Oklahoma [Mr. ISTOOK] that was designed, if you can believe this, to restrict the first amendment rights of everyone in America if they receive anything of value from the Federal Government, restrict their employees and those with whom they do business.

The Istook language, however, exempts those who contract with the Federal Government, as opposed to receiving a benefit or thing of value. I watched, therefore, with great interest during the consideration of the defense appropriations bill just a week ago today when there was a discussion between the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] and the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] about whether the political speech and activities of defense contractors should also be limited.

As the Speaker will remember, the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] offered an amendment that was a watered down version of the political activities restriction the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ISTOOK] and the majority party had endorsed in August in the appropriations bill. The Schroeder amendment would have disqualified for Federal defense contracts any business that spent more than a small amount of its budget on State, local, and Federal political activity of almost any kind.

As with the Istook language, I believed the Schroeder amendment was a bad idea and I voted against it; but I describe it as a watered down version of the Istook political speech restriction amendment, because the Schroeder amendment would not have required contractors to report their political activities to the Federal Government, whereas the Istook amendment, which applies to all other groups receiving anything from the Federal Government, does require political activities reports to be sent in to the Federal Government.

I say it was a watered down version, because the Schroeder amendment would not have subjected contractors to harassing lawsuits from any citizens, whereas the Istook amendment does that, subjects all other groups to this sort of litigation. But, Mr. Speaker, even in this watered down state, most Republican Members of this body voted against any restriction on how much defense contractors can lobby the government. Those voting no included most of the leadership of the majority, folks who had previously voted, unabashedly, to restrict the ability of churches, nonprofits, individuals, and even many businesses, to speak to the public or to their elected officials at the State, Federal, or local level about important policy issues.

The majority needs to explain to the American people why they feel it is OK to muzzle ordinary citizens and organizations, but at the same time let defense contractors who take billions of dollars in Federal contracts do so without any of the same restrictions.

The inconsistency here, and that is a polite way of putting it, the inconsistency in the majority leadership and most of its members' position is made very clear by the comments of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations who, after having voted for the Istook language, characterized the amendment of the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] last week as follows:

> * * * a denial of the privilege of the First Amendment, which is the right of speech under the Constitution of the United States, to exercise their opportunity to speak to their government, to the representatives of their choice.

Mr. Speaker, why are the first amendment rights of defense contractors to lobby the Government for more contracts and funds more protected under the Constitution than the YMCA's or the Catholic churches or the American Red Cross' first amendment rights to advise us on issues affecting kids or older Americans or the safety of the Nation's blood supply? Is it different because the YMCA receives funds to provide after school day care, instead of funds to build missiles and planes? What kind of Constitution does the majority think that we have?

Mr. Speaker, when the Istook political speech restriction amendment comes before us again for another vote, and I expect it will, please remember those words of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, his eloquent defense of the first amendment rights of defense contractors, and for the sake of fairness, let us support the same fundamental rights for the YMCA, the Catholic Church, and the rest of this Nation.

## THE MEDICARE PRESERVATION ACT OF 1995

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, today the American public was expected to receive the details of the Republicans' plan to slash Medicare, but the Republicans seems to be delaying further, and really, we do not know when the specific plans are going to be released. I have to say, Mr. Speaker, that I was outraged to find out how few details we were actually given in the document that was presented today by the Republican leadership. I have a copy of it here, the Medicare Preservation Act of 1995.

We do know that we are talking about cutting $270 billion out of Medicare, and we know that that is going to have a devastating impact on senior citizens, because it is the largest Medicare cut in the history of this country, but to this day and at this hour, with only, I think, about a week left before there is supposed to be a 1-day hearing before the Committee on Ways and Means on the Medicare changes, we still do not have the details of the plan.

I think it is really unfortunate, because the seniors that I know that are in my district are demanding to know how this cut is going to affect them. They are not buying into this Republican smokescreen about reforming Medicare. The fact of the matter is that Medicare is not broke, it has worked very well for the last 30 years in providing health care and good quality health care for most senior citizens, and all that we really have is a Republican plan to essentially take $270 billion out of the Medicare program to finance largely a tax cut for the wealthier Americans.

I do not think it is fair. I do not think it is fair that the senior citizens of this country should have to take such a large brunt, if you will, of the effort to provide a tax cut, or of the effort to provide deficit reduction.

One of the bases that the Republicans are using for saying that this large cut is necessary is that they claim that within 7 years Medicare will be insolvent. They base that on a trustees' report that came out this year, and we get trustees' reports from Medicare on an annual basis.

What they fail to point out is that historically there has not been as much as 7 years outlays, if you will, for Medicare funding. Oftentimes it has only been 1 or 2 years before Medicare is insolvent. The reason for that is because this Congress traditionally did not want to leave a lot of money available for Medicare in future years because of the fear that it would be raided by provides, and that hospitals or doctors or other health care providers would say to themselves ''Gee, there is this large pot of money out there, so we had just better charge more for our services.''

There is no reason in the world to think that because for 7 years we have enough money to pay for Medicare services and for health care for seniors, that somehow that means that the system needs to be radically changed. It does not. They are only proposing this cut, this huge cut, in Medicare because they want to use it to pay for a tax cut, again, mostly for well-to-do Americans.

This plan that was released today by the Republican leadership, and it is not a plan, it unfortunately does not provide much information at all; it does not tell us how this $270 billion is going to be implemented, this cut, cut it does have some pretty scary things in it which I would like to relate, if I could, during my time here this evening.

First of all, with regard to the part B premium, which is the part of the Medicare Program that pays for doctors' bills, essentially, the one that seniors now basically voluntarily contribute to out of their pocket, but of course most seniors use it in order to finance their payments for doctors, for their physicians, the part B premium essentially

under this proposed plan would increase to about $93 per person by the end of the 7 years in 2002.

□ 1645

Earlier this week I think it was, I think it was on Sunday, the Speaker said that seniors would have to pay $7 more per month for the part B premium, which translates into $84 more per year for part B for their doctor's services. He said that as if that was a glorious thing, that they were only going to have to pay this extra $7 a month or $84 a year.

I would like to mention first of all that many seniors are struggling with what they currently pay for their part B premium and really cannot afford to spend another $7 a month. They are on fixed incomes, they do not have anywhere else to go.

I talk to people on a regular basis when I am back in my district who say, ''Gee, I've budgeted for the month and I've only budgeted with some play of $5,'' so if you talk about a $7 increase, that is a lot. However, after making that statement on Sunday about the $7 increase, the Speaker came back on Tuesday and said that it was going to be about $32 per month, or $384 per year, in effect doubling the seniors Medicare part B premiums. Well, if we are talking about $32 more per month, and I think it is probably going to be even more than that when we finally get the figures, we are essentially talking about doubling the amount that seniors have to pay out of pocket just for part B, just for their doctor's services.

Some people may say again, ''Well, gee, that doesn't seem like a lot of money,'' but if you are a senior citizen, many of whom make $8,000, $9,000 a year, the majority of whom probably could not afford that $32 a month, and keep in mind that this doubling of their premium is only happening in order to finance a tax cut, because if we look at the amount of money, the $270 billion that is being taken out of Medicare, you could just put that right next to the $245 billion in tax cuts that are being proposed and see how they almost translate directly.

The other thing that was mentioned again in this very skimpy outline which does not really tell us how they are going to achieve this $270 billion in savings is what I call means testing—basically an income-related proposal whereby if you are above a certain income, either for a single person or for a married couple, that you would increasingly, depending upon your income, have to pay more for your part B premium to the point where at a certain income level, you would pay for the whole thing, essentially phasing out part B for some individuals.

I think although some may say, ''Well, what's the difference if some people who are in the higher income categories have to pay for the whole cost of their Medicare premium? Why should I worry about that? I don't care. They've got a lot of money. What is it to me?''

I maintain that that is totally wrong. A contract was made 30 years ago when Medicare was passed in this Congress and signed by the President which said that if over the years while you were working you paid into Medicare, that when you retired, when you got to be the age of 65, that Medicare was going to be available for you. To suggest that people at a certain income level should have to pay almost 100 percent of the cost of their premium I think is basically breaking the contract that was made when Medicare was passed 30 years ago.

I would also point out that we already have means testing when you pay into Medicare. In other words, you have been paying into Medicare over the years based on your income. So if your income is higher, you have been paying more. All of a sudden now we are going to have another means test when you try to take advantage—and you are over 65—of the Medicare Program.

It is also wrong because we are going down the slippery slope here now. We start means testing Medicare and maybe under the Republican proposal I think it is $75,000 a year where you start having to pay extra and ultimately it gets phased out completely and you have to pay the whole cost. Well, today it is $75,000, that is budget driven. But in this Congress—and I have seen it happen before—tomorrow, next year, it will be $50,000, year after that, it will be $40,000, $35,000, eventually for budget reasons you will see that that amount will be reduced and reduced and reduced and more and more senior citizens will end up having to pay more and more money to pay for their Medicare and to pay for their health care program.

The other thing that is in this document which is also very interesting, my biggest concern really, other than the additional cost that seniors are going to have to pay under this Republican plan when we finally get it, is that a lot of senior citizens are going to be forced into HMO's or managed care.

Right now if a senior citizen has a doctor or goes to a certain hospital because it is in the vicinity of where they live, Medicare guarantees that that hospital or that physician will be reimbursed. It is called a fee-for-service plan. They choose the physician, they choose the hospital, and Medicare reimburses most of the cost.

But what I believe is going to happen under this plan, and again for budgetary money reasons in order to finance this tax cut, is that more and more seniors are going to be forced into HMO's where they cannot choose their doctor or they cannot choose the hospital that may be close to them, and they have to go into a managed care plan or an HMO where those choices are made by others.

That is a very terrible thing for a lot of senior citizens, first of all because a lot of them have used the same physician for years and they are confident that that physician can care for them. Also, many of them live close to a hospital that they like and they do not want to have to go to a hospital that is 15 or 20 minute or maybe even an hour, who knows how far away if they are living in a rural area.

Well, in this plan, again it is not clear what is in this plan, but in this plan, the suggestion is that there will be fixed dollar payments to HMO's. In other words, that if they choose to opt for an HMO or a managed care system, then the Government will pay a flat amount to that HMO or to that managed care system. It is not at all clear whether or not that HMO can charge more to the senior for a better, more comprehensive health care plan.

It is almost similar to the voucher. The Republican document does not suggest that they are moving to a voucher system. But if they, in fact, give a flat rate to the HMO and then say that the HMO has to take what the Government gives them, and the HMO says, ''that is not enough to pay for the cost of the traditional care that we provide, so we are going to have to provide less quality care or reduce the amount of doctors, whoever participates, but if you pay an extra $1,000 or if you pay an extra $1,500 a year, we will give you a better plan,'' then in effect we have created a situation where the seniors have to pay money out of pocket to get a better traditional quality health care plan that they are used to.

Again, it is not clear what exactly the Republicans have in mind. Hopefully, at some point over the next few weeks we will get some more details about exactly what this means.

The other thing that is in this document that is a very dangerous precedent, which again is likely to force many low-income senior citizens into HMO's or managed care systems where they do not have a choice of doctor or hospital, is that the proposal does away with Medicaid paying for supplemental insurance. A lot of senior citizens have what they call MediGap. Medicaid pays the MediGap so that they do not have to pay out of pocket for the extra coverage that they get under MediGap because Medicare does not pay for that coverage.

Seniors are not going to be allowed to use their Medicaid to pay for that supplemental health insurance coverage for items that are not covered by Medicare. What that means is that low-income people will be forced into HOMO's, low-income seniors, because they will not be able to pay that extra MediGap insurance in order to continue with a fee-for-service system where they choose their own doctor or their own hospital. They will literally be forced into an HMO or a managed care system, without a choice of physicians or choice of hospital, because

there is no one to make up for that premium for the supplemental insurance.

There are a lot of very sinister ways, I believe, when we finally get the details of this plan where I think it is going to be increasingly evident that many seniors, if not all, who do not have extra money are going to be forced into an HMO or a managed care system where they do not have a choice of their physician or for the hospital that they want.

Again, and I have to stress that over and over again, the plan or the outline that was presented today by the Speaker and by the Republican leadership talks about $270 billion in cuts but does not tell us where those cuts are going to come from. We do not know whether the majority of it is going to come from reduced payments to health care providers like the hospitals or the doctors.

We know that probably about $80 billion is going to come from these increased premiums that I talked about before for Medicare part B, which will essentially double the premiums that seniors are going to have to pay for their physician's care. But we do not know where the rest of the moneys come from, the other $200 billion or so. Is it going to come from reduced payments to hospitals and to physicians? If that is the case, we are going to see a number of things happen.

If you cut into the amount of the payments that are made to the hospitals or the physicians, you are going to see a lot of physicians who will not take Medicare patients anymore, and so access to doctors is going to be limited, and you are going to see a lot of hospitals that are either going to close because they depend too much on Medicare to finance their operations or simply cut back on services in various ways. They can cut back by not providing certain community services, by not providing certain equipment. In my own district, we went during the August break to Monmouth Medical Center which is in my hometown of Long Branch. They depend on Medicare for the majority of their revenue. If they have a significant decrease in the amount of money that they are reimbursed for Medicare payments, they are probably going to have to cut back on staff, cut back on community services, cut back on clinics, cut back on all types of things. Some of the hospitals are in such a critical situation in New Jersey, we have identified, I think, through the New Jersey Hospital Association about 76 hospitals that are put on a critical list, they are so dependent on Medicare and Medicaid payments that if the amount that they got is reduced significantly, some of them will definitely close and we will see a situation where people who have traditionally relied on a local hospital will not even be able to find the hospital because it will not be there anymore and they are going to have to go elsewhere. Even if you take this $270 billion cut and you subtract the $80 billion that is going to be paid for on the backs of seniors because they are doubling their part B premiums, and even if you took, say, another 100 or 200, I do not know how many billion in reducing the amount of payments that go to hospitals and the physicians, there is still about a $90 billion what I call black hole that is left totally undecided in this plan, because essentially what the plan says is that we will figure out between now and 2002 whether whatever we come up with works in terms of saving money and if it does not, they we will just do some sort of across-the-board cut, and that will probably mean increased co-payments, deductibles, even less provider fees, whatever. Even though they suggest that they are not going to increase copayments and are not going to increase deductibles, the bottom line is that with this huge black hole that is not financed in any way as part of this plan, I have no doubt that they will be forced ultimately to come up with increased deductibles or copayments as a way of trying to finance this overall program.

I guess the saddest thing for me is that all this is happening so quickly and without any input from the public. Back in April when the Republican budget was adopted in this House and in the Senate, we were told that Medicare was going to be slashed by $270 billion and that was going to be used either for deficit reduction or for the tax cut. April, May, June, July, August, it is now September, I do not know how many months that is, 4 or 5 months later, we still have no plan. Yet next Thursday in the Committee on Ways and Means or soon thereafter there is going to be just one day of hearings on whatever plan we finally get, one day for the American people and for Congress and for all the people that are concerned about the health care delivery system to review whatever plan we finally get between now and that 1 day when those hearings are held in the Committee on Ways and Means.

It is totally unjustifiable for the Republican leadership to come forward with this stealth plan, after talking about these cuts now for 5 or 6 months, to come up with the implementation at the last minute and expect the public and the Congress to digest it and vote on it in 1 day with such a little period of time to review what this is all about.

□ 1700

I think that that is the biggest, the cruelest hoax, if you will, that is to be placed out in this House and on the American people. This is such an important program that affects senior citizens and all those that depend upon senior citizens.

Remember, it is not just seniors, but all their dependents that would have to help them pay for the extra care or care for them if they are not able to get care. Everyone in this country is going to be impacted by this program. Yet, we are talking about this plan coming out possibly within the next week with 1 day of hearings and a quick vote in committee and this House thereafter.

If the Republicans ever reveal their plan, I have no doubt that the American people should be able to analyze what the Republicans are going to do to them. Instead, the Republicans are holding secret meetings without senior citizen input.

Last year, they criticized President Clinton's health care plan because they said he was holding closed-door meetings. But at least President Clinton's plan was made public for over a year and we had the opportunity to analyze it. We are not going to have the opportunity to analyze this one.

I waited this morning. I listened to what the Speaker said on CNN. I got a copy of what was put out by the leadership, and it still does not tell me how they are going to implement this $270 billion in Medicare cuts. I am still waiting for it, and the American people are still waiting for it.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is our obligation as Members of this House and as Congressmen to make sure that that plan comes out in specifics and there is ample time to analyze it before we vote on it in this House and in this Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

THE EFFECTS OF REDISTRICTING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The first hour is allocated to the minority leader. The Chair is advised that he has designated the gentlewoman from Georgia [Ms. MCKINNEY] to control the balance of the time.

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to come here again this evening to discuss the issue of redistricting.

Mr. Speaker, you are very well aware, we are in the midst of a historic fight, really, in the State of Georgia, and the future of African-American representation is at stake in the decisions that will be made relative to Georgia's newest district, Georgia's 11th Congressional District.

We understand that this redistricting issue is a basic issue about the allocation of power in this country. The question is: Are we going to have a government that is reflective of those who are governed, or will our Government consist of a few hand-picked people who are the political and economic elite of this Nation, or will people like me be able to walk the Halls of Congress, be able to gain election to policymaking positions, to be able to become a part of the very fabric of America's democracy?

The reason I say people like me, is because I come from common stock. I am not from a wealthy family. My father was a policeman in the city of Atlanta for 21 years. He was one of the first black policemen.

He had to endure outrageous conditions where he could not go into certain areas of town; he could not arrest

people who were not black; he could not even change his police uniform in the headquarters of the Atlanta Police Department. The black policemen of his era were forced to go around the corner and down the street to the local black YMCA and change their clothes.

Out of his struggle to be able to practice his profession with dignity, came the opportunity to change politics in the city of Atlanta. Even at a very early age, I am fortunate to have been a part of his struggle to make change in the city of Atlanta. Through the collective efforts of people from common stock all across this country, we have been able to make a democracy in this country of which we can be proud.

Now, we can truly say that people can rise above tremendous odds, people can overcome tremendous circumstances, and people can become a fabric in our democracy.

Through our participation, we can give hope to people who have been hopeless. We give voice to people who had been voiceless. We now are able to make dreams come true. And even in the much-maligned 11th Congressional District of the State of Georgia, we have been able to make dreams come true.

I have got some maps here of districts that have not had to endure the kind of negative remarks or negative characterizations that have been made about the district that I represent.

We have here the district from Illinois, the Sixth District, which has a supermajority; happens to be 95 percent. That majority is white. This district has remained unchallenged. Nobody thought that this district had an irregular shape. Nobody thought there was anything wrong with the supermajority of 95 percent.

This district has been untouched and unscathed, as we have seen the issue of redistricting raised all across the South and now even into our northern States.

I also have a map of another district. This is the Sixth Congressional District of Texas. Now, all of the districts in Texas were challenged, but something strange happened. Only the districts that were African-American were found unconstitutional and one district that is majority Latino was found unconstitutional. But this district, which has a very regular shape according to the courts, and, of course, there is nothing wrong with the supermajority, was found constitutional.

It seems to me that there is definitely a double standard if anyone could say that this district is neither of irregular shape nor of supermajority that is unconstitutional

Of course, this is the 11th Congressional District of Georgia. The Supreme Court did not say that it was irregular in shape, but they did say it was unconstitutional, because of a 64-percent supermajority.

Of course, what kind of people are in this district? People who only want a fair shake from their Government. People who want to feel that they can go to their precinct and cast a vote for a candidate who at the end of the day will be a representative of their choice.

If the people in Georgia who happen to reside in Georgia's 11th Congressional District now find that they must cast a vote in which their vote is not as meaningful, I think it would be a sad day in the State of Georgia.

But, Mr. Speaker, we are a nation of laws and we are a nation of court decisions. And, of course, all of us have to abide by the laws of the land and we must also abide by court decisions, even when we disagree with them.

I am pleased that we have with us a representative, strong advocate for the people of the State of Florida. One of the things that we noticed is that women have an opportunity to get elected as a result of redistricting, because we have open seats, because we have retirements. So, when redistricting takes place, sometimes women are negatively affected.

We have with us Representative CORRINE BROWN whose district has also been targeted and I would hope that CORRINE does not have to go through what I am going through in the State of Georgia. But I guarantee my colleagues one thing, the face of this redistricting battle is as much about women as it is about African-Americans.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I want to say before I begin, in this Congress it has been pretty hot for me in these last 6 months and it has not been a lot of fun, but one of the joys has been serving with the gentlewoman from Georgia [Ms. MCKINNEY] in the 103d and the 104th; a Member that is committed to all of the people in this country. We stand together and I will fight for all of the people.

Ms. MCKINNEY. Thank you.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, that is one of the things that I can also attest to, that what we are experiencing now is not the first time it was experienced in the Congress of the United States. In fact, in the 1800's, the same kind of challenges to African-Americans took place.

This year, we celebrate the 30th anniversary of the Voting Rights Act, and the 75th anniversary of women's right to vote. In 1962, only 5.3 percent of the voting age black population was registered to vote in Mississippi. There were only 500 black elected officials in the entire country. Today there are over 5,000 black elected officials.

The 75th anniversary of women's right to vote represents a long struggle and great sacrifices. Women had to fight against entrenched opposition with almost no financial, legal, or political powers of their own.

For the first 150 years of our Nation's history, American Government did not include women. Does the gentlewoman from Georgia want to respond to that? Can you imagine this Congress without any women?

Ms. MCKINNEY. I can imagine it, but I cannot imagine a real democracy without women.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. But women won the right to vote by the slimmest of margins. In the House of Representatives, suffrage passed by exactly the number of votes needed, with one supporter carried in from the hospital and the other leaving his wife's deathbed to vote.

In the Senate, suffrage passed with just two votes to spare. When the 19th amendment was sent to the States for ratification, Tennessee, the last State, passed it by a single vote during a recount. So it just amazes me that people cannot understand how important their vote is.

Redistricting, since the 1990 census, has marked tremendous gains for women and minorities. In 1992, the year we were elected to Congress, was a historical year for Florida. For the first time in over 120 years, an African-American was elected to Congress from Florida.

I do not understand why people do not feel history is important. I want to repeat that. For the first time in over 120 years, an African-American was elected to the U.S. Congress from Florida.

At the same time, I was elected to represent the Third Congressional District, my colleagues, Representative CARRIE MEEKS and Representative ALCEE HASTINGS were also elected to represent Florida.

□ 1715

Sixteen new African-American Members, mostly from the South, were seated in the House of Representatives, and one African-American Senator, CAROL MOSELEY-BRAUN, was seated, expanding the Congressional Black Caucus members to 40, the largest ever. Now there are 57 women, 19 Hispanic, 8 Asians and 1 American Indian. This is the highest number of minorities to ever serve in the history of the U.S. Congress. Despite these gains, Less than 2 percent of the elected officials in this country are black. We still need the Voting Rights Act, and we still have a long way to go. I want to repeat that: Less than 2 percent of the elected officials in this country are black.

I and others would not have the honor to serve in Washington if it were not for the courage and sacrifice of great leaders who led the way before us. Let me tell you about the person from Florida, the first black, and only, elected was Josiah Wells, was elected from the area that I now have the honor of serving, Gainesville, Fl., and he was elected in the year 1879. He was elected from the Third Congressional District, just like me. Josiah Wells' election was challenged, and he lost his seat after only less than 2 months in office.

However, by the time he had already been elected to a new term, believe it or not, his next election he won, the courthouse burned down, the election

was challenged and he was thrown out. So it is not much different between 1879 and 1995, thus ended Florida's first congressional career for a black Representative.

I went on and did some research on him. He left the Congress. He went to my school, Florida A&M University, and he headed up the Department of Education there. Once Reconstruction began, 21 black Congressman were elected from the South between 1870 and 1901.

However, after 1901, when Jim Crow tightened his grip, no black was elected to Congress from the South in over 70 years. It is more timely than ever to study what happened to black representation during the Reconstruction. This period may seem like ancient history, but what happened then seems to be happening over again. When the redistricting process began in Florida in 1992, leaders of the Florida Legislature, where I served as a representative for 10 years, proposed that we have one African-American congressperson from Miami, at 52 percent, even though the census shows that minorities in Florida represent close to 40 percent.

The proposed new African-American district would be located in Miami, although Orlando, Jacksonville, Daytona, Tallahassee would still be unrepresented. The legislative leaders made it clear they would not compromise, and, in fact, I want you to know what happened in Florida. The legislature could not draw districts in Florida. The courts took over, and the reason why the courts took over is because everybody that was in charge of the redistricting was running for Congress. So it did not have anything to do with whether you were African-American, but everybody in charge was running, from the President of the Senate to the people in the House, that headed up redistricting to the people in the Senate.

So we could not pass a plan in Florida. So you cannot disregard the role that politics plays in drawing districts.

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, I have read the brief that the plaintiffs in your case filed. I would like for you to explain to the American people the basis on which the plaintiffs have filed a lawsuit against the Third Congressional District of Florida. What were some of their reasons?

Ms. BROWN of Florida. The main reason is that they felt that the person from the Third Congressional District voted with the Black Caucus, not voted for the people of the Third Congressional District.

I had 13 town meetings during the break. I saw over 3,000 people, and we are altogether on our other issues. We all do not support any of the Medicaid cuts; you see, this is what we have in common: We do not support the cuts in education, the cuts to the senior citizens; putting children first with the cuts. If we are supposed to balance the budget, the people from the Third Congressional District feel that women and children should go first. It should not be on the backs of the poor people and the working people in this country.

Ms. MCKINNEY. But the plaintiffs have said that because you vote with the Congressional Black Caucus on these kinds of issues, that you do not deserve to sit in Congress and that the people that you represent do not deserve to have a voice in Congress? Is that what they are saying?

Ms. BROWN of Florida. That is exactly what they are saying, but more than that, the people of the Third Congressional District have had opportunities to decide who they want to represent them, and we are not talking about some of these Members of Congress that just did win. This Member won close to 60 percent.

Ms. MCKINNEY. So you won.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Keep in mind now, the plaintiff, I beat him close to 70 percent.

Ms. MCKINNEY. Wait a minute now. I do not believe what you are saying, because the organizer of the plaintiffs in the 11th District of Georgia was my former opponent.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Well, the organizer of the Third Congressional District, who, by the way, does not live in the Third Congressional District, you know, but wants to dictate what happens in the third, I beat him close to 70 percent in the last election, well, in 1992.

Ms. MCKINNEY. So really it appears that what we are seeing is people run for office.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Losing by large numbers.

Ms. MCKINNEY. They lose, then they cannot stand the agony of defeat, particularly to a woman.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. A black woman.

Ms. MCKINNEY. So then they go against the will of, I won by 66 percent in 1994, so they go against the will of 66 percent of the people in the district. I had five plaintiffs, and they take it out on 580,000 people, is that what you are saying?

Ms. BROWN of Florida. That is exactly what I am saying. That is exactly what I am saying. For the courts, this is the sad indictment to come up with rulings to ignore the history of this country; you know, it would have been nice to think that America has always been color-blind and that women and minorities have always had the opportunity to participate. But they have not.

As I told you earlier, women for the first 150 years of this country could not vote in this country.

Ms. MCKINNEY. I am so pleased that we have been joined by another woman whose district has been declared unconstitutional.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Excuse me, is this the same district that Barbara Jordan represented for over 20 years?

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. No.

Ms. MCKINNEY. This is a new district, but Barbara Jordan's historic district was also found unconstitutional by the Texas lower court, but now they found this district constitutional, so this district is constitutional, but this woman does not deserve a seat in Congress.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. If that is Ms. JOHNSON from Texas I think she has a very compact district, although compactness should not be the only criteria to decide how to district.

Ms. MCKINNEY. Why do we not hear from Congresswoman EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON from Texas and she can tell us about the Texas situation.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Thank you very much. Let me applaud you for being persistent about the right of voters in the various districts. In Texas, black citizens were not allowed to vote in the primary until 1944, and then they bought poll tax, and it was not until the early 1970's that we were allowed to register to vote without paying.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Excuse me, I did not hear you. You must be mistaken.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. No; it is a matter of record. We had to pay poll tax to vote and, then we had to go through a lot of intimidation. So we were delighted when the Voting Rights Act came in 1965, and for the first time in Texas, for the 1970 census, we were able to have an opportunity to have representation at State level as well as congressional level.

The district that I occupy was supposed to come about after the 1970 census. But, indeed, it came 20 years later. The district that I represent is one that is over one metropolitan area, and it is clear that the lines are a little jagged, not quite as jagged as District Six. I do not know the real difference, actually, except that mine is 45 percent black populated, and because of that it was declared unconstitutional. It is interesting.

Ms. MCKINNEY. Wait a minute. Your district is 45 percent black and it is unconstitutional, my district is 64 percent black and it is unconstitutional. What is your district?

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mine is 50–50.

Ms. MCKINNEY. Yours is 50 percent black, that is unconstitutional. Does that mean any percent black is unconstitutional?

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. It appears that way because that district is 91-percent white and it is constitutional.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Let me say, in Florida, until 1982, we elected two members to the Florida Senate for the first time in 100 years. I just want you to know we have not come that far. The history of representation in this country is not great. If you look down in Florida, we did not elect a woman until, I think, 1986, not in the history of the State of Florida.

Ms. MCKINNEY. Congresswoman BROWN and I were amazed to discover that the organizer of the plaintiffs in the Georgia case was a gentleman who

had run in the 11th district and had lost. The same situation prevails in the Florida case. Could you tell us a little bit about the plaintiff in your State?

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. It became a problem because he lost?

Ms. MCKINNEY Well, I doubt very seriously, had he won, that we would be in this situation now.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. So if you do not win when you run, you can file a lawsuit?

Ms. BROWN of Florida. I guess so, and you have friends in the courts.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. I think the thing that troubles me the most about this is that we have heard statements from some that feel that they should not be represented by black people. That is clearly very interesting, since we have been represented by whites all of our history.

Ms. MCKINNEY. We continue to vote for whites.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Indeed, and most of them have not really been that responsive.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. You know one of the things that I find outstanding by every black Congressperson that I know is that we vote for people issues, and it does not have anything to do with color. When I vote for lunch programs, I want all of the children to be able to go to school and have school lunch.

While fighting against Medicare and Medicaid and the cuts, I am representing all of the people of Florida. I do not see how a Congressperson from Florida can go along with the proposals that they have to cut Medicaid and Medicare. Reverse Robin Hood: Robbing from the poor and working people to give to the rich. There are not other Members in Congress more democratic than the black Members of the caucus.

Ms. MCKINNEY. Well, I would agree with you and say that when I put my card in the little machine and I press my ''yea'' or ''nay'' button, it does not have ''black'' on it. So when I cast my vote, my vote counts the same as everyone else's vote up here, and when I cast my vote on issues, I am looking at the impact of that vote on all of my constituents, not just not black constituents. When I come up here, I do not vote just for black people, I vote for everybody.

□ 1730

Ms. BROWN of Florida. It just always amazes me how when people parade through black churches in September, October, and November, they see no relationship to what they do in January once they are sworn in.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Well, I think the important thing is for those persons that we represent, we try very hard to be responsive. We answer mail, we visit, we answer questions, and we try to respond and vote to represent that majority.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. All of the people.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. I am sorry to say that very, very often, when I have voted for people, I did not get that responsiveness. I did not always get my letters answered. If I asked questions they did not like, I was avoided. That has not happened with me. What about the other gentlewomen?

Ms. MCKINNEY. I can tell the other gentlewomen that in our congressional office we have serviced, in our casework alone, thousands of our constituents. Now, we do not hang a shingle on the door that says black here and white here. We do not do that. Everybody comes into our office and we treat everybody with dignity and respect, because that is the way we want to be treated. So we do not make a difference between our constituents. We serve all of our constituents.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. I am very proud of the service that my office rendered to the people of the Third congressional district. I have gone into little counties and the next day the headlines in the paper reads the first time in anybody's memory they had even seen a Member of Congress.

Ms. MCKINNEY. That is correct.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. The first time they had ever seen a Member of the United States Congress.

Ms. MCKINNEY. I represent a little county of roughly about 2,000 folks or so. It is Glascock County. It is the peacock capital of Georgia. I went there for a visit. It was the first time that that county had ever been visited by a Member of Congress. And that county, by the way, is a majority white county. So we do not distinguish our constituents on the basis of race, and it is unfortunate that five unhappy people would be able to hold 580,000 people hostage as we go through this redistricting process.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. I believe that one thing that I will always be known for is my responsiveness to all people without regard to color or age or gender, and I think my record is clear.

As a matter of fact, I have not won with less than 73 percent of the vote. When I ran for the Texas House in 1972, I became the first black woman in the whole area ever elected to public office and I did not get any more opposition the whole time I held that office. When I ran for the Texas Senate, after my first race, I did not get any other opposition. So I must be pleasing a majority. I received 93 percent of the vote in my primary coming to the U.S. Congress.

I believe that I am pleasing the majority. But there was one person who indicated that she did not want to live in that district and so she joined with the plaintiffs. I do not have a problem with that person's opinion. I have lived in districts that I did not want to live in. But I think it is called democracy. Democracy in this country is admired the world over. We have attempted to spread it throughout the world and it is a difficult form of government. It is probably the most expensive form, but it is the form that we all prefer. It is a form that we have respected, it is a form that we fought for.

In every war, we have been a part of that, defending this Nation. We have been a part of law enforcement. We have been a part of teaching. I do not know a profession that we have not wanted to be, even before we could be, a part of.

I believe that this country has promised all of its people one vote per person, and I do not think it eliminates us now. I realize that it did at one time. I believe that these districts are worth standing up for. I think they are worth fighting for, because we fought for freedom and this is all a part of it.

It is clear that we have been dealt some negative blows. It is clear that we have all suffered race discrimination. it is clear that we continue to face those barriers. But I believe if we succumb to those barriers, we will be letting a lot of people down. We would be letting this country down because this country's promise is not to have discriminatory practices, and we owe that as a responsibility to all of this Nation's people.

We need to get to know each other, because once we do, we will not have the same barriers as before we do. I believe that it has been educational for the persons that I represented to get to know me and for me to get to know them. That is really what makes a real understanding and acceptance.

It is unfortunate that we have to go through this first, but can either of the gentlewomen name any institution that has not come through the growing pains? And, yes, this has been long, it has been hard, it has been heartbreaking, it has been disappointing, and it is hard to explain it to your children, it is hard to explain to your grandchildren, but we cannot give up.

Ms. MCKINNEY. We absolutely cannot give up.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. We stand on very tall shoulders. If we think about people that have died to give us the opportunity to stand here on this floor and have this conversation, then I am committed that we will never go back to an institution of all white men.

Ms. MCKINNEY. I agree with the gentlewoman, and I just did a little list here of the women whose districts have been targeted. Women. So while we three up here also happen to be African-American, we are women trying to make it in a traditionally male environment.

SHEILA JACKSON-LEE is the gentlewoman's colleague from Texas; the gentlewoman from New York, NYDIA VELÁZQUEZ, is America's first Puerto Rican American Congresswoman. Somebody in the State of New York does not like the fact that we have, for the first time in our Nation's history, a Puerto Rican American woman voting on the floor of the United States House of Representatives.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. As I said before, this is the first time, these past 3 years, or 2½, that we have had a diverse Congress. It has been the most diverse. Look who championed the issues of the people. I am very proud to stand with the Women's Caucus, the Hispanic Caucus, the Black Caucus, the Democratic Caucus for the people of this country.

If we look at the attacks on affirmative action, and I recognize that is another talk, but we have 98 percent of all of the jobs in all of the categories held by white males and they are only 42 percent of the population. It is like my grandmamma's sweet potato pie. All we have is a thin slice, and they do not want us to have that slice.

Ms. MCKINNEY. Well, I want to thank both of the gentlewomen for joining me in this special order and I would like to conclude by saying that I know that this struggle, as the gentlewoman correctly point out, is growing pains for the south and it is growing pains for our Nation.

We do not stand alone in Georgia's fight that we are having. We have been joined by the Congressional Black Caucus, the Democratic National Committee, the Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee, the State of Texas, the National Voting Rights Institution, Mexican American Legal Defense Educational Fund, National Asian Pacific American Legal Consortium, the NAACP, the National Organization for Women, the National Organization for Women Legal Defense Fund, National Urban League, People for the American Way, and Women's Legal Defense Fund. It is obvious that we do not stand alone.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. It is very ironic that gerrymandering never became an issue until they started to include us. Districts were drawn all kinds of ways. I happened to have chaired the State Senate redistricting committee for congressional districts, and all kinds of requests came in. They wanted to include their grandfather's burial site, their grandmother's birthplace, an army site, a certain street, and a little store that they visited in. But when it includes black voters, it becomes illegal.

Ms. MCKINNEY. I would ask the people of this great Nation to please stand with these women who are here and the other women whose districts have been targeted and say that we appreciate the kind of democracy that we have now achieved; and while we are faced with the position of some people trying to take us back, this country will not go back, and that the people will join with us as we fight to move this country even more forward toward a greater type of democracy that includes everybody.

I thank the other gentlewomen very much for participating.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. I thank the gentlewoman.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. I thank the gentlewoman.

## REPUBLICAN AGENDA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLER of Florida). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOKE] is recognized for 60 minutes as a designee of the majority leader.

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to review some of the areas that we have been involved in the past couple of weeks that we have gotten back since the break, and particularly to look forward to what we are going to be doing during the next 2 months, because this is going to be an extraordinarily busy time, a very exciting time, and, frankly, and extremely challenging time for House Republicans on a number of fronts.

I think, first of all, it is important to look at the big picture and to remind ourselves, and, of course, I am not speaking directly to the American people, but to you, Mr. Speaker, and perhaps they will hear also, but to remind ourselves that as we responsibly cut Government, which is what the American people want us to do, we also intend to grow America. Our plan is based on the principle that America's greatness is based on its people, not its bureaucracy, and that its greatest accomplishments lie in front of us and not behind us.

We have essentially four things that we are going to continue to work on up until the end of this term of the first year of the 104th Congress. The first is to balance the budget in 7 years. As we all know, Mr. Speaker, we passed a budget resolution in late June that shows a roadmap to how we can get to a balanced budget by the year 2002. We have worked assiduously passing appropriations bills that will do exactly that.

First of all, in these appropriation bills, we have begun with the legislative branch itself and the conference report, because we all know that charity begins at home and so do the cuts. If we cannot take personal responsibility right here in this House, and if we cannot set an example and show how we Republicans ourselves are willing to make the sacrifices that are necessary, how on Earth can we possibly ask the American public to do the same thing.

So, Mr. Speaker, we began with an 8 percent reduction in the 1996 appropriation for legislative branch, and that is a $205 million cut below the 1995 levels. I think it is important to remember that when we are talking about this cut of $205 million, that is a real cut. That is not a phony smoke and mirrors Washington cut, that is actual real dollars: $205 million less than what we are spending in fiscal year 1995, the year that is going to end on October 1.

That is a remarkable difference, because in the past we have used this dark alchemy of baseline budgeting to confuse the American public. And it is the same dark alchemy that is being used right now by our liberal friends on the other side of the aisle to claim that we are decreasing, or cutting, slashing I think is the word that is used most frequently, slashing Medicare in order to pay for ''tax cuts for the rich''.

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that we are increasing in real dollars; not in inflated dollars, not in projected dollars, but in real dollars off of the 1995 actual amount. We are increasing the amount of money that will be spend on Medicare.

□ 1745

I am going to get to that in a minute, but I want to emphasize, as I go through some of these appropriation bills, that we have actually genuinely cut real dollars; in the case of leg branch, 205 million real dollars, from what we spent in 1995, not $205 million less than what somebody at CBO, an analyst who was never elected to anything at CBO projected we would be spending in 1996, but in fact $205 million less than we have spent in 1995.

How about on the foreign operations side of it? We did slash foreign aid. We cut the foreign aid appropriation by $1.5 billion below the 1995 levels. That is an 11½-percent reduction.

In the Department of Interior appropriations bill we cut spending there by $1.6 billion over the 1995 levels.

And we eliminated bureaucracies. We ended the funding for six Federal agencies, including the National Biological Survey, the Bureau of Mines, the Office of Indian Education, and the Office of Emergency Preparedness.

Treasury-Postal Service; we delivered spending cuts that we promised. We reduced spending by more than $300 million below the fiscal year 1995 levels.

In the Department of Agriculture we have truly sown the seeds of deficit reduction. We have cut farm and food spending by $6.3 billion below the 1995 fiscal year budget. That is a 9-percent reduction.

The American people have been saying for several decades we are subsidizing agricultural interests in a way that does not make any sense, and, if you listen to many, many farmers, they say exactly the same thing because what we do is we pay farmers to not grow crops that they probably would not have wanted to have grown anyway had the market been allowed to act as it should, and, as a result of that, we have a distorted marketplace in the agricultural industry in this country, and we are making those changes in real terms on a real-time basis.

Also in the Department of Agriculture we have reduced welfare spending. We have cut the food stamp budget by $1.7 billion below fiscal year 1995, a 6-percent reduction going specifically after the waste, fraud, and abuse that exists in that area at the same time that we have increased nutrition funding. This is the WIC program for women, infants, and children, and also the school nutrition, school lunches, that we have increased substantially. WIC goes up 7½ percent. That is $260