

Conference agreement compared with:	
Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1995	-15,461,879,071
House bill, fiscal year 1995	+2,715,865,363
Senate bill, fiscal year 1995	-518,262,426

BOB LIVINGSTON,
JOHN T. MYERS,
RALPH REGULA,
JERRY LEWIS,
JOHN EDWARD PORTER,
HAL ROGERS,
JOE SKEEN,
FRANK R. WOLF,
TOM DELAY,
BARBARA F. VUCANOVICH,
JIM LIGHTFOOT,
S. CALLAHAN,
RON PACKARD,

Managers on the Part of the House.

MARK O. HATFIELD,
TED STEVENS,
THAD COCHRAN,
ARLEN SPECTER,
PETE V. DOMENICI,
P. GRAMM,
C.S. BOND,
SLADE GORTON,
MITCH MCCONNELL,
CONNIE MACK,
CONRAD BURNS,
RICHARD SHELBY,
JIM JEFFORDS,
JUDD GREGG,
R.F. BENNETT,
ROBERT C. BYRD,
D.K. INOUE,
E.F. HOLLINGS,
J. BENNETT JOHNSTON,
PATRICK J. LEAHY,
DALE BUMPERS,
BARBARA A. MIKULSKI,
HARRY REID,
BOB KERREY,
HERB KOHL,
PATTY MURRAY,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE CONGRESSIONAL RESOLUTION 67, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEARS 1996, 1997, 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, AND 2002

Mr. SOLOMON, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104-125) on the resolution (H. Res. 149) providing for consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 67) setting forth the congressional budget for the U.S. Government for the fiscal years 1996, 1997, 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE U.S. NAVAL ACADEMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, and pursuant to the provisions of section 6968(a) of title 10, United States Code, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Naval Academy the following Members

of the House: Mr. SKEEN, of New Mexico; Mr. GILCHREST, of Maryland; Mr. HOYER, of Maryland; and Mr. MFUME, of Maryland.

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE U.S. MILITARY ACADEMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, and pursuant to the provisions of section 4355(a) of title 10, United States Code, the Chair Announces the Speaker's appointment as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Military Academy the following Members of the House: Mrs. KELLY of New York; Mr. TAYLOR, of North Carolina; Mr. HEFNER, of North Carolina; and Mr. LAUGHLIN, of Texas.

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE INSTITUTE OF AMERICAN INDIAN AND ALASKA NATIVE CULTURE AND ARTS DEVELOPMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, and pursuant to the provisions of section 1505 of Public Law 99-498 (20 U.S.C. 4412), the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment to the Board of Trustees of the Institute of American Indian and Alaska Native Culture and Arts Development the following Members of the House: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska; and Mr. KILDEE of Michigan.

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE HARRY S. TRUMAN SCHOLARSHIP FOUNDATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, and pursuant to the provisions of section 5(b) of Public Law 93-642 (20 U.S.C. 2004(b)), the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment as members of the Board of Trustees of the Harry S. Truman Scholarship Foundation the following Members of the House: Mr. EMERSON of Missouri; and Mr. SKELTON of Missouri.

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

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

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

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

tleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

CLEAN WATER ACT AND THE GREAT LAKES INITIATIVE

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I come to the well this evening to express my strong opposition to H.R. 961, the Clean Water Act amendments and why I urged its defeat. It steps back from the progress resulting from our Nation's commitment to clean water as a national treasure.

I represent a Great Lakes district along Lake Erie. Cumulatively, the Great Lakes contain 20 percent of all the fresh water on the face of the Earth. For those of us who remember when swimming or fishing in Lake Erie was hazardous to your health, the actions the House is taking to weaken Clean Water Act protections are backward-looking. I am astounded that anyone can fail to see the great progress we have made over the last 25 years to clean up our Nation's water. Today, after two decades, the job of cleaning up Lake Erie is one-half finished. Our progress is laudable, but the goal has not been achieved along our coast or on the Nation's other major waterways.

I can remember when the Cuyahoga River burned and when Lake Erie was declared dead. Some of our colleagues, Mr. Speaker, have apparently forgotten. We have made great strides toward renewing our water resources, but there is still a long way to go. In Ohio, 92 percent of our lakes and 60 percent of our rivers still cannot support fishing or swimming on a year-round basis. Some of our waters still cannot support aquatic life. Just last summer the city of Toledo found it necessary to pump fresh water into the Ottawa River just to restore some oxygen and flush out the polluted discharge from combined sewer overflows. The job of cleaning our waters is far from over. The task of cleaning up dozens of major toxic burial grounds leaching into our fresh water tributaries stands before us.

The aspect of H.R. 961 about which I am most concerned is the provision to make adherence to the standards of the Great Lakes initiative voluntary on the part of Great Lakes States. This initiative has been a model bipartisan effort to standardize water quality protections in the Great Lakes watershed. Over the last 6 years, Federal guidelines have been developed, which, under current law, the States have 2 years to implement. Under H.R. 961, adherence would be voluntary. States could choose which standards to implement

or they could choose to unilaterally weaken certain standards.

This might possibly be an acceptable program for waters within a State's boundaries, but seven States and another country adjoin the Great Lakes. Allowing eight different sets of standards for these waters is irrational. As different States adopt differing water quality standards, their efforts may be defeated by a neighboring State's program. Voluntary compliance may even lead to a race to the bottom for water quality as each State offers weakened standards as an inducement to bring polluting industries into their State or to keep them there. Mexico's policy of competing for investment with lax environmental standards may find its counterpart in interstate or international economic rivalries on our northern border.

The Great Lakes comprise 95 percent of the fresh surface water in the United States. That is a resource too valuable to risk. Yet today we have restrictions on the consumption of fish from these waters because of mercury and PCB pollution. Lake St. Clair and the southern shore of Lake Erie were closed for the better part of the month of August last year because of fecal coliform contamination. The job is far from done in the Great Lakes. This is not the time to minimize our efforts.

Setting consistent water quality standards in the Great Lakes watershed is the only reasonable way to protect these waters. The only way to ensure consistent standards is through entities such as the Great Lakes initiative. It once was common to find fish with festering lesions and tumors coming out of Lake Erie. Today it is rare, but it still happens. There used to be a viable commercial fishing industry on the lakes. That industry rapidly diminished as warnings about eating Great Lakes fish increased. We can restore that industry if we continue to clean up the lakes. That won't happen if we can't assure consistent water quality standards for the Great Lakes Watershed. Let's not weaken the Great Lakes initiative.

The bill we have before us also takes other major steps backward. H.R. 961 allows for increases in toxin discharges into our waters, and it weakens public notification requirements when swimming or fishing is unsafe. It lets industry off the hook by weakening requirements for pretreatment of industrial toxins before they are discharged into municipal wastewater treatment systems.

H.R. 961 also dramatically undermines attention to wetland habitats—which play such an important role providing storage areas for flood waters and which naturally filter pollutants—by removing half of them from regulatory oversight. And the bill completely ignores the serious issue of nonpoint source pollution and how to reduce toxic runoff from farms, yards, streets, and parking lots.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to be able to vote for a clean water bill that aims

at meeting the original goals of the Clean Water Act, to make all our Nation's waters fishable and swimmable. But I am not going to have that opportunity. H.R. 961 will actually reverse the progress we have made under current clean water law. This bill will expose our communities, our water-dependent industries, and our fishery resources to continued and increased degradation. I want to support legislation that strikes an appropriate balance between a healthy economy and healthy water.

UNLESS WE DO SOMETHING ABOUT IT, MEDICARE WILL BE BROKE BY 2002

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

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, as everyone in this Chamber knows, we have a crisis coming in America, and it is a crisis that needs the best solutions that we can find on a bipartisan basis, and that is the crisis that the trustees responsible for analyzing the hospital portion of the Medicare have recently noted. They said in their report the present financing schedule for the Medicare program is sufficient to ensure the payment of benefits only over the next 7 years.

Now this is not a group of Republicans or Libertarians or Independents trying to scare the people. These are three of the top Cabinet officers of the President of the United States, Robert Rubin, Secretary of the Treasury; Robert Reich, Secretary of Labor; Donna Shalala, Secretary of Health and Human Services. They concluded the Medicare fund is projected to be exhausted in 2001, just after the turn of the century. This is their April 3, 1995 report.

Now Medicare, as we know, in the projections from 1995 to 2002 has been predicted to grow at 10 percent per year, and Medicaid at 10.3. Note Social Security with COLA's is at 5.3, other entitlements at 4.1.

The reality is the trust fund for Medicare, unless we do something constructive about it, will be empty in 2002.

□ 1830

That is what the trustees, the agents of the President, have noted on page 13 of their 1995 report, House Document 104-56.

Unfortunately, the trustees identify the problem, but they have not given us the benefit of their wisdom, if any, on this subject, as to how we can avoid the disaster that is headed our way in 2002.

Now, the House Republicans have faced up to this matter. We have not heard a peep from the President, a peep from his three Cabinet officers, but the House Republicans have noted in 1995 the Medicare spending per recipient in the Republican budget will be \$4,700. In

2002, it will be \$6,300. It will go up just as Social Security is going up, at approximately 5 percent a year.

Now, a lot of nonsense has been uttered, some of it on this floor, designed to scare seniors. I happen to care very deeply about this program. Not only that I am in my sixties and understand what it means when you are without Medicare, but the fact that 30 years ago, in 1965, as assistant to the Republican whip of the Senate, Senator Kuchel of California, I was part of the drafting team that worked with the Johnson administration to get a bipartisan bill, Medicare, through the Senate.

We need to be sure in this Chamber that that hospital fund is sound. We need the administration to face up to this and provide some leadership, or at least give us some of their ideas. So far, as I said, the President's agents have stepped up to the plate, winced, and are back in the dugout. They should be asked, as we tried to do earlier today, to give us their recommendations. Unfortunately, they seem to lack the courage to recommend to the Congress appropriate courses of action. We on the Republican side would welcome that.

This is the type of thing that should not be partisan, and the President needs to assume some leadership and not just stay in the background, assuming that Republicans will trip over themselves or that those on the Democratic side that want to help us on a bipartisan basis will trip over themselves. We will not.

The fact is the people expect us to function in a sensible way to solve problems, and not just sit there, posturing politically, and hoping for the best in the next election. Those that do not step up to the plate, face up to this, they will not be around after the next election.

So I urge my colleagues who have had quite a bit of criticism in recent days on this subject, let us get down to work, roll up our shirt sleeves, and solve the problem. The Republican budget has an increase for Medicare spending per recipient as you can see, \$4,700 in 1995, \$6,300 in 2002. That is positive effort. We need more of it by more people in this Chamber.

EDUCATION ASSISTANCE VITAL FOR AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CAMP). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WISE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, today while we are all talking about the budget, I would like to talk some about growth, because the reality is that you do not cut your way out of this kind of deficit problem, \$1.2 or \$1.4 trillion worth of cuts, cutting every program 30 percent across the board. You certainly do not