

tax on that. So, if the Government helps collect child support, the Government keeps 10 percent of that money.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that again, I think, is very antifamily values and antieverything the Congressional Caucus on Women's Issues had worked for. If my colleagues look at any number of other issues, they see them being rolled back, they see them being rolled back, and, as my colleagues know, people do not believe it. We had even the Violence Against Women Act barely, barely funded when it was unanimously agreed to a year ago.

I hope people watch what happens to that statue of those three women, and wake up and find out what is happening to the statutes that so many women have cared about, and men, too.

#### MEDISCARE TACTICS AND OTHER FALL FICTION

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

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I always enjoy spending time of course in the Sixth District in Arizona, but I also enjoy returning to the well of this body to hear some very creative accounts of what has transpired here, and I appreciate my predecessor here in the well for offering her unique interpretation on events, but, as the RECORD will reflect, because I have done some checking specifically about the statue of the suffragettes that came to the floor as a unanimous-consent request, one Member, a new addition to this House, the gentlewoman from North Carolina, stood in opposition citing the cost of \$80,000 to \$100,000.

Now there are those in this body who say, "Hey, it is no big deal. A little bit of money for a symbol; that's fine." I personally would like to see the statue brought up, but perhaps we ought to find some means of funding to remove the statue—

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYWORTH. No, not at this time, I will not yield. The gentlewoman has had 5 minutes. I appreciate my amount of time. I will not yield to the gentlewoman at this time. I would be happy to debate her at a later time.

So too have we had interesting interpretations, not only from the gentlewoman and indeed from almost all the folks over here on this side of the aisle, as to what is transpiring in terms of health care for all Americans, but especially health care for senior citizens. I listened with great interest as my friends on the other side continue to play the game of "MediScare."

As my colleagues know, we thought the big fiction time for reading, Mr. Speaker, was in the summer with those great big, thick paperback books. No, no. It is right now here in the fall with the blatant charges that are coming from the other side that are just filled with disinformation.

With reference to the so-called spousal impoverishment statute, I would hope that Members on the other side would stand with us to rail against the greater source of spousal impoverishment and family impoverishment, and that is a confiscatory tax policy that penalizes for Americans for succeeding not only in this life, but from the grave. The same folks who voted to tax us retroactively maintain an estate tax that is absolutely confiscatory and punishes the very people we should be helping. Indeed our entire policy is this: "If you succeed in this Nation, somehow you are to be punished." It is not fair.

Why it is not fair that one works hard and succeeds. They ought to take that money and surrender it to the State.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYWORTH. I will not yield at this juncture. I will continue my remarks, and the gentlewoman has had her time earlier.

My colleagues heard it completely in the fiction that we will hear no doubt again from the other side today. It has been the greatest line. It is cited as a catechism even among the pollsters of the liberal news media who seek somehow to solidify something that is absolutely false. The other side will march to the well of this House and say that the new majority is trying to change Medicare to pay for a tax cut. That is just blatantly and totally false. The fact is the new majority worked very hard on a budget plan to bring this budget into balance within 7 years that paid for all of the tax reductions along the way.

My colleagues, here is the big secret that somehow is not getting out. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, I would challenge the major news media outlets of this Nation to use this part of my remarks because it is the absolute truth, and it is what people are missing in this whole debate. If our budget were balanced today, right now, we would still have a problem with the Medicare trust fund. Members of both parties, three members of the President's own Cabinet, tell us that Medicare is going broke. We have to fix it, and something else that follows the school lunch fiction and all the other scare tactics. The fact is we are not cutting Medicare. We are reducing the rate of growth. The average expenditure per beneficiary rises almost 40 percent over the next 6 years, from \$4,800 this year to \$6,700 in the year 2002. So, it is not a cut, and to hear the wailing and gnashing of teeth, and creative accounting from the other side almost defies imagination.

I say to my colleagues, apply it in everyday terms to your own life. Your son or daughter comes to you asking for an allowance. I use an example from my own. My oldest daughter, going from junior high to high school, wanted an allowance increase from \$5 a week. I felt in a sense of parental lar-

gesse we double it to \$10 a week. Now because I did not give her \$15, Mr. Speaker, she wasn't yelling that it was a cut of \$5. She got a real increase.

So, my colleagues and Mr. Speaker, listen closely to the charges. They are without foundation. It is the MediScare tactics of the past. Read the real record. Check the real numbers.

#### OUR SENIORS' CONCERNS ABOUT REPUBLICAN MEDICARE REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from Texas, Mr. GENE GREEN, is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to my colleague, the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER].

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I will be very brief because the gentleman from Texas is being very kind. I am glad I got to answer these statements.

No. 1, the cost for bringing the statue up. There has been a private group that the Senate has put together that is willing to do this, it is my understanding, so that is not an issue.

No. 2, I find that countering spousal impoverishment by saying that estate taxes are too high; for heaven's sakes, if they are both in the poorhouse, estate taxes are not going to matter.

So we are beginning to see what the gentleman from Arizona and his party—

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman did not yield to me, and I do not mind yielding. I think I yielded to the gentleman every time.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. SCHROEDER. At this point, Mr. Speaker, I yield back to the gentleman from Texas, Mr. GENE GREEN.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. I will yield, but let me make my remarks about the Medicare to my colleague from Arizona because I want to make sure my colleagues understand that that is what our morning hour here is about, so we can exchange ideas and talk about it.

Over the last week I spent a lot of time in my district, like other Members have, and I used this last week to meet with constituents, and visit a number of my senior citizens' centers, and answer their questions, and I have not had the opportunity to host our Social Security Commissioner, Dr. Shirley Chater, in Houston, and she toured one of our west-end senior citizen centers, the Magnolia Senior Nutrition site, and also the Texas Medical Center to talk with those who are most affected by the proposed cutbacks in Medicare.

□ 1245

You will notice I did not say cuts, cutbacks, because when you add more population to it and you do not plan for that increase, it is a cutback.

Ms. Chater made an interesting point during her visit. I would like to reiterate it. We have all heard the word "bankrupt" a lot. All by friends on the other side of the aisle stand up and wave the Medicare Trustees' report and explain how they are trying to save the system from going bankrupt. Ms. Chater is not only Social Security Administrator, but she is also one of the trustees of the Medicare trust fund, and she pointed out to the seniors in Houston, TX that the system really is not going bankrupt. It may have problems that need to be addressed, like it has eight times or nine times in its history over the last 30 years, but as long as people paid into the trust fund, those of us who are earning now, it is not going bankrupt as long as we plan for the future.

My friends on the other side of the aisle say we are scaring seniors. Seniors ought to be scared. I think the polls show they are getting scared by what they hear. In fact, they should be the ones that should quit scaring seniors into thinking they are going to cut \$270 million out of Medicare and it will not be around next year unless they do that, because that is what the fear is: Unless we cut \$270 million out of the growth over 7 years we will not have Medicare next year.

We will have Medicare next year, we will have it the year after that, but we need to have a reasonable plan to get its policies on expenditures in line like we do every Federal program; but not \$270 billion, more like \$90 billion. It is not true, and it is wrong to scare the people into thinking that.

Let us be honest with the American people. They need \$270 billion to meet their tax cut goals. I have heard those goals were met with the appropriation bills. But, Mr. Speaker, we have only passed one appropriation bill here on this floor that went to the President, and was vetoed last week, so those cuts are not in place.

Now they are talking about cutting Medicare. There are no ifs, ands, or buts; the seniors in this country will have to bear the brunt of the pain to balance that budget to give that tax break. That is the truth, and even the Republican Members of our other body have expressed strong opposition to cutting taxes while simultaneously slashing Medicare.

These Senate Republicans are beginning to say, as our Democrat leader, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT], has said for months, in fact the gentleman from Missouri was in Houston at another senior citizen site a few months ago, and said that before we start talking about reforming Medicare, let us sit down and look at the whole budget, but let us take off this tax cut of \$247 billion.

I was in Houston for over a week, and I have talked to hundreds of seniors. Several have asked me to outline what the plan entailed. I have briefly explained \$110 billion will come from health care providers, 80 billion from the beneficiaries and their increase in Medicare part B, and \$80 billion from future unspecified cuts will be decided by some bureaucrat here in Washington, DC. Of course, that begged the question: Who is going to make that decision? Will these unspecified cuts be out of providers, or will they come from increased beneficiaries' cuts? We do not know, but that is the only place this can come out of, unless we take more out of the Federal budget.

The translation is, I tell the seniors in my district, to expect more direct hits down the road if this plan passes. My constituents asked me, "It's kind of sketchy to us. Why don't we get some more detail?" I said, "Okay, that is what I will do." I am waiting, because I know the Committee on Ways and Means is still meeting, to see what their plan will do on these unspecified cuts.

Mr. Speaker, I know I have exhausted my time, and my colleague, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYWORTH], has left. But I know that I join with a lot of people, the AARP, the American Medical Association, and a lot of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle who question what may be happening to Medicare if we do not do something reasonable instead of cutting \$270 billion.

---

#### THE UPCOMING WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON TRAVEL AND TOURISM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EVERETT). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ROTH] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, I want to say something today about a worldwide phenomenon that is taking place that we seem to be oblivious to, and we should be aware of. That is what is taking place in travel and tourism. If you take a look at the jobs, not only in our congressional districts but around the country and around the world, there is no industry like travel and tourism that is creating jobs and meaningful employment for people.

On October 30 and 31, let me repeat that, on October 30 and 31 of this year, of this month, we are going to be convening here in Washington the biggest White House conference on travel and tourism ever. As chairman of the Travel and Tourism Caucus here in Congress, the largest caucus here in Congress, I can vouch for the fact that we have not given enough recognition to travel and tourism. Travel and tourism does not ask anything from the Government, it just gives to the Government. It is the biggest tax producer in America. Tourism in the United States

is a \$360 billion business. It is the Nation's second largest employer.

Travel and tourism is a worldwide phenomenon. Do you know that 10 percent of all the jobs throughout the world come from the area of travel and tourism? It is also the largest producer of taxes in the world. Jobs and taxes translate into travel and tourism. This is true globally, but it is also true locally for all of us. In every single one of the 435 congressional districts, travel and tourism has a preponderant, overwhelming influence.

For example, in my own district in Wisconsin, tourism brought in more than \$6 billion in States' revenue. That is more than \$17 million a day, and it puts bread on the table of some 128,000 workers just in our State. Just in my district alone, people vacationing and traveling for business spend over \$700 million every year, and 18,000 new jobs are created as a result.

That is why I want all of our Congressmen to focus in on this conference on the 30th and 31st of this month, because it is the first time we have had a conference like this. If we want good-paying jobs for our people, if we are concerned about what is happening for senior citizens and Medicare and Medicaid and so on, we have to have dollars to fund those programs. Those dollars come basically from travel and tourism. All of us rely on the travel and tourism dollar.

We in Congress must recognize that industry for the jobs and prosperity it creates in our towns, cities, and throughout America, and quite frankly throughout the world. I want to do something positive here to help our working people. Therefore, I encourage all of you to become involved in the Travel and Tourism Caucus. We have some 280 members in our Travel and Tourism Caucus, but we have 435 Congressmen, so in this interim period, between now and the conference, the White House conference, I am asking every Member of Congress to join, to become a Member of the travel and tourist industry, because we have to high-profile this industry.

It is time for us to get involved. Travel and tourism is the incoming economic tide of the future. In every one of our congressional districts, in every part of America, in every part of the world, the global economy is being influenced by travel and tourism. October 30 and 31 is when the conference will be held, when we give recognition to the men and women who make travel and tourism such a wonderful benefit to our districts, our country, and the world.

---

#### CALLING FOR TIME FOR CONSIDERATION AND PUBLIC SCRUTINY ON PROPOSED MEDICARE REFORMS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May