

BUSH 2001 TAX REDUCTION BY STATE FY 2001–2002—Continued

	Total (Dollars in millions)	Per capita	Per household
Texas	7,719	362	936
Utah	595	260	673
Vermont	197	320	828
Virginia	3,069	426	1,102
Washington	3,169	527	1,362
West Virginia	363	201	518
Wisconsin	1,888	349	902
Wyoming	207	411	1,061
District of Columbia	317	559	1,445
Total	111,571	392	1,013

Notes. Includes provisions that only affect individual income tax liabilities.
Source. Tax Foundation.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, this chart illustrates the benefits of the income tax rate reductions State by State. As you can see, all taxpaying families in all States benefit. The examples are endless of the great benefits that we realize when we give tax relief to working families.

While I am pleased about the first anniversary, I won't be satisfied until we make these bipartisan measures permanent.

Let's tell every taxpayer they can count on the 10 percent bracket 10 years from now. Let's tell the small business owner that, after 10 years of hard work, they won't face a tax rate of 39.6 percent. Let's tell the single mother with two children that her taxes won't rise by \$1,200. Let's tell the newlyweds that 10 years from now they don't have to face a marriage penalty. Let's tell family farmers they won't face the death tax 10 years from now. Let's tell workers saving for retirement that they can put away \$5,000 in their IRA 10 years from now. Let's tell a young couple that 10 years from now they will continue to be able to save \$2,000 each year per child for college savings.

I would like to sum up. In historical context, the tax relief package provides a modest refund to all taxpayers at a level previously supported by the Democratic leadership. Over time, the Democratic leadership's notion of what the top rate of tax should be has moved up.

Three assertions about the tax relief package, repeated almost daily by its critics, are incorrect. I will correct them once again. The tax relief package is bipartisan. The tax relief package did not cause our current or long-term budget problems. The tax relief package is progressive.

Finally, and most importantly, the tax relief package provides important resources for families, small businesses, retirement security, and education. These resources are valuable and should be available to the American people on a permanent basis.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has used his 20 minutes.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. BREAUX. Madam President, a parliamentary inquiry with regard to

the time situation: Is it allocated to morning business or where am I?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until 11:45 is controlled by the Republican leadership.

Mr. BREAUX. Madam President, I ask then if the acting Republican leader will yield me some time.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Mr. GRASSLEY. How much time is the Senator going to use?

Ms. SNOWE. Madam President, I will use 15 minutes, but I am happy to defer to the Senator from Louisiana to precede me if I may and ask unanimous consent, of course, to do so, and then I will take my 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are only 12 minutes remaining under the previous order.

Ms. SNOWE. May I ask unanimous consent to extend that by 3 minutes to 15 minutes and 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BREAUX. Parliamentary inquiry: If I understand that, it is extended by 5 minutes, that will be until 10 to noon. Let me have 5 minutes now.

Ms. SNOWE. I am glad to yield 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

MEDICARE

Mr. BREAUX. Madam President, today is a very important day because it is the 37th anniversary of the passing of the Medicare legislation providing universal coverage of health care for all seniors. Everybody got it. No matter what your income was, there was no gap. Those with low income got Medicare, hospital, and doctor coverage. If you were of moderate income, you got it. If you were upper income, you got it. It was a concept 37 years ago that Medicare should be a universal health care plan for all seniors.

Today, we are at some point going to be debating a fundamental change in Medicare by saying that only a portion of seniors are going to get real prescription drug coverage—not all seniors, but we are going to means test it. According to the piece of paper provided by the supporters of that approach, individuals below 200 percent of

poverty—which is \$13,300 for an individual—are going to have a Cadillac-type of coverage plan. But if you make \$13,301, tough luck. You are going to have to pay 95 percent of your drug coverage if you are not below 200 percent of poverty until you reach a figure of about \$3,300 worth of out-of-pocket drug expenses, and then the Government will make up 90 percent.

It is really interesting to see whom are we talking about covering. It is also important to think about whom we are not covering under this scaled-down version.

The average number of people in the United States below 200 percent of poverty is 30 percent. That means 70 percent of the American elderly would not qualify by being under 200 percent of poverty. These are working people who have paid taxes when they were working, who are retired, and now, because they don't qualify as being 200 percent under poverty, all of a sudden we are going to leave them out of a Medicare Program that was supposed to provide universal health coverage for all Americans. This is a fundamental break with what Medicare was all about, which was a universal plan for all seniors, not just for seniors making under 200 percent of poverty.

Seventy percent of America's elderly would not qualify for the 200 percent poverty standard. That is not what we signed into law 37 years ago and celebrate today, the advent of a Medicare Program that was universal coverage for all citizens.

I understand why we are attempting to do that. That is because we are trying to spend less money. The tripartisan plan said we could spend \$370 billion and reform Medicare by giving seniors new options and also provide a universal prescription drug plan that covered all seniors, not just those under 200 percent of poverty.

If I were a senior who had an income of \$13,301, according to their chart, I would be very unhappy with what the Senate is considering now. Seventy percent of America's seniors would not qualify under 200 percent of poverty. We can do better than that. We can do far better than that. We can do more for less, if we do it correctly and we do it in the proper fashion.

We had a plan under the tripartisan plan that was a comprehensive plan. It was a \$24-a-month premium for seniors who have to meet a \$250 deductible, and