



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 104th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 141

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, OCTOBER 10, 1995

No. 156

House of Representatives

The House met at 12:30 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. EVERETT].

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
October 10, 1995.

I hereby designate the Honorable TERRY EVERETT to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING BUSINESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of May 12, 1995, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning hour debates. The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to not to exceed 30 minutes, and each Member except the majority and minority leaders limited to not to exceed 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] for 5 minutes.

THIS CONGRESS IS ANTIEVERYTHING THE CONGRESSIONAL CAUCUS ON WOMEN'S ISSUES HAS WORKED FOR

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I take the floor to talk about some interesting things that symbolize what is happening in the political debate in this House.

Last week we saw a real brouhaha on this floor about something I never thought we would see a brouhaha over. There are three women in the basement of this building that represent the suffragettes, and when that statue

was done, they were supposed to bring that statue and bring it in the rotunda. As my colleagues know, the statue was done many, many years ago, but they never put it in the rotunda. They have kept it in the basement.

Mr. Speaker, this year we are celebrating the 75th anniversary of women having the right to vote, and so some of us thought, well, maybe it is time we could at least keep our word to the people who paid for that statue and see if we could bring it up to the second floor where it belongs, in the rotunda. I guess they thought there were too many women in the rotunda already. I did not see any; I mean it is kind of a guy circle in there. But guess what? When it came to the floor, Members on the other side of the aisle said no, and that symbol, representing women and the gains they have made in the 75 years, got pushed back down in the basement where they still are if we were to walk around and see them. Hopefully we will finally reach some consensus on it.

But that also reflects what is happening to statutes, or laws, that have been passed by this body because many of the statutes that we have worked so hard to get through are being derailed, they are being pushed back down or pushed out of the lawbooks, and let me talk about some of those.

One of the things that I was proudest to have participated in was in 1988 we did something I think every American and everyone who stands in this well and talks about family values ought to have been for, and that was no American family should be forced to go to the poorhouse because one person in that family got terribly ill. This bill was called the Spousal Impoverishment Act, and what it meant is that there were many elderly couples, and when one would get to the point where they needed to go to a nursing home, there was nothing else that could happen. Both had to sell everything they had

and be totally impoverished before Medicaid would allow one to go into the nursing home, and then, when that one was deceased, my colleagues can imagine what happened to the remaining spouse. There they were, totally impoverished.

Mr. Speaker, our bill said that was wrong, and what we should do in that family situation is divide those assets between each party and, yes, use the asset, the half of the assets that represent the one, but we do not impoverish them both because one got ill.

My colleagues, that was done away with by the Committee on Commerce last week as they marked up the Medicaid bill and had no hearings. So the spousal impoverishment statute, just like the women's suffrage statue, has not been allowed to come to the first floor. The spousal impoverishment statute has been shoved out of the lawbooks, and we are back to putting families' lives on the line.

Another thing that happened was that adult children, their homes could be attached, all sorts of things could happen if their family member was in a nursing home and could no longer pay. So it not only went to the immediate couple, it then could go back to their children, and we started reaching back and put liens on their homes and whatever until they started paying, and I do not think there is any American alive who wants their children to be tapped for that. We all want to be independent. We all hope we will live to be healthy in our old age and never need to have this happen. But again we have prevented that from happening through the law, and again that all disappeared as it came out of the Committee on Commerce in the new Medicaid bill as it now stands.

We saw on the Senate side, the other body, we had worked so hard for child support enforcement, strong child support enforcement. The other body in its wisdom has decided to put a 10-percent

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper containing 100% post consumer waste

H9745

tax on that. So, if the Government helps collect child support, the Government keeps 10 percent of that money.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that again, I think, is very antifamily values and antieverything the Congressional Caucus on Women's Issues had worked for. If my colleagues look at any number of other issues, they see them being rolled back, they see them being rolled back, and, as my colleagues know, people do not believe it. We had even the Violence Against Women Act barely, barely funded when it was unanimously agreed to a year ago.

I hope people watch what happens to that statue of those three women, and wake up and find out what is happening to the statutes that so many women have cared about, and men, too.

MEDISCARE TACTICS AND OTHER FALL FICTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYWORTH] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I always enjoy spending time of course in the Sixth District in Arizona, but I also enjoy returning to the well of this body to hear some very creative accounts of what has transpired here, and I appreciate my predecessor here in the well for offering her unique interpretation on events, but, as the RECORD will reflect, because I have done some checking specifically about the statue of the suffragettes that came to the floor as a unanimous-consent request, one Member, a new addition to this House, the gentlewoman from North Carolina, stood in opposition citing the cost of \$80,000 to \$100,000.

Now there are those in this body who say, "Hey, it is no big deal. A little bit of money for a symbol; that's fine." I personally would like to see the statue brought up, but perhaps we ought to find some means of funding to remove the statue—

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYWORTH. No, not at this time, I will not yield. The gentlewoman has had 5 minutes. I appreciate my amount of time. I will not yield to the gentlewoman at this time. I would be happy to debate her at a later time.

So too have we had interesting interpretations, not only from the gentlewoman and indeed from almost all the folks over here on this side of the aisle, as to what is transpiring in terms of health care for all Americans, but especially health care for senior citizens. I listened with great interest as my friends on the other side continue to play the game of "MediScare."

As my colleagues know, we thought the big fiction time for reading, Mr. Speaker, was in the summer with those great big, thick paperback books. No, no. It is right now here in the fall with the blatant charges that are coming from the other side that are just filled with disinformation.

With reference to the so-called spousal impoverishment statute, I would hope that Members on the other side would stand with us to rail against the greater source of spousal impoverishment and family impoverishment, and that is a confiscatory tax policy that penalizes for Americans for succeeding not only in this life, but from the grave. The same folks who voted to tax us retroactively maintain an estate tax that is absolutely confiscatory and punishes the very people we should be helping. Indeed our entire policy is this: "If you succeed in this Nation, somehow you are to be punished." It is not fair.

Why it is not fair that one works hard and succeeds. They ought to take that money and surrender it to the State.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYWORTH. I will not yield at this juncture. I will continue my remarks, and the gentlewoman has had her time earlier.

My colleagues heard it completely in the fiction that we will hear no doubt again from the other side today. It has been the greatest line. It is cited as a catechism even among the pollsters of the liberal news media who seek somehow to solidify something that is absolutely false. The other side will march to the well of this House and say that the new majority is trying to change Medicare to pay for a tax cut. That is just blatantly and totally false. The fact is the new majority worked very hard on a budget plan to bring this budget into balance within 7 years that paid for all of the tax reductions along the way.

My colleagues, here is the big secret that somehow is not getting out. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, I would challenge the major news media outlets of this Nation to use this part of my remarks because it is the absolute truth, and it is what people are missing in this whole debate. If our budget were balanced today, right now, we would still have a problem with the Medicare trust fund. Members of both parties, three members of the President's own Cabinet, tell us that Medicare is going broke. We have to fix it, and something else that follows the school lunch fiction and all the other scare tactics. The fact is we are not cutting Medicare. We are reducing the rate of growth. The average expenditure per beneficiary rises almost 40 percent over the next 6 years, from \$4,800 this year to \$6,700 in the year 2002. So, it is not a cut, and to hear the wailing and gnashing of teeth, and creative accounting from the other side almost defies imagination.

I say to my colleagues, apply it in everyday terms to your own life. Your son or daughter comes to you asking for an allowance. I use an example from my own. My oldest daughter, going from junior high to high school, wanted an allowance increase from \$5 a week. I felt in a sense of parental lar-

gesse we double it to \$10 a week. Now because I did not give her \$15, Mr. Speaker, she wasn't yelling that it was a cut of \$5. She got a real increase.

So, my colleagues and Mr. Speaker, listen closely to the charges. They are without foundation. It is the MediScare tactics of the past. Read the real record. Check the real numbers.

OUR SENIORS' CONCERNS ABOUT REPUBLICAN MEDICARE REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from Texas, Mr. GENE GREEN, is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to my colleague, the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER].

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I will be very brief because the gentleman from Texas is being very kind. I am glad I got to answer these statements.

No. 1, the cost for bringing the statue up. There has been a private group that the Senate has put together that is willing to do this, it is my understanding, so that is not an issue.

No. 2, I find that countering spousal impoverishment by saying that estate taxes are too high; for heaven's sakes, if they are both in the poorhouse, estate taxes are not going to matter.

So we are beginning to see what the gentleman from Arizona and his party—

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman did not yield to me, and I do not mind yielding. I think I yielded to the gentleman every time.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. SCHROEDER. At this point, Mr. Speaker, I yield back to the gentleman from Texas, Mr. GENE GREEN.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. I will yield, but let me make my remarks about the Medicare to my colleague from Arizona because I want to make sure my colleagues understand that that is what our morning hour here is about, so we can exchange ideas and talk about it.

Over the last week I spent a lot of time in my district, like other Members have, and I used this last week to meet with constituents, and visit a number of my senior citizens' centers, and answer their questions, and I have not had the opportunity to host our Social Security Commissioner, Dr. Shirley Chater, in Houston, and she toured one of our west-end senior citizen centers, the Magnolia Senior Nutrition site, and also the Texas Medical Center to talk with those who are most affected by the proposed cutbacks in Medicare.