

Medicare that will result in doctors being allowed for the first time to overcharge the seniors. Seniors right now are capped.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHAW). The time of the gentleman has expired.

MEDICARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Texas, Mr. GENE GREEN, is recognized during morning business for 4 minutes.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, a lot of people who are here today and Members that are watching in their offices, this is our morning hour that each of us can get up and talk at this time for 4 minutes on issues that concern us.

A lot of us, whether you are Republican or Democrat, were concerned last week about the Medicare trustees issuing their report on the status of the Medicare trust fund. The trustees said that if nothing is done, the trust fund will be insolvent in the year 2001. This is a serious problem which the Congress should address in a bipartisan way.

However, instead of addressing this short-term problem of Medicare, because it is a short term, it was addressed in 1993 and extended it, and now we need to do it again. We should have done it in 1995 and now we should do it in 1996, to move the year out from 2001 to 2005 and hopefully 2010. But the Republican majority continue to insist that the way to do that is to cut Medicare trust funds and yet at the same time provide even more money in tax cuts.

Again this year the numbers have gone down. In 1995 we were looking at \$270 billion cuts in Medicare and \$245 billion in tax cuts. Well, this year it has gone down to where we want to cut \$168 billion in Medicare over 6 years and provide another \$176 billion in tax cuts. The cuts in Medicare are the cuts in the expected growth. The reason that is hard, I know a lot of times people listen and say, "Well, it's not really a cut in Medicare," and it is not. There is a growth in Medicare. But we have to have the expected growth in Medicare because there are more seniors growing into Medicare every day and if we just match inflation, then we are going behind and the people who are there now, the 70-year-olds, the 80-year-olds who are on Medicare are going to see a cut in the services they have. That is why it is a cut in Medicare even though it is a cut in the growth. But again we need to deal with Medicare and not talk about the tax cuts because they are irresponsible.

There is no free lunch. We learned that in the 1980's when Congress passed tax cut after tax cut and yet increased spending. You cannot cut taxes and increase spending. That is what they are looking for. There is no pain-free that you can do. But they have conven-

iently forgot that the last time Congress did this in the 1980's with a Republican President and Democratic Congresses, that is why we now have a \$5 trillion debt, and that is why it needs to be dealt with. But that was not done just by Democrats. In fact the last balanced budget we had in this country was in 1969 at the height of the Vietnam war and also at the height of the Great Society. So do not let anyone tell you that the Great Society causes debt. It is Congress not being able to control its expenditures on a yearly basis. We are still living with these consequences of the 1980's.

Now we have the summer movie season. For a year and a half the Republicans have been trying to write a sequel to the supply-side deficit from the 1980's. We call that "The Original." In Congress they offered the tax cuts and told the public we would grow ourselves out of deficits and into prosperity. In the sequel now we are seeing they want to offset their tax cuts with Medicare cuts. Unfortunately for the American people the sequels are rarely as good as the original and that is what worries me.

One of the other ways that they talk about preserving Medicare is medical savings accounts. Again we are considering a bill today for health care for everyone and hopefully we would have a health care reform bill. But it is going to die on the cross of the medical savings accounts and that is what is frustrating, because medical savings accounts, I can go out now or any individual can go out and buy a high deductible insurance policy now that says, "OK, I'll pay my first \$5,000." The problem is that the Republicans and medical savings accounts want to give that \$5,000 as a deductible on their taxes. This is the same Congress in the 1980's that removed the tax deductions for average individuals for buying regular medical care policies. If we are going to do it for the rich, then we need to do it for everyone who buys any type of health care policy. Let us make all health care premiums deductible and not just those for the rich.

HOUSE SET TO ELIMINATE BILINGUAL VOTING BALLOTS

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

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, later today the House Judiciary Committee will mark up legislation repealing the federally mandated law which requires bilingual voting ballots. It is about time this action was taken.

In the United States today there are some 375 voting districts across this country that require the printing of ballots in foreign languages.

In theory, these services should not be needed at all. Voting rights are extended to American citizens and, by law, English is a requirement for citi-

zenship in this country. In 1905 this Congress passed a law that said that in order for one to be a citizen and to vote, one had to have a working knowledge of the English language, so we should not even be providing government services in direct contradiction to the spirit of the law.

So I think this legislation which is before the Committee on the Judiciary today is preeminently legislation that we should be addressing now and should also be voting on this session of the Congress. These services of bilingual ballots are very expensive and unnecessary. By and large, multilingual ballots are rarely requested and even less often used than they are anticipated.

In one recent election in California, it cost something like \$100 per ballot that was used. So not only are bilingual ballots in contradiction to the present law, the spirit of the law, but also they cost the taxpayers one heck of a lot of money.

These ballots have other, more serious costs associated with them, too. For example, providing these special services creates the fiction that newcomers in this country can enjoy all the benefits of citizenship without learning the language of the land.

It is important to remember that if one wants to be successful and have their children be successful in our country, that the new Americans I think realize more than anyone else that the ladder of opportunity, the rungs of that, are the English language. Because in order for one to read a want ad, in order for one to fill out applications, in order for one to become integrated into the society, English is extremely important. One cannot become successful unless one has a good understanding of the English language. I think reality tells us that this is true.

Also, exercising one's rights of citizenship involves more than just casting a vote. It means making a thoughtful decision regarding the issues and the candidate. Multilingual voting ballots give individuals the right to vote without granting them the power to cast an informed vote. How can a person who is not versed in at least a working knowledge of the English language take part in the political campaign, listen to the debates, listen to the issues and therefore cast an informed ballot?

Mr. Speaker, multilingual ballots are another vestige of the 1960's obsession with the Great Society and the caretaker state in the 1960's, when we had the Great Society and government was going to do everything for everybody. Now this vision of government is bankrupt and we must dismantle the legislative relics of that era. That is why the legislation which is only a first step that is being taken up in the Committee on the Judiciary today is so important, because it is getting us back on the track of commonsense government again.

THE 104TH CONGRESS IS LEAST PRODUCTIVE SINCE WORLD WAR II

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, today is BOB DOLE's last day in the U.S. Senate. I would like to salute the legacy of outstanding public service that BOB DOLE has given to this great country of ours.

While it is his last day, I truly do understand why he would like to depart the Congress of the United States. If we take a look at what has occurred in the 104th Congress, we can get some idea why anyone would want to distance themselves from this failed 104th Congress.

The gridlock strategies that have been imposed by the Speaker of the House, Mr. GINGRICH, have led to the dubious distinction for the GOP-controlled 104th Congress as the least productive Congress since World War II. By any measure, the 104th Congress has been a failure.

This lack of productivity of this Congress has been noted by neutral commentators. Helen Dewar of the Washington Post has written, "Their ambitions have far outstripped their legislative achievements, resulting in one of the least productive sessions in modern history, a session long on promise and short on results." Similarly Kevin Phillips, who is a partisan, a Republican analyst, has noted, "The 104th Congress may be the worst in 50 years."

First we can examine the number of bills that have been enacted, and as of June 11 this Dole-Gingrich Congress has enacted a total of 150 public laws, the lowest total at this point in the Congress going back to World War II. Second, not only have they failed to pass a number of laws, but what they have succeeded in doing is doing harm to men, women, and children in this country.

If we do not want to take a look at the numbers and numbers of laws that have been passed, that is fair. But what we do need to do is take a look at policy, and what kind of policy have they implemented and what kind of policy have they tried to derail. Let us take a look at that. By pursuing an extremist agenda, the Dole-Gingrich Congress has failed to deliver any kind of results to the American people.

Specifically, no health insurance reform, no minimum wage increase, no balanced budget, no expansion of access to educational opportunity, as a matter of fact, cutting off avenues of educational opportunity to young men and women in this country and cutting a school loan program. I could not have gone to college without student loans. Why do others who have them and had them in coming here want to let them go for others in this country? No welfare reform. No tax cuts. No improvements in pension security, and no improvements in environmental protection.

Let me tell my colleagues one specific area in which they will do and are contemplating doing great harm to the American public, and that is in the area of Medicare and Medicaid, hurting seniors in this country. All they are asking, after a lifetime of work and playing by the rules, is a decent and a dignified and a secure retirement.

Today on this floor we will discuss a budget resolution that has come back after being debated by the House and the Senate, and the stakes are high in this debate today because Medicare and Medicaid are going to be cut in a sweeping way if the Republican majority has its way, if Mr. GINGRICH has his way. Today 37 million seniors depend on Medicare, and we in the Congress have a solemn obligation to make sure that they can count on it. Medicare must be protected.

Medicare and Medicaid once again are on the chopping block, with a \$168 billion cut in the Medicare Program, \$72 billion in the Medicaid Program. Let me just say that today 99 percent of our seniors are covered through the Medicare Program. They have health insurance because of Medicare.

□ 0945

There are people here who would tell you they are not going to cut this program, and in fact that is precisely what they are going to do. They are going to remove the restrictions that are now placed on doctors and hospitals, where they cannot overcharge seniors. Those will be gone.

I implore the American public, listen to the debate today, and do not allow this Gingrich Congress to do harm to seniors in this country.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHAW). Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the House stands in recess until 10 a.m.

Accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 45 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess until 10 a.m.

□ 1000

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 10 a.m.

The Reverend Dr. Donald F. Christian, Office of the Bishop, Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, Washington, DC, offered the following prayer.

Almighty God, You are the giver of all that is good and the provider of all that is needed, so we offer our gratitude this day for Your many gifts and blessings. For the diversity of Your created order seen all about us in the animal, vegetable, and mineral worlds, for the beauty of life which can be observed in plants, the places, and the people of Your kingdom, our voices join together to proclaim our gratitude. Yet, we must also confess that we have sometimes allowed Your gift of

diversity to divide us and thereby allow animosity, hatred, and even bigotry to enter our lives and Your world. We acknowledge, that our sometimes frantic activity has permitted us to be less than grateful for nature's beauty of color and its symphony of music provided without cost to one and all alike. Good Lord, forgive us. So, we begin this day, with bowed heads and humble spirits accepting our dependency upon You, offering our gratitude for Your kindness, and seeking mercy for our shortcomings. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Chair's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5, rule I, further proceedings on this question are postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain fifteen 1-minutes on each side.

LET US GET TO THE TRUTH NOW ABOUT WHY THE WHITE HOUSE OBTAINED FBI FILES ON 349 REPUBLICANS

(Mr. BOEHNER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, by now we all know about the White House's FBI files, background files, on some 349 Republicans here in Washington. A couple of them happened to be staffers that work for me. Now, only the White House knows why they asked for these files, and only the White House knows what they have done with these files over the last several years.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is time for the White House to come clean, to work with the FBI so that we have no more coverups, and that we get to the bottom of this truth on this issue now, not after the election in November.