

in there, there is no book to stop the agency from getting out of control. In your amendment you talk about going back to the 1987 delineation manual and sticking to that until we get something better. You define wetlands in your definitions of your amendment as land that supports aquatic vegetation or wetlands-type vegetation. That is your definition of a wetland.

I say to my colleague, now, on your way home tonight, or when you come in in the morning, because it's going to be dark here, go by just 395, make a right, go down about a mile, and you'll see a sign that says the future site of the Fairmount Hotel, and it's an acre or two of land that has toolies, that has sitting water on it, that looks, by every definition, as a wetland, but this is land that's been developed for a long time that we tore down an old building. They're putting up a new one.

I say to my colleagues, I mean you have got to have something more to it than that. You've got to define the difference between the wetlands I saw in Louisiana and this. You've got to define the difference between what the value of these wetlands are to the environment. You don't do that; that's what we're trying to fix.

Mr. Chairman, we are trying to stop the agencies from going out, and running amok, and trying to do this type of thing. That is what has to stop. I say to my colleague, your amendment to this bill doesn't do that, and I understand the importance of wetlands in different parts of the country. I heard the people in North Carolina talk about the importance of wetlands to their area. I heard the people in Louisiana talk about the fishermen, talk about the importance of wetlands to their livelihood. I heard the people in Vancouver talk about the importance of wetlands to their livelihood, but there is a big difference between the wetlands that they talk about and the wetlands that look like this. They are not the same thing.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. POMBO. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BOELERT. I would like to read one section, section 818, definitions. The term "wetland" means those areas that are inundated or saturated by surface water or ground water at a frequency and duration sufficient to support and that, under normal circumstances, do support, a prevalence of vegetation typically adapted to life in saturated soil conditions.

Mr. POMBO. OK. Now, does the gentleman understand his definition because I am going to ask the gentleman a question about that?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. POMBO] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. POMBO was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. POMBO. I say to the gentleman, If you understand your definition of

what is in your amendment, if I had a broken water pipe, and the land was sufficiently saturated so that it would support the kind of vegetation that is in a wetland, would that not fit your definition?

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

Mr. POMBO. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BOEHLERT. No, it would not, because that was manmade, and it is frequency that the gentleman is ignoring. That was a one-time occurrence.

Mr. POMBO. Reclaiming my time, I have read the gentleman's amendment. Reclaiming my time, the gentleman's definition states that it is land that is saturated enough so that it will sustain aquatic vegetation.

Mr. BOEHLERT. But the gentleman is forgetting the frequency part of the definition. That is important.

Mr. POMBO. Yes, if the land is wet long enough, it will support that kind of vegetation.

In my house in California, across the street they have a cattle trough, and it runs over all the time because it comes out of a spring and it supports aquatic vegetation. It has got toolies down the cattle pasture. It is saturated long enough to fit the gentleman's definition, and it is not a wetland, and that is the kind of stuff we are trying to stop. I say to the gentleman, You don't allow us to do that. You're getting back into the original reason that the Clean Water Act was passed. We wanted to stop polluted rivers. We wanted to stop polluted rivers.

Now, somewhere along the line they decided that we were going to regulate wetlands under the Clean Water Act, and there is a reason to protect wetlands. We all understand that. Any of us that have done our homework understands the reason to protect wetlands, real wetlands. But there is a big difference between differing types of wetlands. I say to the gentleman, What you have in your home State is not the same as what I have in my district.

□ 2030

What Mr. HAYES has in Louisiana is not the same as what is in my district. You are not giving us the ability to differentiate between those. You are throwing it back to the bureaucrats, throwing it back to the regulators and telling them you are going to make the decision. You are avoiding making the tough policy decisions that have to be made. Let us give it to the bureaucrats.

One of the things that has frustrated me the most about serving in this body is that we intentionally draft legislation to be as vague as possible so that we can always blame it on the regulators. We can always blame it on the bureaucrats. It is always their fault. It is never our fault.

Unless we start making changes like this bill has in it, we will never correct these problems. Make the tough decisions.

Mr. SHUSTER. 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. HAYWORTH) having assumed the chair, Mr. MCINNIS, 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. 961) to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, had come to no resolution thereon.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET TO FILE REPORT ON CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET, FISCAL YEAR 1996

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Budget have until midnight tonight to file its report on the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1996.

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

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HAYWORTH). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

MEDICARE AND THE BUDGET

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

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, our Republican colleagues tell us they want to fix Medicare. But I find it curious that fixing Medicare was never a Republican priority until they needed to pay for a \$345 billion tax break for the wealthy.

Even now the Republicans have failed to put forth a concrete plan that will ensure the long-term solvency of Medicare without compromising health care costs and quality for our Nation's seniors. All the Republicans have put forward is a proposal to cut Medicare by \$285 billion. This plan is all cuts and no reform.

This convenient discovery of a Medicare crisis is nothing but a smoke-screen for the real Republican goal: They want to use Medicare as a piggy bank for their tax giveaway to the wealthiest 1 percent of the taxpayers.

The GOP budget takes away \$1,060 in Medicare benefits from seniors on fixed incomes to pay for a \$20,000 a year windfall to those Americans making over \$350,000. Courageous? Hardly.

And, what of the Republican plan for reform? While the Republicans don't mind being specific about tax giveaways and Medicare cuts, they've

taken a Let's Make a Deal approach to Medicare reform. They've given us door No. 1, door No. 2, and door No. 3, but they want to pass the buck on who makes the painful choices.

Regardless, it's clear that seniors will be stuck with the booby prizes. Secret documents from the House Budget Committee show that the Republican plan would force seniors to pay more in deductibles, premiums, and copayments.

According to House budget committee documents, options the GOP has proposed would:

Increase the deductible that beneficiaries must pay for doctors' services before Medicare coverage begins. The annual deductible, now \$100, would be raised to \$150.

Nearly double the monthly \$46 premium to \$84 by the year 2002. That would be an increase of \$456 a year for seniors—just in increased monthly premiums.

Charge co-payments of 20 percent for home health care and laboratory tests.

Republicans call these extra costs for seniors part of the fair shared sacrifice needed to balance the budget. But there's nothing fair and nothing shared about this sacrifice. All the sacrifice will come from seniors, many on fixed incomes who simply can't afford these extra costs. And the benefits go primarily to the wealthy in the form of tax cuts.

It's no wonder that Republican Representative GEORGE RADANOVICH of California said the following: "If we had come out with this budget as our Contract, they wouldn't have voted us in."

Amazingly, while some Republicans are honest enough to admit that balancing the budget will be painful, Speaker GINGRICH claims that \$283 billion in Medicare cuts will be painless. The Speaker wants to have it both ways: He claims that the Republican plan saves money and balances the budget, and in the same breath he also claims that this plan increases Medicare spending. These claims beg a simple question: If the Republicans aren't cutting Medicare, then where are the savings?

True, overall Medicare spending in the year 2002 will be more than it is today. But the spending level in the Republican plan falls woefully short of keeping pace with health care inflation or with increased enrollment in the program. The consequence of the Republican plan will be reduced benefits, higher costs, or both. Republicans know this is the case and it's time to come clean with the American people.

These drastic cuts in Medicare have come as a surprise to many Americans. Even to many Americans who voted in the new Republican majority in 1994. Remember the GOP "Contract With America"? Medicare cuts weren't included in the Republican blueprint.

But now that the Republicans have given away all the goodies of the Contract in the first 100 days, they need to

find someone to pay for them. And seniors on Medicare are a convenient target. That's what this is all about.

Promises made, promises kept—that's been the Republican rallying call of late. But it seems that Republicans have forgotten our solemn promises to America's seniors.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Guam [Mr. UNDERWOOD] is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. OWENS 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. COLLINS of Illinois (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), on May 15 and 16, on account of personal business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

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

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

Ms. DELAURO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. UNDERWOOD, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. OWENS, 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 Ms. DELAURO) and to include extraneous matter:)

Ms. PELOSI.

Ms. SLAUGHTER.

Mr. KANJORSKI in two instances.

Mr. POSHARD.

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island.

Mr. VOLKMER.

Mr. RUSH in two instances.

Mrs. MALONEY.

Mrs. MEEK of Florida.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota.

Mr. GEPHARDT.

Mr. GEJDENSON.

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

Mr. BLILEY.

Mr. RAMSTAD.

Mr. BEREUTER.

Mr. HOUGHTON.

Mrs. KELLY.

Mr. DAVIS.

Mrs. MORELLA.

Mr. CRANE.

Mr. FLANAGAN.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 40 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Tuesday, May 16, 1995, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 or rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

876. A letter from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Department of Energy to sell Eklutna and Snettisham projects administered by the Alaska Power Administration, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Resources, Commerce, Ways and Means, the Judiciary, Transportation and Infrastructure, Government Reform and Oversight, and the Budget.

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:

Mr. ARCHER: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 1590. A bill to require the Trustees of the Medicare trust funds to report recommendations on resolving projected financial imbalance in Medicare trust funds (Rept. 104-119, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. KASICH: Committee on the Budget. House Concurrent Resolution 67. Resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the U.S. Government for fiscal years, 1996, 1997, 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002 (Rept. 104-120). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

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. GEPHARDT (by request):

H.R. 1635. A bill to combat domestic terrorism; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and