs initiatives, hundreds of millions of dollars proposed so that mayors in cities all over the country can put on these seminars and say, oh, this is the mayor's summer job fair for youth. And it hap-

pens in most every city in the country. How many people know that that is coming out of the Federal Treasury, so mayors all over the country can claim responsibility for kids working? Except a lot of those are, frankly, make work jobs. They are not really working. Some of them are sitting around listening to music but being paid for it.

I realize that is not always the case, and I know that is not what the gentleman from Illinois intends. But when employment is up and unemployment is down, they say, well, the answer is we have to spend more on Federal job programs. And, of course, if employment is down and unemployment is up, they say, oh, that is another sign we need to spend more money on Federal job programs. Whether times are good, times are bad, times are indifferent there is only one answer we hear; we have to spend more. Why? Not because there is a real need. The need, as people see it, is political. They want to tell people if they want to work, they are going to be beholden to a politician, because we want their first, their first effort to be to turn to some sort of Federal job program so that a Congressman or a mayor or somebody else in politics can claim credit for getting them work.

Well, let me tell my colleagues, the economy does not boom because government is out there with make-work programs or Federal work programs. It booms when we enable businesses, private individuals, to flourish and hire people. And believe me, there are tons of jobs out there for kids this summer and for adults as well. That is what we want. But is there not ever a moment of relief when we say we have had some success with getting the American economy going so there are opportunities for people if they are just willing to take them? We say, oh, no, no, we cannot do that. We have to have more Federal money instead.

Why not relieve the tax burden on people, not have so many Federal programs, not teach them that they should be beholden to somebody in politics for the right to work? Teach them self-accountability, teach them the free enterprise system. We have tons of Federal job programs already, billions of dollars each year, and I do not think it is justified to say we should quit paying down the national debt so that, instead, we can add another \$200 million to these spending programs. I do not think that is the way to go.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise first of all in strong support of the Jackson amendment. But before I get to why this amendment is so crucially important in our new economy, where we are involved in trade and worker dislocation and underskilled and unskilled workers, I want to join in the chorus of accolades for the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER).

There are a lot of great things we can say about the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER) and his devotion to education and his hard work in his district, in his independence in his voting record, fighting for what he believes in, but I want to state in one area of this bill, where he has fought to increase the National Institutes of Health spending, where I have children and young people in my district that get on a plane, oftentimes once a month to go from Indiana to Washington, DC., to get help at that National Institutes of Health, that that funding increase is saving lives all over the third district of Indiana, the State of Indiana, and the world, literally, and we thank the gentleman for his efforts in that area.

On this Jackson amendment, I want to state my unequivocal support. The chairman knows that we are in a new world, with new challenges, and a new economy. And in this new world we have challenges, such as how do we help our workers get cradle-to-grave training in unskilled and underskilled areas?

In my district, in the third district of Indiana, in the Midwest, the heart and soul of manufacturing in this country, we have many of our workers that are currently trying to move from the tool box to new technology and training. They are trying to move from how to work with a power drill and a hammer and a screwdriver to a robotic arm and a computer. This Jackson amendment helps the unskilled worker and the underskilled worker get those skills to move from the tool box to the technology of the future.

The second reason I support the Jackson amendment is because it deals with dislocated workers. Now, we just had 237 people vote for the China trade bill, and we are going to have some dislocation in trade in the world. New Democrats, for one, believe that we need to follow up on our trade votes with investing in the workers of this country and making sure that they can survive in this new economy; that we can export products into China, not jobs into China.

1430

So we need to make sure this dislocated worker that was in a foundry gets the new skill to go work in a chip manufacturing plant.

So, Mr. Chairman, this Jackson amendment realizes the importance of investing in underskilled, investing in unskilled workers. This Jackson amendment understands the new economy and the challenges of trade. This Jackson amendment understands that we need, with our business community and our unions, one of the biggest challenges, new workers and more skilled and more productive workers. That is what we are investing in with the Jackson amendment, to make sure that skilled workers are a premium and that we do not just address the challenges of this economy by bringing in H-1B visa personnel from India and

China but we invest in our workers here in America.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER) has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. ROEMER was allowed to proceed for 30 additional seconds.)

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, our amendment is very, very specific. The activities covered for youth in this House bill is 599,400 youth will be covered under this bill. Our amendment moves that number to 739,000 youth. For youth opportunities, the House bill covers 40,700 Americans. Our bill moves that number to 84,600 Americans.

For young offenders, it moves the House bill from 3,500 youth under the bill to 18,800 youth under the bill; adult activities from 342,800 to 380,000.

I want to thank the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER) for his strong support of this amendment. This is a pro-American amendment, not a Democratic amendment, particularly at a time, as the gentleman pointed out, that our economy is doing so well. Let us spread the wealth.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, this is a pro-American amendment, and it is a pro-worker amendment, and it is a pro-business amendment.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve my point of order.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Jackson amendment and with great respect for our distinguished Chair, because I am sure that he would be willing to work with us to sit down and figure out a plan so we can help strengthen our workers and make sure that all of our citizens have the opportunity to succeed.

This amendment invests in the adult, youth, and dislocated worker training that Americans need to compete and succeed in the new economy. Investing in training is not only good sense, it is good business. An essential ingredient to sustaining a strong economy is to ensure that we are training the skilled workers that this economy needs.

Since January 1993, the unemployment rate has fallen, we have heard, from 7.3 percent to 3.9 percent, its lowest level in 30 years. And that is great. Over 21 million new jobs have been created. Employment population rates are at a record high. That is great news.

But, unfortunately, many Americans have not shared in these benefits. They may live in areas of extremely high unemployment, areas where the industries are changing, workers are underutilized, where the risk of becoming a dislocated worker remains high. Amer-

icans are worried. In fact, last year 33 percent of workers surveyed said they were frequently concerned about being laid off. This figure exceeds, much to my surprise, comparable figures of 17 percent and 21 percent in 1979 and 1989 at similar points in the business cycle and even exceeds the rate during the 1981-1982 recession.

We cannot completely protect American industry and workers from the vast changes in our economy, but we can do something to address their concerns and their needs for retraining.

To keep the good economy going, we need to intensify, not reduce, our efforts to increase access to broad-based skills training. Now is the time. The unprecedented strength of this economy gives us the rare opportunity to bring skills and jobs to individuals and communities that have for too long been left behind.

There are approximately 13 million Americans, men and women, moving from welfare to work, young people who have dropped out of school, displaced workers, individuals with disabilities and veterans who need the training and the opportunity to get and keep good family-supporting jobs.

I do not see my colleague, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ISTOOK), on the floor, but I did want to address some of his comments. I agree with my colleagues who understand that we have to invest in the programs that do work and discontinue the programs that do not work. But there is a difference. Maybe there is a distinction between our sides of the aisle.

I believe that we need better evaluation of programs that are not working. We have to make sure they are really training our young people for the jobs that exist, not cut them out.

Now, there are some who would say, and I think the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ISTOOK) was saying that before, that if a program is not working, get rid of it. I see too many young people who need the training to get the new jobs. And as we were talking before, no matter which side they are on the recent trade debate, we are here asking for more visas to bring people in from India and China, more skilled workers in.

There are too many people in our country who need that training to be part of the new economy. Therefore, I strongly support the amendment of my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. JACKSON).

We have a responsibility at this time of prosperity to make sure that we are reaching out and giving every young person that opportunity to get the training so that they can succeed, and I think that is what this is all about.

So I want to applaud the gentleman and support him. I know that our chairman will be happy to work with us later on in the process, and I hope we can continue to invest in these programs so we can train our workers that are being displaced.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve my point of order, and

I ask unanimous consent to strike the requisite number of words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman continues to reserve his point of order; and, without objection, the gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I would say to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), who was not here when the chairman of the full committee spoke, that we have, as the gentlewoman knows, recently eliminated over 150 job-training programs and consolidated those into a much, much smaller number. And, as he mentioned, evaluations are being conducted today to determine whether they are providing the kind of results we are looking for, for people or not. We do not yet have that data, but we believe that they are undoubtedly doing a much better job than all the little programs did in terms of getting results for people.

I would also say to the gentlewoman that, since most of these programs are administered through the States where there are pockets of unemployment that are higher than in other areas, the States can direct their money to where it is most needed. So there is a flexibility enough in the programs to address needs that are particular at any one place.

I think the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER) has left the floor, but he mentioned the need for support for workers that are displaced by trade. That is a mandatory program in the Department of Labor. It is funded at \$94 million, and funds there should be ample to take care of people that might be displaced by reason of trade rather than for other reasons.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PORTER. I yield to the gentlewoman from New York.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank my distinguished colleague for his comments. I appreciate his efforts to provide for evaluation dollars to make sure these programs are effective.

I would just say that where there may be some disagreement, and I am hoping that we can work together as we move towards the final product, that as we reevaluate the needs, the needs for the H-1B visas, that we can take this dollar amount into consideration; and there may be more need, as we are saying there is, for more investment in particular areas.

That does not mean that what we are doing is not trying to establish the best programs and evaluate them and make sure they are succeeding. But I think we disagree, and we believe that there has to be even more investment because it is so critical at this time of displacement as a result of trade and other areas.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, there is certainly no difference between us in terms of our intent to provide the best possible opportunities for people who are outside

the workforce to be trained for jobs that can provide them a higher standard of living and to provide those protections for individuals that are needed in a very dynamic economy.

We simply feel that by reason of the economy growing so fast and unemployment being so low and employment being so high that there is simply less demand than there is where the economy is not performing that way as it has sometimes in the past.

So I do not think there is any real disagreement among us except that we feel that these are lower priorities than others in the bill given our need to choose priorities given this very, very strong economy.

Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve my point of order.

Mr. STRICKLAND. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, sometimes I think that those of us who serve in this Chamber need a reality check. I serve a county where the unemployment rate is 17.1 percent. I serve multiple counties that have double digit unemployment. That is why I rise today in strong support of the Jackson amendment to restore funding for programs that help jobless Americans.

I guess some people think that things are so good that we do not have any dislocated workers to worry about. I would invite the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ISTOOK) and others to come to my district in southern Ohio and see the conditions there, come and talk with one of the 800 coal miners who are about to lose their jobs in a region that suffers 10.5 percent unemployment, miners who are awaiting word today on a job-training grant they view as their best hope for future employment.

I would like for them to come and talk to one of the 550 union workers from the Goodyear plant who lost their jobs last summer and are now back in school thanks to a Federal dislocated workers grant. Without further education, how can they ever expect to land a job in a county with an unemployment rate over 11 percent?

I would like for my colleagues here to come to southern Ohio and talk to some of the 619 union workers from Ironton Iron who lost their jobs in March and who just recently received word that there would be trade adjustment assistance for them.

This community of just over 12,000 people has lost over 1,200 jobs in the last year and a half. Ten percent of the entire population is jobless. Tell them they do not deserve a second chance.

I would like for my colleagues to come to southern Ohio and visit the Piketon uranium enrichment facility and talk to the enrichment workers who will lose their jobs next month because this Government chose to privatize their industry. Go tell them they are not a priority.

Mr. Speaker, this Nation may be doing well; but there are people, and many of them are in my district, who

are being left behind. This Congress should not be funding tax cuts for the wealthy and at the same time cutting funds for training jobless workers. It is unconscionable.

For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to support the Jackson amendment.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I am really excited that the gentleman from southern Ohio (Mr. STRICKLAND) came to the floor today to make the case for support of this amendment.

Under the House bill, 215,800 fewer of the 3.3 million workers who lose their jobs through no fault of their own each year will be served under the President's request of \$389 million for dislocated worker assistance, which my amendment, Mr. Chairman, restores to the Labor, HHS mark.

Mr. Chairman, every time I come to this House floor and offer an amendment of the magnitude that we are talking about, someone inevitably says, minorities are doing better. I mean, here comes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. JACKSON) to the House floor. He has got to be talking about minorities.

The gentleman does not represent a district primarily of minorities, but he talked about counties where unemployment in his congressional district are as high as 17 percent.

1445

I was hoping that the gentleman would please expound upon what the implications of this increase would do for his congressional district.

Mr. STRICKLAND. My people who have lost their jobs through no fault of their own, these are salt of the earth people, people who want to work, who want to enjoy the American life as we enjoy it here in this Chamber. Yet they are being deprived oftentimes of getting the skills they need to enable them to go out and to compete. These are folks who have worked at steel foundries, they have worked at heavy manufacturing jobs. Those jobs are disappearing from my district. They need to go back; they need to learn how to become computer literate. They need new technological skills. Without them, they are destined to be jobless. We just simply cannot forget those people. I applaud the fact that we have a booming economy. I applaud the fact that in Redmond, Washington, I have heard some of the average salaries are at six figures. But I have got people who are struggling to survive. This Congress cannot forget those Americans. If we do, we are being negligent and we are failing. We are failing not only our individual constituents, but we are failing this country.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. I thank the gentleman for his support of my amendment.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve my point of order.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Jackson amendment to restore \$1.25 billion for skill training programs at the Department of Labor. Last week, I joined over 200 young people from a coalition of Alternative Schools Network, CCA Academy, the Latino Alternative School, 200 young people who were marching and protesting. They were marching and protesting the reductions of millions of Federal dollars allocated to skilled training programs for at-risk youth. I, along with the 200 people there, tossed peanuts around to symbolize the small amount of money being allocated to skill training programs and the Labor-HHS appropriations bill.

If this budget appropriations process was a poker game, we would have to say that Labor-HHS was dealt a weak hand but still had to play. Therefore, I believe that the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER) has done what he could with a faulty deck stacked against him.

Mr. Chairman, these people were not protesting for the things that normal teenagers are often concerned about. Rather, these teenagers were protesting for the opportunity to learn. They were protesting for the opportunity to become well-trained workers and the opportunity to make contributions to this Nation. They were protesting so that we will not have to import workers from foreign countries to take care of skilled job opportunities that are needed.

If we truly want to improve the environment of those less fortunate in this society, what we really need to do is provide the necessary funding this amendment calls for. We need to show our communities that we believe that education and job training are essential tools for success. We need to show that we understand what it means to a community when the businesses are downsizing, privatizing, and moving out of the community and in many instances out of the country, obviously displacing workers and increasing the need for training so that they can survive and participate.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I urge a vote in support of the Jackson amendment. If we had an adequately funded skill training program as well as an adequately funded Labor-HHS appropriations bill, we could truly fulfill our duty to help build a society where no sick person would go unattended, no hungry person would go unfed, no able-bodied person would go without adequate employment. Mr. Chairman, we need to ante up. We need to live up to our promise, live up to our duty, live up to our responsibility and vote yes to the Jackson amendment.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve my point of order.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, when Congress passed the Workforce Investment Act, we believed that we were making a statement about the importance of investing in the American worker. Because by investing in the American worker, we are investing in the future of America. We are investing in developing skills for American workers. We are investing in the hopes and dreams of American workers. We are investing in the hopes and dreams of those who are dislocated, those who are disabled, those who are young, those who are offenders, to those who want to fully participate in what we call the American dream. We are investing in assisting American business in helping to provide American business with a well-trained workforce. We are investing in the jobs of tomorrow.

We all know that unemployment is low, but unemployment is low among trained workers. Everyone knows that. But unemployment remains a crisis among teenagers, minorities, and dislocated workers. I represent the State of Ohio and the City of Cleveland. Our manufacturing economy is in transition. Over the last year, we have seen representatives from the State of Ohio, from the State of Michigan, the State of Indiana, the State of Pennsylvania take to the floor of this House to talk about the impact of our trade policies on the steel industry.

We sought protection for our steel industry because tens of thousands of jobs have been at risk because of dumping. But in some cases, the job loss was felt, and in manufacturing industry after manufacturing industry, we have seen a dislocated workforce with people hungry for retraining. We saw over 400,000 American jobs lost in NAFTA. We will see hundreds of thousands of jobs lost in our trade deal with China, where we have a \$70 billion trade deficit. That job loss will not only be in manufacturing where we need people retrained, but that job loss will be in high-tech industries where people who are currently working in high-tech industries will need to be retrained.

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

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

Mr. PORTER. I would simply say to the gentleman that trade adjustment assistance is a mandatory account and it is fully funded obviously in the bill. So that part, no cuts have been made obviously.

Mr. KUCINICH. I thank the gentleman. The point being that not only have we a challenge with respect to the existing workforce but the workforce of tomorrow is going to be severely impacted by policies which do not take a strong stand for worker retraining. The Workforce Investment Act called for one-stop shopping, for helping people make applications, getting them into a program, getting them into retraining.

So we go from a one-stop system to a full-stop system.

The legislation which we will be voting on absent the Jackson amendment cuts \$21 million from job opportunities for young people. Now, I know there have been people on this floor talking about the summer jobs program just being some kind of a slush fund. How dare this House of Representatives attack opportunities for young people who otherwise would not have a job. It is the moral obligation of government to stand as a guarantor of employment for our young people if the private sector does not or cannot provide the jobs. It is our moral obligation. We need to show our young people that it pays to work. We need to develop in our young people the work ethic. We need to stand strong and to say that wherever we can provide more opportunities for our young, that we provide those opportunities. We need to make sure that we look at the implications of welfare reform here. We are taking people off welfare, and we are cutting job training programs. There is something wrong with this picture.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) has expired.

(On request of Mr. FORD, and by unanimous consent, Mr. KUCINICH was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PORTER. I would say the rhetoric is soaring here. If this is that high a priority, what is wrong with offering an amendment to move some funds out of another account of lower priority to this priority? This amendment is out of order because the gentleman has not sought any offsets. He just adds spending without any responsibility. If it is that high a priority, I would say to the gentleman from Ohio, offer an amendment to move money from a low priority account and let us consider it.

Mr. KUCINICH. Reclaiming my time, this is the tax break issue. We are going to get into that. Yes, there is no offset, but there are some who are being very insistent on passing tax cuts for the wealthy. If there was not this insistence, there would be money in the budget to invest in working families. We are told a rising tide lifts all boats. But what if people are not in the boat? What if they do not know how to swim?

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve my point of order.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. JACKSON) for his leadership and thank all of my colleagues on this side of the aisle for theirs as well on this important issue.

We have heard it mentioned over and over again. We are indeed, I say to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING), the chairman of my full committee, at the zenith of our

prosperity as a Nation. It is amazing. We have heard those in this Congress criticize this administration. We have heard those in this Congress try to take credit for the amazing growth that has taken place over the last 8 years.

It is difficult, it is hard to imagine that we have come so far and that we have accomplished so much considering the rhetoric that goes back and forth. Eight years ago the Dow was at 3500. Today it is three times that. Eight years ago the unemployment rate was hovering at about 8 percent. Now it is around 4 percent. Eight years ago there were only 50 worldwide Web sites. Today there are more than 50 million.

We are only at the beginning of this amazing revolution. Many of our companies, American companies are producing more wealth than many countries around the world. But in many communities, including my home of Memphis, talk about the growth of the Dow and even the NASDAQ is almost as foreign as international monetary policy.

A few of us on this side had the opportunity, Mr. Chairman, to visit some of our high-tech leaders out in Silicon Valley over the recent break. We can read about it and listen to those talk about the amazing and wonderful things happening out there, but until you actually witness it, it is difficult to grasp, to see young people really at the start of a revolution helping to transform our entire economy and really everything that we enjoy and do in life really to produce a positive benefit.

We had an opportunity to meet those who are sequencing the human genome. It is amazing in a few years we might be able to attack breast cancer and prostate cancer and catch those cells early on. I thank the gentleman from Illinois for all his work with the National Institutes of Health. But the common denominator in all that these leaders out there talked about was the need to close the skills deficit that is plaguing our domestic workforce.

We will vote in a few weeks, perhaps in a few days on whether or not to raise the quota, and "quota" on that side of the aisle is often a profane word, but to raise the quota for H1-B visas to bring in workers to fill jobs here in America because we have not stepped up to the plate to train a new generation of workers.

The one issue that came out of all the sessions that we had, Mr. Chairman, the one thing that could jeopardize our prosperity and continued growth is the lack of an investment in a qualified workforce for the future.

1500

I support raising this quota in the short term, but it is foolish to believe for one moment that we are going to solve our domestic workforce challenges and problems by bringing in foreigners every year to fill the jobs which we should be training people to do here.

With this vote on the Jackson amendment, we make this choice, I say to all of my colleagues: do we wish to continue to be a Nation of entrepreneurs and innovators and workers, or do we want to banish ourselves to a country of temporary workers and low-wage workers? My Republican colleagues have asked for offsets. I suggest that they cut their tax break, make some investments in children and young people throughout this Nation, not just for these young people, but for all of those leaders in industry. I am sure we could go home, and this is not a partisan issue back home, Republican businessmen, Democratic businessmen and business women all say the same thing, and that is that they are looking for more qualified workers.

Mr. Chairman, I would close on this note, and perhaps I think the most exciting thing about what the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. JACKSON) is doing, restoring the money for youth opportunity grants and summer jobs programs for kids. The main reason I support summer jobs for kids is because I want your wallets to stay in your back pockets, I want your hub caps to stay on your cars, I want women's pocketbooks to stay on their shoulders.

When we teach and train young people and expose them to the rigors and habits of work, good things happen, Mr. Chairman, good things happen, I say to Members on both sides of the aisle. Last week the application period for the Memphis summer jobs program closed, and 800 teens will have jobs for the summer. That is wonderful. That is the good news. But the bad news, Mr. Chairman, is that 3,000 go home without jobs. We will find a way to arrest them if they do something wrong during the summer; we will find a way to process them; we will find a way to prosecute them; we will find a way to house them for a few days or a few weeks. But we cannot find the capacity, we cannot find the wherewithal, we cannot find a solution amidst all the rhetoric, to just give them a summer job, give them an opportunity.

I am a little offended when I hear some of my colleagues brag about the job core center; I brag about it too, but they are two totally different programs we are talking about here. Sensible Members on that side understand that; sensible Members on this side understand that. Let us discontinue the name calling and the game playing. Instead of arresting these kids, let us give them a job and an opportunity and in the meantime help prepare them for the demands of this new marketplace.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve my point of order.

Mr. BLAGOJEVICH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, let me talk a little bit about summer jobs. I want to associate myself with the previous speaker. I think it certainly makes perfectly good sense to do what we can to make sure that the kids have a chance to

work as opposed to giving them a chance to hang around a street corner. There is no question about it, if the kids are employed, working on and pursuing something tangible and something productive keeps them away from the street corners, keeps them away from the bad influences that could cause them to, frankly, at a turning point in their lives, either move towards a productive life or go down the other route.

I believe that a short-term investment in summer jobs programs for kids, for teenage kids in disadvantaged communities is a long-term investment, not only in the next generation of Americans, but also in terms of protecting the taxpayers' pocketbook. Because if we put our money into the kids early enough and give them a chance to learn the habits of work, we are probably, in all likelihood, creating a workforce and a next generation of Americans that are going to value work and not hang around the street corner, not get arrested and not cost the taxpayers dollars that they ultimately pay to incarcerate them because at a turning point in their lives they have taken the wrong path.

Mr. Chairman, studies show, studies show that early work experience increases somebody's earning potential by 10 to 12 percent. One year on a job during a summer means 2 years in college in terms of earning potential for the future. If we are going to be about pursuing the American dream and if we are going to be about building a better future for America, I can think of few things more important than \$254 million in a multitrillion-dollar budget to restore the summer jobs programs to give disadvantaged teenagers a chance to not only get a job early, but also learn what it is like to work and develop the habits of work, because one does not just grow up being able to work; one learns those habits. One is not born as a worker; one is taught to work by the habits and the values that are instilled in us.

One of the previous speakers on the other side suggested that the summer jobs programs are make-work programs. One of the previous speakers suggested that what we ought to do he said was, and if I am not quoting, I am paraphrasing, we ought to teach them accountability and teach them the free market. But in so many communities in our country, disadvantaged communities, be it in the inner cities or the poor rural areas, those kids do not know free enterprise; those kids do not know what it is like to be accountable. They learn that early in life. A summer jobs program gives them a chance to do that.

The summer jobs programs we are talking about impacting kids at 14 and 15 and 16. These are kids in areas that do not have access to the jobs that are available in this burgeoning economy that we live in in America today. For those kids the American dream is not a dream. For those kids, the American

dream does not even exist. They live in an environment of hopelessness. We need to give them a chance to learn the habits of work early in life, and a \$254 million investment to help fund those programs I think goes a long way in the long run to give them a better future and save taxpayer dollars in the long run.

There has been discussion about the job core program. The job core program is a good program. We have funded that program. But one of the unintended consequences of that program is that it is taking money away from the summer jobs program; and in some cases, with the job core program, a kid can be in high school and we are rewarding a kid who drops out of high school and giving that kid a job; but we are doing nothing about a kid who is in school and needs to do something during the summer months when all of the opportunities to be mischievous and others are available.

So I hope that we recognize the need to fund the summer jobs program and recognize the job core program does good things, but has, in some cases, hurt the summer jobs program.

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

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

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, the job core program has proven over and over again a very effective program. Many of us think of our summer youth programs as the way they are in our cities, but there is clear evaluation that the summer youth program does nothing to increase job skills and provide greater access to the job market. It may keep kids out of trouble, but it does not do what the gentleman has been alluding to it is doing. In many cases, it is a make-work program that is a disgrace. In other cases, like our own area, it is a well-run program and does have benefits. But one of them is not obtaining job skills and getting greater access to a job or to the job market.

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

Mr. BLAGOJEVICH. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I am an exception to that. I had a summer jobs program, and I graduated from law school and my voters elected me to Congress. I would just submit to the gentleman that there are those of us who never attended the job core program, but had a few summer jobs here on the Hill and other places and moved right into the workforce. My voters think I am doing a good job, perhaps some here may not.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would continue to yield, I would say again the job core program is very effective. Some summer youth jobs programs are good; others are not good.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. BLAGOJEVICH) has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. BLAGOJEVICH. Mr. Chairman, let me simply say that if some are good and some are not good, I think it is well worth the investment to make sure that we make those that are good the rule and not the exception, and make the other ones that are not as good, make them work. But the principle still applies: providing opportunities for kids early on at 14, 15 and 16 is a good idea. It keeps them off the street; that is a good thing. And, secondly, it gives them a chance to learn work. If we can make those programs better, that is fine.

Where I come from in Chicago, I have seen examples of how that works. There is a young man from the Robert Taylor Home named Paris Thompson who was 14 years old when he first had his chance to work under the Met program in Chicago. Today he is 27 years old, and today he is lobbying Congress. He began his early experience at the Robert Taylor Home learning the value of work in an environment where there are kids like him who did not have that experience, who are not doing the things that they ought to be doing, and in many cases are in the penitentiary.

With that, I would simply say, let us take action on Jackson and support the Jackson amendment.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve my point of order.

Ms. DeLAURO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, let me just say one word about summer jobs. I held recently in my community with about 140 young people, the issue was not summer jobs, but it was a youth violence conference to talk to young people about their own responsibility with regard to youth violence. Some of the kids came up to me afterward and they said to me, what is going on with this summer job effort? We were relying on that. Our families were relying on that. We want to try to participate. Can you help us try to get the resources that we need in order to be able to have summer jobs? They saw this as a part, again, of the responsibility in the context of youth violence.

If we have young people who are working and who are off the streets and at the same time gathering some skills and in many instances, these young people are trying to provide their own families with some assistance, economic assistance at the same time. It is a very, very worthwhile investment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. JACKSON), my colleague and friend. The Department of Labor's request essentially was designed to ensure the success of America's workforce investment system and its programs, trying to serve American workers and their employers. The point of our speaking up here today and the

point of this amendment by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. JACKSON) is that the bill that we have up on the floor here today seriously jeopardizes this goal. We have seen the employment rate in this Nation fall since January of 1993 from 7.3 percent to 3.9 percent. It has risen a little bit in the last month or so, but the long and the short of it is it is at its lowest level in 30 years. We have seen 21 million new jobs that have been created, and employment population rates are at record highs. We understand that, and we are happy about that. But the fact of the matter is that not all have prospered.

Earlier, a colleague on the floor said that we have all of these industries and businesses which have all of these jobs that are available and they do not have people to fill them. Well, they just proved the point of the Jackson amendment by saying that in fact what we do need to do is to train folks for those jobs, and we have the capacity to do it. But not all have responded because of this economic environment that we are in. So many Americans are being left behind. We have pockets of high unemployment, pools of untapped, underutilized workers who exist out there and who are at risk; and there are dislocated workers.

I cite my own third district of the State of Connecticut, a State, I might add, that has been heavily dependent on defense and one that has been dependent on the insurance industry. Insurance in my State has downsized, dislocating a lot of workers. The defense industry has downsized, dislocating a tremendous amount of workers. Those workers wanted to continue at Sakorsky and at Pratt & Whitney and at the Stratford Army Engine plant, but they have nowhere to go today. These are people who have kids in college, who have mortgages to pay, and who are fighting for their lives in order to be able to meet their responsibilities and their obligations as parents and as breadwinners for their families.

Mr. Chairman, we are leaving them high and dry, without the opportunity to get further skills training, to get the kind of training that they need to put them back into the economic mainstream once again. We have 90 million adult Americans who perform at low levels of literacy. These are individuals who are not well equipped to meet the challenges of the new economy. Yet, this bill slashes the kinds of programs that provide hard-working Americans with the skills that they need to compete in today's economy. That is the issue my friend, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. JACKSON), is making. That is the one that we are trying to impress on people here today.

Mr. Chairman, we want people to be able to realize their dreams in this country. That is why we deal with school-to-work programs, that is why we encourage people to work and to take on that responsibility. That is what this country is all about. That is

a very deep-seated value in the United States.

Mr. Chairman, in April of 2000 there were 13 million untapped and underutilized Americans, 5.2 million who were unemployed, 4.4 million who were out of the labor force but wanted to work, and 3 million who worked part-time, but wanted full-time work. In March of 2000 there were 22 metropolitan areas with unemployment rates in excess of 7 percent. The low skills of many of the poorest Americans reflect accumulated disadvantage. Poor families and neighborhoods in which they grow up and live, underfinanced, often ineffective schools that they attended, lack the access to jobs that provide meaningful training and opportunities for advancement. Any attempt, any attempt to improve their schools has got to address the barriers that they face.

Mr. Chairman, we cannot leave people behind in this country. That is not what this Nation is founded on. It is founded on responsibility, hard work. Let us train people to do it. Let us vote for the Jackson amendment.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve my point of order, and I ask unanimous consent to strike the requisite number of words.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to emphasize something about the amendment that bears on all of this discussion. The reason this amendment is out of order is because the gentleman from Illinois has no offsets.

Now, the majority, in accordance with a budget resolution adopted by the majority of both Houses of the Congress, has to live within its allocation.

1515

It is easy to offer an amendment simply adding back money. That does not take any responsibility.

The gentleman could have offered an amendment with offsets. The difficulty is that his side of the aisle it seems to me is unwilling to provide cuts anywhere; is always willing to add money, but unwilling to take the responsibility to say, this is a higher priority, this is a higher priority.

We have to do that. We have to do that. That is our job. We have to be responsible for the bottom line.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment because it is in violation of section 302(f) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

The Committee on Appropriations filed a suballocation of budget totals for fiscal year 2001 on June 7, 2000. That is House Report 106-656. This amendment would provide new budget authority in excess of the subcommittee suballocation made under section 302(b) and is not permitted under section 302(f) of the Act.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for a ruling of the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands the gentleman from Illinois has yielded back his pro forma amendment.

Does the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. JACKSON) wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is conceded and sustained.

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. MCHUGH) having assumed the chair, Mr. BEREUTER, 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. 4577) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

1530

#### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCHUGH). Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 3:45 p.m.

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until 3:45 p.m.

1545

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MCHUGH) at 3 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.

#### PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 8, DEATH TAX ELIMINATION ACT OF 2000

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 519 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 519

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 8) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to phaseout the estate and gift taxes over a 10-year period. The bill shall be considered as read for amendment. The amendment recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means now printed in the bill shall be considered as adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate on the bill, as amended, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means; (2) the further amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this

resolution, which may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, and shall be separately debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent; and (3) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York (Mr. REYNOLDS) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY); pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

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

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, the legislation before us today provides for the consideration of H.R. 8, the Death Tax Elimination Act of 2000. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 519 is a modified closed rule which is a standard rule for all revenue measures.

The rule provides 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means. Additionally, the rule waives all points of order against the bill.

The rule further provides that the amendment recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means now printed in the bill shall be considered as adopted.

The rule also provides for consideration of the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the report if offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) or his designee, which shall be considered as read and shall be separately debatable for 1 hour, equally divided between the proponent and an opponent.

Finally, the rule provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, Benjamin Franklin once noted that "in this world, nothing can be said to be certain except death and taxes." But while death may be certain, taxes are immortal. That is because our current tax system plays a cruel joke on farmers and small business owners.

After years of hard work and sacrifice, building their farm, ranch or business, working Americans hoping to pass on their legacy to their children and grandchildren often find their life's work will instead be passed on to the Federal Government.

The death tax is turning the American dream into The Nightmare on Elm Street.

The death tax is arguably the biggest threat to the future viability of small businesses, family farms, and ranches. It creates a disincentive to expand and create jobs. It often literally taxes family businesses right out of the family.

According to the National Federation of Independent Businesses, nearly 60 percent of business owners say they

would add more jobs over the coming years if death taxes were eliminated.

The death tax has turned Uncle Sam into the Grim Reaper, destroying family-owned farms and ranches with penalties reaching as high as 55 percent and forcing farmers and ranchers to sell off land, buildings, or equipment otherwise needed to operate their businesses.

When those farms and ranches disappear, the rural communities and businesses they support also suffer. A piece of community and family history is lost forever. The death tax impact on family farms is so devastating that the Farm Bureau has listed elimination as their number one priority.

Think about that. An industry association concerned with all aspects of farming and ranching lists the death tax as the number one threat to the viability of family farming. That is how repressive this tax is.

Now, many opponents of eliminating the death tax argue that estate planning is a viable alternative to changing our tax laws. Their theory that our farmers and ranchers should be huddled with accountants rather than growing food for America is both misguided and wrong.

They fail to take into account the high cost of estate planning tools, both the time spent away from their businesses and the high price tag that includes attorneys fees, life insurance premiums, and internal labor costs. Would not we rather have small business owners and farmers using their resources to operate and expand their businesses and to create jobs?

Too often there is a simplistic approach that we should soak the rich. The problem with that theory, as Ronald Reagan once said, is that everybody gets wet in the process. Nowhere is that more profound than in the death tax; for it is hard working middle American families who are most hurt.

But that is not all. The death tax actually raises relatively little revenue for the Federal Government. Some studies have found that it may cost the Government and taxpayers more in administrative and compliance fees than it raises in revenue.

Last year, the Public Policy Institute of New York State conducted a survey on the impact of the Federal estate tax on upstate New York. The findings were alarming. The study found that, in the past 5 years, family-owned and operated businesses on average spent nearly \$125,000 per company just on tax planning alone. These are costs incurred prior to any actual payment of Federal estate taxes.

The study found that an estimated 14 jobs per business have already been lost as a result of the Federal estate tax planning. For just the 365 businesses surveyed, the total number of jobs already lost due to the Federal estate tax is over 5,100.

Mr. Speaker, a clear majority of participants in this survey indicate that the death of an owner would put their