

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 1045, the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

## BROKEN PROMISES TO THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] is recognized for 60 minutes as the minority whip.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise this afternoon to express my deep concern over the proposed Republican budget cuts in Social Security and in Medicare and Medicaid. What is quite disturbing to me about these cuts is that they are broken promises to the American people, to our seniors who have labored so hard in this country to provide for this great Nation of ours, and what is equally disturbing about these cuts, which will cost the seniors, the Medicare cuts, will cost the seniors in the year 2002, 7 years from now, \$1,000 a year.

What is additionally so disturbing is that in the same budget proposal are tax cuts for the wealthiest people in our society. Over 50 percent of the tax cuts; it is a \$100 billion tax cut over 10 years, over 50 percent of those tax cuts go to people making over \$100,000 a year.

There is something called the alternative minimum tax, and for those of you who are not familiar with that, back in the early 1980's we found that major corporations, in fact, 130 of the top 250 corporations in America, were paying no taxes at all between 1981 and 1985, during at least 1 year, no taxes. And it was, the rest, the burden was picked up by everyone else. So we decided to change that law. Even Ronald Reagan agreed that it was embarrassing, and it was an outrage. We changed the law that required major corporations to pay at least something, a minimal tax.

Well, under the tax proposal we passed last month under the Contract With America, the Republicans got rid of that minimum tax, and now we are back to where we were, where we will have major corporations not contributing their fair share to the tax burden on the American people. So what you have in this tax bill is getting rid of the alternative minimum tax, you have got 50 percent of the benefits going to the top virtually 1 percent, so if you are making \$230,000 a year, you are going to get \$11,000 in tax breaks.

We think the tax cut is weighted very too heavily to benefit the wealthiest people in our society. And to give you an example of that, I should talk to you about one provision we had on

the floor about a month and a half ago that would allow billionaires in our society, and millionaires, very few billionaires, but there are some, to avoid paying taxes if they renounce their American citizenship. We tried to close that loophole on the floor of the House. Republicans defended it all. All but 5 Republicans voted to keep that loophole for the wealthiest people in our society. You might say, "Well who does that?" About 24 people. You know what the cost to us as a country is over 10 years as lost revenue because of that? \$3.6 billion.

So they have got this tax bill that benefits primarily the wealthiest people in our society, and they have got this budget bill that will hit the most vulnerable people in our society, our young people and our older people, and when it comes to Medicare, they take a giant whack out of the disposable income of our senior citizens.

Let me just tell you exactly what they do. The Republicans in Congress are proposing a new budget that will mean serious cuts. It will even cut back COLA increases. Over the next 7 years, Medicare will be cut by 25 percent. Medicaid, which provides the only long-term care many seniors now have access to at all, will be cut by 30 percent. Social Security COLA's will be cut by 0.6 percent a year starting in 1999. For the average senior citizen, this will mean higher out-of-pocket expenses, fewer benefits, less choice of doctors. It will mean higher Medicare premiums, higher deductibles, higher copayments.

By the year 2002, Medicare costs will increase over \$1,000, as I said, for every senior citizen. Social security COLA's will be \$240 less for every senior. Cuts in Medicaid will mean 2.9 million Americans will lose long-term care.

When we talk about Medicaid, it is not only the poor in this country, but we are talking about a program that provides, I believe, about 40 percent of long-term care for our seniors in this country. 2.9 million Americans will lose long-term care, and these cuts will not pay for fixing the Medicare system. Instead they will go into a tax package that provides tax breaks for the wealthiest people in the country and allows some of our wealthiest corporations, as I said, to pay no tax at all. That is not fair. It is not right. It is a broken promise to the American people.

These cuts in Medicare and Medicaid and Social Security are not just going to affect senior citizens. Now, how is the average working family going to pay for additional costs of caring for their parents and grandparents? How will they pay for the rising costs of long-term care, prescription drugs, home health care, and hospital bills? How are the middle-aged children of these elderly people in our society, how are they going to maintain these increased costs for their parents and their grandparents? And if they have kids who may want to move up in our

society through the education system and get a college education and if their kids are on student loans, those kids, in fact, will, in fact, be hit hard because under the same budget proposal the costs of a student going to college who is on student loans now, we call them Stafford loans, but they are better known as student loans around the country, in Michigan, that student will pay an extra \$4,000.

□ 1315

So, they are getting squeezed on each end. If you got kids, and you got elderly parents, you are going to get hit on both ends.

Mr. Speaker, it was 50 years ago last week that Americans defeated Nazi Germany in World War II, and all over America we celebrated that day by remembering the brave men and women on both the battlefield and the home front who led our country to victory, and, looking at pictures of our parents and our grandparents from back then, they were so young, and they were so full of life, it is hard to believe that they would ever grow old. But they have, Mr. Speaker.

The generation that beat Hitler, built our economy, raised our families, are now America's senior citizens, and today many of them are living on fixed incomes. Their Social Security is the only thing many older Americans have each month to pay their rent, to pay their heating bills, to pay for their food, for medicine and doctor bills, and for most of them it is not easy. They have to struggle to make ends meet. Those of us who go home each weekend in our district meet them constantly. We know of the struggle they have to go through.

But today, instead of trying to make life easier and more fulfilling for them, Mr. Speaker, Republicans in Congress are trying to make their lives harder. In their budget proposal House Republicans have not only proposed cutting Social Security by \$240 a person, they are also asking every senior to pay an additional \$3,500 for Medicare.

Now, as I have said, Medicare, of course, is the system we have in this country for health insurance for our senior citizens. We did not have that before 1965. You did not have Medicare, and, as a result, many seniors, when they got into their senior years, had no health insurance and fell directly into poverty. Social Security adopted by Franklin Roosevelt, a Democrat, in 1935; Medicare, adopted in the administration of a Democratic President, Lyndon Johnson, and a Democratic Congress; changed the lives of tens of millions of American seniors and kept them out of poverty in their senior years.

After sending out press releases after press releases bragging about how they were going to leave Social Security and Medicare alone, House Republicans have broken that promise, and they have targeted our seniors, and the worst part, Mr. Speaker, they are not

being asked to sacrifice to balance the budget, or to cut the deficit, or to make the Medicare system even stronger. The Republicans, as I said, are cutting Medicare and Social Security for one reason and one reason only, to pay for tax breaks, over 50 percent of which go to the wealthiest people in our society. And if you look at the numbers, they nearly match up. Their Medicare cuts equaled the tax breaks, what the Wall Street Journal called the biggest tax bonanza in years for the upper-income Americans. It is not me saying it, but the Wall Street Journal. The voice of the wealthy in this country said it was the biggest tax savings bonanza in years for upper-income Americans, and, under the Republican plan, we are going to take more money from seniors whose average income is \$17,000 a year so we can give a \$20,000 tax break to families earning over \$250,000 a year.

Does that sound fair to you? Is that what this country is all about? Is that what this last election was all about? Is that what our parents fought for and sacrificed for in the greatest battle for democracy in human decency that the world has even seen? I do not think so.

Last week the New York Times revealed in an article by Robert Pear, in a confidential memo, something that every American should read. It was circulated. This memo was circulating among House Republicans, a memo detailing where some of these Medicare cuts will come from. Among other things, it recommended doubling the annual deductible, increasing the monthly premium by 50 percent, charging patients for a portion of home health care, and the list goes on, and on, and on, and this just does not affect seniors. You know, as I said earlier, where is the average working family going to come up with the money to pay for this?

Well, Mr. Speaker, in the past week we have seen Republican after Republican come to this floor and try to convince us that nobody is going to be hurt by these cuts, and they bring out charts, and they throw numbers around, and they talk about limiting growth on projected spending, and they try to tell us how a cut really is not a cut.

But, you know, none of this Washington bureaucratic talk means much to a constituent of mine, Iris Doyle who I have known for a long time. Iris Doyle is a proud senior citizen who lives in my district. For 16 years she taught a class on U.S. citizenship. She literally spent her life helping people gain access to the American dream, and to this day she still has a framed copy of the Declaration of Independence hanging on her wall. But the times have not been easy for Iris. Eleven years ago her husband died, 3 years after that her only son died, and during the time of their illnesses she was sick herself; she had cancer. For 18 months she endured chemotherapy treatment after chemotherapy, and she says, "Thank god.

Thanks to the wonders of modern medicine the cancer is in remission."

In order to pay off their hospital bills which totaled over \$12,000, she literally had to sell her house. Then more bad luck hit. She came down with Legionnaire disease which forced her to stop working. Today she lives on a monthly Social Security check totaling about \$550, and a small school pension kicks in in another 134 months. Out of that small amount of money she has to pay for everything, rent, and food, and medicine, and heat, and transportation, and clothing, as well as her medical bills which thankfully, are not as high as they could be. Now twice a year she sees an oncologist for cancer, but Medicare does not cover the cost of the visit because she does not quite meet the annual deductible. So her oncologist let her set a payment plan. Every 6 months she pays about a \$75 bill. And you know what? She struggles to make that payment.

Now you tell Iris these Medicare cuts are not going hurt anybody. Tell Iris that a 50-percent increase in Medicare premiums is nothing. Tell her that she can afford these cuts. Because, if you do, she will probably tell you what she told me. She said, "You know, DAVID, it's unfortunate that when you get in the later years of your life, when you've taught kids, and you have to worry about things like this, but I don't think those people in Washington know what they're doing to people," and then she said, "I don't think they care."

Mr. Speaker, I think she is right. I do not think my friends, many of my friends in this institution, realize what these cuts are going to do to these people, particularly my friends on the other side of the aisle. But I do know one thing. This is not what the American people voted for last November. We did not vote to cut Medicare in order to pay for tax breaks for the privileged few. Our parents and our grandparents stood by America in times of war and peace, and we must stand by them today. That is the sacred promise that we made on Medicare, and I believe it is time we lived up to that promise.

We will be engaged in a very vociferous debate for the remainder of this week, and I daresay for the remainder of this Congress, on this very issue. The cuts that have been put forward by the Republicans in the House, in the Senate, will devastate millions of people in this country, not only seniors, but their children who must care for them in their later years. This is an unconscionable act in light of the outrageously inappropriate, unfair, unequal tax cut that the Republicans have put forward for the wealthiest few in our society.

I do not know how to get this message across to the American people except to talk to them at home and to talk to them on the floor of the House of Representatives. There was an interesting piece today in the Washington

Post on the front page about how a large majority of people in this country today do not read the newspaper, do not watch the national news, and only pick up their news from talk radio and, occasionally, from tabloid television, and so in many instances miss the news, and those are the very people that will be hurt by what the Republicans are trying to do to Social Security, to Medicare, and to Medicaid.

Now I can only say to my colleagues that this is in my almost 20 years in this institution, or 19 years in this institution and 4 years as an elected official in Michigan, the most inequitable and the most egregious acts of unkindness in terms of a budget that I have ever seen. I assume people will become outraged. I know the AARP issued a report on Friday detailing the effects of these cuts. I know the Hospital Association is concerned because what these cuts really mean in addition is that many of our hospitals are going to close around the country.

I know our seniors are going to be concerned because, if they have a doctor that they like to go to, basically what this plan does is move them into a managed care system where they will not have the choice of the doctor they want unless they pay an even higher premium that I have quoted on the floor this afternoon. So, you are losing choice of doctor, you are paying more out of your pocket, all in order to save \$300 billion over 7 years, \$300 billion that will be used to pay for this tax cut that will go to the wealthiest people in our society.

I do not think I have seen in my years of public service anything as bold and as inequitable as this tradeoff. It is right there for everyone to see, and people will have to make up their minds whether this is what they had in mind when they voted on November 8, 1994.

The American family is squeezed today. Since 1979, 98 percent of all new income growth in the country went to the top 20 percent of households in America. The other 80 percent stayed even or went down, and most of them went down. We are seeing a bifurcation in our society today of wealth and people who cannot make it, and it is tearing this country apart, and it is having more of an effect on this Nation than just pure buying power or economics.

□ 1330

It is making people lose faith in the system. It is making people feel hopeless. It is what drives gangs to violence in inner cities and militias to violence in rural areas. We have to get back to the time in our country and our society and in this institution where there is some basis of equity and fairness and justice. The rich cannot have it all, and that is the direction we are going. This latest assault on seniors is a rollback not only of the New Deal of Franklin Roosevelt or the Fair Deal of Harry Truman or the programs of the Great

Society of Lyndon Johnson, it is a rollback to the days when we were indeed a society of extreme wealth and people struggling to make ends meet.

We bridged a lot of that gap. We made America a place of promise for virtually 80 percent of our population after the Second World War. And this latest budget is a rollback.

So I would say to my senior friends particularly who are watching, but also to my friends and colleagues from the country who approximate my age, 50, that these cuts will take a terrible, terrible toll, a psychological toll, a financial toll, and a spiritual toll, on the Nation.

I urge my colleagues in this body to reject this budget when we vote on it on Thursday of this week. Send it back to the Committee on the Budget. Let us have hearings on it. This was rolled out at midnight, by the way. Nobody saw it. Democrats did not see this until 1 o'clock in the morning, and they rolled it out a few days later on votes.

The American people need to see what is in this budget, and when they get a load of what has happened, to students, to our seniors, to Social Security. There was a promise made by the Speaker, Mr. GINGRICH, sitting up directly behind me, that they would not touch Social Security, and they have. They have cut COLA's, and it will affect every senior in this country hundreds, if not thousands, of dollars.

They said they would not monkey with Medicare, but they have. They have. It should not be surprising that they have. The majority leader, Mr. ARMEY, when he first ran for Congress, ran against Social Security. He does not really think we ought to have it, he thinks we can devise a better system, we should get rid of it. Back in 1986, Speaker GINGRICH hedged Medicare and the payments on Medicare against additional defense spending.

There are no friends of Social Security or Medicare, or few friends, I should say, on this side of the aisle. There are some. I do not mean to impugn the motives and actions of all of the Members on the Republican side of the aisle, because there are some who do care for these. But, for the most part, they will be voting in lockstep on Thursday to implement these cuts.

So I would just like to conclude, Mr. Speaker, by urging each and every one of my colleagues to look at the Robert Pear piece in the New York Times which outlines the memo that talks about the additional cuts in Social Security, the additional deductibles on Medicare, the additional premium increases, and also to look at the AARP report with respect to the same issue.

One final comment on choice, because I know it is so important, because so many of our seniors rely on a certain doctor for their care. They have confidence in that doctor. They should know that with this new system that we are about to embark on, if it becomes law, that choice will be taken away. Or you can keep it if you want,

but you are going to have to pay an even higher premium, an even higher premium than I have talked about here on the floor this afternoon.

#### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without prejudice to the resumption of legislative business, pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 5 p.m.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 36 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until 5 p.m.

□ 1700

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. WELLER] at 5 o'clock p.m.

#### REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1114

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 1114.

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

There was no objection.

#### REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1120

Mr. RAMSTAD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my name as a cosponsor of H.R. 1120.

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

There was no objection.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Speaker, for the first time in over 6 years, I was out of town on personal business last Thursday and Friday, and missed a portion of the rollcall votes on H.R. 961. I ask that the RECORD reflect that had I been present, I would have voted in the following manner: "No" on rollcall votes 321, 322, 323, 324, 325, and 328; and "aye" on rollcall votes 326, 327, and 329.

#### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned subject to the call of the Chair.

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. WELLER] at 6 o'clock and 3 minutes p.m.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS TO SIT TOMORROW, TUESDAY, MAY 16, 1995, DURING 5-MINUTE RULE

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on International Relations and its subcommittees be permitted to sit tomorrow while the House is meeting in the Committee of the Whole under the 5-minute rule.

It is my understanding the minority has been consulted and there is no objection to this request.

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

There was no objection.

#### CLEAN WATER AMENDMENTS OF 1995

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 140 and rule XXIII the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 961.

□ 1804

#### IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 961) to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, with Mr. MCINNIS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Friday, May 12, 1995, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DE LA GARZA] had been disposed of, and title VIII was open at any point.

Are there any amendments to title VIII?

#### AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BOEHLERT

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BOEHLERT: Strike title VIII of the bill (page 239, line 3, through page 322, line 22) and insert the following:

#### TITLE VIII—WETLANDS CONSERVATION AND MANAGEMENT

##### SEC. 801. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the "Wetlands and Watershed Management Act of 1995".

##### SEC. 802. FINDINGS AND PURPOSES.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds and declares the following:

(1) Wetlands perform a number of valuable functions needed to restore and maintain the chemical, physical, and biological integrity of the Nation's waters, including—

(A) reducing pollutants (including nutrients, sediment, and toxics) from nonpoint and point sources;

(B) storing, conveying, and purifying flood and storm waters;

(C) reducing both bank erosion and wave and storm damage to adjacent lands and trapping sediment from upland sources;

(D) providing habitat and food sources for a broad range of commercial and recreational fish, shellfish, and migratory wildlife species (including waterfowl and endangered species); and