

over and over again the talk about forcing seniors into managed care, forcing seniors into managed care. We do not do that. What we do is we preserve the system. We preserve it not only for this generation but the next, and I hope we all vote for it tomorrow.

VOTE "NO" ON THE REPUBLICAN
PLAN TO RAPE MEDICARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BUNN of Georgia). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KLINK] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KLINK. Mr. Speaker, there was a song back in the early 1970's by Janis Joplin, and the previous speaker, my colleague from Pennsylvania, kind of reminded me of it. I would like to change the words, and that is she said, "Freedom is just another word for nothing left to lose." I think it is freedom is just another word for being forced to choose, and that is what the Republican Medicare plan is about. Senior citizens will be forced to choose whether or not they want to follow their doctor. That is as the Republican fail-safe, and he is right. If people want to stay in traditional Medicare as they have it today, they will be able to do it, but they may find out that their doctor does not do it because the fail-safe plan the Republicans have built into Medicare is going to squeeze the traditional medical fee for service, and so you may have to choose whether or not you stay with your doctor or whether you follow that doctor who decides to go out and get involved in HMO's or managed-care systems.

So freedom to choose is being forced to choose, to have to choose whether you want to stay with your Medicare system as it is now or you want to stay with your doctor if that doctor decides to sever himself from the system.

This Congress began the 104th Congress with very loud chanting of a Contract With America. Medicare, Mr. Speaker, is a Contract with America. It is a contract that was made 30 years ago at a time when one in three senior citizens in this Nation lived in poverty, when it was common for senior citizens to have to decide whether they were going to heat, whether they were going to eat, buy medicine, or pay the rent. It was a common problem prior to Medicare for the children of those senior citizens to have to decide what they would do with their assets, how much they would spend or how much they would sell off if mom or dad got sick. This is the 1930's, and 1940's, and 1950's, prior to Medicare that the Republican plan wants to take us back to. This is the \$270 billion that they want to cut, \$270 billion they want to cut, and, yes, dollars are fungible. These dollars are not going into, this \$270 billion that we are cutting from growth of the program, is not going to prop up Social Security. It is not going to prop up Medicare. Dollars being fungible, it is

going to pay for that \$245 billion tax cut.

Now, I know that my colleagues on the other side say we are not cutting, we are not cutting. We are slowing the increase. The question is this:

Will seniors get less? Yes. Will seniors pay more? Yes. They are going to pay more and get less. That is a cut. Will the part B premium double over 7 years from \$46.10 now to over \$90? Yes, that part B premium will be doubling. Will it go back to prop up the part A that the trustees' report deals with and that seniors are upset with? No, it will not be used to prop up part A. Did one Republican vote for the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993 that at that time saved Medicare? Not one, not in this body and not in the other body, and that was in 1993 when we were told the same thing that we are being told now, that we have to make adjustments on Medicare. Not one Republican vote went up to save Medicare in 1993. Yet, now they have got all their concerns, and in fact how many Republicans voted for Medicare back in 1965 when it went into law? The fact of the matter is 93 percent of them voted against it.

The majority leader takes to the well of the House and says in a free country he would have no part of Medicare, and yet we hear Member after Member stand up saying, Trust us, trust us. We want to save Medicare. We are all for it now.

I say to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, Your actions speak much louder than your words and speak many more volumes than your words, that in fact it is evident to us that you have not ever supported Medicare and you are not supporting Medicare now.

This whole idea of a Medicare savings account, what a joke it is. Senior citizens in my district, very poor to moderate income in coal-mining and steel towns of southwestern Pennsylvania, many of my seniors live only on Social Security, and I know Social Security was not intended to be the sole support of people in their final years, but a point of fact: For many it is. Those people cannot afford to plow in thousands of dollars that they would spend in a few moments of having major health problems. They cannot afford it, and in fact I heard from a lady just several weeks ago who said to me, "Congressman KLINK, the fact of the matter is that after I pay the expenses that I have to pay, my rent, my utility bills, I've got \$87 that's for food, that's for everything that I am going to spend for the rest of the time I'm here."

Medicare savings accounts will not help people like that. Vote no on the Republican plan to rape Medicare.

REPUBLICAN PLAN BRINGS
HEALTH CARE INTO THE NINETIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gen-

tleman from Georgia [Mr. KINGSTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, you know we all elected 435 Members of this body on certain campaign promises and representations, and, you know, some of it is campaign rhetoric and some of it is not, some of it is righteous indignation, and some of it is accurate, some of it is not. But when you get elected, we know you do have to do the hard job of governing, and some of the job is very, very difficult, some of the decisions that you have to make.

Now one of the things that we as the new majority were faced with this year was the bankruptcy of Medicare, and that is from the chart right here where the trustees, the Medicare trust fund, said that the plan is going to go bankrupt in 7 years. We got to deal with that. We cannot hide our heads in the sand.

Now just think what would happen in a good bipartisan effort if the best ideas of the Democrat Party, the best ideas of the Republican Party, came together and said, By golly, this is—these are our moms and dads. We got to come together and save this.

You know it is very difficult to get some things established in this town, or some things passed, when you have a whole group of special interest organizations out on both sides of the aisle convincing constituencies that the sky is falling. If the Republican plan goes through, or if the Democrat plan goes through, send me your \$25 check to prevent this horrible thing from happening, and yet, you know, I would think inside this body of the 435 of us would maybe be above that kind of foolishness, that we would say, you know, maybe there is something to be said for what the Democrats are saying, and maybe there is something to be said for what the Republicans are saying, and just maybe we can get our ideas together and do the best for both instead of all this that, oh, you are going to cut, you are going to throw senior citizens out on the street, you are going to do this, you are going to do that.

You know, I heard a speaker earlier tonight say we voted against the Clinton plan and we should not have voted for it. It added countless new bureaucracies and agencies in the health care system that clearly had rationing, and there were not choices of physicians. You know here is a plan that allows choice of physicians.

Now you know the Washington Post, which as my Democrat colleagues would say certainly is not exactly the Republican, you know, GOPAC brochure; you know what do they say about the Republican plan? They are saying that they are being responsible, this is credible, it is innovative, it addresses a genuine problem. That is what the Republican plan says.

Now you know on you folks it says what the Democrats do and it is scare tactics, demagogery, and it is wrong.

Now I do not believe that every member of the Democrat Party is wrong and doing scare tactics, but I would say there is a good number of you doing that, and it is kind of—I will be glad to yield to my friend from Miami who is above this and I hope would not be described by the Washington Post.

Mr. DEUTSCH. Actually could I have the last poster, please? The previous one you cite the—

Mr. KINGSTON. Reclaiming my time back, I am on this poster now, and, when we get to your plan, I will give you that poster—

Mr. DEUTSCH. Does the gentleman yield for 1 second?

Mr. KINGSTON. One second.

Mr. DEUTSCH. You know you have a quote from the trustee report up on the last poster, and would the gentleman agree with the trustee report which does not call for \$270 billion in cuts?

Mr. KINGSTON. Now let me reclaim my time. As the learned gentleman from Miami knows, that they did not stipulate it. Now you guys came up with this \$89 million kind of a late hit. I am sure—

Mr. DEUTSCH. Eighty-nine billion.

Mr. KINGSTON. Eighty-nine billion. I am sure they would hold it up and say what are we going to do? You know we got to get off the book deal on GINGRICH, come up with a plan this year. Well, you know, here is a program for us. We are going to go ahead and jump on Medicare.

You know, to my friend, the distinguished lawyer, I want you on the team. You have a lot to offer, and I am sure that with all the intelligent men and women on your side of the aisle and on our side of the aisle we could do what is right for mom and dad. We can give them that choice of physician. We can give them the plan that is going to be there tomorrow. We can let them have the same choices we have when we go into our insurance situation, and we would not have to tell them, you stay with that 1964 Blue Cross plan that we designed for you because you are not driving that 1964 Chevrolet Biscayne any more. We want to bring you into the nineties on health care.

That is what we are trying to do, and I think itself so irresponsible for us, and it is really just tacky, and it is not what we are sent here to do, is to say, oh, look what's happening. This is a tax cut for the wealthy and so forth. So I will be glad to yield to my friend when I get some time later on.

□ 2230

SENTIMENT AGAINST REPUBLICAN MEDICARE PLAN RUNS HIGH

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, if we want to deal with the war of the newspaper clippings, let me read a few headlines: "House GOP Medicare Bill Wins

Over Doctors with Hidden Enticements, Promise of Profits," "Keep Nursing Homes Standard," "GOP Medicare Bill Seems to Favor Fraud."

Washington Times, not a liberal newspaper in this town: "Ride for Doctors," "Beneath the Surface, the Health Care Plan is Offering Booms," "GOP Changes May be Worth Hundreds of Millions to Doctors and Hospitals."

Let us see what else we have here. "Bills Would Relax Federal Controls on Nursing Homes."

So, let us deal with it. There are lots of newspaper articles and lots of commentary about the Republican plan.

Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we will vote and the Congress will vote cut \$270 billion in Medicare to pay for a \$245 billion tax cut for the wealthy. I will vote against it. I will vote against it, because the people that I represent have asked me to vote against it. My constituents have sent me petitions, they have called my office, they have written heartbreaking letters, all to tell me to vote against the Republican pay-more-get-less plan.

I want to share some of their thoughts and feelings here tonight. Let me hold up this stack of Medicare questionnaires that have been collected throughout Connecticut's third district by wonderful senior volunteers.

The question put to my constituents was, would you support a plan to cut Medicare in order to finance a tax cut? The overwhelming response was no. In fact, more than 12,000 petitions were collected by our Medicare team captains in a little over 5 weeks. That is 12,000 signatures opposing the Medicare cuts.

The sentiment against the Medicare cuts runs high. Let me read a letter from Helen Patent of New Haven, CT, because I think that she speaks for so many seniors.

She writes, and I quote, "I am very, very upset that Congress wants to put such devastating cuts in Medicare and Medicaid programs. There are so many people that rely desperately on these programs. My husband and I are both very dependent on Medicare. After raising seven children, my husband is retired. We both have had triple bypasses within the past six years and have tremendous hospital, doctor and medical bills. Without the help of Medicare, we would have lost our house and all that we have worked so hard for. Please preserve our Nation's health care system to ensure that every individual has the right to health care now and in the future."

I say thank you kindly to Helen Patent for her letter. Helen and seniors like her all across this country depend on Medicare. They know that it works, and they do not want this Congress to destroy Medicare.

It is time for Congress to put the public interests before the special interests. Read the headline on this article.

But that is not what we have seen in this body when it comes to Medicare.

In fact, in the last week, two groups came to Washington because they had concerns about the GOP Medicare bill. Members of one group were treated to a closed-door meeting with the Speaker; and members of the other group, they got arrested.

The first group was the American Medical Association. The AMA got a back-room deal worth billions of dollars.

The second group was the National Council for Senior Citizens. The National Council and the 15 seniors got a trip to jail. They closed the light in the hearing room, they put handcuffs on these senior citizens, they put them in the car, in the wagon, and they took them downtown to be arrested, and they held them for 2 hours. Yes, indeed, they did.

What was the crime of these seniors? They came to the people's House. That is where we are. We are in the people's House. They came here to ask questions about a Medicare bill that affects their lives every single day. They wanted to participate in our democracy.

Mr. Speaker, we serve at their pleasure. That is what we do, is to bring their voices here. They wanted to see the details of a proposal that has such a deep impact on their life.

Medicare cuts are not an abstract issue to American seniors, and these cuts mean pain for our Nations seniors.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2425, MEDICARE PRESERVATION ACT OF 1995

Mr. LINDER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104-282) on the resolution (H. Res. 238) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2425) to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to preserve and reform the Medicare Program, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

DEMOCRATS' FAIRY TALES REQUIRE A RESPONSE

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

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I really did not come intending to speak on this, but I have heard so many fairy tales in the last 20 minutes that I thought it was worth responding.

Mr. Speaker, those poor seniors that came to the Committee on Commerce seeking information, only seeking information, made a phone call before they came to the police department in Washington DC and said, what must we do to get arrested? They did it, and they were arrested. They were immediately released. That is a fact, and they were sent on their way because they in fact did disrupt a committee hearing.

We have heard a lot about doctors' hidden enticements in favor of fraud.