on some of the numbers. We talk about the budget, and I have said over and over again we need to make sure that whatever is resolved with the budget, that Medicare is preserved, that Medicaid is preserved, that those programs are not cut in order to finance tax breaks for the wealthy, and also that we are concerned with environmental priorities and education priorities.

I just wanted to give some information about numbers and how some of those priorities transfer into real terms and into the effects on the average American, particularly with regard to Medicare and Medicaid.

The Republican-proposed budget cuts Medicare by $270 billion and increases costs on beneficiaries. In effect, these cuts increase direct and indirect costs on Medicare beneficiaries, on our senior citizens, placing a huge financial burden on seniors and people with disabilities.

If you look at it, the cuts in the Medicare Program alone basically are $1,700 per beneficiary, per senior citizen, by the year 2002, and premiums for those seniors increase to $89 per month in 2002, an annual increase of about $440 per couple.

If you also look at the amount of money that is going to be available to Medicare by reference to the amount of money that would be available for someone who is getting health care in the private sector, the $270 billion Medicare cut would limit spending per Medicare beneficiary to a rate that is more than 20 percent below the projected private insurance per person growth rate over the next 7 years. So Medicare now will not be keeping up with the amount of money that is available for those who are paying for their health insurance privately.

Even more important, right now Medicaid pays for the Medicare premiums, coinsurance, and deductibles for people who are below 100 percent poverty. In other words, a lot of low-income senior citizens have their part B premium covered by Medicaid. They do not have to pay coinsurance and they do not have to pay deductibles.

Well, all that is gone under the Republican proposal. So all those people now would have to take that money out of their pocket. Of course, they cannot afford to do so, because they are in fact low income.

What we are going to see happen under these Republican Medicare cuts is essentially quality and access for a lot of senior citizens will suffer. When you get to Medicaid, it is even worse, because Medicaid right now is an entitlement program for low-income people, whether they be seniors, children, pregnant women, the disabled, whatever.

Under this Republican proposal, there no longer is any guaranteed health car for those low-income people under Medicaid. Instead, a block grant goes to the States and we estimate that about a 28-percent cut will be available. The amount of money that will be available will be about 28-percent less under this Republican proposal block granted to the States than what is available now under Medicaid.

What that means is a lot of States simply will not cover people under Medicaid. They will make no categorizations of who is covered and who is not, and that means a lot of low-income people will not have access to health care.

We also estimate that about 330,000 people could be denied nursing home coverage, because right now Medicaid pays for most nursing home care and essentially guarantees nursing home coverage for those seniors who cannot afford to pay for nursing home care privately. That is all gone. There is no guarantee of nursing home care anymore, because, again if the States decide they do not want to provide for certain categories of people, they simply will not.

If you look at where the tax breaks are going under the Republican proposal at the same time, the tax breaks are mostly going for the well-to-do. Nearly half of the benefits under the Republican tax package, about 48 percent, go to the top 12 percent of families, those of incomes of $100,000 or more. If you are actually making less than $30,000 a year, you are probably going to end up paying more in taxes because the earned income tax credit that goes to a lot of working low-income people is cut severely. So a lot of people who are making less than $30,000 a year and who are working essentially are going to be paying more taxes instead of less.

Last, I wanted to talk about the impact of this Republican budget on the environment. It funds enforcement of public health and environmental safeguards 25-percent less than what we have now.

So, again, the environmental priorities are essentially downgraded, and we hope that the President is able to negotiate a better budget bill to preserve these priorities.

## MAKING ENGLISH THE OFFICIAL LANGUAGE OF THE UNITED STATES

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 3 minutes.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, the Senate Governmental Affairs Committee prepares to hold hearings tomorrow on the issue of making English our official language. One of the issues that heavily dominates that debate is this issue of bilingual education, which was started as part of the Great Society Program back in 1968 and has grown and mushroomed to the juggernaut that it is today. I wish to put this problem into a proper perspective.

Mr. Speaker, a quick look at some startling facts will tell us all we need to know. Today, 32 million Americans don't speak English. In just 5 years, that number will increase to 40 million. English is a foreign language for one in seven Americans.

For most of our Nation's history, America gave the children of immigrants a precious gift—an education in the English language. As each new wave of immigrants arrived on these shores, our public school system taught their sons and daughters English, so they could claim their place in the American dream.

What are we doing for these new Americans today? Instead of a first-rate education in English, our bilingual education programs are consigning an entire generation of new Americans—unable to speak, understand, and use English effectively—to a second-class future.

This tragedy has human faces. Let me tell you about two people's experiences which will illustrate the impact of our failed bilingual education programs. I've never heard the problems with bilingual education more poignantly put than in the words of Ernesto Ortiz, a foreman on a south Texas ranch who said: ''My children learn Spanish in school so they can become busboys and waiters. I teach them English at home so they can become doctors and lawyers.'' Ernesto understands that English is the language of opportunity in the country. He understands that denying his children a good education in English will doom them to a limited—as opposed to limitless—future.

Bilga Abramova also understands this simple truth. Bilga is a 35-year-old Russian refugee who has entered a church lottery three times in an attempt to win 1 of 50 coveted spaces in a free, intensive English class offered by her local parish. Her pleas in Russian speak volumes about the plight of all too many immigrants: ''I need to win,'' she said. ''Without English, I cannot begin a new life.''

The ultimate paradox about our commitment to bilingual education in this country is that Bilga and others like her all across the country are on waiting lists for intensive English classes while we spend $8 billion a year teaching children in their native language.

You've heard from parents like Ernesto Ortiz and how they feel about bilingual education. Even teachers oppose these programs. A recent survey of 1,000 elementary and secondary teachers found that 64 percent of these teachers disapproved of bilingual education programs and favored intensive English instruction instead.

Even longtime defenders of these programs are starting to change their tune. The California Board of Education approved a new policy last month in which they abandoned their preference for bilingual education programs.

This year marks the 27th year of bilingual education programs. For more and more people, that is 27 years too long. It is time to take a fresh look at

this problem. Bilingual education has had 27 years and billions of dollars to prove that it accomplished what it said it would do in 1968: teach children English quickly and effectively. Too many people lose sight of the fact that the real issue here is how to help children and newcomers who don't know English and who need to assimilate.

Let us not forget about Ernesto Ortiz and his children, about Bilga Abramova and other new Americans like them. While a Senate committee will discuss this issue for the first time tomorrow, Ernesto and Bilga have already given us their testimony on bilingual education, in words and in images. We must not lose sight of the fact that this is not just an abstract public policy issue; bilingual education and our national language policies have real world consequences. When our policies fail, the failures have names and faces attached to them. When our policies serve to divide rather than unite us, the rips appear in the very fabric of the American Nation. Don't underestimate this issue's importance. This is an issue that can affect the very future of new Americans and America itself.

## OUTRAGE OVER FRANCE'S NUCLEAR TESTING PROGRAM IN SOUTH PACIFIC

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

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise again today to express my outrage and dismay with the continuation of France's willful disregard for the millions of human lives that may be seriously at risk because of its nuclear testing program in the South Pacific. France has now exploded four nuclear bombs in addition to 166 nuclear bombs that have already been exploded, filling the landscape in and outside of the Moruroa Atoll in French Polynesia.

It may not be now, Mr. Speaker, but within the next 10 years when the French Government is no longer around in this part of the world, when the Moruroa Atoll finally starts to break apart, the horrors of France's nuclear testing contamination will infuse itself into the fish and other living organisms in our Pacific marine environment. If by some accident of nature this atoll starts to break up because of serious volcanic or earthquake disturbances in or around the ocean floor, what then, Mr. Speaker?

The French Government certainly does not have the capability to clean up the environmental nightmare sure to result, and perhaps our own country may have to commit resources to clean up the mess.

Mr. Speaker, do our colleagues and the American people realize that scientists have verified that the two areas of the Pacific where considerable concentrations of ciguatera poisoning exist are found in the reefs and marine life of the Republic of the Marshall Islands and of French Polynesia?

Mr. Speaker, may I remind my colleagues and the American people there is a direct correlation between nuclear tests that were conducted in the Marshall Islands by our own Government and the nuclear tests now being conducted by the French Government in French Polynesia. The point is, Mr. Speaker, ciguatera poisoning is heavily concentrated in the fish and marine life of these two areas of the Pacific, and there is a tremendous need right now to examine this serious by product of nuclear testing which poisons the very food we depend upon from the Pacific Ocean.

Mr. Speaker, we do not need to explode more nuclear bombs to see if it does harm to human beings.

□ 1245

The two nuclear bombs that were dropped on the residents of the cities of Hiroshima and Nagasaki some 50 years ago killed and vaporized some 290,000 men, women, and children in Japan during World War II. Mr. Speaker, while the international community looks on, France continues to defy the concerns of millions of people around the world, continues to explode their nuclear bombs not in or anywhere near France, but some 14,000 miles away from Paris.

Mr. Speaker, I submit here is a classic example of a so-called democracy that so desperately wants and desires respect and preeminence as a superpower in Europe, they are pursuing nuclear weapons development at the expense of the lives and safety of some 200,000 French citizens living in French Polynesia. Mr. Speaker, how does one justify the Chirac government's exploding more nuclear bombs when over 60 percent of France's public is opposed to nuclear testing? How about the 200,000 French citizens who will be directly impacted if nuclear contamination breaks out from the atolls, where the tests now are being conducted?

Is it fair, Mr. Speaker, for President Chirac of France to conclude that the lives of 200,000 French citizens living in French Polynesia are deemed expendable for the sake of France to become a preeminent force in Europe? Is it also fair, Mr. Speaker, that President Chirac has now determined that the safety of some 28 million people living in the Pacific region is also deemed expendable so as to promote France's nuclear capabilities? In the name of fairness and equity, Mr. Speaker, what right does President Chirac have to impose the hazards of nuclear contamination on millions of people in the Pacific who are not subject to French control? Mr. Speaker, I am not one to defend China's nuclear testing program, but at least they test within their own backyard.

Mr. Speaker, recently the gentleman from Massachusetts, Congressman EDWARD MARKEY, and the gentleman from California, Congressman PETE STARK, and myself introduced a bill, H.R. 2529, that places up to an 800-percent duty on all French beaujolais wine imported to this country. With each nuclear explosion, the price of French wine shall escalate. People should not buy French wine to protest France's testing. I ask my colleagues and the American people to support us in this effort, and to send President Chirac a strong message: Nuclear testing and nuclear bomb explosions are no longer relevant in our world today.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, when are we going to stop this madness, in that we continue to justify ourselves by saying this is the only way that we are going to defend ourselves, by having a nuclear deterrent capability. Mr. Speaker, this is the height of contradiction. We outlaw germ warfare, we outlaw chemical warfare, but we don't touch nuclear warfare, the most destructive warfare in existence. This the height of hypocrisy, Mr. Speaker. The height of hypocrisy.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD articles on the European Community's reaction to the bombings.

[From the Washington Times, Nov. 20, 1995]

TEST CRITICS RILE PARIS

CHIRAC CANCELS SUMMITS WITH ITALY, BELGIUM

(By Pierre-Yves Glass)

PARIS.—French nuclear tests in the Pacific have blown open a rift between France and most of its European partners. For Paris, their criticism of the blasts amounted to betrayal.

Angered by their support of a U.N. resolution condemning French nuclear tests, President Jacques Chirac on Friday abruptly canceled planned summits with the leaders of Belgium and Italy.

Paris justified its action, saying the positions of those states and eight other European Union members didn't ''correspond to our idea of European solidarity.''

By joining 85 other nations in condemning France, those 10 EU states broke a decades-old tradition of backing a fellow EU member when it deemed its actions essential to its national interests.

But their act could be a reminder to Mr. Chirac that the EU has 15 states and isn't just a club run by its most powerful members—France, Germany and Britain.

The French have to understand that their partners in the European Union have opinions on an initiative on which they have not been consulted,'' Belgian Prime Minister Jean-Luc Dehaene said Saturday.

France has responded to world outrage by insisting its series of six underground nuclear blasts in French Polynesia this fall are essential to ensure the viability of its nuclear arsenal. Government sources said the fourth detonation would take place within the coming days.

Paris has pledged to sign a testban treaty next spring after completing the tests. The United States, Britain and Russia all have adhered to a moratorium on nuclear testing.

A U.N. commission's resolution Thursday ''strongly deplored'' continued nuclear tests by France and China—without naming the countries—and demanded the General Assembly call for a stop to them.

Among the EU's 15 members, only Britain—the bloc's other nuclear power—voted with France against the resolution. Germany, Spain and Greece—usually staunch French allies—abstained.