

Medicare part A, the hospitalization insurance program, draws its revenue from a trust fund that currently contains \$135 billion. This trust fund will begin losing money next year and will be insolvent by 2002. We must provide security to our seniors that there will be a safety net for their use if needed in 7 years.

Enrollees in Medicare part B, the program that finances outpatient medical treatment, will pay a premium of \$46.10 a month and a deductible of \$100 this year. In return they will receive benefits averaging nearly \$2,400 per enrollee, with taxpayers subsidizing \$1,800 per beneficiary. By 2002, that subsidy will reach \$3,900 per individual. This subsidy will cost taxpayers \$1.5 trillion over the next 20 years if the current course continues. The average one-earner Medicare couple will receive \$126,700 more in benefits than they contributed over their working life.

In April, I completed another round of town meetings in the Fifth District of Indiana. The solvency of Medicare was a top concern. I heard a similar message from young and old alike from Kokomo to Winamac and from Logansport to Plymouth. Hoosiers don't want a quick fix that doesn't work. They don't want accounting gimmicks. They don't want political posturing. They want Congress to reform the system to ensure security for years to come. The solvency of Medicare is very real to Hoosier families and seniors.

House Republicans have proposed a budget plan that balances the Federal budget by 2002, without touching Social Security or raising taxes. This means that for the first time since 1969, our deficit by 2002 will be zero. Medicare spending is projected to increase from \$178 billion in 1995 to \$258 billion in 2002. That's a 45 percent increase over the next 7 years. What does this mean for the average Medicare recipient? In 1995, the average Medicare beneficiary will receive \$4,684 in benefits which increase to \$6,293 in 2002. Again, benefits increase—not decrease.

The Board of Trustees for the Medicare Trust Fund, appointed by President Clinton, have issued a report saying Medicare's short-term fiscal health requires either an immediate increase in payroll taxes of 44 percent or an immediate decrease in Medicare spending of 30 percent. Yet both of their proposals would only ensure solvency for 25 years. I support a less draconian approach such as reducing the growth of Medicare by just 5 percent a year. No tax increase nor enormous cuts. A 5 percent reduction in growth will provide for long term security of the Medicare program.

Because a centralized Government monopoly is inherently inefficient, wasteful, and too slow to adapt to new ideas and new solutions, we must transform Medicare. Every senior citizen should have more choices in health care and more control over their own lives, thus providing more security. A transformed Medicare system will provide better health care at lower cost with greater choice. Failure to transform Medicare will lead to cuts in services and financial crisis.

The President should be a leader, not a follower. The President's own Cabinet members, as trustees of the Medicare Trust Fund, have issued a report clearly stating that Medicare is in dire need of reform. President Clinton has been absent from this debate. Frankly, I am very disappointed that it will take Congressional legislation to bring the President into this discussion. I hope the President will take

a seat at the table and help the Congress address this important issue. If not, the Congress clearly has the determination to do so without him. I support H.R. 1590.

Finally, the imminent crisis in Medicare funding is real and unavoidable. Responsible reform of Medicare is a top priority of this Congress. It should be everyone's purpose to reform and improve Medicare to provide the best possible service to its beneficiaries. I look forward to working with my constituents, my colleagues, and hopefully the President to find real solutions to improve these programs.

THE FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION REFORM ACT OF 1995

HON. JAMES L. OBERSTAR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 1995

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to cosponsor H.R. 1392, the Federal Aviation Administration Reform Act of 1995, introduced by our colleague, JIM LIGHTFOOT. Congressman LIGHTFOOT'S bill makes important reforms which will enhance FAA's ability to carry out its responsibilities, while preserving FAA's basic structure which has enabled the agency to become the world's finest. Although I have reservations about some provisions in the Lightfoot bill, overall it is a major contribution to our effort to reform the FAA.

I strongly support the provisions in H.R. 1392 which would take FAA out of the Department of Transportation and make FAA an independent agency. This reform has been supported by 10 of the 11 living former Administrators of FAA. The strong support of the former Administrators should be given great weight, in view of their distinguished careers in the military and private sector, and the fact that they served our a period of more than 30 years, under Presidents of both parties, from John F. Kennedy to George Bush.

As the former Administrators have pointed out, FAA's responsibilities to develop the aviation infrastructure and to ensure aviation safety and security are basically technical in nature. FAA's skilled professionals are well equipped to carry out these responsibilities, without second guessing from political appointees at the Department of Transportation.

I have observed DOT's oversight of FAA for many years. DOT's review often does little more than delay important decisions. In some instances, DOT overrules sound FAA decisions, on ideological grounds, or to gain short term public relations advantages.

I would also emphasize that all 11 of the living former Administrators strongly opposed a reform which is not in the Lightfoot bill, but has been proposed by the Department of Transportation; to split FAA into a quasi-public corporation, like the Postal Service, for air traffic control and a rump FAA to regulate the corporation and carry out FAA's other responsibilities. In hearings before the Aviation Subcommittee, Najeeb Halaby, FAA Administrators from 1961 to 1965, testified that: "Corporatizing part of the FAA could disintegrate the present comprehensive system of safety which has served the nation so well. It would result in potential serious conflict between the new corporation, the NTSB and the DOT/FAA. Since the proposed corporation

would be a monopoly, it would not achieve the savings of free competition. Since it would be a federal corporation, the public would not consider that federal employees really had been reduced or true savings achieved. . ."

Administrator Halaby's statement was specifically endorsed by all 11 former Administrators.

The Lightfoot bill makes important reforms in the laws and regulations governing FAA's procurement of equipment and FAA's relationship with its skilled work force. FAA is now governed by burdensome procurement laws and regulations which have slowed FAA's program to modernize the air traffic control system. Equally burdensome laws and regulations on personnel have limited FAA's ability to recruit scientific and engineering professionals and to fully staff air traffic control facilities in high cost of living areas. The Lightfoot bill adopts a balanced approach to these problems by giving FAA flexibility to develop its own procurement and personnel systems, while retaining an opportunity for Congress to review these programs before they are implemented. Congress would also review the new personnel and procurement programs in the year 2002 when they would need to be reauthorized. The personnel and procurement reform programs developed under the Lightfoot bill would not only benefit FAA, but would also provide important data for reforming these processes for other Government agencies.

I am also supportive of the provision in the Lightfoot bill which gives the FAA Administrator a 7-year term in office. In recent years, Administrators have often served for 2 years or less. This is not enough time to ensure that needed reforms are implemented. The turnover in Administrators has caused reform to proceed by fits and starts, and prevented a sustained, consistent approach. Last year we passed legislation giving the Administrator a 5-year term in office. A 7-year term would be even better.

I have reservations about the provision in the Lightfoot bill to establish a panel to consider innovative financing mechanisms to ensure adequate funding for aviation infrastructure needs. We do not need a panel to discover that the basic problem is that the more than \$5 billion a year generated by excise taxes on aviation system users, such as the 10 percent tax on airline passengers, is not being fully spent to develop the aviation infrastructure. The failure to fully spend these revenues is a breach of faith with aviation users. The taxes were imposed in 1970 for the purpose of financing the airport and airway trust fund which supports development of the air traffic control system and airports. In recent years, the user contributions have not been fully spent, but have been used to reduce the deficit in the general budget. The cumulative amount of taxes which has not been spent now totals more than \$3 billion. A critical step in overcoming this problem is to pass H.R. 842, which would take the trust fund out of the budget process and permit all funds contributed by users to be spent for the intended purpose of developing our Nation's airports and air traffic control system.

Overall, I believe that the Lightfoot bill makes a major contribution to FAA Reform. I look forward to working with Congressman LIGHTFOOT and my colleagues on the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure to develop an FAA reform bill which will ensure that

we will continue to have the world's finest aviation system.

TRIBUTE TO MARGARET STANFILL MOORE ORIGINALLY OF HAYTI, MISSOURI

HON. BILL EMERSON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 1995

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Margaret Stanfill Moore, whose outstanding service as a nurse in World War II provided an invaluable role in several key battles, including the liberation of Europe.

Margaret Stanfill Moore holds the distinct honor of being the first woman to set foot upon the beaches of Normandy on D-Day, June 6, 1944. She followed the first wave of Allied troops ashore and immediately began ministering to wounded soldiers and paratroopers. Her work was crucial to saving the lives of Americans and our Allied friends.

Not only did Lieutenant Stanfill heroically rush to the shores of Normandy, but she was also one of the first nurses on the scene in the North Africa campaign. After North Africa, she followed Allied troops into Sicily. Margaret bravely risked her life in some of the most important battles of World War II to save the lives of American and Allied troops.

I am proud to boast that lieutenant Stanfill is from Hayti in the Eighth District of Missouri. The daughter of Mrs. Ola Stanfill, Margaret Stanfill Moore is a graduate of Hayti High School, Class of 1930, where she was captain of the girls' basketball team and the county high school tennis singles champion. Following high school, Margaret entered Nurses Training at the Baptist Hospital in Memphis, TN. After spending a year in private practice, she joined the U.S. Army Nursing Corps.

It is with honor that I recognize Margaret Stanfill Moore for her invaluable and outstanding service to our country. There is no more honorable an occupation than saving the lives of wounded American soldiers. The veterans of World War II thank her, I thank her, and America thanks her.

END THE CUBAN EMBARGO

HON. JOHN JOSEPH MOAKLEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 1995

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I recently wrote to President Clinton urging him to immediately begin negotiations with the Government of Cuba aimed at lifting the economic embargo and normalizing relations.

For over three decades, we have tried to force Fidel Castro from power by maintaining a tight economic embargo on Cuba. But, that embargo has failed to hasten Mr. Castro's departure and has failed to fuel the type of internal pressures to advance the democratic reforms that so many of us want to see.

Instead, the embargo has encouraged and strengthened the sentiments of nationalism in Cuba, provoked an increase in immigration to the United States—and it has provided Mr. Castro with a perfect excuse to justify the failures of his system.

It is my hope that the Clinton administration will recognize the obvious failures of our current policy and change course.

I would like to call my colleagues' attention to a recent article written for the Boston Globe by Elizabeth Shannon entitled, "United States Should End Its Embargo Against Cuba." Ms. Shannon, who is a writer and administrator at Boston University, makes a compelling case for changing our policy.

[From the Boston Globe, May 4, 1995]

UNITED STATES SHOULD END ITS EMBARGO AGAINST CUBA

(By Elizabeth Shannon)

President Clinton's reversal of our Cuban refugee situation may be the administration's first step toward changing a policy which has been ill-advised and self-defeating throughout this century. To insist on continuing and expanding the harsh and illogical embargo against Cuba when an accord favorable to both countries could be reached is inconsistent with American self-interest. What good is it to have 11 million people near starvation or to create political chaos on a small island just 90 miles off our shores?

Whatever Fidel Castro is—guerrilla fighter, oppressive dictator, unrelenting windbag, nouveau capitalist—he is well aware of the failure of the Revolution and is groping for a way out, peering through the doors of private enterprise that are opening up to him and liking what he sees.

Through his own mismanagement and the loss of the \$5 million annual subsidy from the Soviet Union, the infrastructure of Cuba is in shambles. The Spanish colonial mansions in Havana's suburbs are in bleak disrepair. Black smoke from oil wells pollutes the air. The few cars one sees are vintage American models, making the streets of Havana look like a set for a Bogart film. Engines rust on unused rail tracks, and buses have been replaced by ancient flatbed trucks with benches nailed to the floor to serve as public transportation.

Children beg on the streets of Havana. The only miracle left, hard to fathom, is the good nature and indomitable spirit of the Cuban people and their faith, slightly frayed, in "El Comandante."

Cuba is trying to deal with its economic crisis by participating in joint private enterprise projects, mainly with Canada, Mexico and Europe. It is also pouring money into tourism, which is growing at the rate of 20 percent annually.

There is still no free press, radio or television and one wonders about the literacy level when there are so few books to read. There are no young, would-be Fidels in the university; dissenters who still fear a knock on the door at night.

Nevertheless, there is an easing of some of the harsh, repressive social policies of the past two decades. The availability of educational opportunities and day care centers have made it possible for women to achieve goals not available to them in the pre-Castro days. Churches are open again after more than two decades. The repulsive policy of informing—on one's neighbors, friends, family—is becoming discredited.

The farmers' markets that are now allowed in the cities have eased the harsh deprivation of food supplies. Pork and fowl, beans, rice and vegetables are plentiful. The markets are crammed with shoppers, trading in dollars, the favored currency, instead of Cuban pesos.

But the Cuban people, adoring as many are toward their "Maximum Leader," are restive and eager for a better life.

A respected journalist who has lived in Cuba through the Revolution said to me re-

cently: "Castro will change. He is, above all, a pragmatist and is keenly interested in how history will judge him. Of course, he must save face. Let him devise the words he will use to roll with the change. Democracy? People here aren't too interested in democracy. They are most interested in getting food on the table without having to stand in line for hours, in having things work, in good gasoline, new cars, a transportation system, electricity that doesn't work on whim."

Cubans want to talk business. And, ironically, it may be American businessmen rather than politicians and diplomats who change our Cuban policy. They are flocking to the island.

It would seem that these moves toward capitalism would make America happy and might even make Sen. Jesse Helms smile. But our reaction has been to tighten the embargo and punish those countries—our allies and friends—who do trade with Cuba, creating more ill-will.

What guides our current policy toward Cuba? It is a combination of inertia and our indefatigable desire to punish Castro, to bring him down, that feeds the inflammatory rhetoric of Helms and the implacable hatred toward Castro of members of the exile community, who are now threatening to shut down businesses in Miami in protest of Clinton's new policy. It does nothing to create a viable climate in which to bolster Cuba's waning economy into a stable, thriving and eventually capitalistic society.

If there is one lesson to be learned from the story of Vietnam, so sorely reopened by Robert McNamara's memoirs, it is to recognize the fatal miscalculation of foreign policy-makers who, so sure of their direction, don't read the road signs. Policies conceived in honest hope grow old and out-dated and, eventually, fatal. The theory that to make democracy work in Cuba we must "defeat Castro" and punish the Cuban people is flawed.

A European diplomat said to me in Havana: "Castro could probably defend Cuba against 100,000 American Marines. There is no way he could defend it against 100,000 American tourists!" This moment in Cuba's history is an opportunity for President Clinton to begin the process of negotiation. Perhaps Jimmy Carter could make a stopover in Havana when he is in the area.

ABOLISHING THE SUBMARINE PATENT

HON. CARLOS J. MOORHEAD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 1995

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, recently, advertisements appeared in most of the newspapers in my 27th Congressional District, including the entire back page of the L.A. Times. These advertisements were purchased by a newly created group calling themselves Intellectual Property Creators. The ads were supporting the passage of H.R. 359, a bill introduced by my friend and colleague from California [Mr. ROHRBACHER]. The purpose of this type of lobbying is to bring pressure on me and the subcommittee I chair, to process this bill immediately. The bill, H.R. 359, is very controversial and of dubious merit. However, I have indicated that the subcommittee will hold a hearing on this issue next year.

The issue is the change in the U.S. patent law that occurred last year with the enactment of the GATT implementing legislation which