

cost taxpayers an additional \$345 billion. Over and above the deficits that we run each year, we are adding another \$345 billion dollars to the national debt for this tax cut package.

Why did we do it? A lot of people wonder. Of course it is good news for a politician to go home and say, guess what, I got a tax break for you. But people at home I think are a little wiser and understand at a time of deficits a tax break, particularly for the wealthy people and corporations, is certainly not the right medicine for the patients.

So now let us fast-forward to 1 a.m. this morning when the House Budget Committee decides to put out their House Budget Resolution and lay out the spending goals for Congress for the next year.

Well they had a problem. They not only had to deal with the deficit, they had to figure out how to pay for that tax break, and so they had to make deeper cuts in spending in order to take care of the Republican tax break, and to come out with the so-called balanced budget when it is all said and done.

So, where did they turn to make the cuts in Federal spending to pay for the tax break for wealthy individuals and profitable corporations? They turned to Medicare. In fact, they cut over a 7-year period of time \$283 billion from Medicare. Medicare of course is the health insurance plan for America's senior citizens.

What does that mean when you make a \$283 billion cut in Medicare? It means that during that 7-year period of time, every senior citizen in America will be asked to pay an average of \$3,500 more in premiums in Medicare. So you have the seniors, many of them in very low income situations if any income, paying more, so that they can in fact compensate for the Republican tax break.

That to me raises some serious questions of fairness. And make no mistake, we are talking about cuts in Medicare. Many Republicans will stand up and say it is not really a cut, you Democrats have it wrong all over again. We are increasing spending.

Well, let me try to tell you what they mean by that. Assume for a minute that you get a notice from your bank or savings and loan that your mortgage payment just went up \$100 a month. That is a source of real concern for most families. But then your boss tells you, incidentally I am giving you a raise of \$50 a month.

Well you thank your boss. You think to yourself, I am still \$50 short. What the Republicans are doing is providing the \$50 a month in Medicare increases when the cost of Medicare is going up \$100, and the same thing is going to be happening in the out years. The cost of Medicare goes up, but the Republicans do not provide enough money for it because they have to take care of this tax break that they passed.

And then take a look at what they did on Social Security. We stood on

this floor, passed a resolution and said no, not never, never will we cut Social Security, not even to achieve a balanced budget. Just count on it. And everybody ceremoniously voted, went home and put out a press release and told the seniors they never, never have to worry, we are never going to touch Social Security.

Guess what, 1 a.m. this morning in comes the House Republican budget resolution and it cuts Social Security.

It reduces the COLA, the cost-of-living adjustment for Social Security. So here you have the senior citizens getting hit in both directions. First they do not get the cost-of-living adjustment they anticipated for Social Security, and then have to pay for more Medicare.

For what? To pay for the Republican tax break. That to me is upside down. If we are going to balance the budgets, let us do it in a fair way and not nail Medicare and Social Security.

A MOTHER'S DAY TRIBUTE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Speaker, this Sunday, May 14, 1995, we will have another very joyous occasion to celebrate and commemorate a very special day for Americans, and so I thought it appropriate during the course of deliberation and sometimes making very difficult decisions on behalf of all of our citizens to simply take a moment to part the waters and stop for a moment and pause and simply say happy Mother's Day, happy Mother's Day to the mothers, to grandmothers, to mothers-in-law, to stepmothers, to foster mothers, those mothers who take in children, mothers who have adopted, and act as mothers, those women with no relation by blood or law but have really mothered someone somehow, somewhere, and certainly to those mothers in your neighborhoods and cities and towns and our counties and our States and our churches and synagogues and parishes and mothers who are always there to help someone. I simply want to say to you and to all Americans let us make May 14, 1995 a very special time, a very close time, a very rewarding time for that woman who has been so very special to you. Let us make sure we say to each and every one of those mothers and I certainly want to say to all of those in the 18th Congressional District of Texas happy Mother's Day to you. You deserve it and we could not have done it without you.

COME SHOP WITH ME FOR MOTHER'S DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, this Sunday America celebrates Mother's Day. And families all over our country will gather on this day to honor the women who strive every day both inside and outside the home to keep the families of America strong; a celebration they richly deserve.

□ 2100

We all know that American women are working more and more inside the home and outside the home, and what we may not know is that many of them are working for less money.

For women in many industries, textiles, apparel footwear, for instance, their pay has actually dropped nearly 5 percent over the last 10 years in spite of the fact that they are working harder and working longer. In fact, one-third of America's working women earn poverty-level wages.

Ironically, many of the gifts which we traditionally give our mothers on Mothers' Day as expressions of our gratitude turn out to be the products of industries which depend on the depression of wages, primarily women's wages, both at home and abroad, products such as new shoes or new handbags or new outfits and, yes, even roses.

Last Tuesday, I had the privilege of participating in a press conference at which we pointed out the discrepancies in wages between products made in our country and the same products made overseas, in fact, products made by U.S. companies that have outsourced production abroad. We, to demonstrate our point, dressed a mannequin in many of these foreign goods, and on the mannequin we had a Coach handbag, where American women used to earn \$7.42 an hour, not high wages by any standards, but today those bags are being made by Korean workers being paid \$1.64 an hour, and those Coach bags cost nearly \$200. So who is making the profit off those women?

Or Naturalizer shoes; women in our country used to make \$6.95 an hour in manufacturing Naturalizer shoes, but their wages and jobs are gone, and those shoes are now made in Brazil, where women there earn 47 cents an hour, but, of course, Naturalizer shoes cost well over \$50. So who is making the profit off those women?

Or take this sweater, a Chaus sweater that used to be manufactured in the United States, where women earned \$7.88 an hour. Now this very same sweater made by that same company in China, where women work for pennies, but, of course, the sweater is not cheap. In fact, the price tag on this one is over \$40. Who is making the profit off those women?

Or take this skirt, manufactured by the At Last Company. This skirt used to be made in the United States of America. Women workers earned \$7.49 an hour. Now this skirt is being made in India, and chances are if a child in India helped make that skirt, which is very likely, no wages were paid.

So it being Mothers Day, we provided our mannequin with a dozen roses. Roses are grown in this country, and they are harvested, and the average wage of farm workers is \$5 an hour. But, of course, the roses that are available in this community today are provided through Colombia, where workers earn 55 cents an hour. But if you try to buy your mom a dozen roses in Washington this week, it is going to cost you \$75. So ask yourself, who is making the money off of these women?

But are we getting a real bargain for all of this value for our money? A break for the consumer? Well, I ask you, is a bargain a Coach handbag at \$200 or Naturalizer shoes at \$50 or a Chaus sweater at \$40 or roses at 75?

The Come Shop With Me campaign asks: Is it worth it? Are we really getting a good deal? Can the 7,300 people who have lost their jobs making handbags here in America afford a \$200 Coach handbag made in Korea? Can the 17,700 women who have lost their jobs in our country in the footwear industry buy Naturalizer shoes made in Brazil that cost \$50? And can the women of Brazil or the women of Korea or the women of India, can they buy those products on the wages they earn? Absolutely not.

Over the last decade in our country, nearly 300,000 women workers have lost jobs in the textile industry alone, mostly to foreign competition.

Mr. Speaker, let me end by saying the Come Shop With Me campaign will continue over the next few months to draw our attention to the human cost of trade.

Tonight I say to the mothers of America and the world, "Happy Mother's Day. We will not forget you."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

[Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

[Mr. PALLONE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mrs. MEEK of Florida (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for today after 4:15 p.m., on account of illness.

Mr. PASTOR (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for today after 5 p.m. and

the balance of the week, on account of personal business.

Mr. TANNER (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for today after 5 p.m. and the balance of the week, on account of official business.

Mr. BONO (at the request of Mr. ARMEY), for today and May 12, on account of medical leave.

Ms. DUNN of Washington (at the request of Mr. ARMEY), for today after 3:30 p.m. and the balance of the week, so that she may attend the graduation of her son Reagan from Arizona State University.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative programs and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. WATT of North Carolina) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. OWENS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. LIPINSKI, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. CLAYTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BECERRA, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DURBIN, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HAYWORTH) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. BROWNBACK, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. METCALF, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan, for 5 minutes, on May 16 and 17.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at her own request) to revise and extend her remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. WATT of North Carolina) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. COLEMAN.

Mr. DURBIN.

Mr. RUSH.

Mr. FOGLIETTA.

Mr. GORDON.

Mr. BAESLER.

Mr. TOWNS.

Mrs. THURMAN.

Mr. MONTGOMERY.

Mr. REED.

Ms. KAPTUR.

Mr. MANTON.

Mr. JACOBS.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HAYWORTH) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. DUNCAN.

Mr. MARTINI in two instances.

Mr. WALSH.

Mr. PACKARD.

Mr. BILIRAKIS.
Mrs. ROUKEMA.
Mr. DORNAN.
Mr. YOUNG of Florida.
Mr. FORBES.
Mr. HUNTER.
Mr. GOODLING.
Mr. GUNDERSON.
Mr. MCKEON.

Mr. HORN in two instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. KAPTUR) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. UPTON.

Mrs. FOWLER.

Mr. GOODLATTE.

Mr. TRAFICANT.

Mr. RAHALL.

Mr. MFUME.

Mr. KIM.

Ms. MCCARTHY.

Mr. STOKES.

ADJOURNMENT

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 5 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, May 12, 1995, at 10 a.m.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Ms. PRYCE: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 144. Resolution providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 535) to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey the Corning National Fish Hatchery to the State of Arkansas (Rept. 104-116). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MCINNIS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 145. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 584) to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey a fish hatchery to the State of Iowa (Rept. 104-117). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mrs. WALDHOLTZ: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 146. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 614) to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey to the State of Minnesota the New London National Fish Hatchery production facility (Rept. 104-118). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. THOMAS (for himself, Mr. STARK, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. ENSIGN, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. CRANE, Mr. HOUGHTON, and Mr. SAM JOHNSON):

H.R. 1610. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require employer-provided group health plans to credit coverage under a prior group health plan against any preexisting condition limitation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.