

all miss him here so terribly much—his knowledge, his wit, his writing, his counsel, his love.

We will have him always, in our hearts, and on our shelves, as he ambles the catlines byways of heaven with his brothers—holding aloft the black-thorn cane their father brought from Ireland much more than a century ago.

It that really what heaven will be like? Remember, Dad called it a mystery. It is a concept beyond our mortal grasp. But I know how I'd like to think of it. I imagine that as Charles Andrew Brady entered the Light, he heard the sweet baritone of Jehovah say, "Well done, oh good and faithful servant."

CROW CREEK SIOUX TRIBE INFRASTRUCTURE TRUST FUND ACT OF 1995

HON. TIM JOHNSON

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 19, 1995

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing legislation to establish a trust fund within the Department of Treasury for the development of certain tribal infrastructure projects for the Crow Creek Tribe. These projects were outlined in previous legislation but were never completed due to limited funding sources. The Crow Creek Development trust fund would be capitalized from a percentage of hydropower revenues and would be capped at \$27.5 million. The tribe would then receive the interest from the fund to be used according to a development plan based on legislation previously passed by Congress, and prepared in conjunction with the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Indian Health Service.

The Flood Control Act of 1944 created five massive earthen dams along the Missouri River. This public works project, known as the Pick-Sloan Plan, has since provided flood control, irrigation, and hydropower for communities along the Missouri. Four of the Pick-Sloan dams are located in South Dakota.

The Impact of the Pick-Sloan plan on the Crow Creek Sioux Tribe has been devastating. Construction of the Big Bend and Fort Randall dams was severely detrimental to economic and agricultural development for the Crow Creek Tribe. Over 15,000 acres of the tribe's most fertile and productive land, the Missouri River wooded bottom lands, were inundated as a direct result of the Fort Randall and Big Ben dam construction. The tribal community has still not yet been adequately compensated for the economic deprivation brought about with Pick-Sloan.

Through the Big Bend Act of 1962, Congress directed the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the Department of the Interior to take certain actions to alleviate the problems caused by the destruction of tribal resources and displacement of entire communities. These directives were either carried out inadequately or not at all. The legislation I am introducing is the first step toward keeping the promises Congress made to the Crow Creek Sioux Tribe.

Congress established precedent for this legislation with the Three Affiliated Tribes and Standing Rock Sioux Tribe Equitable Compensation Act of 1992. At that time, Congress determined that the U.S. Army Corps of Engi-

neers failed to provide adequate compensation to the tribes when their lands were acquired for the Pick-Sloan projects. There is little controversy on finding that the tribes bore an inordinate share of the cost of implementing the Pick-Sloan program. The Secretary of the Interior established the Joint Tribal Advisory Committee to resolve the inequities and find ways to finance the compensation of tribal claims. As a result, the Three Affiliated Tribes and Standing Rock Sioux Tribe Equitable Compensation Act set up a recovery fund financed entirely from a percentage of Pick-Sloan power revenues.

The Crow Creek Sioux Tribe Infrastructure Development Fund Act of 1995 will enable the Crow Creek Tribe to address and improve their infrastructure and will provide the needed resources for further economic development at the Crow Creek Indian reservation.

This legislation has broad support in South Dakota. South Dakota Governor Bill Janklow strongly endorses this funding mechanism to develop infrastructure at the Crow Creek Sioux reservation. I am including a letter of support from Governor Janklow to be printed in the RECORD.

I urge my colleagues to strongly support this important legislation and correct this historic injustice against the Crow Creek Sioux Tribe.

STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA,

June 22, 1995.

HON DUANE BIG EAGLE,

Chairman of the Crow Creek Sioux Tribe, Post Office Box 50, Fort Thompson, South Dakota 57501

DEAR CHAIRMAN BIG EAGLE: Thank you for giving me a copy of the proposed federal legislation that requires the federal government to fulfill the commitments made to the Crow Creek Sioux Tribe in the Big Bend Act of 1962.

I wholeheartedly support this legislation and your efforts to develop Fort Thompson with the infrastructure and community facilities that the Crow Creek community should have received long ago. The method for funding in the bill is fair and I hope a majority of both houses of Congress and the President will realize the importance of passing this bill and signing it into law.

In several different ways, all of the various groups of people who live in South Dakota have not received the benefits promised when the great dams were built in the 1950s. The persistence of the members of the Crow Creek Sioux Tribe to right this wrong is worthy of high praise. Congratulations on creating an excellent proposal.

If there is anything I can do to help you, please let me know.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM J. JANKLOW,
Governor.

COALITION MEDICARE PROPOSAL

HON. BILL ORTON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 19, 1995

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the coalition Medicare reform alternative. In doing so, I will be voting against both the Democratic and Republican Medicare reform proposals considered today. I would like to explain why.

Today, we are considering only the Medicare portion of the Republican budget reconciliation package. This separation of Medi-

care from the rest of the Republican budget proposal is an effort to convince the American people that reduced spending in Medicare is not related to the rest of the budget. It is an effort to convince the American people that a \$270 billion reduction in Medicare spending is necessary to address the impending insolvency of the Medicare HI trust fund in the year 2002. It is nonsense.

The bipartisan Concord Coalition perhaps said it best: It all began with the irreconcilable goals announced in the GOP's Contract With America: Balance the budget while at the same time enacting large tax cuts and pushing many large programs, most notably Social Security, off the table. Inevitably, a disproportionate share of the budget-cutting burden fell on Medicare.

The coalition Medicare reform proposal, of which I am a cosponsor, proves that the solvency of the Medicare HI trust fund can be restored, within the context of a 7-year balanced budget, while cutting \$100 billion less in Medicare spending than the Republican proposal. I am disappointed that the Rules Committee did not make in order consideration of the coalition proposal on the House floor, because I believe it is closer to the priorities of the vast majority of Americans than either of the two proposals that we will be debating today.

The American people deserve a complete debate of the choices we face as a nation as we begin to balance the budget. Today, we will debate two options regarding Medicare: reducing Medicare spending by \$270 billion in the context of a budget that contains a \$245 billion tax cut, and reducing Medicare spending by \$90 billion in order to restore solvency to the Medicare trust fund without balancing the budget.

There is a responsible alternative that sadly will not receive consideration: restoring the solvency of the Medicare program within the context of a balance budget without providing an immediate tax cut. I believe that this option represents the preferences of the majority of Americans.

The coalition alternative includes many of the same proposals contained in the Republican proposal: it allows the formation of provider sponsored networks, it means-tests part B premiums, and it expands the choice of seniors within the Medicare system.

However, there are many distinctions. The Republican plan raises premiums on all senior citizens. The coalition only raises premiums for wealthier seniors who are better able to afford an increase. The coalition plan also protects reimbursement rates in rural areas where hospitals are more likely to close, continues minimal standards for nursing homes, and maintains eligibility for health care at military facilities.

Finally, unlike the Republican plan, we do not include \$35 billion in unspecified cuts, which the Republican Senate Finance Committee chairman labeled "blue smoke and mirrors."

We need to keep in mind two things when considering these proposals today: First, we cannot continue to borrow from future generations in order to have things we are not willing to pay for now, and second, we cannot overlook the needs of current generations as we set national fiscal priorities. I believe that the coalition alternative does the best job of balancing these two concerns.

Further, let it be clear that while the impending trust fund insolvency is an extremely serious and real concern, it is not a new finding. For many years, the trustees' report has indicated the insolvency problem in the Medicare HI trust fund. In fact, recent estimates had actually extended the insolvency date, and the trustees report itself stated that the long-range status of the HI Program had improved.

What is new is that Congress has decided to balance the budget and must address this insolvency in doing so. In addition, it is new to enact a \$245 billion tax cut at the same time that the budget is being balanced—this means Congress must cut more spending in order to compensate for reduced tax revenue.

The coalition Medicare proposal represents the most sensible approach to achieving Medicare solvency because it does not lose sight of the larger health care picture in a rush to balance the budget. It extends solvency over a 10-year period, creates a bipartisan Commission to address long-term solvency, protects beneficiaries, and eases the burden on rural hospitals which provide critical services to rural communities but often rely on Medicare and Medicaid for a majority of their funds.

Therefore, the coalition Medicare proposal achieves and exceeds the goals of the Republican proposal while containing spending reductions to a level that can be absorbed by the health care market without reducing seniors' access to health care—particularly those seniors with low incomes—or quality of health care.

I know that the Utah Association of Healthcare Providers and others share my concern about the magnitude of spending reductions contained in the House Republican proposal. They estimate that some hospitals in Utah will close as a result of these cuts, particularly hospitals in rural areas where over 60 percent of funding can be received from Medicare and Medicaid.

The \$170 billion reduction contained in the coalition budget is almost identical to the amount that organizations like the American Hospital Association have said they can achieve without severely reducing the quality of, or access to, health care received by beneficiaries.

Let me make clear that I consider the need to balance the Federal budget the highest priority we face in Congress, and have worked hard for policies and specific spending cuts to reverse the spiraling deficit. But having agreed to balance the budget in a 7-year period, it is now crucial to have a thorough debate regarding the Nation's fiscal priorities. Tough spending cuts are necessary to achieve such a balance and seniors will have to share in these cuts. However, since the spending cuts contained in any balanced budget will be difficult, it is even more imperative that we cut spending first before cutting taxes.

Recent polls show that insistence on tax cuts in light of the tough decisions necessary to achieve a balanced budget does not reflect the priorities of the American people. Over 80 percent of Americans oppose cutting future costs of Medicare to pay for a tax cut. Higher income Americans are even less supportive of making Medicare cuts in order to finance tax cuts than other Americans.

In conclusion, containing health care costs is an essential part of the balanced budget equation. Health care is the fastest growing portion of the Federal budget, and if we do

nothing, by the year 2030, all that our Federal tax dollar will pay for is health and retirement programs.

However, there is also more than one way to achieve a balanced budget and contain health care spending. There are important questions to discuss regarding how we can contain health care costs without decreasing quality or denying beneficiaries access to health care.

The Medicare reforms we are considering raise issues beyond simply balancing the budget and restoring solvency to the Medicare trust fund—reforms must include the impact of the costs of health care being shifted as the Federal Government pays proportionately less of health care spending.

I believe that it is critical for Congress to work with, and listen to, the American people as we attempt to determine which proposals are most appropriate and cost-effective.

The fact that the coalition Medicare proposal will not be considered in the debate today denies a voice to the moderate mainstream majority of Americans. I regret that the full details of this proposal will not receive a fair hearing.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. NEIL ABERCROMBIE

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 19, 1995

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, on October 17, I was unavoidably delayed on my return to Washington, DC, from Hawaii because of a plane delay. Had I been present I would have voted "nay" on rollcall vote No. 714 and "yea" on rollcall votes Nos. 715 and 716.

LEGISLATION MAKING FGM ILLEGAL

HON. PATRICIA SCHROEDER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 19, 1995

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I was glad to hear that the Senate has approved legislation making female genital mutilation illegal and implementing education and outreach efforts to stop its practice in this country. I commend Senator REID for attaching his bill, which is a companion to mine, to the foreign operations appropriations bill that the Senate passed on September 21. The House passed its foreign operations bill on July 11 without a similar provision and now it is up to the conference committee to preserve the Senate language of FGM.

I have spoken on this floor many times regarding FGM, and some States are now passing or considering their own legislation to ban it. The problem in this Congress seems to be that Members still do not believe that such a brutal procedure happens in this country, something my bill and Senator REID's would seek to correct. Lest there be any doubt that it does happen here, I refer Members to the October Atlantic Monthly, which features an article by Linda Burstyn about the efforts of activist Mimi Ramsey to end FGM in this country.

TRIBUTE TO MILKEN FAMILY FOUNDATION NATIONAL EDUCATOR AWARD WINNERS

HON. MIKE WARD

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 19, 1995

Mr. WARD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate the Milken Family Foundation National Educator Award winners. A recognition luncheon to honor these five exemplary individuals will be held Wednesday, October 25, at noon at the Marriott Hotel in Louisville. At the luncheon Dr. Wilmer S. Cody, Commissioner of Education; Foundation officials; leaders from business, government, and education, and the award-ees' families will assemble to honor this year's recipients.

In 1981, the members of the Milken families conceived an educator awards program based on their belief that the most effective way to address the crisis in K-12 education was to focus on the needs and the resources of educators and to encourage bright young men and women to enter the profession. I applaud the Foundation's efforts to improve our Nation's educational system.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that a copy of the distinguished award winners which I am submitting be placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I hope that the teachers will continue their invaluable service to the cause of education.

The recipients are: Barbara Byrd Fendley, a teacher from Dupont Manual High School in Louisville; Jerry L. Hodges, a principal from Williamsburg High School in Williamsburg; David E. Jordan, a principal from South Junior High School in Henderson; Susan Bernstein Stucker, a teacher from Blazer High School in Ashland; and Joyce Ann Mason Winburn, a teacher from Eminence High School in Eminence.

THE BILINGUAL EDUCATION TRAP

HON. TOBY ROTH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 19, 1995

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call the attention of my colleagues to a column that appeared yesterday in the Wall Street Journal. The author, Michael Gonzalez, makes a compelling case against bilingual education and for preserving our common bond, the English language.

Mr. Gonzalez' article shares his personal experience with bilingual education programs as a new American growing up in New York City. His story is a cautionary tale of bureaucratic excess and educational ineffectiveness. Rather than helping children learn English, the bilingual education programs he describes actually hold them back.

A recent survey showed that in just 5 years, there will be 40 million Americans who can't speak English. Those Americans will be isolated, cut off from realizing the American dream, if they don't have the one skill that is required for success in America: fluency in English.

We should heed the warnings of people like Michael Gonzalez, who have experienced the