

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

tax your way out of it. You are going to have to have a strong element of economic growth. My concern about this budget that will be on the floor today and tomorrow, the Republican budget out there for review, actually Wednesday and Thursday, is that what this budget does is it goes after growth.

Let me give you an example why. I hold here thousands of petition signatures of West Virginia college students and high school students, and I am willing to bet some parents, all who signed petitions circulated across our State in just the last couple of weeks urging Congress not to adopt the student loan cuts that are proposed in this budget. Whether it is West Virginia University, Shepherd College, Glenville, Fairmont State, University of Charleston, D&E, Davis and Elkins, you name it, 16 colleges and universities participate in this program, sending petitions under our own name, SAVE, Save America Via Education. They organized this effort themselves. They circulated the petitions, got up on Internet. The message is clear to Congress, thousands of people saying "Do not cut student loans."

Basically what is proposed to be cut is the Stafford Student Loan Program, the one that pays the interest while the student is in college and for 6 months thereafter.

Does it make much of a difference? It adds something like 20 to 50 percent to the lifetime cost of that loan. Many of these students somewhere along the road, and I visited many of the locations, said to me if that had been in effect I would not be able to be in college today; I would not be able to be in school today.

I have heard some say lightly, well, \$21 a month, maybe that is all it is going to be. One CD, one music CD. Rubbish. For many people, \$21 a month is a lot of money over a number of years. It is more in many cases, such as the nontraditional students, the mother who has put herself through a 4-year program, now getting an MBA, who said her daughter is now getting ready to enter undergraduate school, who told me how it would have been impossible at \$21 more a month to have accomplished that.

Why is this so important? It is so important because, getting back to growth for a second, the opportunities created by a college education mean that our economy will grow at record levels. Those of you older than 40 or 50 remember the impact of the GI bill, when millions of veterans came home from the war and were able to get that education.

The Department of Labor estimates that everyone who finishes college on the average will have a 60-percent higher lifetime income than those that do not. This college education clearly is a ticket to success, not only for individuals, but also for our society.

There is also a problem with college classrooms. If you have less people able to attend college, and, incidentally, since 1979 the median income has gone

up roughly 88 percent, I believe it is, while the tuition costs have gone up more than double that. So family income does not keep up with tuition income, which means these programs are more important. But there is also the very real fact that even those able to pay the full amount of tuition will find less students in school and therefore less classes available.

This is not a partisan issue. This is parents. It is teachers. It is students. It is anyone concerned about higher education. These thousands of students from across West Virginia have recognized clearly the impact this has.

Incidentally, it is not an interest loan deferral for all their lives; it is only for the time they are in school. They pay these loans back. But what the Federal Government does is to assist them in making sure they do not pay interest while they are actually in school.

So I would urge Members not to support this Republican proposal to cut student loans. While I am here, let me note I found of interest, it was just a month ago as I traveled the State when Republicans were asked about this. They said we have no intentions to do that. Today it is in the budget in a bigger way than I ever dreamed. I thought it was going to be \$16 billion. It is 33 billion dollars' worth of cuts.

So to respond to those who signed these petitions, this battle is going to go on over the summer and fall, and we urge many more people to make their voices heard. If you want to talk about growth, growth in our children, growth in our society, growth in our economy, then we cannot be cutting the student loans. I would urge rejection of the budget for that reason alone.

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

[Mr. MILLER of California 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 gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. WARD] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. WARD 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 gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DEFAZIO] is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

HOUSE REPUBLICAN BUDGET PROPOSAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Missouri

[Mr. CLAY] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the House Republican budget proposal.

There is a saying which goes "If you think education is hard, try ignorance." In today's budget-cutting frenzy, Republicans seem to be doing everything possible to establish ignorance as our national educational policy.

Recall that their assault on education started in the cafeteria, with their misguided, vicious attack on the School Lunch Program. With this latest volley, Republicans have now moved the battlelines into our Nation's classrooms, libraries, vocational training centers and, finally, to our college campuses.

The House Republican budget proposal would virtually obliterate the Federal role in education. It is a repudiation of this Nation's century-old bipartisan, national commitment to enhancing the educational opportunities of all of her citizens.

The House budget proposal is extremist and completely out of step with the views of the American people.

Moving into the classroom, Republicans would abolish or slash extremely popular and successful educational programs. Programs like Head Start, which they would reduce by \$609 million in 1996, cutting off services to as many as 100,000 children a year.

The widely popular school-to-work initiatives that help the majority of high school graduates learn the technical skills they need to get good-paying jobs.

Republicans would eliminate across-the-board efforts in 47 States to improve reading and writing, to put computers into the classroom, and to improve academic standards through Goals 2000.

The budget proposal virtually eliminates the Safe-and-Drug-Free School Program—even though drug use is on the rise among schoolchildren.

Programs that target assistance to 700,000 at-risk, disadvantaged children would be abolished. Republican hostility to programs designed to lift disadvantaged children out of poverty through learning is completely at odds with our highest ideals, as well as decades of bipartisan congressional policy.

Having laid waste to the cafeterias and the classrooms, the Republicans move on. They would eliminate Federal support for public libraries—the main repositories of knowledge and wisdom in our society.

Their next target is higher education. Their proposed cuts in student aid are a dramatic departure from the national policy established by nearly every President and Congress since President Truman, the Republicans are endangering the American dream for millions of working-class families.

House Republicans recommend cutting student aid as one way to finance