

These cuts will not go to offset the cost of the hurricane. These cuts will only be used to facilitate additional tax cuts to our Nation's wealthiest Americans, those who make well over \$200,000 a year and up.

Republicans are cutting services for hard working families in my district and, instead, giving away \$70 billion in new tax cuts to the wealthiest Americans. These cuts are reckless, in my opinion, and unfair to the middle and lower income families and reflect the Republican-led Congress' double standards.

Cuts to Medicaid, an already underfunded program, would have a devastating impact on women and their families by cutting vital services especially important to them. Medicaid is an important health insurance program for millions of low income elderly and disabled Americans.

State and Federal Governments have ensured that more than 53 million people, including 14 percent of low income Americans, have access to health care services through the Medicaid program. This includes 25 million children. More than 1 in every 4 children in the U.S. is covered by this program.

This also includes more than 30 percent of children with disabilities who rely on Medicaid for health coverage and services. Medicaid, as you know, provides essential care, such as family planning, breast and cervical cancer treatment, care for disabled women, to more than 16 million women, including approximately 10 million women of child-bearing age.

Nearly 1 in 10 women in the U.S. receives health care coverage through Medicaid. One-third of all poor women are covered by Medicaid, including 40 percent of single women. Mothers are twice as likely as men to qualify for Medicaid, because they are poor and in lower paying jobs that are less likely to have employer-sponsored insurance.

Health insurance, as you know, is critical to women, because mothers with health insurance are more likely to stay employed and get health care for their children than those lacking insurance. And women, as you know, of reproductive age are in a vulnerable position, because they are more likely to lack health insurance.

Medicaid accounts, as you know, for two-thirds of all of the Federal and State family planning funding nationwide. And, by the way, low income pregnant women can receive critical prenatal care when they need it without being turned away from the program.

Medicaid ensures that women receive a full spectrum of maternity coverage, including prenatal, labor and delivery and postpartum care. Medicaid, as you know, is important to the health of women of all ages, and Medicaid is the largest source of funding for women over the age of 80 living in nursing homes.

This program covers high-cost nursing homes and long-term care services.

In my State of California, the Medicaid program is run jointly by the Federal, State and local county governments. The Federal share cost in California is about 50 percent.

Medicaid in California provides vital health services to low income women who comprise right now 74 percent of the beneficiaries ages 19 and older. And in my State of California, 42 percent of all births in the State are paid for by Medicaid.

These facts demonstrate, in my opinion, that Medicaid is a significant health safety net for women and their children. The cuts in Medicaid would shut the neediest individuals out of the public health system and put the health of millions of women and children at risk. Proposing reductions without ensuring the preservation of coverage for those in need simply transfers the burden to the States that are already overstretched.

Medicaid cuts will shift costs to the States, impose higher costs to beneficiaries, and health care providers. States would be forced to reduce coverage and benefits. Despite the national tragedy, the proposed Republican budget would cut billions of dollars from Medicaid while doing nothing to make sure that we have affordable health care for Americans.

Democrats believe in strengthening and not undermining Medicaid. The Federal Government should fulfill its promise of being a reliable partner. We must protect Medicaid and maintain the current Federal commitment to this fundamental public health insurance system.

I am in strong opposition to the Republican budget, because it does not keep the best interests of women and their children in mind. I urge my colleagues to provide full funding for Medicaid, and preserve the health care safety net program that many women and children rely on currently.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. PAUL addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MORAN of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

#### WHERE IS THE U.S. BEEF IN JAPAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MORAN of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I rise this afternoon to discuss the eco-

nomic harm that U.S. farmers and ranchers have experienced as a result of the Japanese embargo of U.S. beef. This issue has gone on far too long, and we in Kansas have lost our patience.

Mr. Speaker, Japan has prohibited the imports of beef from the United States since December 2003 when a single case of BSE was found in a Canadian-born animal.

Since that time, the United States has undergone rigorous and thorough surveillance programs for BSE testing and has implemented safeguards to protect human and animal health. These safeguards have far exceeded internationally recognized standards promoted by the World Organization for Animal Health, of which Japan is a member.

While the Sanitary and Phytosanitary Agreement provides that members of the WTO have the right to take measures to protect human, animal and plant health under principles of sound science, the SPS Agreement does not allow WTO members the right to discriminate and restrict trade arbitrarily.

□ 1645

The U.S. State Department, the Office of the United States Trade Representative, and the United States Department of Agriculture have worked tirelessly to reopen this market for U.S. beef, and I commend them for their efforts.

On October 23, 2004, nearly a year ago, the United States and Japan concluded an understanding that established a process to lead to the resumption of beef imports from the United States. Despite this agreement a year ago, the Government of Japan continues to delay imports of beef from the U.S. on a basis and factors not grounded in science or consumer safety.

Losing the export market to Japan is having a significant impact upon our entire industry, and it also puts at risk a well-established bilateral trading relationship. This 2-year delay has now almost totaled \$3.4 billion in losses to American agriculture. Whether you are a farmer or a rancher, a beef processor or a retailer, this loss of market is having a detrimental effect upon that business, upon our rural communities, and upon the agriculture economy. The U.S. cattle and beef industries are losing \$100 million each month that Japan remains closed to U.S. beef markets. Since December 2003, the U.S. meat industry has lost 10,000 jobs, mostly attributed to a loss of the export markets.

In March this year, Mr. Speaker, I introduced House Resolution 137, which currently has more than 80 co-sponsors. I encourage my colleagues to join me in sponsoring this legislation. The resolution is a sense of the House of Representatives that if the Government of Japan continues to delay in meeting its obligations under the understanding reached last October, then