

While we in the United States may sometimes complain about the skyrocketing costs of college tuition or the need for more classrooms, what we often take for granted is the fact that everyone has access to education. This is not always the case in other countries. For example, in countries such as Albania and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, ethnic minorities are often denied access to education.

Although international law and treaties signed by Albania guarantee ethnic Greeks a right to education in their native tongue, they are still denied equal access. Indeed, as Mrs. Porter, wife of Congressman JOHN PORTER of Illinois, pointed out to me in a letter dated December 14, 1995: "The oppression on the Greek minority in Northern Epirus is palpable. It is evident in the lack of Greek schools in towns and villages with predominately Greek populations and the denial by the government that such need exists."

While this situation troubles me, I am encouraged by the friendship and cooperation agreement that the two countries signed this March.

In addition, to the situation in Albania, a similar situation exists for ethnic Albanians in the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia. The Albanian-language University of Tetova still has not been officially recognized by the government. Ethnic Albanians are denied equal access to education. Indeed, as my friend and colleague, Congressman GILMAN, stated last September, the government "is not taking sufficient steps to ensure that those citizens from its considerable Albanian population are provided with adequate opportunities for higher education in the Albanian language."

Mr. Speaker, the challenge we face is to bridge the education and cultural gaps that exist in these countries to ensure that their respective ethnic minorities receive the education to which they are entitled. We must work to encourage removal of educational barriers, not only in the southern Balkans, but also in other parts of the world.

#### TRIBUTE TO RICHARD STULZ

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

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, America is a great country because we are a Nation that is filled with great people.

A wonderful person passed away a couple of days ago, a good friend, Dick Stulz, who was one of the border patrol leaders in the San Diego area, was a wonderful citizen, a wonderful husband and had a great family of children and grandchildren who absolutely adored him.

Dick Stulz was a guy who believed very strongly in two things: securing America's border and taking care of his people.

Last time I saw him, he had a border patrol agent under his wing as one of the union leaders of the border patrol, and he was trying to see to it that this gentleman who had been assaulted at

his house by illegal aliens would get some protection from his government.

Dick Stulz passed away a couple of days ago and his wife Veronica gave me that call about that tragic situation. She was at his side when he passed away.

I thought it would be important to tell my colleagues a few things about Dick. He was born in Philadelphia, PA. He was one of those guys who joined the Marine Corps in 1952, served with them for 30 years. As his duty stations, both at home and abroad, he was instrumental in establishing the communications networks that are required to support various military activities.

Furthering his dedication to government service, Dick was a lifetime member of the Navy-Marine Corps Military Affiliate Radio System. As such, he participated in several recovery missions during man's historic decade in space, spanning Apollo missions 7 through 17, where he played an integral role in processing and patching both military and civilian phone traffic between the recovery ship and various points around the globe.

□ 2245

His work on the Apollo recovery missions earned him lifetime membership with the VHF Spacenet.

In addition to his military service, as I said, he worked for 25 years with the United States Border Patrol. His job was effectively coordinating communications between field stations and agents on patrol along our border. And during this time at the Border Patrol Dick became highly involved with the National Border Patrol Council Local 1613, where he served as first vice president, and it was Dick Stulz who interested me in the idea that the Border patrol needed help and that the Border Patrol represented not just a faceless agency that secured America's border, but it represented some of the finest public servants in the United States. And it was a result of Dick's work that we started a scholarship fund for the children of Border Patrol families, and we are going to continue that fund. We are going to call it the Dick Stulz Memorial Fund. His wife Veronica, I know, will help us to make it work and keep it going.

And I just wanted to remind my friends also that on a more personal level Dick was always mindful of his military brethren and their sacrifices, and he actively supported a lot of veterans organizations. He had the distinction of being the only non-Hawaiian member of the Hawaii VFW Post 9512. He supported Pop Warner leagues around the country, and additionally he did just about everything that his children and grandchildren asked him to do.

Dick Stulz was a wonderful American. He is a kind of a person that makes this country work and gives us faith in our fellow man. So, Mr. Speaker, I know that my colleagues join me in wishing the very best for Dick's family in mourning his passing.

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

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

#### SOCIAL SECURITY REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, usually I am sort of a calm, old farmer from Michigan, and I take the ups and downs and the comments of what people say pretty casually. This afternoon, though, I was quite upset when I heard Secretary Rubin and Secretary Shalala and the commissioner of the Social Security Administration, Shirley Chater, in effect say that there was not very much trouble with today's report of the trustees on Medicare and Social Security.

The report on Social Security said the fund would technically be broke by the year 2029, and the reaction from that group was that, look, that gives us a lot of time in the future to make the changes we need. Social Security has never been broke.

I guess, Mr. Speaker, my problem is why are our heads in the sand? Why are they putting their heads in the sand? Why are Republicans, why are Democrats, not facing up to the issue of saving Social Security?

Look. Let me tell you what happened back in 1983 before the Greenspan Commission started. At that time they said the unfunded liability of Social Security would take 1.82 percent of existing payroll to make Social Security solvent. Guess what it is today? Today it is up to 2.17 percent of existing payroll to keep Social Security solvent, and yet Secretary Rubin said, well, you know, we have approximately \$500 billion in the trust fund. But there is no money in the trust fund. Every dollar of surplus money that comes into that Social Security trust fund automatically goes into the general fund and is spent for whatever we spend money for in the United States Congress.

There is no trust fund. The money comes in one month from the FICA taxes from current workers, and it goes out immediately that month to existing retirees.

Just think of this. Back in 1945, right after World War II, there were 42 people working for every one Social Security retiree. Guess what it is today? Today it is three. When the baby-boomers retire, around 2013, there is going to be about 2½ workers. And yet the reaction was from one of the questions of the press, "What do you do you when the baby boomers start retiring around 2012 and there is no money in the fund? Where are you going to come up with the money," Secretary Rubin said, "Look, that interest alone in a separate fund will last until 2019."

My colleagues, Mr. Speaker, there is no separate fund. We have used up all of the money. If we were to start today to make Social Security solvent for the next 75 years, we would have to, if we just looked at reducing benefits or increasing taxes, we would have to increase the FICA taxes by 16 percent starting today, or we would have to start reducing benefits by 14 percent, starting today.

Now, that is why some of us have decided to introduce a Social Security reform bill to gradually increase the retirement age, to allow individuals to invest some of that money in their own account.

I know why they are saying there is no big deal. They do not want to disrupt the senior vote for this coming November election. But it is not fair to the future. I think the mistake they are making, Mr. Speaker, is thinking that senior citizens only care about their own economic welfare.

Here is what I think American senior citizens care about, and that is leaving a good world, a good United States, to their kids and their grandkids.

#### SOCIAL SECURITY TRUST FUND SOLVENCY

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, the congressional Republicans today began once again to distort the issues surrounding the Medicare trustees' report, basically in order to attempt to justify their extreme and damaging cuts in the Medicare program. It is the same thing they did last year. If you think about over the last 18 months, the congressional Republicans have refused to cooperate with President Clinton and congressional Democrats to make responsible adjustments to Medicare and extend the solvency of the trust fund. In fact, if you look at the votes over the last 18 months, congressional Republicans have repeatedly voted for deep cuts in the Medicare program in order to pay for their massive tax cuts for the wealthy and against bipartisan reforms that would extend the solvency of the trust fund.

I just wanted to point out some of the key votes on this issue because once again we heard today that there was no effort by the President or by the Democrats to solve the problem with the trust fund. The President actually stated today, mentioned on several occasions when there were votes in this House to try to deal with the solvency issue, and he actually asked the congressional Republicans, the Republican leadership, to come out and support similar type proposals once again before the end of this Congress.

Back in May of 1995, about a year ago, the House Republicans brought up their budget resolution for the fiscal year, and that vote basically provided \$288 million in Medicare cuts to pay for

\$345 billion in tax cuts targeted to the wealthy. This was the first major time when we saw the Republican leadership move on these massive cuts in Medicare and propose major changes that I think negatively impact the Medicare program.

Now, the Medicare cuts in that first budget resolution, the one that they passed last year, were more than 3 times larger than the \$90 billion in Medicare cuts that the trustees stated were necessary to extend the solvency of the trust fund through 2006; in other words, another 10 years. According to the Treasury Department, 52 percent of the tax cuts in that proposal went to the top 12 percent of American households, those making over \$100,000, and it not only made these cuts that basically was transferring money to wealthy Americans, but it also undermined the current Medicare program. Among other things, the deep GOP cuts would have doubled the monthly Medicare part B premium paid by all Medicare beneficiaries, drastically reduce the reimbursement paid to providers under the Medicare program, which would result in hospitals closing and also, I believe, jeopardize the general quality of health care available to seniors.

Now, some have said, well, what was the Democrats' alternative? Well, in October 1995 the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS], a Democrat who is the ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means, brought up a vote on exactly or proposed an amendment on exactly the \$90 billion in Medicare reforms; in other words, the level of cuts that the Medicare trustees said was necessary to make sure the program remains solvent into the next century.

Well, 233 House Republicans voted against the Gibbons substitute, again a strong indication of the fact that they were not really interested in dealing with the solvency issue but wanted to make the larger cuts that would have primarily been for tax breaks for the wealthy and the substantive changes in the Medicare program.

We had other votes. We had a vote on October 19 also. This was a motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT] to recommit the budget or to recommit the GOP Medicare Revisions Act and basically would have removed the increase in the monthly part B premium paid by all Medicare beneficiaries. So once again Republicans on record, in this case 233 Republicans who said that it was okay to significantly increase part B premiums for every Medicare beneficiary who opted for the part B program, which pays for doctor bills.

Now, this year we see the same thing happening again. On May 18, just really a few weeks ago, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO], who is the ranking Democrat on the Committee on the Budget, he brought up the Clinton budget, the President's budget that essentially contained \$116 billion in Med-

icare reforms and would have again solved the solvency problem and extended the Medicare program and kept it solvent into the next century. This was again something that was 225 House Republicans voted against.

So when someone says to me, what are the Democrats doing, what is the President doing to try to deal with the solvency problems, those votes have come up, the President's budget came to the floor, and once again the Republicans voted it down.

Instead what we got on May 18 was the new Republican budget resolution for the next fiscal year. Again the same thing again. It called for \$168 billion in cuts in the Medicare program, too much unless you want to use it for tax breaks for the wealthy.

#### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HAYWORTH. In view of the preceding remarks, do the rules of the House require that speakers tell the truth during the course of their remarks?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is not a valid parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HAYWORTH. I thank the Chair. However, I find it a valid point.

#### MEDICARE TRUST FUND

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

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, you know the one thing, or one of the things, that a representative democracy cannot tolerate is the poison of disinformation and deceit and demagoguery. And it is a solitary, singular and extraordinarily disturbing time when it is necessary to, or one is certainly moved to feel the necessity to correct the record at every single turn just so that the poison of disinformation, the poison of deceit, the poison of hypocrisy and the poison of lies will not completely undermine the very fabric of our ability to represent ourselves in a representative democracy.

So what I would like to talk about this evening is the Medicare trust fund and particularly this chart because what this is this is the Federal hospital insurance trust fund report, for it represents the report for 1995 and then for 1996.

In 1995 the trustees, the President's trustees; these are not, they are not supposed to be, partisan trustees, they are nonpartisan, or they really should not have a partisan impact. But if they were going to be considered partisan, I suppose you would have to consider them to be Democratic representatives because they were all appointed by the President. But I do not consider them to be partisan; I do not think that is correct. I think that in fact they were