

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-

nomical 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

the United States trade representative should immediately impose retaliatory trade sanctions against Japan.

While I do not wish for the U.S. and Japan to enter into a drawn out trade dispute, the reality is that Japan cannot have it both ways, and they must be required to uphold their agreement. The United States works to promote free trade agreements throughout the world, and it is important for our trading partners to honor the current agreements and international standards; and without those assurances, support for trade agreements will clearly erode.

Recently, I was joined by over a hundred Members of Congress in writing President Bush asking him to make restoring this market of U.S. beef to Japan his highest economic priority in his discussions with the Japanese Prime Minister. I support our government's efforts to reopen our beef exports to Japan; but, again, Japan continues to unjustifiably delay the process.

Last month I testified before the House Committee on Ways and Means and urged the committee to bring this resolution to the floor and show Japan the serious nature of this trade issue. I appreciate very much the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) for holding the hearing and for allowing me to testify.

Many members of that committee during the hearing agreed that this action needs to be taken to address this issue.

Mr. Speaker, Japan cannot have it both ways. They cannot benefit from exports to the U.S. while denying our imports such as beef with no scientific evidence to support their actions. Congressional patience has been exhausted. It is time that House Resolution 137 be brought to the floor and a clear message be delivered to Japan. Let us allow the will of the House to be heard. Patience is a virtue no longer.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. WOOLSEY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time of the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

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

There was no objection.

#### BUILDING A STRONG AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gen-

tleman from Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, since the year 2000 this Congress has racked up more than \$3 trillion in new debt. How did that happen? They tried to do what no other President has tried to do and no other Congress, to fund two wars with four tax cuts.

This Congress has served as an ATM to special interests, showering them with billions in tax breaks and hand-outs. Suddenly our Republican friends have become born-again budget hawks. In fact, tomorrow we may have to vote on a resolution to slash more than \$50 billion from education, health care, nutritional investments important to millions of Americans and families and their future. All for what? So we can fund \$70 billion in tax cuts just for the wealthy Americans.

That is what this budget package is, \$70 billion in tax cuts. At the same time that these so-called new-born fiscal conservatives are complaining about the deficit, they are going to push through yet another round of tax cuts on top, close to \$20 billion added to our deficit.

I ask my colleagues, are these the choices the American people asked us to do? To date, the American taxpayer has funded \$445 billion in the effort in Iraq, \$20 billion going to rebuild Iraq. We have built and renovated 110 primary health care centers in Iraq, vaccinated 3.2 million Iraqi children; all the while here in the United States the Republican budget has cut \$10 billion from Medicaid. We have also cut community health care clinics.

In Iraq we have rehabilitated 2,700 schools, trained 36,000 secondary education school teachers. What is their budget doing for America? They cut \$806 million from America's public schools, Leave No Child Behind. They have also proposed nearly \$9 billion in cuts to college student aid. We funded nearly 3,100 community development projects in Iraq alone. Yet the President's budget is cutting the community development grants here for the United States by \$250 million.

The Corps of Engineers in the United States has been cut by over \$300 million. Yet we built a new light rail system in Iraq. We have also rebuilt their dam with a levee in it. All the while their budget cuts from America's future and American families' future while literally loading up close to \$445 billion for the effort in Iraq, of which \$20 billion goes to rebuilding their schools, their health care, their nutritional programs, things that we are cutting from the United States and from American families.

Every President going to war has thought about America's future. During the Civil War, Abraham Lincoln thought of the Land Grant College system. President Roosevelt in the middle of the World War II thought of the G.I. Bill. President Eisenhower at the tail end of the Korean War built the interstate highway system for the United

States. During the height of the Cold War and Vietnam War, President Kennedy envisioned a man on the Moon.

What does this President propose? Eliminating Amtrak, cutting \$9 billion from student aid, and cutting veterans benefits. Why? Because he has tried to do something that no other President has thought of doing, which is to cut taxes in the middle of two wars. Where has it left America? \$3 trillion in debt, cuts in our future for American families.

Now Americans are faced not only with these cuts in its investments. Gas prices are nearly \$3 a gallon, home heating costs are up by 50 percent this winter, inflation has increased at the fastest rate in 15 years, hundreds and thousands have lost everything in the gulf coast, and our brave men and women are fighting and dying in Iraq with no end in sight.

Yet what are we proposing to America? Cuts in their educational investments, cuts in health care investments, cuts in nutritional investments. All the while we are making those same types of investments in Iraq. That is not the choice the American people want.

I have no problem if we are going to make a commitment to Iraq and Iraq's future and the future of their children. I have a problem when we are not going to leave America stronger, but weaker, at the end of that effort, and we are not willing to make that same investment in American children's future.

We cannot afford those types of choices. Those are the false choices. All the while what we are trying to do is wall off and protect tax cuts for the wealthiest 1 percent, people making \$300,000 a year, while the rest of America gets cuts in Amtrak, student aid, nutritional programs, veterans get cut from their health care benefits. That is not what the American people think of as an investment in their future. It is clearly not the one you are willing to make in Iraq where we now have a \$445 billion bill due to the American people. It will get close to \$600 billion before it is all over. The American people are going to be asked to pay for it.

How are they going to pay for it? With cuts in their education college loans, cuts in their communities' health care clinics, cuts in Medicaid, cuts in Medicare, cuts in their programs that have guaranteed them a middle-class future. We should find ways to balance the budget, but we should not do it on the backs of our children.

The American people expect their leaders to make the right choices. Mr. Speaker, it is time Congress changes its tune. We can do better. Building a strong America begins by building a good America here at home.

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