

There was no objection.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks, and that I may be allowed to include tabular and extraneous material, on H.R. 1905.

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

There was no objection.

#### APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 1817, MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 1817) making appropriations for military construction, family housing, and base realignment and closure for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

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

There was no objection.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. OBEY moves that in resolving the differences between the House and Senate, the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill H.R. 1817, be instructed to not provide funding for non-quality of life projects added above the President's request, which are in excess of the cumulative amounts added for such projects in the House passed bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] and the gentlewoman from Nevada [Mrs. VUCANOVICH] will each be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the House will recall that when the House passed the military construction bill, it included added projects for high-priority quality-of-life projects such as barracks, child care centers, family housing, and medical facilities.

The bill also provided roughly \$150 million for projects that were not requested by the President for operational needs.

The other body, however, added some \$350 million in projects, many of which do not appear to fit anybody's definition of a high priority.

My motion, Mr. Speaker, provides very specific direction to the conferees that in resolving the differences between the House and the Senate on

projects that the most high-priority needs be addressed and that the cumulative level of funding for non-quality-of-life projects added by the Congress not exceed the level currently in the House bill, which is roughly \$150 million.

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

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this motion to instruct conferees.

The committee has put quality-of-life projects first. We have worked hard in a bipartisan manner to fund troop housing, family housing, child development centers and medical projects. We have put our dollars where the Department of Defense needs them most.

We have funded projects that are priority locations.

So I urge my colleagues to support the gentleman's motion, and I support it.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman.

I would clarify this motion does not address any added projects specifically. Therefore, the motion does not preclude any specific project from being considered in conference. The motion simply limits the total amount of non-quality-of-life add-ons.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to instruct.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees: Mrs. VUCANOVICH, and Messrs; CALLAHAN, MCDADE, MYERS of Indiana, PORTER, ISTOOK, WICKER, LIVINGSTON, HEFNER, FOGLIETTA, VIS-CLOSKY, TORRES, and OBEY.

There was no objection.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. 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. 1817, the bill just considered.

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

There was no objection.

#### APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE U.S. MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, and pursuant to the provisions of section 1295b(h) of title 46, United States Code, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy the following Members of the House:

Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. MANTON of New York.

There was no objection.

□ 1900

#### SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

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

[Mr. HOYER 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 California [Mr. HORN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

#### REHABILITATION NEEDED, NOT SURGERY

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, during the month of August, I met with many senior citizens who are very concerned about the proposed Republican Medicare reductions of \$270 billion. I am even more concerned that there are no specifics as to how the cuts will be made. The Republicans so far have refused to give us any details concerning their plan.

The public has the right to examine the Republican plan. Instead the Republicans are opting for the stealth attack approach of slipping cuts right by seniors before their plans can be analyzed.

Many Republicans are claiming that Medicare is going broke, which is simply not true. Medicare is more solvent today than it has been in a long time. The trustees report show that definitively.

As a matter of fact the trustees have spoken out against the Republican plans in a commentary entitled, "Rehabilitation Needed, Not Surgery,"

which was printed in the Los Angeles Times. I would like to submit this commentary for the RECORD.

The article outlines the fact that the Republicans did not stumble onto something new regarding the question of Medicare solvency.

In the last 20 years, the trustees reported several times that Medicare would run out of money in 4 years or 6 years. The recent trustee report extends solvency to an all-time high of 7 years, 1 more year than was the case last year. I wonder why Republicans did not raise this issue last year, when health care reform—to increase health coverage—was the biggest issue of the year?

Throughout the last 20 years questions of solvency have been raised and Congress worked together making the minor adjustments necessary to maintain Medicare's funding. Congress can work together again, if Republicans will drop their \$270 billion Medicare cut.

The trustees go on to say that the Republican's Medicare cuts are excessive, citing that "It is not necessary to cut benefits to ensure the fund's solvency." I believe the true motivation behind the largest Medicare cuts in history is giving the better-off a big tax cut. Republicans first propose taking \$270 billion out of Medicare and then call it reform.

Seniors in New Jersey realize what is really happening. They are being asked to come up with more than \$1,000 a year in out-of-pocket costs in order to finance a tax cut largely for the wealthy. It is simply not fair and those of us who care about seniors must fight to kill this terrible Republican proposal.

The article referred to is as follows:

[From the Los Angeles Times, Aug. 28, 1995]

REHABILITATION NEEDED, NOT SURGERY

(By Robert E. Rubin, Donna E. Shalala, Robert B. Reich and Shirley S. Chater)

Our nation is involved in a serious examination of the status and future of Medicare. Congressional Republicans have called for \$270 billion in cuts over the next seven years, claiming that Medicare is facing a sudden and unprecedented financial crisis that President Clinton has not dealt with, and that all of the majority's cuts are necessary to avert it.

While there is a need to address the financial stability of Medicare, the congressional majority's claims are simply mistaken. As trustees of the Part A Medicare Trust Fund, which is the subject of the current debate, and authors of an annual report that regrettably has been used to distort the facts, we would like to set the record straight.

Concerns about the solvency of the Medicare Part A Trust Fund are not new. The solvency of the trust fund is of utmost concern to us all. Each year, the Medicare trustees undertake an examination to determine its short-term and long-term financial health. The most recent report notes that the trust fund is expected to run dry by 2002. While everyone agrees that we must take action to make sure that the fund has adequate resources, the claim that it is in a sudden crisis is unfounded.

The Medicare trustees have nine times warned that the trust fund would be insol-

vent within seven years. On each of those occasions, the sitting President and members of Congress from both political parties took appropriate action to strengthen the fund.

Far from being a sudden crisis, the situation has improved over the past few years. When President Clinton took office in 1993, the Medicare trustees predicted the fund would be exhausted in six years. The President offered a package of reforms to push back that date by three years and the Democrats in Congress passed the plan. In 1994, the President proposed a health reform plan that would have strengthened the fund for an additional five years.

So what has caused some members of Congress to become concerned about the fund? Certainly not the facts in this year's trustees report that these members continually cite. The report found that predictions about the solvency of the fund had improved by a year. The only thing that has really changed is the political needs of those who are hoping to use major Medicare cuts for other purposes.

President Clinton has presented a plan to extend the fund's life. Remarkably, some in Congress have said that the President has no plan to address the Medicare Trust Fund issue. But he most certainly does. Under the President's balanced budget plan, payments from the trust fund would be reduced by \$89 billion over the next seven years to ensure that Medicare benefits would be covered through October 2006—11 years from now.

The congressional majority's Medicare cuts are excessive; it is not necessary to cut benefits to ensure the fund's solvency. The congressional majority says that all of its proposed \$270 billion in Medicare cuts over seven years are necessary. Certainly, some of those savings would help shore up the fund, just as in the President's plan. But a substantial part of the cuts the Republicans seek—at least \$100 billion—would seriously hurt senior citizens without contributing one penny to the fund. None of those savings (taken out of what is called Medicare Part B, which basically covers visits to the doctor) would go to the Part A Trust Fund (which mostly covers hospital stays). As a result, those cuts would not extend the life of the trust fund by one day.

And those Part B cuts would come out of the pockets of Medicare beneficiaries, who might have to pay an average of \$1,650 per person or \$3,300 per couple more over seven years in premiums alone. Total out-of-pocket costs could increase by an average of \$2,825 per person or \$5,650 per couple over seven years. According to a new study by the Department of Health and Human Services, these increases would effectively push at least half a million senior citizens into poverty and dramatically increase the health care burden on all older and disabled Americans and their families. The President's plan, by contrast, protects Medicare beneficiaries from any new cost increases.

As Medicare trustees, we are responsible for making sure that the program continues to be there for our parents and grandparents as well as for our children and grandchildren. The President's balanced budget plan shows that we can address the short-term problems without taking thousands of dollars out of peoples' pockets; that would give us a chance to work on a long-term plan to preserve Medicare's financial health as the baby boom generation ages. By doing that, we can preserve the Medicare Trust Fund without losing the trust of older Americans.

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

[Mr. MCINTOSH 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 Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, this year, as we celebrate the 75th anniversary of women's vote, our society has once again dusted off its perennial "women's question"

What do women want?

Well the events of this week, from the fight of women NGO's at the conference in Beijing to have their voices heard, to the fight of the brave Oregonian women who wanted simply to have a public hearing about Senator PACKWOOD's sexual misconduct, make one thing pretty clear.

Women want dignity and respect so that they have the same opportunities as men to achieve and contribute to their society.

Dignity and respect.

#### BEIJING CONFERENCE

Respect from Boutros-Ghali, who won't even go the U.N. Conference on Women, but gives it as a consolation prize to a country who is on global probation for its dismal human rights violation.

Respect from Chinese for the democratic ideals that allow freedom of speech and freedom of assembly.

Respect from countries that practice traditions that degrade women. Examples: FGM; sold into the slavery of prostitution; doused with gasoline and burned to death because their dowries are deemed too small.

Respect in the workplace.

Which brings us to the Packwood case and the women who so bravely came forward with examples of Senator PACKWOOD's sexual misconduct.

This summer I met with 4 of the 17 women who brought the complaint against Senator PACKWOOD. They spoke of their outrage with Senator PACKWOOD's abuse of power. They said his behavior was "demeaning, disrespectful, and humiliating to those who are the victims."

As Senator MCCONNELL said today, "There was a habitual pattern of aggressive, blatantly sexual advances mostly directed at members of his own staff or other whose livelihoods were connected in some way to his power and authority as a Senator."

I applaud the Senate Ethics Committee for standing firm and clearly saying, we will not tolerate this type of behavior.

I found the committee's vote a real sea change. No doubt about it—having more women in the Senate—especially women like Senator BOXER, Senator MIKULSKI, and Senator SNOWE who were willing to shake things up—helped to create this new climate.

The ruling is certainly shaking the foundations of the club. It's no secret that these guys have protected each other over and over again. The ruling is a signal that those days are over.

Most importantly, the vote shows that the Senate, and Congress, has evolved in understanding that women are in the workplace, and they deserve respect.

We tell private employers that this conduct will land them in court. Today, we tell elected officials, this behavior will kick them out of Congress.