United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 104th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 141 WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, JUNE 30, 1995 No. 109

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. HASTERT].

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore, laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
June 30, 1995.

I hereby designate the Honorable J. DENNIS HASTERT to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Remind us, O God, that along with the changes of the times, there is also the unchanging; that along with all the transient values, there are also eternal values; that along with limited relationships, there are also abiding friendships; that along with all the new words of each day, there is also Your enduring Word. For all Your good gifts and for Your continuing presence with us in every moment of life, we offer these words of thanksgiving and praise. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the Chair's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 305, nays 69, answered ''present'' 3, not voting 57, as follows:

[Roll No. 465]

YEAS—305

Ackerman
Allard
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Beilenson
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Browder
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cardin
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Christensen
Chrysler
Clement
Clinger
Coble
Coburn
Collins (GA)
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cooley
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cunningham
Danner
Davis
de la Garza
Deal
DeLauro
DeLay
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Ensign
Eshoo
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fields (LA)
Flake
Flanagan
Foley
Forbes
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Frost
Funderburk
Furse
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefner
Heineman
Hilleary
Hobson
Holden
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Hunter
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jackson-Lee
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Johnston
Jones
Kanjorski
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kim
King
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Lantos
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lazio
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Longley
Lucas
Luther
Maloney
Manzullo
Martinez
Martini
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum
McDade
McDermott
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Meehan
Metcalf
Meyers
Mica
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Minge
Mink
Molinari
Montgomery
Moran
Morella
Murtha
Myers
Nethercutt
Neumann
Norwood
Nussle
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Paxon
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Pryce
Quillen
Ramstad
Reed
Regula
Rivers
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Schiff
Schumer
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Sisisky
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stearns
Stenholm
Stokes
Studds
Stump
Stupak
Talent
Tanner
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thomas
Thornberry
Thurman
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Upton
Vento
Vucanovich
Walker
Wamp
Ward
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker

☐ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., ☐ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.
Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper containing 100% post consumer waste

Wolf
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Young (FL)
Zeliff

NAYS—69

Baldacci
Brown (CA)
Burton
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clyburn
Coleman
Costello
Crane
DeFazio
Dingell
Durbin
Evans
Fattah
Fawell
Fazio
Filner
Foglietta
Ford
Geren
Gillmor
Green
Hall (OH)
Hastings (FL)
Hefley
Hilliard
Hoekstra
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Kleczka
LaFalce
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lincoln
Lowey
McKinney
McNulty
Meek
Menendez
Mineta
Mollohan
Neal
Ney
Obey
Payne (NJ)
Pickett
Rahall
Rangel
Richardson
Rush
Sabo
Sawyer
Schroeder
Scott
Skaggs
Slaughter
Stockman
Thompson
Thornton
Velazquez
Visclosky
Volkmer
Wise
Yates
Zimmer

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—3

Edwards
Harman
Nadler

NOT VOTING—57

Abercrombie
Baker (CA)
Bartlett
Becerra
Bono
Bryant (TX)
Chenoweth
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Dellums
Doolittle
Dornan
Fields (TX)
Fowler
Gallegly
Gekas
Gutierrez
Hayes
Herger
Hinchey
Hoke
Hostettler
Hutchinson
Kasich
Kennedy (RI)
Klink
Leach
Lofgren
Manton
Markey
McCrery
Mfume
Moakley
Moorhead
Myrick
Oberstar
Owens
Pombo
Quinn
Radanovich
Reynolds
Riggs
Rose
Sanders
Serrano
Skelton
Stark
Taylor (MS)
Tucker
Waldholtz
Walsh
Waters
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Williams
Wilson
Young (AK)

☐ 1021

Mrs. MEEK of Florida changed her vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mr. DIXON, Ms. DANNER, and Ms. RIVERS changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTERT). Will the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, if the House would come to order, this week the House passed a constitutional amendment with strong bipartisan support to pledge allegiance to that flag. Would the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT] come over here in a bipartisan effort and join me in leading the Pledge of Allegiance.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York was recognized to lead the House in the Pledge.

Mr. SOLOMON led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WISE].

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 130, nays 263, not voting 41, as follows:

[Roll No. 466]

YEAS—130

Ackerman
Andrews
Baesler
Baldacci
Barcia
Bentsen
Berman
Bevill
Bishop
Bonior
Boucher
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Clay
Clayton
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Conyers
Coyne
Danner
de la Garza
DeFazio
DeLauro
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Durbin
Engel
Ensign
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hilliard
Holden
Hoyer
Jackson-Lee
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)
Kennelly
LaFalce
Lantos
Lewis (GA)
Lofgren
Lowey
Maloney
Markey
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McDermott
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Mink
Mollohan
Moran
Nadler
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Peterson (FL)
Pomeroy
Rangel
Reed
Richardson
Rivers
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sawyer
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Sisisky
Skaggs
Slaughter
Spratt
Stark
Stockman
Stokes
Studds
Thompson
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Tucker
Velazquez
Vento
Volkmer
Ward
Watt (NC)
Wise
Woolsey
Wynn
Yates

NAYS—263

Allard
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Beilenson
Bereuter
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Borski
Brewster
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cardin
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chapman
Christensen
Chrysler
Clement
Clinger
Coble
Collins (GA)
Combest
Cooley
Costello
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis
Deal
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doggett
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Foley
Forbes
Fox
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Funderburk
Ganske
Gekas
Geren
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Green
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hefner
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Johnston
Jones
Kasich
Kelly
Kildee
Kim
King
Kingston
Kleczka
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lazio
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Lincoln
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Longley
Lucas
Luther
Manzullo
Martini
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Menendez
Metcalf
Meyers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Minge
Molinari
Montgomery
Morella
Murtha
Myers
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Ortiz
Orton
Oxley
Packard
Parker
Paxon
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Pryce
Quillen
Quinn
Rahall
Ramstad
Regula
Riggs
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Roth
Roukema
Royce
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Schiff
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stenholm
Stump
Stupak
Talent
Tanner
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thomas
Thornberry
Thornton
Thurman
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Traficant
Upton
Visclosky
Vucanovich
Walker
Wamp
Waxman
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wolf
Wyden
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—41

Abercrombie
Baker (CA)
Becerra
Bono
Bryant (TX)
Chenoweth
Coburn
Condit
Cramer
Dellums
Dornan
Fields (TX)
Flanagan
Fowler
Gallegly
Gibbons
Hinchey
Hoke
Jacobs
Jefferson
Kennedy (RI)
Klink
Leach
Manton
Martinez
Mfume
Moakley
Moorhead
Radanovich
Reynolds
Serrano
Skelton
Smith (NJ)
Waldholtz
Walsh
Waters
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Williams
Wilson
Young (AK)

☐ 1041

Mr. TEJEDA and Mr. ORTIZ changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD changed her vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. GEPHARDT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I wish to inquire about the schedule.

I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY], the distinguished majority leader, to announce the schedule for the rest of the day.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, it is our intention today, as we are prepared to proceed on the rule for Medicare select, and then immediately after that, to move on to Medicare select. As the Speaker knows, this is very important legislation, and the timing is critical because of a deadline that must be met.

Following our completion of work on Medicare select, it is our intention to move on to the adjournment resolution, which needs a rule; so we will be doing the rule and then the adjournment resolution. Any other business scheduled for today is business that we can put over until after the Fourth of July work recess so that upon completion of the adjournment resolution, pending action in the Senate, we ought to be able to have completed our day's work. That ought to enable us to get our Members well on their way to their districts for the district work period by the scheduled 3 o'clock departure time.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I would simply inquire of the gentleman, this obviously means that changes in committee assignments will be held until after the Fourth of July recess?

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, let me say, we would anticipate that action to take place sometime after 6 on Monday, the 10th.

As the Members might want to be reminded, we have tried to conclude the district work period by a return on Monday, the 10th, that would involve no votes before 5 on Monday, the 10th, to give that day to the Members for travel with a sense of security that they would not face a vote prior to 5 and have the opportunity to make their trip.

That being the case, we would not, since there seems to be a high interest in this matter of the committee appointment, we would not begin consideration of the committee appointment until after 6, probably, on Monday, the 10th. But we should, as I think we have indicated, expect that votes might begin as early as 5 on Monday, the 10th.

So we would do the four scheduled suspensions and then move on to the Medicare select—I am sorry, the committee assignment, International Relations, Appropriations, Resources, and so on as the week goes by. Monday night we will do the committee assignment after 6.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTERT). The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SOLOMON. Is it true that there will not be an intervening vote before we take up the rules, and Members do not have to stay in the well of the House?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair cannot anticipate what votes will come forward.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Edwin Thomas, one of his secretaries.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 483, MEDICARE SELECT POLICIES

Ms. PRYCE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 180 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 180

Resolved, That, upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 483) to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to permit medicare select policies to be offered in all States, and for other purposes. All points of order against the conference report and against its consideration are waived. The conference report shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Commerce. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the conference report to final adoption without intervening motion. Upon the adoption of the conference report, Senate Concurrent Resolution 19 shall be considered as agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. PRYCE] is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. PRYCE. Mr. Speaker, for the purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. BEILENSON], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, time is of the essence. Once again, that is the basic principle underlying our consideration of legislation to extend the Medicare Select Demonstration Program.

In April, the Rules Committee reported a timely rule for H.R. 483. Today, we bring to the floor a rule making in order the conference report accompanying H.R. 483, with only hours to go before this valuable program is set to expire.

In 1990, Congress created the 15-State demonstration Medicare Select Program to allow Medicare recipients the opportunity of purchasing a Medigap managed care option. The project in those states is set to expire today, June 30, and unless Congress takes prompt action to renew it, the insurance benefits of nearly half a million senior citizens covered by the Medicare Select Program would be in serious jeopardy.

The conference agreement extends the Medicare Select Program for a period of 3 years. It also expands this option to seniors in all 50 States, and puts it on track to finally becoming permanent if the Secretary of Health and Human Services certifies that the program has met certain conditions.

In addition, the conference agreement clarifies that the definition of a State, for the purposes of this bill, includes the District of Columbia and the territories of the United States: Guam, Puerto Rico, the Virgin islands, and American Samoa.

In order to expedite consideration of this conference agreement in the House, and to ensure that seniors will have uninterrupted coverage, the Committee on Rules has reported a straightforward and fair rule for this very necessary legislation.

Specifically, the rule provides for 1 hour of general debate on the conference report, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Commerce.

The rule also stipulates that the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the conference report to final adoption without any intervening motion.

Under the rule, all points of order against the conference report and its consideration are waived. While the Rules Committee generally prefers to avoid handing out such blanket waivers, this waiver and the rule itself are necessary because of a potential violation of clause 3 of rule XXVIII (28), which prohibits the inclusion of matters in a conference report beyond the scope of matters committed to conference by either Chamber.

A question has arisen as to the apparent lack of definition of the term State in either the House or Senate-passed bills. As I mentioned earlier in my statement, the conference report contains a definition of States which includes the District of Columbia and U.S. territories.

The waiver granted in the rule is a precautionary step to ensure that passage of this critical legislation is not unnecessarily stalled by this particular provision or by any other unforeseen, yet potential violation contained in the conference report.

Members might be interested to know, also that this rule fully complies with the 3-day availability requirement for conference reports, as the report was filed on June 22.

Mr. Speaker, the conference agreement provides a reasonable balance to permit a very valuable, and successful program for our senior citizens to continue, while allowing us time to evaluate the program more closely before making it permanent.

Our colleagues should keep in mind that the Medicare Select Program provides seniors with another viable option to receive affordable medical care. Premiums under the select option have resulted in savings as high as 37 percent over traditional Medigap policies. By giving older Americans more

choices within Medigap, we give them the flexibility to choose plans which meet their own special or individual needs.

In closing, I would remind our colleagues that the sponsors of this legislation have made it very clear that the House needs to act on this bill before leaving for the Fourth of July district work period. The Medicare Select Program is only hours away from expiring.

More than 450,000 Medicare beneficiaries will be impacted if the Medicare Select Program is not renewed. The Senate adopted the conference report on June 26. This rule will enable the House do to its part for our senior citizens.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 180 is a fair, balanced, and responsible rule. It was approved unanimously by the Rules Committee last night, and I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to give it their full support.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Ohio for yielding time to me. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we support the rule which, as my colleague and friend on the Committee on Rules has pointed out, waives all points of order against the conference report and is necessary because the conferees added new material not included in the House or the Senate bill.

The addition is minor. That is why we agreed unanimously last night to this rule for the conference report.

The legislation we are about to consider under this rule would expand the availability of an experimental Medigap Program, known as Medicare Select, from 15 States to the rest of the country. The Medicare Select Program makes available to senior citizens a managed care insurance policy to fill in the gaps of Medicare coverage. It differs from other Medigap policies that require senior citizens to participate in the insurer's selected network of health care providers in order to receive payment for Medicare's cost sharing amounts.

There have been a number of substantial concerns raised about the operation of Medicare Select Programs. In its initial estimate of the bill, CBO noted that a preliminary study of this program by the Health Care Financing Administration found very little management of care by the insurers and no measurable cost savings to Medicare.

In addition, preliminary data for a subsequent study indicate that Medicare costs have actually gone up in eight of the States where these programs now operate. Many of us had hoped that we would be able to postpone final consideration of the bill until results of the subsequent study are available to the Congress sometime this fall. We would be in a better position to evaluate the usefulness and cost of this alternative program to the elderly who choose to participate in it. Nonetheless, we understand that the proponents of this legislation feel it is important to complete consideration as soon as possible to ensure that the beneficiaries currently enrolled in the program do not lose their coverage.

□ 1100

In addition, Mr. Speaker, the conference report extends the authorization for the program for only 3 rather than the 5 years included in the original House and Senate bills. It also allows the Secretary of HHS to discontinue the program at the end of 5 years, if it is determined that the program results in higher premium costs to beneficiaries or increased costs to the Medicare Program itself.

This issue of cost is, Mr. Speaker, of course one of the real major and regular concerns about Medicare Select. Our colleagues will fully discuss all of this during the debate on the conference report.

We have absolutely no objection to the rule reported by the Committee on Rules last evening for consideration of this conference report. We urge our colleagues to approve the rule so we may proceed with consideration of H.R. 483 today.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

(Mr. DINGELL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, this is a bad rule, it is a bad bill, it is bad legislation, it has been handled poorly, it is going to hurt the American people, it is going to raise the cost of Medicare, and it is going to be generally bad for the economy, the country, and the budget. Having said, that, Mr. Speaker, it is probably OK to proceed.

I would urge my colleagues to vote this rule down. I would urge them with equal vigor and diligence to vote down the legislation. The bill is being pushed more rapidly than information is available, and more rapidly than the committee or the House is being permitted to gather the facts about what the legislation does.

Initial information shows that Medicare has had its costs increased 17 percent on the average in States in which this Medicare Select Program has been made available. What that means is that senior citizens are getting less for more, and the Medicare system is getting billed more for less. This is a wonderful giveaway to the health insurance companies. It is being crafted in a fashion which defies good explanation.

The rule is needed today because the Republican leadership pushed this bill through the House without adequate thought, and then rushed it to a conference which did not deserve that honorable title between the House and Senate. We had a conferees meeting, which was scheduled for 5 p.m. one day last week. It was over at 5:01 p.m. Only yesterday did the Republican leadership become aware of the fact that they had a number of significant scope violations in a two-page bill.

Clearly slovenly legislation, slovenly legislative process is before this body. The issues presented in the statement of managers and in the offers passed back and forth between the House and Senate were presented as merely technical, but they were in fact highly substantive, and they will, for example, try to make gifts through these devices to the health insurance industry.

The result of this action is also to assure that the study which should take place to find out what is really going to happen under this Medicare Select Program will be so crafted as to make it very difficult to in fact obtain the necessary facts that the Congress ought to have, to know whether we ought to continue to extend this outrage, or whether in fact we ought to terminate it, as we indeed should.

The scope of the bill was expanded so that insurance companies can sell highly questionable policies not only in 50 States but in the territories and in the District of Columbia as well. I am certain that there are a number of guileless, unsuspecting elderly consumers in these locations that can be plucked for further advantage and further economic benefit to the health insurance industry.

Of course, the health insurance industry will profit mightily from this further largesse by this Congress under the Republican leadership at the expense of the taxpayers, at the expense of the budget, and at the expense of Medicare recipients.

The subjects of the GAO study in the bill was changed, so it will be more difficult for us to get GAO to present us with options for modifying the MediGap market, and therefore, to be sure that the seniors who switch out of these Medicare select policies can do so in a way where they can get back into a decent package of insurance.

Understand, this is insurance which does not go on a level basis, it starts at about $870 a year, if one is 65, but by the time one has reached 85, it is going to cost $2,300 or $2,400. Nobody is telling the senior citizens about that at all. Of course, the process here has been crafted so as to proceed with such blinding speed that no one will see that the senior citizens, the Medicare trust fund, the American people, are going to get skinned by this outrage.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote against the rule. I urge them to vote against the bill. I predict that if this bill passes and is signed into law, we are going to find that Medicare is going to cost the taxpayers and the trust fund about an additional 17 percent. I tell the Members, they should put that in their book. They are going to have a chance to remember that when we review this legislation.

Ms. PRYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS], chairman of the Subcommittee on Health of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I had not planned to speak, but I do want to put the statements of the gentleman from Michigan in context. He was one of the 14 who voted against the bill originally. There were 408 Members who supported it.

Mr. Speaker, on April 4 he sent out a Dear Colleague letter that said, ''Why the rush to bring H.R. 483 to the floor this week?'' He just in the well stated, ''Why the rush on moving forward with this legislation?'' June 30, today, is the expiration date for this program. I would think that is why the rush argument has been laid to rest.

As far as scope is concerned, we said it was going to be available to 50 States. The majority on the other side of the aisle, in their wisdom, decided to contest that; since the 50 States was extending it to the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico, as according to the Social Security Act, they were going to argue that was out of scope, so we simply went to the Committee on Rules to make sure that we could include the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico in the scope.

As to the GAO study, I think the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] knows that we do not need legislation to get a GAO study. A Member just has to ask.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. BALDACCI].

Mr. BALDACCI. Mr. Speaker, it is the height of hypocrisy for the majority party to pat themselves on the back for restoring the Medicare Select Program, when just hours ago they cut $270 billion from Medicare to help pay for tax breaks for the wealthy.

The Medicare Select Program is a good program. It is a program that pays the cost for sharing of Medicare beneficiaries if they go into a selected list of providers, but the Medicare Select Program is a supplemental program, and after today, it has nothing to supplement.

Medicare select is a worthwhile program, but this worthy program cannot begin to make up for the damage of the massive Medicare cuts made earlier. Medicare select is supposed to be the frosting on the Medicare cake, not the entire cake. A diet of frosting only is bound to make the stomachs of America's seniors upset. I know that is how I feel today.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. PRYCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on this legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Ms. PRYCE. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. STARK], the ranking member of the subcommittee.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in hopeless opposition to a rule that was crafted in the dead of night, and I rise to warn the American public. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL], who spoke a few minutes ago, was absolutely correct. This is terribly flawed legislation. This bill destroys a fairly good idea.

This bill has been introduced and written by former operatives of the health insurance industry. It deregulates supplemental insurance, and provides an opportunity for the worst shylocks in the health insurance industry to steal from the Medicare system and from our seniors.

Sitting right over there is a man who, within the past year, has received hundreds of thousands of dollars from the health insurance industry. He is a Republican Committee on Ways and Means staff person who drafted this bill for the health insurance industry.

Mr. Speaker, they are entitled to get payback for the huge contributions they made to the Speaker's campaign funds. That is OK. We know that goes on. However, I am telling the Members, Mr. Speaker, that what has happened here presages doom. If this kind of sloppily drafted legislation is how the Republicans think they are going to find a way to cut $270 billion out of Medicare, they would save everybody a lot of time by just moving to eliminate Medicare, because they will do it through stupidity, lack of experience, urgency to provide help to the people who have feathered their campaign nests, and with complete disregard for the seniors.

Mr. Speaker, the seniors who sign up for this in States where it is not regulated, and it is regulated in those States, it is regulated by no one except the good conscience of the insurance companies. Companies like Prudential, who have stolen billions of dollars from seniors, companies that are under indictment or have pled guilty and paid $300 million, $400 million in fines are the same companies who are going to take care of our parents, and indeed ourselves, under this plan. Do not buy into that.

Mr. Speaker, this is just a precursor of the Republican plan to destroy Medicare. We will hear about it after the recess. We will hear about taking $270 billion out of the most popular program, the most efficient insurance program in the country. It is being done at the behest of the health insurance companies by the Republicans. Members should vote against this rule in protest, and Members should vote against the bill.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GENE GREEN].

(Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, the gentleman from California, for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I voted for the Medicare Select bill as it first came up, and now I intend to support the conference committee report. But I have some concern about it, in light of the big picture. That is what we need to look at today on this House floor. I hope the American people are looking at it, particularly those people who are senior citizens.

Mr. Speaker, the budget resolution was passed yesterday, planning $270 billion in cuts in Medicare, and at the same time providing tax cuts of $245 billion. I do not think it makes sense that today, the very next day, we have a conference committee report on Medicare Select, which supplements the same Medicare Program that was cut yesterday.

Those of us who support the HMO concept and managed care, still support the individual making that decision. However, with what happened yesterday and what will happen over the next few years, we will see that freedom of choice for our seniors and future seniors limited. It has not happened yet, but we are setting the stage for it, as we stand here.

I represent the city of Houston in Harris County. We have 286,000 seniors who receive over $1.5 billion in Medicare payments. A $270 billion cut nationally over the next few years will impact those seniors. Mr. Speaker, the Republicans seem to not understand that health care costs are going up, and they are going up because we are an aging population. To cut those seniors, the growth, as they say, will force them to go into more managed care and into Medicare Select like we are seeing today.

We are voting on the conference committee report that offers seniors hopefully the goal of more coverage under the HMO and more expansion, but the secret of the HMO concept for seniors is freedom of choice, their freedom of choice to go into it, not somebody in Washington, a bureaucrat or even their elected Members of Congress saying, ''You have to go to a Medicare Select plan.''

Mr. Speaker, let me repeat what we are talking about today. We will see over the next few years senior citizens being forced into the Medicare Select or other HMO programs, removing that freedom of choice as part of the way to save that $270 billion. That is what people need to understand. That is the fear I hear from my constituents at home.

Mr. Speaker, last Monday I was with a hundred senior citizens in the city of Houston. Some of them were in the Medicare Select or the HMO that is offered by a number of private contractors. Some of them were happy with it. However, they wanted to make sure it was their choice, not the choice of the U.S. Congress or that of some bureaucrat. We promised Medicare in 1965.

Frankly, if we waited for the Republican majority to provide for Medicare back then, it would not be here today.

□ 1115

I guess what I am concerned about is the forced cuts, Mr. Speaker, particularly in the budget bill passed yesterday with the change in the Consumer Price Index, and again in light of what is happening today with this bill.

We will see the Consumer Price Index readjusted to where the cost of living increases in Social Security will be reduced. That reduction, with the increase in Medicare expenditures, will cost senior citizens who are now receiving it, and again those who are growing into it, those 60-year-olds, those 55-year-olds who are looking forward to be able to have some type of security and having medical care when they are over 65.

I like the idea of Medicare select, Mr. Speaker, but I do not like the idea when we encompass everything together with the cuts we will see and the forced choices those people are going to have to make. I think that is what we need to be concerned about. I would hope over the Fourth of July recess and over the next couple of months and even over the next few years, because this will not happen today or tomorrow or next week, but it will surely happen with the budget vote yesterday to cut $270 billion out of the growth of Medicare.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that all of our Members remember that, when we vote for this bill.

Ms. PRYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. JOHNSON].

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I just want to thank the preceding speaker for his support of Medicare select. There were 408 Members of this House that voted for it. I hope every one of those 408 Members will vote for it again, because this is an entirely voluntary alternative for our seniors. In the States where it has been available, it has offered them more care at a lower cost and been well-regulated by both the State and the industry and some Federal rules.

I also want to point out that as we reform Medicare, as we assure that Medicare will be there for our seniors and provide the quality of care that we have depended on Medicare for, we will over the next 7 years increase spending per senior in America from $4,800 on average to $6,700 on average. That is a one-third increase, a very solid increase in the face of declining costs in the health care sector. Our seniors are going to be well cared for.

While change is hard, if it is made with concern and in a responsible way, we can increase the money that we make available for senior care per capita throughout this Nation in an honorable way and one that supports the needs of retirees in this great Nation of ours.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. POMEROY].

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker, it has been a contentious, partisan week in the House of Representatives, and much of the division has involved the Medicare Program. The budget passed by this House yesterday on a largely partisan vote imposes cuts of $284 billion that will be devastating to the program.

That will definitely mean higher out-of-pocket costs for seniors and less choice. I feel bad about that issue this morning and bad about the way the House resolved it and anxious about how those cuts will actually be put in place as we deal with the legislation that is before us.

It is sometimes difficult, then, to get on to other issues where there is in essence no partisan division, where it is a pretty clear and simple little bill that ought not have some of the rancor from earlier debates spilling over into it, but that is not precisely the case with the Medicare select extension before us today.

It passed the first time in the House of Representatives 408 to 14, most Democrats, most Republicans joining together in a rather unusual show of bipartisan support for a program. Why did that vote occur? Because I think the Members recognized that a program such as this, a voluntary way for seniors to opt for an insurance program that is going to give them a premium discount, that has had a successful run in the 15 States that have been allowed to run the Medicare Select Program, ought to be extended to the 50 States, ought to be given a 3-year extension so that the marketing of this program can begin in earnest.

I know something about this program. I was the insurance commissioner in North Dakota at the time it passed. I lobbied HHS to get North Dakota into the program because I believed in it. Ten thousand North Dakotans participate in this program. They get a monthly savings in premium amounting to 17 percent below those buying the Blue Cross/Blue Shield Medicare supplement that is not Med select.

Medicare select saves money. It negotiates discounts from the hospital and passes it on to the senior citizen. It also passes on any managed-care savings experienced in claims payment to the senior citizen purchasing the insurance policy.

What is wrong with this? Is this some sort of diabolical plot by the evil insurance industry? Certainly not. Certainly not. It is a simple little program, it works well, and we ought not take some of the bad feeling we have about some of the other discussions going on around here and bring it to this little issue. Medicare select should be passed. This House passed it once before, 408 to 14, and I trust we will again this morning.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. KENNEDY].

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Speaker, I was among those who voted against it when it came to the floor last time, and I want to correct something that my colleague was talking about in terms of leaving it up to the States.

Maybe it was good for North Dakota, and I am sure my colleague, when he was an insurance commissioner, looked out for the consumers, but I can tell you the problem with having 50 different select plans, 50 different select plans regulated by 50 different States. It means that seniors in one State, like in my State of Rhode Island, if they have their Medicare Select MediGap plan and they go over to Massachusetts, it is a different plan. That, to me, does not sound like the proper approach to take to this when we are talking about needing comprehensive savings.

In addition, I just want to talk a little bit about this so-called increased choice. Under the guise of giving seniors increased choice, Congress is about to pass legislation that will in fact box them in. Yes, one more plan will now be available, but it is a narrow one and it is difficult, leaving many seniors in a potentially very risky situation. More choice do not simply mean better choices. For seniors who are considering the Medicare select policy, keep one thing in mind: This plan could be hazardous to your health.

When Medicare select came before us the last time, I supported an alternative that addressed the serious flaws in Medicare select. This amendment would have ended the problems with price rising with age, lowered the barriers that make it difficult and risky and dangerous for seniors to switch, and would have limited the extension until we know that this is a really good idea, because the jury is still out.

Let me just add, what this does it, it puts it into the insurance companies' hands and allows them to come up with the rating system. I have seen these Medicare select plans, because in my State I represent the fourth most elderly district in this country, and the senior citizens in my State are worried about this because they know better than we do what is coming down the road.

It means that they are going to be able to age-rate you. What does that mean? That means when you get older, they are going to be able to jack up the premiums, and because you are locked into this plan now, you are locked in for life.

You try to switch, and guess what: You are going to be paying all those preexisting condition prices, because another insurance company is not going to want to pick up because you may have had asthma, you may have had some kind of visiting nurse care you might have needed, and new plans are not going to want to touch you.

Why? Because they are not going to make money off of you. Because if you are sick, insurance companies do not want to cover you. That is why we have Government, because Government is going to regulate the private sector when it comes to insurance, to make sure that the private sector does not run roughshod over the senior citizens and take advantage of them.

Believe me, if you do not think they are going to do it, you have got another think coming, because these HMO plans are all about making money, and they do not make money off people who are sick. They do not make money off senior citizens.

Be careful, Members. Be careful when you vote for the select plan, because the Republicans did not allow enough time for us to do a proper study of this and now they want to open it up to all the States under the guise of new choice.

What is that new choice? It is a bait-and-switch routine. It says new choice. We do not want to face the tough choices, so we will let this private marketplace reduce your benefits. That is what we are saying.

We are squeezing the Medicare budget. We are seeing it on the floor of this House. We are squeezing Medicaid. We are cutting the senior citizens Medicare Program. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH], the chairman of the Committee on the Budget, says we are not, that we are only reducing the rate of growth, but make no mistake about it, there is going to be less money in Medicare.

What is going to happen? There is not going to be enough money to go around, so the MediGap select policies, that is, the supplemental insurance that allows senior citizens to cover what Medicare will not cover, if Medicare does not have as much money as they had before, you better believe they are going to have to have more in the way of supplemental insurance to bridge the gap. Congress is passing this Medicare select because the Republicans are just about to pass all these cuts to Medicare.

Mr. Speaker, this idea that this is going to save you money, this is really tricky. If you join the HMO plan, you are not paying as much, so who would not want to buy into that?

But let me warn you, in policies that have already been issued under this Medicare select policy, once you are in the plan, it does not bar them from jacking the rates up on you. Now you are stuck because you are in the plan. You have signed your rights away as a consumer.

And guess what? Let's say your doctor leaves the plan and you want to go back to your doctor. Forget it. Under Medicare select you cannot do that, because if your doctor is not on the list of approved doctors, you are not going to get that doctor. Let's say you want to switch and follow your doctor. You cannot do that.

Then as far as the prices, initially you have got a lower price, but like I said earlier, they will jack the price up on you once you get older. Once you get older, they are going to be able to age-rate you.

Mr. Speaker, insurance commissioners in the various States may be able to look after the senior citizens, but I just think it is a really terrible approach. It is the kind of approach we have been taking to everything, give it back to the States, but on health care I think we are making a big mistake when we are trying to have a patchwork quilt.

It is going to be a spot, State-by-State approach to this problem, and I do not think it is the right way to go. We need comprehensive health care reform that regulates the insurance companies on the national level, because in a small State like mine in Rhode Island, these insurance companies are going to be able to run roughshod over us and we are not going to have a leg to stand on.

My State is a million people. Do you think we are going to be able to stand up to those insurance companies and say, ''Hey, what you're doing is wrong''? Forget it. We cannot do it. We have got insurance companies in our State who are already threatening to say, ''We're not going to write your automobile insurance anymore.'' I do not want that to happen to health care and it should not happen to health care.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to direct a question to the manager of the rule. I note that in the last words in the rule, it says, ''Upon the adoption of the conference report, Senate Concurrent Resolution 19 shall be considered as agreed to.''

To what are we agreeing in this rule? Can anybody help me to know what is in Senate Concurrent Resolution 19? I think this is an important matter, because the Senate would not have passed a concurrent resolution on it unless it were important, but we are being asked to agree to this.

To what are we being called upon to agree? Is this something that was considered in the 1-minute conference which we had between 5:00 and 5:01, or was it some matter which was not considered, which now must be considered and added to the proceedings of this body?

□ 1130

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, can the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLILEY], my good friend, tell me what momentous Senate concurrent resolution we are adopting in the rule and why we could not consider it out in the open and have everyone know what we are doing here?

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

Mr. DINGELL. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] that it is right out in the open. That the Senate resolution merely conformed the title to what we are doing.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I would ask the gentleman, is that because we were sloppy in the House or because the Senate was sloppy or because the conference was sloppy in the processing of legislation? I understand that the title is to be changed so that it no longer refers to an amendment to the Social Security Act, but it refers now to an amendment to OBRA; is that correct?

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, it is not the proper duty for us to question what the motives of the Senate were for doing what they do. But I did point out that the resolution does conform the title to the bill. That is done all the time.

Mr. DINGELL. With great respect for my colleague, what this shows is this is stupid legislation, further done with great speed and limited wisdom.

Ms. PRYCE. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve my time.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO].

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to speak on this, but I felt at this point that I would want to comment. The gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. KENNEDY] raises what I think are generally concerns about the entire way the health insurance industry is regulated in this country and the problem with adverse selection and other factors that really can work against the interest of working people and seniors generally. There is not doubt that this body needs to address unfair insurance practices and the overall problems of our patchwork health care systems. Furthermore, I do not believe that debate over this measure should be mistaken for the broader debate that needs to take place over protecting and improving on our Medicare system. What is important to keep in mind is that this program has been a positive if small step, toward providing more MediGap options for seniors who can get additional benefits at no more cost.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I rise in support not only of this rule, but of expanding this effort to experiment with health maintenance organizations and other forms of managed care in all 50 states.

While all of the data on this program is not conclusive, in my state of California, this demonstration project appears to be working. Seniors have the choice of opting for managed care MediGap programs or they can stick with a more traditional fee-for-service type MediGap Program. It is their choice.

There is a high rate of consumer satisfaction with these plans. Last year Consumer Reports Magazine rated the top 15 MediGap insureres nationwide. Eight of them were from the Medicare

Select Program. And while we need more analysis, there are strong indications that the program could eventually keep costs down.

I must emphasize that this is not a carte blanche extension. Medicare select cannot become permanent if the Secretary of Health and Human Services determines that it costs the Government money, that it did not save beneficiaries money, and did not provide quality health care. And I think it is the responsibility of both sides of the aisle to make sure that all three of those criteria are met and that we back the Health and Human Services Secretary if she or any of her successors determine that we have failed to meet this criteria.

Mr. Speaker, I would hope that this Congress, while supporting this today, will pay attention to the data that results from these further experimentations. Medicare select is an important test case for the Medicare system.

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule waiving points of order on the Medicare select conference report.

The Medicare select program provides Medicare beneficiaries with a cost effective alternative to typical MediGap policies. It gives seniors the option of purchasing a MediGap policy for hundreds of dollars less than the typical policy. Hundreds of thousands of Medicare beneficiaries benefit from these policies.

Medicare select policies, however, are sold through a demonstration authority which expires tonight at midnight. This conference report will extend the program and allow all States to participate in this excellent program which provides less costly MediGap policies to our Nation's elderly.

At this late date, however, our colleagues on the other side of the aisle were attempting to delay the continuation of this program by raising the most obscure and nitpicking objections based on scope violations. There are no real scope problems in this conference report. However, the Democrats in their effort to stop this program were resorting to technical nitpicking.

And who will be the individuals hurt if this program is stopped? The hundreds of thousands of elderly who have purchased these policies. I ask you to support this rule so that we can proceed to the consideration of the conference report. A vote for this rule is a vote for our Nation's Medicare beneficiaries, who can then gain the benefits of these innovative MediGap policies which provide high quality care at an affordable price.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule on the conference report on Medicare Select. I come to the floor with a strong feeling of deja vu. When I appeared on the floor to speak in favor of passage of H.R. 483 earlier this spring, I indicated how important the Medicare Select Program was and how the fate of half a million beneficiaries rested on the action taken by the House.

The road to this point, in my view has been unnecessarily long. If it were not for the action on the other side of the aisle, we would not be here at the 11th hour seeking passage of a rule to bring this 2 page conference report to the House floor. We have delayed long enough.

Medicare Select is a very simple program. It is a particular type of MediGap policy which allows seniors to choose a medicare benefits package modeled on a preferred provider delivery system of health care. The Medicare Select policy allows seniors to buy a less expensive MediGap insurance policy which wraps around the traditional medicare benefit. It represents the new wave of innovative managed care delivery options that the private sector is currently using to hold down the rise in health care costs. Let us remember that for those elderly who choose a MediGap policy, it is 1 of 11 options currently available.

I urge my colleagues to pass this rule so that we can enact this legislation swiftly. Our senior citizens deserve no less.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. PRYCE. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 483) to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to permit Medicare Select policies to be offered in all States, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTERT). Pursuant to the rule, the conference report is considered as having been read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of Thursday, June 22, 1995, at page H6256.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLILEY] will be recognized for 30 minutes and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLILEY].

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report to accompany H.R. 483.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the conference report to extend the Medicare Select Program. The conference report provides for a 3-year extension of the program. The report also requires the Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services to conduct a study comparing the health care costs, quality of care, and access to services under Medicare Select policies with other MediGap policies. The Secretary is required to establish Medicare select on a permanent basis unless the study finds that (1) Medicare select has not resulted in savings to Medicare Select enrollees, (2) it has led to significant expenditures in the Medicare program, or (3) it has significantly diminished access to and quality of care. I think the bill provides for a reasonable balance that will permit a valuable and innovative program for our senior citizens to be continued while permitting a more informed evaluation of the program. We must remember that Medicare Select is a MediGap insurance policy which provides seniors with another option to receive medical care. By giving the elderly more choices within MediGap we give them the option to pick plans which meet their individual needs.

In my view, we must not allow this program to expire. It is unfair to both participants and insurers alike to have to worry about what the Congress will do next. Medicare Select is a small but important program, and I might add, a highly regulated program. It is regulated under the Federal MediGap standards. There are additional Federal statutory standards for select policies, plus our States' insurance departments regulate them under State law. Medicare Select saves senior citizens money, provides more choice for senior citizens than the current Medicare risk contract HMO, and has given them the opportunity to secure a more comprehensive benefits package. If we do not act to extend this program, no new enrollees will be permitted to enroll in select plans and we will see the ultimate demise of these plans. The end result is bound to be significant increases in premiums for current enrollees. Medicare beneficiaries will be denied a product that saves them money and which has served them well. There is no reason not to extend this program in a responsible fashion.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this conference report.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my time be equally divided between myself and the gentleman from California [Mr. STARK], a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, and that he be permitted to control that time.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 4½ minutes.

(Mr. DINGELL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the agreement we are voting on today extends the Medicare select demonstration program to all 50 States for a 7½-year period beginning in 1992.

It does so with no appreciation of the consequences of this. Although many support this program, I believe that because Medicare cuts required by the Republican budget in the amount of some $270 billion are so drastic, and

will require such fundamental reductions in the Medicare program, it is impossible to pass any Medicare legislation, including Medicare select without taking those reductions into account.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, as many of my colleagues know, we argued in the committee that we should await the results of the State evaluations before expanding this program to all 50 States. It has come to my attention that the preliminary results of this evaluation are now in, but they have not been made available by the handlers of the legislation.

Those results indicate that Medicare select is significantly associated with Medicare cost increases in 8 of 12 select States. Let me repeat that. Medicare select is associated with cost increases in 8 of 12 States.

Furthermore, the cost increase is 17.5 percent. The cost increase is 17.5 percent. That is not fiscal responsibility.

Now, while I know these results will not be final until next month, we should clearly examine the results before passing an expansion to all 50 States. How can we possibly extend a program that has the potential of increasing Medicare costs in all of the 50 States, as it has in the States in which it is now used by the amount of 17.5 percent?

This leads one to the unfortunate conclusion that my Republican colleagues are willing to cut back on benefits to Social Security recipients and to Medicare recipients, but that they are not willing to lock up a program which is going to increase costs to the Medicare system and to increase profits to the insurance companies.

Mr. Speaker, I therefore urge that we vote ''no'' on the conference agreement on H.R. 483, and that we reconsider these changes in the light of evaluation results and in the context of budget reconciliation. Then we can more fully examine the entire Medicare Program, which is going to be examined in extenso in connection with reconciliation, because we are going to have Republican cuts in Medicare recipients, and we should include the Medicare cost increases which will result in the additional beneficiary out-of-pocket costs that will occur under this program, along with increased utilization and limitations on the beneficiaries' choice of providers as indicated in the preliminary report.

Let me remind my colleagues that Medicare select has had some peculiar consequences. It has not been the unmixed blessing which the proponents would have us believe. First of all, it has raised costs, but it has done some other things which have significant impact on recipients.

It first of all starts out low and goes up. The average premium cost at the beginning is around $870 a year. But by the time the recipient has reached the age of 85, it has risen, lo and behold, to something like $2,300 a year.

Now, during that time he is locked in because any preexisting conditions which he had during the time or before he got on Medicare select, he cannot carry over and have treated in any new package. So if a person joins this Medicare Select Program, he is locked in. He cannot get out because he cannot get treatment for new conditions.

Those new conditions are carefully walled out by preexisting condition clauses in any new insurance policy. So he pays more and more and more and he cannot get out. If his doctor moves or his hospital closes or some condition requires him to want to go to a particular person, doctor, or facility for treatment and they are not included in this HMO, that individual cannot go.

This is Medicare select all right. It is selected for the benefit of the insurance companies who are going to make lots of money. And they are going to make it, in part, off the Medicare trust fund and they are going to make it in part off of the poor little guy who is dependent on Medicare for providing his benefits.

□ 1145

They are going to skin the public, and everybody is going to act with great surprise when we find the new returns and the new information show us that we have in fact cost ourselves a lot more money; we have in fact denied Social Security and Medicare recipients benefits; and we have benefited the health insurance industry; and we have left ourselves in a situation where we all of a sudden find that Medicare has cost a lot more.

I urge my colleagues, vote this down. Let us consider it in a more temperate fashion, and let us consider it when we can have a look at all of the things, including the cuts in Medicare benefits which are coming to the Medicare recipients courtesy of my good friends and colleagues on the Republican side of the aisle.

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER], the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and compliment him on his good work on this bill.

It is a good conference agreement that deserves the support of every Member of this House. The Medicare Select Program expires today if we do nothing.

Early in the session, we heard from Members who opposed this program, that there is no need to rush, that we are moving too quickly, and yet here we are only hours away from the program expiring and over 450 thousand seniors are still uncertain as to their fate under this important program.

The Senate has already passed the conference report by unanimous consent. The 408 Members of the House who voted in favor of extending the Medicare Select Program earlier in this session should support this conference report and send it to the President for his signature tonight. It is a simple, noncontroversial bill which extends to seniors across the country the opportunity to choose at their option a Medigap program that has proven highly successful, high quality, and cost effective, and contrary to comments that were made earlier a few minutes ago, the CBO scores this as revenue neutral to the Medicare Fund, and the opponents of this know that.

My thanks to all the members of the Committee on Ways and Means and Committee on Commerce who have made this legislation possible. I particularly cite the outstanding work of two members of my own Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS] and the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. JOHNSON]. It was their energy and commitment that brought us to this point today.

Mr. Speaker, this is a worthy proposal. I urge an ''aye'' vote on the conference report.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this conference report legislation seeks to extend and expand the capricious demonstration program which will endanger the Medicare program and its beneficiaries.

Basically it is a license for the insurance companies to steal.

Medicare is the finest health care program in the county. There is no insurance plan in the country that offers more beneficiary choice. It is valued because we in Congress have worked long and hard to make it so.

Today by forcing a premature expansion of this demonstration program, the Republicans in Congress are turning their backs on this great tradition. Republicans are putting the interests of private insurance companies ahead of the Medicare program, not only in this bill, but in their budget bill which seeks to cut $270 billion out of the Medicare program, and they are ignoring the beneficiaries who rely upon it for their health care security.

This bill, as I have said before, is written by a Republican Ways and Means staff member who, within the past year, was receiving hundreds of thousands of dollars from the health insurance industry. Talk about big time sellout to private interests, this bill takes the cake.

Medicare select will be presented as a program without problems, just another choice for the seniors to elect. The facts are quite different.

At the time of the committee action on this bill, only a very preliminary evaluation of the Medicare Select Program had been concluded. That preliminary analysis found as follows:

> There is little coordination or management of care by organizations offering Medicare Select. The network formed by insurance companies were initially organized to increase Medicare market share at network hospitals rather than to minimize utilization.

Since the time of the committee action, a more complete evaluation of

Medicare select has been conducted, and before my Republican friends dismiss the report as some partisan document, I would like to remind them that this report was commissioned by a Republican administration, and the researchers who conducted the study were selected by that Republican administration. The study has been ongoing for well over 2 years. I will enter the study in the RECORD, and it is important to note here that in the study it talks about costs and utilization findings to date. The study says:

We were surprised to find Medicare Select is significantly associated with Medicare cost increases in 8 of the 12 select States: Alabama, Arizona, Florida, Indiana, Kentucky, Minnesota, Texas, and Wisconsin. For the eight States indicating positive impacts on Medicare program costs, the average impact is 17.5 percent. The estimates vary from 7½ percent in Minnesota to a 57-percent cost increase in Indiana. However, only the Indiana estimate is much more than 20 percent. The results indicate that the cost increases substantially reflect increases in inpatient hospital utilization. These estimates are unusually robust.

That is the understatement of the day, 17.5 percent increase on the Medicare trust fund, in addition to cutting $270 billion out. As I have said before, you would save the taxpayers a lot of money if you just introduced a resolution to eliminate Medicare tomorrow, let the Republicans vote for it. That is basically what they intend to do. Let the public see their true colors.

Given the findings and the fact that the Congressional Budget Office found that this study raises serious questions about the operation of the Medicare Select Program, why are the Republicans rushing forward to extend and expand this demonstration project, particularly when they are trying to reduce Medicare expenditures? Are they that cavalier about the report's conclusion? For months congressional Democrats and the administration have called for a limited extension of the program in order that the assessment of the demonstration could be completed and necessary adjustments made based upon its findings. Republicans have only marched forward faster.

Why? Whose interests are the Republicans responding to in this intemperate bill? Why are we trying to reduce costs under Medicare, and this program at the same time is moving in exactly the wrong direction?

Halting the expansion of this demonstration program is the only prudent action for us to take.

Proponents of this bill have made the claim if we do not extend it beneficiaries will be harmed. That is wrong. It is absolutely not the truth. Everyone should understand there is no current participant in the Medicare select plan who will lose coverage if we do not extend the program today. Certainly, additional beneficiaries will be prohibited from enrolling after today, but current enrollees would be allowed to continue in the plans.

By voting ''no'' today, the program evaluation will be allowed to be completed without corrupting Medicare.

And, third, voting ''no'' today will confirm our responsibility for the fiscal integrity of Medicare by blocking a premature expansion of this program.

How can any of us explain to our constituents a vote to expand a program from 15 to 50 States that has just been found to raise costs to the Federal Government by tens of millions of dollars? That is fiscal irresponsibility at its highest.

For those who ignore the evidence and vote to expand this program today, before adjustments can be made to it, you are in effect voting to increase Medicare's costs by $800 for each beneficiary who ends up in one of these plans. That is not fair to the seniors.

Finally, what does the Medicare beneficiary get who is in the Medicare select plan? Access to a very limited network of doctors and hospitals. You prevent them from getting the ability to switch out of the Medicare select plan and back into a reasonable MediGap program. You deny them their choice of medical independence.

In my home State of California, the Medigap plan will cost them an extra $3,360 in premiums.

For the fiscal integrity of the Medicare trust fund and the protection of beneficiaries, you must vote ''no'' on the conference report to H.R. 483.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BILIRAKIS], the chairman of the Health and Environment Subcommittee.

(Mr. BILIRAKIS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the conference report on H.R. 483, legislation to extend and expand the Medicare Select Program.

The Omnibus Reconciliation Act of 1990 was established by a Democratic Congress, under which insurers could market an additional Medigap product, an additional Medigap choice, known as Medicare select. Medicare select policies are the same as other Medigap policies except that supplemental benefits are paid only if services are provided through designated providers. The demonstration was limited to 15 States and expired December 31, 1994. The demonstration was extended through June 30, 1995, in the Social Security Act Amendments of 1994.

The conference report on Medicare select provides that:

First, Medicare select is extended to all 50 States for a 3-year period. The Secretary is required to conduct a study comparing Medicare select policies with other Medigap policies in terms of cost, quality, and access. Further, it provides that Medicare select will remain in effect unless the Secretary determines, based on the results of the study, that Medicare select has: First, not resulted in savings of premium costs to beneficiaries compared to non-select Medigap policies; second, resulted in significant additional expenditures for the Medicare Program; or third, resulted in diminished access and quality of care.

Second, GAO is required to conduct a study by June 30, 1996 to determine the extent to which individuals who are continuously covered under Medigap policies are subject to medical underwriting if they switch plans and to identify options, if necessary, for modifying the Medigap market to address this issue.

Select policies do not affect the obligation of Medicare to pay its portion of the bill. Beneficiaries who obtain covered services through one of the network's preferred providers will generally have their benefits paid in full. Under OBRA 1990, the select plan is also required to pay full benefits for emergency and urgent-out-of-area care provided by non-network providers.

Select policies do not remove a beneficiary's freedom to choose any fee-for-service provider. If a beneficiary is unhappy with a Medicare select provider for any reason, that person may opt out at any time to get off the plan and pick up any other Medigap policy, or he can remain in the plan and go to any provider, and Medicare will pay if it is a covered service. However, in that case, the beneficiary may be liable for a deductible and coinsurance.

An insurer marketing a select policy is required under OBRA 1990 to demonstrate that its network of providers offers sufficient access to subscribers and that it has an ongoing quality assurance program. It must also provide full and documented disclosure, at the time of enrollment, of: network restrictions; provisions for out-of-area and emergency coverage and availability; and cost of Medigap policies without the network restrictions.

In addition, Medicare select policies are governed by the same types of regulations imposed on Medigap policies concerning: limitations on preexisting conditions; loss ratios; portability; guaranteed renewal, and open enrollment.

OBRA 1990 also included significant penalties for Select plans that: Restrict the use of medically necessary services; charge excessive premiums; expel an enrollee except for nonpayment of premiums; or withhold required explanations or fail to obtain required acknowledgements at the time of enrollment.

The following are Medicare select demonstration States: Alabama, Arizona, California, Florida, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Missouri, North Dakota, Ohio, Texas, Washington, and Wisconsin.

As of October 1994, approximately 450,000 beneficiaries were enrolled in Medicare select; while the majority are covered through Blue Cross/Blue Shield plans, approximately 50 companies offer Medicare select products.

Current authority for the program expires in June 1995. Failure to extend the authority for the program would result in the inability of insurers to enroll new beneficiaries in Medicare Select Programs as of July 1995, although they could continue to serve current enrollees. This would lead to higher premiums for enrollees and the potential withdrawal of insurers from the market.

Is that what we want? It seems to me that none of our people want that. The gentleman from California has stated that Medicare select plans are not adequately regulated and has told us how terrible the plans are. Well, that is his opinion. Here are the facts:

The National Association of Insurance Commissioners [NAIC] has testified in favor of the program and stated that out of the 10 Medicare select States that report into the NAIC's Complaint Data System, there were only 9 Medicare select complaints last year.

The program has been a very good one for senior citizens. In August 1994, Consumer Reports rated the top Medigap insurers nationwide. Eight out of ten of the top-rated 15 Medigap plans were Medicare Select Plans.

It is a very popular program in my home State of Florida where some 13,000 Medicare beneficiaries are enrolled.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation so we may continue to provide older Americans with an often needed and in my opinion, necessary option.

□ 1200

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. BILBRAY], a member of the committee.

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Speaker, I have to stand in support of the proposal, and I just want to point out to my colleague from California there is a 100,000 Californian seniors that want that choice. I have a stack, I have stacks of comments coming from my seniors in my district saying how it is nice to be able to have options that Washington is not mandating on seniors, that seniors are allowed to be treated as dignified individuals. This program was something that has worked, is continuing to work, in our State, and to restrict it not only from the rest of the country, but to allow it to die, is not a vote in support of seniors and their dignity, but actually a support to replace the dignity of seniors' choices with big centralized Federal control systems, and I think the problem is some of our colleagues are so wedded to command and control, big, centralized government that they are willing to sacrifice our seniors' ability to have the dignity of having their choice to choose something that serves them, and I think that we need to start treating our seniors with the dignity they earned over the years.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN].

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the adoption of the conference report on H.R. 483, a bill to permit Medicare select policies to be offered in all States.

Let me state that I oppose adoption of this conference report reluctantly. We have underway in a limited number of States, including my own State of California, a demonstration project to study the value and effects of Medicare select policies. I favor letting that demonstration continue. I favor continuing to offer Medicare select policies where they are currently being tested under the demonstration.

But I have grave concerns about expanding Medicare select to all States. At the time this bill passed the House I raised these concerns and suggested the prudent course would be to wait and receive the evaluation of the demonstration that was underway. We did not.

Now, before the conference was concluded, HCFA provided us with some preliminary information that the evaluation was finding. And that information should give pause to any prudent legislator. They found that Medicare select was significantly associated with cost increases in spending in the Medicare program itself in 8 of the 12 States where select policies were offered.

Surely, on a day when the Republicans in this House passed over the nearly unanimous objection of the Democrats a budget which slashes Medicare spending by $270 billion over the next 7 years, it is folly to pass legislation which threatens to increase the cost to the public of Medicare so that more private insurance companies can reap profits on their Medicare select policies.

It is only prudent to stop this expansion of Medicare select until we can be sure that they are not adding to expenditures in the Medicare Program.

We might also pause and consider the irony of the actions we have taken today. Let's think about why we need MediGap and Medicare select policies in the first place.

We need these policies for one simple reason: Medicare requires people to pay a lot of money out-of-pocket when they get sick. Most Medicare beneficiaries are so frightened by the amounts they have to pay if they get sick that they spend hundreds of dollars to buy MediGap protection.

And yet, as a result of the Republican budget this House adopted today, people on Medicare are going to have to pay a lot more.

Their MediGap premiums will soar—whether they try to economize by using Medicare Select or not. And if they just can't afford a Medigap policy any more—they will live in fear of having to pay a lot of out-of-pocket costs.

Some 4 million seniors under this Republican budget may find that they can't even afford to pay the higher premium to keep Medicare Part B protection at all. Once Medicaid is an underfinanced block grant program—which is what the Republican budget makes it—seniors can forget about any assurance of help from Medicaid to pay their Medicare premiums.

Remember, who the typical person is who relies on Medicare. Most Medicare beneficiaries have modest incomes of $25,000 or less. Nearly a third of them depend on Social Security for almost all of their income. And now they are going to find that this Republican budget means that half of their Social Security COLA is being eaten up by increased premiums and cost-sharing in Medicare.

We ought to be talking today about how to make Medicare better—about how to help people who can't afford the prescription drugs they need, who fear ending up in a nursing home that they can't afford.

Instead this House adopted a Republican budget that slashes the Federal commitment to Medicare and Medicaid. And we now are about to adopt a conference report which extends a program which might be costing Medicare money instead of saving it.

This is not responsible legislating. This is not putting the interests of Medicare and Medicaid beneficiaries first.

I urge rejection of the conference report.

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. JOHNSON], the principal author of this legislation.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLILEY] for his leadership and hard work on getting this program before us for final action.

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to rise today in support of this final agreement to extend and expand Medicare select. This is the right kind of health plan choice for us to make available to all seniors in America at this time. Medicare select is a Medigap policy. That is it is just insurance covering costs and services that Medicare does not. The difference is the Medicare select enrollees get their care from a preferred provider organization, but they are still Medicare beneficiaries. Medicare will cover health care costs for them even if they go outside the network. By staying within the network beneficiaries make the best use of their coverage because the health plan picks up most or all of their out-of-pocket costs.

Medicare select is not, and I repeat, not, an HMO risk contracting plan. Such plans require beneficiaries to get their care entirely within the network or Medicare will not pay. With select, seniors in America have that choice to be part of an integrated system of care, but still go outside that system if they want to and if they choose to. Medicare covers their charges outside that network.

It is very important that, as we carry forward this debate and as we give seniors choices in America, they understand clearly what their choices are,

and so I want to make clear that my esteemed colleague from Michigan is not quite correct when he says that seniors would be locked into these programs. With due respect, in fact he is wrong. Any senior in this program, any Medicare Select System, can go outside that system and, as a Medicare beneficiary, can receive care under Medicare terms, but in addition any senior in a Medicare Select Program can change plans. They can drop this MediGap policy and pick up another MediGap policy, and in every single State in America there are MediGap policies on the market that have no exclusion for preexisting conditions that do not block any seniors out. In sum, in fact, the idea that any senior is locked into a Medicare select choice is simply not accurate, and that is important for seniors to know.

Medicare select also saves beneficiaries money. We know that seniors on fixed incomes have a tough time in this environment, and Medicare select saves them up to 38 percent premium costs.

Medicare select is not a Government program. It is an insurance program, and, as such, it is regulated at both the Federal and State levels. It operates around the Medicare Program, and in those States where it has been expanded, it is saving dollars.

In California with select the cost of medical services per admission is 20 percent lower than for nonnetwork providers. The average length of stay in a hospital is 73 percent lower than for nonnetwork providers, attesting to the management of care, the integration of care, and only one-third as many enrollees are ever admitted to a hospital from these integrated care systems, a great advantage for the elderly. A Washington State Medicare Select Plan operator has reported that Medicare select policies cost 13 percent less than the traditional insurance policy. Even after adjusting for demographic factors the plans realized a 5-percent savings to the Medicare Program.

Now those figures are about real experience. How does that real experience line up with some of the comments that my colleagues have made about the preliminary conclusions of the report that we, as Members of Congress, asked HCFA to do so that we can understand the strengths of this program and the weaknesses more fully?

This is basically how it boils out. That report is reporting very preliminary data. The researchers themselves say the results are inconclusive, but listen to what they say about those areas in which they have seen costs increase. The researchers suggest that under these managed care entities, that is the Medicare select plans, and I quote from the report, new patient screening has detected a large backlog of formerly undiagnosed and untreated problems. This has meant that new patients have unexpectedly large, albeit short-term requirements for medicare treatment. In other words, Medicare select plans are offering seniors far more careful, comprehensive analysis of their health care problems, and, yes, short term it costs more, and many of these plans that this report, this study, is reporting have only been in place 3 months, so we have only been through the high cost analysis and the early treatments.

In one of the States where the program has been in place since 1992, and they have 4 years of cost data, they are seeing significant savings. I ask, ''Isn't that just what we want? Don't we want early intervention? Don't we want prevention? Don't we want that backlog, the formerly undiagnosed and untreated problems, dealt with for seniors in America? And most importantly, don't we want seniors to have the choice, the voluntary choice, of that quality health plan?'' I, for one, do, and my constituents want this choice as well.

As a State that does not have a demonstration project, I get letters daily saying when are we going to have that choice. I urge my colleagues to adopt this conference report and to help us take the first step toward giving seniors in America better choices for their health care.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. CARDIN].

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I support Medicare select and will vote for the conference report to extend this program to all 50 States. If it is properly structured, it can provide more competition, choice and cost savings. However I must tell my colleagues I am concerned that the study that was commissioned by HCFA shows that there might be increased costs associated with Medicare Select Programs in at least eight States which currently have the program. But what primarily concerns me: It seems like this Congress is acting or making decisions on what appears to be facts. When we look at the information we may be acting on what we believe to be correct rather than what the facts show.

□ 1215

Congress is taking as fact that Medicare select extends managed care into the MediGap marketplace and it will save money. Yet when we look at the study, that may not be in fact the case unless the Medicare select program is properly structured. Is this a preview of what will happen when we get to the budget debate?

In the near future we are going to be called upon to act on legislation to cut the Medicare program by $270 billion. Are we going to make these decisions on fact or beliefs? There are very limited ways in which we can reduce the Medicare program by $270 billion. We are going to be calling upon our beneficiaries to pay more, higher copays and deductibles, putting more pressure on the Medicare select program.

We are going to be asking our seniors who already as a class pay the highest amount of out-of-pocket costs, on average 21 percent of their income is used for out-of-pocket costs. If we are going to be talking about $27 billion in Medicare cuts, we are going to be asking our seniors to pay more in copays and deductibles. Will we be acting on our beliefs or on facts?

I am very concerned about that, Mr. Speaker, and concerned that we will not be looking at what impact those types of cuts will have on our seniors. I am worried that we are going to have to cut benefits. The Medicare program already does not cover prescription drugs and very little benefits for long-term care, really no catastrophic care. Yet we are going to be asked to make cuts in the program that could very well take away benefits from our seniors on the belief that that may be acceptable. I want to act upon fact.

We already have inadequate reimbursement levels and cost shifting within the Medicare system, causing in many areas our seniors to be jeopardized from receiving quality care. Are we going to be asked to make additional cuts that could very well cause more cost shifting and less adequate care to our seniors on the belief that that can be absorbed? I want to act upon facts.

The consequences of our actions will dramatically affect our Nation's seniors and their health care. It is imperative that we make these changes based upon the best data available, not just data that we choose to believe.

I hope in the future when we act upon Medicare that we do it upon the facts.

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time remains?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLILEY] has 13 minutes remaining, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] has 4½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from California [Mr. STARK] has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me. As chairman of the House subcommittee of the Committee on Ways and Means, we have looked at this over a period of time.

As a member of the conference committee, we produced a conference report. I am a little confused by the gentleman from Maryland's statement that we would want to base a decision as to whether or not we would go forward with the program on a permanent basis on facts rather than just assumptions or desires or wishes or hopes.

I can only assume that the gentleman from Maryland did not read the conference report, because I would join him, if, in fact, we were talking about creating a permanent program without a basis of analysis of a pilot program.

Despite what may have been from any of the speakers who are in opposition to this, all this does is continue a program until the Secretary determines that, in fact, there are savings, that this is a better program. If the Secretary of Health and Human Services, after a 3-year study, says that this is not saving money, it is not a better program, the program ends. If she finds it does, it goes forward.

So, first of all, the conference report says, we are going to take this pilot program that is in 15 States, make it available to 50 States, but not on a permanent basis. We are going to examine the results after 3 years. And then we will make a determination as to whether or not it is to be permanent.

We heard talk about a study over here. As a matter of fact, on the earlier pilot program, there was supposed to be a study reported to Congress in January. Six months later, it still has not issued a report. What they are talking about is a preliminary finding which was leaked by this administration.

We had the head of the Health Care Financing Administration in front of the subcommittee in which we said, you know, this seems to be a politically charged issue. We have folks who are taking extreme positions and making statements not based upon fact for whatever reason they choose to do so, and I am concerned about the political atmosphere.

So, Mr. Valdeck, please make sure that your operation does not prematurely leak information which may not have been fully evaluated about this program.

Mr. Valdeck in front of the Health Subcommittee said, you bet; we will make sure this information does not come out until it has been analyzed and properly understood and presented. Lo and behold, several weeks ago, initially on the Senate side and now we have heard statements read here that are supposedly flat-out statements of fact that this study shows that there are higher costs. In fact, that is not the case.

Mr. Valdeck apparently was so embarrassed by this that he wrote me a personal note saying that he was embarrassed that the study had gotten out prematurely, that it has not been vetted. They have not done the proper correlations in the study. Somebody is very interested in killing this modest little proposal.

Let us go back and remember what this is. Currently there are 10 programs available to seniors to augment their Medicare program. They are called MediGap. They are insurance programs that fill in where Medicare does not offer as complete a package as people would want. What we are doing is talking about adding one more, an 11th to the 10 that are already there, fully monitored by Health and Human Services. In fact, you have got to explain exactly what you are doing. You have to pass a standardized examination to make sure that you are doing what everybody else is doing. There are categories that have to be met. The seniors are fully protected and they have a choice.

It is not mandated. You choose. We are simply saying instead of 10 choices, we are going to offer 11 choices.

You would think that we are reinventing the wheel by offering seniors 11 choices rather than 10. All we are doing is saying that the 11th choice is of a kind of health care delivery service that more and more Americans find saving them money. That is what this is all about. These fellows over here who used to be the chairmen of the Health Subcommittee and Ways and Means, and the gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN] who spoke earlier was the chairman of the Health Subcommittee of Commerce, and the gentleman from Michigan was the chairman of Commerce, they are used to bottling up reform and change, especially the kind that had the private sector driving down costs in health care.

They are kind of frustrated because with this new majority, different people are in charge. We want to try these new ideas, fully protected with studies by the Secretary making a determination as to whether it goes forward or not.

So I understand their frustration. But in trying to deal with this frustration of being a new minority, you really ought to rely on facts rather than the kind of fear mongering and conjuring up of seniors deserted by their Government when you talk about the Medicare select program.

The gentleman from North Dakota was absolutely right. This is a modest little program. We think it will save money. Four hundred eight Members of Congress, both Democrat and Republican, voted for this the first time around; 14 voted against it. We have high hopes that the same 408 and perhaps some of the 14 who voted against this might join in in sending it to the President today so that on this last day of the pilot program the President will sign this bill so that the seniors will not be fearful that this option will not be available to them.

We are going to pass it today. I have high hopes the President will sign it tonight and then we will move on to more fundamental real reform where seniors will see that more choices will be available to them and that their Medicare dollar expenses will be covered by an ever-increasing amount from the Federal Government.

Those are the facts.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Montana [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

The Medicare Select Program as a model deserves support, and it should be renewed. In fact, we should expand the model, but we should keep it as a model until we know how well in fact it is going to work and what the difficulties in it are. And we already have reports that tell us there are difficulties in it.

So, yes, we would like to see the program continued, but that is not what is going on here. This is a full-scale expansion of the program. We are not certain it works that well. And they want to put it, the Republicans do, in every State in this country. Now, why? and why today?

Because yesterday the Republicans voted to cut Medicare. I know they say they did not cut Medicare but, my senior citizen friends, inflation is going to continue in health care; right? Of course. And new people are going to come into the system, of course. Are they going to receive the same services that today's senior citizens receive on Medicare? No, because the Republicans are going to cut close to $300 billion out of what is needed to meet current services. So do not let them tell you they are not cutting the program.

This proposal being brought to the floor today is a duck and cover for yesterday's action of cutting close to $300 billion.

There is a second reason that they are expanding this program and that is because the lobbyists, including the health care insurance lobbyists, are in full throat and are writing legislation for the Republican leadership.

I chaired one of the subcommittees along with the gentlemen from California Mr. STARK and Mr. WAXMAN, that tried to reform national health care last time. And I learned something, I learned a lot, as chairman of that committee, as we passed out health care reform bills last Congress.

But I learned one thing that I will never forget and that is, you can trust some of the health care insurance industry some of the time, but you cannot trust all of them all of the time. This country has to keep one eye on the insurance company, and this bill takes both Federal eyes off of the health care insurance industry. And senior citizens will rue the day we did it.

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, do I have the right to close?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLILEY] has the right to close.

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, how much time do we now have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Dingell] has 4½ minutes remaining, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLILEY] has 7 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from California [Mr. STARK] has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KILDEE].

□ 1230

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I am deeply concerned about Medicare this year. First of all,

we know that the Republican budget will cut Medicare by $270 billion over the next 7 years. That certainly has to be taken into consideration in the context of this bill. This bill, while it may have some merit, the plan may have some merit, I do not think we should be expanding it as this bill would propose. The bill does allow insurance companies to sell insurance policies to seniors that limit their choice, and they may be locked into those choices.

Basically, Mr. Speaker, I fear that this year, this 104th Congress, we may see a series of things that will be weakening Medicare. First of all, this program itself is a pilot program. We should look at it more. One study indicates that it increases the cost about 17½ percent per beneficiary in 8 of the 12 States, and in only 1 State was there some possible cost savings.

However, put that in context again with what I mentioned in the beginning, that we are cutting $270 billion from Medicare. We have to cast this bill in that context. We are using that cut from Medicare to pay for a tax cut for our very rich.

Mr. Speaker, in my district, I do not see people asking for that tax cut, and especially, I think they do not want to take money from Medicare to pay for that tax cut. My mother died last year at age 84. In her life, both her mental health, her peace of mind, and her physical health was better served because of a good Medicare Program. We should approach this very, very carefully. Do not rob the account and do not expand this program without experience.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Washington [Mr. MCDERMOTT].

(Mr. MCDERMOTT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, this is a perfect example of the triumph of ideology over American pragmatism. The Republicans say they are going to save the fund. First they take $86 billion out by a tax break. Then they take another $280 billion out by the cuts they are going to make. Then their solution is to pick a solution that does not work.

There was a study done by the Research Triangle Institute which says it spends 17½ percent more for select than it does in the system we have today, which means they are going to spend it down quicker. The real result of their efforts is to get rid of Medicare. They want to break the system 17 percent faster by putting people into select. That is not a solution. It simply makes the problem worse. Everyone should understand it and vote ''no.''

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] is recognized for 2½ minutes.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, hurry, hurry, hurry. Let us get this bill through. Let us get it through before the facts are in. Let us get it in before it shows that this package for Medicare Select is in fact going to cost Medicare or the taxpayers more.

Hurry, hurry, hurry. Let us get it through before it shows that the senior citizen recipients of Medicare are not going to get the option to move from policy to policy on their health insurance packages which would supplement their Medicare policies; and hurry, hurry, hurry, before it comes out that a policy which costs about $870 is going to go up to something like about $2,300 by the time you get to 85, if you buy it for $870 at age 67. Mr. Speaker, let us get this thing through before the people find out what we are about. That is what my Republican colleagues are saying. That is what is at issue today.

What is good legislative practice and good legislation? It requires that we should wait and find out what the facts are. The information is already out. Medicare select is costing on the average 17½ percent more. That means that Medicare select is going to cost the Medicare trust fund 17½ percent more. It is going to trap senior citizens in policies on supplemental benefits that will not be able to be carried to new insurers because of preexisting conditions. Costs are going to go up.

Senior citizens are not going to know this at the time that their good-hearted insurance salesman comes around to peddle them this wonderful new Medicare Select. The taxpayers are not going to know that this is in fact going to cause the Medicare trust fund to go broke faster.

Hurry, hurry, hurry. Pass this thing before anybody finds out what is going on. Do it in a conference which takes less than 1 minute by the clock, and then have to be rescued by the Committee on Rules because such a poor job of legislation was done. Mr. Speaker, this is the way we are legislating today.

I would urge Members to vote this outrage down and let us proceed more cautiously. Let us protect the public. Let us see to it that senior citizens, the Medicare trust fund, and the American people get decent treatment here from this Congress today.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California [Mr. STARK] is recognized for 2 minutes.

(Mr. STARK asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, the reason to vote no on this bill is to give the Congress time to perfect the necessary structures and regulations for Medicare Select to work. Indeed, it does work in California. The trouble is, there is only one insurance company, Blue Cross, who has been importuning Members to support it, because the insurance commissioner will not allow it.

The corporation commissioner does, giving Blue Cross a monopoly. That is not fair in California, either. If it is good in California, let us let other insurance companies sell it. Somebody brought up the good name of the Consumers Union. They did in fact mention some of these policies. However, let me summarize Consumers Union's recommendations to the Subcommittee on Health of the Committee on Ways and Means in February of this year.

Consumers Union stated that:

> Congress should study the impact of further negotiated discounts . . . before rushing to extend the Medicare Select program. . . . Research done to date indicates that the Medicare Select . . . has not achieved its goals. It has resulted in a marketplace in which premium pricing games distort the true cost of the policy. It has not achieved cost savings, but merely shifts costs to other consumers. Few insurers and few consumers have participated. In many States, regulation of this product has fallen between the cracks of different regulatory agencies—is it insurance or managed care?—leaving consumers without the protections they need. Congress should not expand the program and make it permanent, but should take steps now to fix what is broken, and what is broken is the pricing structure, the need for open enrollment, and await further study results before locking the program into place. With respect to Medicare Select, Consumers Union would urge you to proceed with caution.

I would join with the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] and others, and urge Members to vote ''no'' to protect the consumers, to protect the Medicare trust fund which the Republicans are going to dismantle and destroy, $1 billion here, $1 billion there, $84 billion to rich seniors, $270 billion to pay the tax cuts to the very richest in this country. Do not let them destroy Medicare any further. Vote ''no.''

SUMMARY OF CONSUMERS UNION TESTIMONY ON MEDICARE SELECT, FEBRUARY 10, 1995

Medicare Select is a cross between traditional Medicare supplement policies (''medigap'') and HMO's. We urge caution when it comes to expanding Medicare Select or making it permanent because of the following major problems:

Pricing games: Medicare Select policies often offer cheaper premiums to begin with. But because of a system of so-called ''attained age'' pricing that many policies use, premiums will rise steeply as the policyholder gets older. Congress should not lock-in or expand a program which perpetuates this deceptive pricing practice.

Illusory Cost Savings: Medicare Select premiums are often low, but at a cost to other Americans. Insurance companies that write Medicare Select policies typically don't pay the deductible to the hospital that other medigap policies are designed to pay. But the hospital still has to cover its costs. The result: it shifts the cost to other patients—and their insurers.

The Medigap Maze: The whole idea behind the OBRA medigap reforms was to allow consumers to make kitchen table comparisons among plans. But the Medicare Select program doesn't forward that goal. Medicare Select adds a layer of confusion by forcing consumers to balance initially lower premiums against restricted freedom of choice of doctor or hospital.

We believe that it is premature to expand or make permanent the Medicare Select program. Preliminary analysis of the program

indicates that so far it has not been successful in reducing costs or even attracting substantial interest from insurers or consumers. We recommend that Congress:

Require ALL states to do what several states have already done: community rate their medigap market to eliminate the hazardous pricing structure used by many Medicare Select plans (and level the playing field among all insurers). Alternatively, condition a state's ability to participate in Medicare Select to a statewide requirement of community rating for the medigap market.

Require a six month open enrollment period for all consumers who were previously enrolled in Medicare Select. (Currently, in many cases, they are not eligible if their Medicare Select insurer does not offer a traditional policy.)

Limit the extension of Medicare Select to a two-year time period that would allow for analysis of cost savings and quality control. Such a study is currently underway at HCFA. Postpone expansion of the program to additional states until the studies are complete and regulatory adjustments can be put in place.

Consumers Union[1] appreciates the opportunity to present our views on the issue of Medicare Select. We have spent several years monitoring the medigap market and working to improve protections for seniors who buy medigap policies. We worked in support of this Subcommittee's efforts to fix the problems in this marketplace, efforts that culminated in the historic enactment of OBRA–90 medigap reforms. These reforms made it much easier for consumers to comparison-shop among so-called medigap policies, which are designed to fill in the gaps in coverage left by Medicare. We continue to believe that these reforms serve as a valuable model for future legislation in areas such as long-term care insurance and regulation of a supplemental market in future health reform.

This testimony addresses one aspect of the Medicare supplement insurance market—Medicare Select. Medicare Select is a cross between traditional Medicare supplement (or medigap) policies and HMO's. In return for initially cheaper premiums, consumers agree to obtain care within a designated network of doctors—in order to be reimbursed for the costs covered by the policy. (Medicare still provides coverage, regardless of whether the provider is in the Select network.)

We believe that there are several problems with Medicare Select. In the big picture, Medicare Select represents a diversion from the tough issue of reining in Medicare costs—through managed care or other steps. Pressing questions that this Subcommittee must address include: to what extent do HMO's—which limit seniors freedom of choice of doctor—truly save costs (or merely select the healthy risks)? Is there adequate quality assurance in Medicare risk contracts? Is there sufficient ability for consumers who do not feel well-served by Medicare HMO's to pick up traditional Medicare/medigap coverage? Is it possible—and fair to seniors—to ratchet down the Medicare budget without achieving cost control in the private insurance sector (in the context of overall health care reform)?

There are several major problems with the Medicare Select market and we urge caution when it comes to making Medicare Select a permanent program:

Pricing games: Medicare Select policies often offer cheaper premiums to begin with. But because of a system of so-called ''attained age'' pricing that many policies use, premiums will rise steeply as the policyholder gets older. Congress should not lock-in or expand a program which perpetuates this deceptive pricing practice.

Illusory Cost Savings: Medicare Select premiums are often low, but at a cost to other Americans. Insurance companies that write Medicare Select policies typically don't pay the deductible to the hospital that other medigap policies are designed to pay. But the hospital still has to cover its costs. The result: it shifts the cost to other patients—and their insurers.

The Medigap Maze: The whole idea behind the OBRA–90 medigap reforms was to allow consumers to make kitchen table comparisons among plans. But the Medicare Select program doesn't forward that goal. Medicare Select adds a layer of confusion by forcing consumers to balance initially lower premiums against restricted freedom of choice of doctor or hospital.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

We believe that it is premature to expand or make permanent the Medicare Select program because of these problems and others described below. Preliminary analysis of the program indicates that so far it has not been successful in reducing costs or even attracting substantial interest from insurers or consumers. We recommend that Congress:

Require ALL states to do what several states have already done: community rate their medigap market to eliminate the hazardous pricing structure used by many Medicare Select plans (and level the playing field among all insurers). Alternatively, condition a state's ability to participate in Medicare Select to a state-wide requirement of community rating for the medigap market.

Require a six-month open enrollment period for all consumers who were previously enrolled in Medicare Select.

Limit the extension of Medicare Select to a two-year time period that would allow for study and analysis (that is currently under way by HCFA) of cost savings (vs. cost shifting) and quality control. Postpone expansion of the program to additional states until the studies are complete and regulatory adjustments can be put in place.

We elaborate on our concerns and recommendations below.

ANALYSIS OF THE MEDICARE SELECT MARKET

PRICING GAMES

Medicare Select policies often use an ''attained age'' pricing structure, which Consumer Reports says is ''hazardous to policyholders.'' Various letters and comments regarding Medicare Select have noted that Consumer Reports found that eight of the top 15 Medigap products were Medicare Select. But this tells only part of the story. Five of the eight policies mentioned use an attained-age pricing structure. Consumer Reports stated that:

Attained-age policies are hazardous to policyholders. By age 75, 80, or 85, a policyholder may find that coverage has become unaffordable—just when the onset of poor health could make it impossible to buy a new, less expensive policy. Take, for example, an attained-age Plan F offered by New York Life and an issue-age Plan F offered by United American. For someone age 65, the New York Life policy is about $114 a year cheaper. But by age 80, the buyer of the New York Life policy would have spent a total of $5,000 more than the buyer of the United American policy.[2]

The attained-age pricing structure allows companies to bait consumers with low premiums in early years, and then trap them with high increases in later years. Standardization of the medigap market resulted in price conscious consumers, with the effect of facilitating a trend away from community-rated policies and toward attained-age rated policies. The percent of Blue Cross-Blue Shield affiliates, for example, that sell attained-age policies grew from 31 percent in 1990 to 55 percent in 1993.

Ten states have recognized this market dynamic and have taken steps to protect consumer either by requiring community rating for this market or by banning attained-age rating. These are Arkansas, Connecticut, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Maine, Massachusetts, Minnesota, New York, and Washington. Four of these states—Florida, Massachusetts, Minnesota and Washington—are part of the Medicare Select demonstration program.[3]

Recommendation: Require ALL states to do what several states have already done: community rate their medigap market to eliminate the hazardous pricing structure used by many Medicare Select plans (and level the playing field among all insurers). Alternatively, condition a state's ability to participate in Medicare Select to a statewide requirement of community rating for the medigap market.

ILLUSORY COST SAVINGS

The purpose of Medicare Select was to cut health care costs through coordinated care networks that increase the use of utilization review and management controls, often through PPO's. It was expected that enrollees would be restricted to a subset of providers. But the experience shows that often there is no restriction of providers. There is little coordination or management of care in Select plans.[4]

Medicare Select premiums may be low for the wrong reasons—because these policies shift costs to others by not covering all the costs that traditional medigap policies must cover. Medicare Select companies often negotiate with providers to eliminate the payment of Part A deductibles. Insurers have indicated that the discounts of the Part A deductible by participating hospitals is the most significant source of premium savings available in Medicare supplements.[5] This means that hospitals get less reimbursement from Medicare Select carriers. It does not mean that the hospital's costs are lower, so cost shifting to other patients (and their insurers) is inevitable.

Before extending Medicare Select to additional states (or for a substantial time period), we urge you to study further why Medicare Select premiums are often low. Are they cutting premiums for their policyholders merely by shifting costs to other payers? Another issue of concern to us is whether the Medicare Select markets in each state are truly competitive. We understand that in California, for example, there is only one key Medicare Select carrier (Blue Cross).[6] A study prepared for HCFA found that three-fourths of Medicare Select enrollees have policies from affiliates of three Blue Cross and Blue Shield plans (in Alabama, California and Minnesota), hardly an indication of a truly competitive marketplace.[7] We urge you to study the level of competition in this marketplace, recognizing of course that traditional medigap policies do compete with medicare Select policies.

Recommendation: Limit the extension of Medicare Select to a two-year time period that would allow for study and analysis (that is currently underway by HCFA) of cost savings (vs. cost shifting) and quality control. Postpone expansion of the program to additional states until the studies are complete and regulatory adjustments can be put in place.

MEDIGAP MAZE

A key goal of the medigap reform legislation that was included in OBRA–'90 was to provide true consumer choice of medigap

Footnotes at end of article.

policy by standardizing policies, thereby simplifying the choice. In light of the minimal role the Medicare Select products have made in this marketplace, we question whether the expanded complexity offers consumers significant benefits. Consumers (in Medicare Select states) must decide between Medicare only, Medicare risk plans, Medicare cost plans, health care prepayment plans, medicare Select plans, and traditional Medicare supplement policies. They can't even consider which of 10 standard packages to consider until they have made this choice.

Furthermore, insurers have indicated that the 10 standard medigap plans are appropriate for fee-for-service (traditional) medigap policies, but not for network Medicare Select products.[8] If Medicare Select necessitates an additional one or more standard policies, then simplicity is further undercut.

NEED TO AWAIT STUDY RESULTS

Medicare Select was included in OBRA–90 medigap reform legislation as a demonstration program. Medicare Select was established with the hope of achieving goals such as reducing health care costs (both for the Medicare program and consumers) and reducing the paperwork burden on consumers (since Medicare Select plans relieve consumers of the paperwork burden inherent in filing claims). It should not be made permanent until studies of its effectiveness have been completed. The preliminary report (February 1994) paints a picture of Medicare Select that is hardly complimentary. A tiny percent of people eligible have enrolled; a small fraction of insurers participate; cost savings appear to be superficial only and may be cost-shifting in disguise; the market is highly concentrated; Medicare Select regulation often falls between the cracks in state regulatory departments.

Some specific findings that should set off alarms to put on the brakes—not rush ahead with a permanent expansion—include:

Some states (e.g., Arizona) have found that market response has been poor and that beneficiaries tend to migrate back to traditional plans.[9]

Several states that were selected for the program could not get it off the ground and dropped out.[10] Others have had no applications for select plans.[11]

When studied by RTI, only 2.5 percent of eligible Medicare enrollees selected Medicare Select policies, and most of these ''rolled over'' from prestandardization products. It appears that consumers are not, in general, attracted to Medicare Select policies.[12]

Nor are insurers attracted to the Medicare Select product: only ten percent of HMOs and medigap insurers in Select sates offer Medicare Select policies, with even interest in some states.[13]

Recommendation: Congress should delay expanding and making permanent the Medicare Select program until further study results are available. It should not be made permanent without fixing the elements that are broken.

REGULATORY GAPS

Medicare Select is fraught with questions about regulatory authority. It is not unusual for a state's insurance department to regulate fee-for-service medigap coverage, but another state department (e.g, Department of Public Health or Department of Corporations) to regulate Select products. It is very possible that Medicare Select policies get lost in the regulatory cracks where authority for traditional insurance and HMO's is split. This confusion has even led to approval of plans (as Select) that deviate from the OBRA '90 standard plan designs.[14]

Medicare Select consumers need regulatory protection. For example, consumers switching out of Medicare Select need protection. Consumers who choose a Medicare Select option must use providers in the designated network in order to get medigap coverage. The NAIC model regulation provided protection to consumers who elect Medicare Select but then wish to change to traditional medigap policy. Companies were required to offer such consumers a policy with similar benefits, without underwriting. But this provision has a loophole—consumers have no assurance of such an offer if the Medicare Select company does not offer a traditional (''fee-for-service'') medigap policy.

In the event that Congress decides to end the Medicare Select program, either now or in the future, then consumers who have Select policies when the program is ended will need protection. Without new entrants in their pool, their premiums (in closed blocks of business) would spiral upwards. They will need the protection from such an open enrollment period.

Recommendation: Congress should require that all policyholders who wish to switch out of Medicare Select be eligible for an open enrollment period (regardless of which company they select) in order to protect them against being locked into a Medicare Select plan that they do not like.[15] This protection would actually help to promote the Medicare Select option because consumers would have a safety valve if they are dissatisfied. If Congress chooses to end the Medicare Select program, insurers should be required to extend an open enrollment period to Medicare Select policyholders. We urge the Congress to study carefully the regulatory experience and analyze where regulatory authority for Medicare Select is best housed.

DOES MEDICARE SELECT COMPROMISE QUALITY?

Medicare Select policies keep premiums low by negotiating lower reimbursement schedules with providers (mostly hospital), providing discounts to policyholders. On average Medicare pays doctors and hospitals about 59 percent of what private insurers pay for the same services. If (in the future) Medicare Select coverage is negotiated downward (e.g., providing Select policies with Part B discounts also), providers will get even less. At some point, the cumulative impact of lower reimbursement has got to have an impact on quality of care that patients receive. This could occur when providers withdraw from providing services to consumers, or when they cut corners (such as patient time) due to the lower reimbursement levels.

Recommendation: Congress should study the impact of further negotiated discounts for providers before rushing to extend the Medicare Select program.

In conclusion, research done to date indicates that the Medicare Select demonstration program has not achieved its goals. It has resulted in a marketplace in which premium pricing games distort the true cost of the policy. It has not achieved cost savings, but merely shifts costs to other consumers. Few insurers and few consumers have participated. In many states, regulation of this product has fallen between the cracks of different regulatory agencies (is it insurance or managed care?), leaving consumers without the protections they need. Congress should not expand the program and make it permanent, but should take steps now to fix what is broken (the pricing structure, the need for open enrollment) and await further study results before locking the program into place. With respect to Medicare Select, we urge you to proceed with caution.

Thank you for considering our views.

FOOTNOTES

[1] Consumers Union is a nonprofit membership organization chartered in 1936 under the laws of the State of New York to provide consumers with information, education and counsel about goods, services, health, and personal finance; and to initiate and cooperate with individual and group efforts to maintain and enhance the quality of life for consumers. Consumers Union's income is solely derived from the sale of Consumer Reports, its other publications and from noncommercial contributions, grants and fees. In addition to reports on Consumers' Union's own product testing, Consumer Reports with approximately 5 million paid circulation, regularly, carries articles on health, product safety, marketplace economics and legislative, judicial and regulatory actions which affect consumer welfare. Consumers Union's publications carry no advertising and receive no commercial support.

[2] ''Filling the Gaps in Medicare,'' Consumer Reports, August 1994, p. 526.

[3] It is premature to evaluate the impact of the combination of Medicare select and community rating, since two states (Massachusetts and Washington) are new to Medicare select and since community rating requirements are fairly recent.

[4] ''Evaluation of the Medicare SELECT Amendments—Case Study Report, RTI Project No. 32U–5531, prepared for Office of Demonstrations and Evaluations, Health Care Financing Administration, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, February 10, 1994, RTI, p. XX–3.

[5] RTI, p. xi.

[6] Three other plans: Foundation Health Plans; National Med; and Omni Health Plan have been approved but had minimal enrollment, that totals less than 500. [RTI, p. IV–17]

[7] p. ix.

[8] RTI, p. xiii.

[9] RTI, p. III–6.

[10] E.g., Oregon and Michigan. RTI, p. XV–1.

[11] E.g., Illinois. RTI, p. XV–3.

[12] RTI, p. ix.

[13] RTI, p. ix.

[14] See, for example, RTI, p. IV–9, IV–10.

[15] In Florida, Select insurers are required to offer at least a basic Plan A in a non-Select form, providing partial protection for people who wish to switch out of Select plans. One side-effect: this provision makes it infeasible for HMO's to offer SELECT plans.

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this has been an interesting debate. It has been about a lot of things, it has been about almost everything except the underlying legislation. We have talked about the budget, we have talked about Medicare in general we have been told ''why the rush?'' The gentleman who poses the question knows full well why we are acting today. This is a demonstration project that expires today, if we do not act. That is why we are here. That is why I urge it to be passed. I am sure that it will be.

We have also heard about the fact that it might cost more. That is interesting, Mr. Speaker, because when this bill was first passed several years ago, a study was supposed to be done. It was supposed to be available in January, but of course the administration advised us that it would not be ready and it would not be ready for months, so they could not provide it to the authorizing committees as the legislation was being crafted.

However, just a few weeks ago, Mr. Speaker, mysteriously, part of the information, not the full report, was leaked, not to the committees of jurisdiction, but to a Member of the other body who is opposed to the legislation. I find that rather curious. Needless to say, this is not the usual method the administration uses to provide committees of jurisdiction with important information.

Mr. Speaker, time is wasting. We need to get on with this program. Let

me finally end this by saying, No. 1, the study that is required before this program expires in 3 years requires the Secretary to discontinue the program if it is found that Medicare select: has not resulted in savings of premium costs to beneficiaries compared to non-select MediGap policies;

Second, they cannot extend it if it shows that it has resulted in significant additional expenditures for the program; or

Third, it cannot be extended if it results in the diminished access in quality of care. There are plenty of safeguards to ensure that beneficiaries are well protected. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the conference report.

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the conference report on H.R. 483, the Expanded Use of Medicare Select Policies Act. While I recognize the role that the Medicare select demonstration program that currently exists in my State of Illinois and 14 other States plays, I am concerned that this legislation is being used as a cover for the draconian $270 billion in Medicare cuts included in the budget resolution conference report that passed this body yesterday.

Under the Medicare Select Program, senior citizens on Medicare are allowed to buy private MediGap insurance policies through managed-care providers to supplement what Medicare does not cover. An important objective, but following what happened here yesterday with the GOP budget plan, Medicare select could easily become the only health care option for seniors, as Medicare is gutted, services are curtailed, and older folks have to pick up the pieces through private plans. The end result will be less access to services and higher out-of-pocket costs.

It is crystal clear to anyone watching the actions of the majority party in the 104th Congress that devastating changes to Medicare are ahead. There is rampant GOP discussions ongoing about turning Medicare into block grants for the States and based on what happened in the House welfare reform legislation to the Federal School Lunch and Breakfast Programs, I know that ''block grant'' is a code word for cutting, slashing, and eliminating.

Let's not fool anyone Mr. Speaker, H.R. 483 is one of the first threads with which to unravel the entire Medicare system. I have far too many senior citizens in my district who depend on Medicare and would be crippled by Republican cuts to the program to allow it to be treated as it has by the Speaker and his cronies.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this conference report and reject the Republicans' attempts to balance the budget on the backs of seniors and then hand them the check when the bill comes due.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time and I move the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 180, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the conference report.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 350, nays 68, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 467]

YEAS—350

Ackerman
Allard
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Bonilla
Bono
Brewster
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (OH)
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cardin
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chapman
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clayton
Clinger
Coble
Collins (GA)
Combest
Condit
Cooley
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cunningham
Danner
Davis
de la Garza
Deal
DeLauro
DeLay
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Dornan
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Durbin
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Ensign
Eshoo
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fawell
Fazio
Flake
Flanagan
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Fox
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Frost
Funderburk
Furse
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Geren
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Green
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hefner
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Holden
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jackson-Lee
Jacobs
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Johnston
Jones
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennelly
Kim
King
Kingston
Kleczka
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Lantos
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Lincoln
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Longley
Lowey
Lucas
Luther
Maloney
Manzullo
Martini
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
McNulty
Meehan
Menendez
Metcalf
Meyers
Mfume
Mica
Miller (FL)
Mineta
Minge
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Moran
Morella
Myers
Myrick
Neal
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Ortiz
Orton
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Paxon
Payne (VA)
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Pryce
Quillen
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Reed
Regula
Richardson
Riggs
Rivers
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Roth
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Sabo
Salmon
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Schiff
Schumer
Scott
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stearns
Stockman
Stump
Talent
Tanner
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thomas
Thornberry
Thornton
Thurman
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Traficant
Upton
Vento
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Waldholtz
Walker
Wamp
Ward
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wynn
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NAYS—68

Abercrombie
Bonior
Borski
Brown (FL)
Clay
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Conyers
Coyne
DeFazio
Dingell
Evans
Fattah
Fields (LA)
Filner
Foglietta
Ford
Frank (MA)
Gibbons
Gonzalez
Hastings (FL)
Hilliard
Hinchey
Jefferson
Kanjorski
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Klink
LaFalce
Lewis (GA)
Manton
Markey
Martinez
McDermott
Meek
Miller (CA)
Mink
Murtha
Nadler
Olver
Owens
Payne (NJ)
Pelosi
Rangel
Rush
Sanders
Schroeder
Skaggs
Slaughter
Stark
Stokes
Studds
Stupak
Thompson
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Tucker
Velazquez
Visclosky
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Williams
Wyden
Yates

NOT VOTING—16

Boehner
Boucher
Bryant (TX)
Clement
Coburn
Dellums
Fields (TX)
Gallegly
McKinney
Moakley
Norwood
Reynolds
Stenholm
Walsh
Watts (OK)
Young (AK)

□ 1303

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Watts of Oklahoma for, with Mr. Dellums against.

Mr. MARTINEZ changed his vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mr. KING, Mr. BERMAN, Ms. RIVERS, and Mrs. MALONEY changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1289

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 1289.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EWING). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Edwin Thomas, one of his secretaries.

PROVIDING FOR IMMEDIATE CONSIDERATION OF CONCURRENT RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mrs. WALDHOLTZ. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 179 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 179

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order, any rule of the House to the contrary notwithstanding, to consider in the House a concurrent resolution providing for adjournment of the House and Senate for the Independence Day district work period.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOBSON). The gentlewoman from Utah [Mrs. WALDHOLTZ] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mrs. WALDHOLTZ. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST] pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, while adjournment resolutions are ordinarily privileged, a point of order could be raised against the July 4th district work period resolution on grounds it violates section 309 of the Budget Act that requires that the House can not adjourn for more than 3 days in July if it has not completed action on all appropriations; and on grounds it violates section 310 of the Budget Act that requires the same with respect for completing action on a reconciliation bill if one is required by the budget resolution adopted by the Congress.

Despite these strictures in the rules. Mr. Speaker, we are well on our way toward completing our appropriations work in timely manner. Accordingly, in deference to the people whom we serve here, and to our families, to whom we have made commitments over the next week, I believe it is appropriate for the House to now adjourn for the Independence Day district work period.

The special rule before us will simply allow us to consider the July 4th resolution by waiving points of order against it.

The adjournment resolution itself, Senate Concurrent Resolution 20, passed the Senate last night and is now pending at the Speaker's table. This rule provides for the immediate consideration of the adjournment resolution. Under the precedent, it is not subject to debate and will immediately be voted on. I urge adoption of the rule.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. FROST asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, this resolution is one big the dog-ate-my-homework excuse for not getting much done over the last 6 months.

It doesn't list all the laws and rules Republicans have violated, we would be here all night. Instead it rolls all of the excuses into one sentence that gets House Republicans off the hook in terms of the many and varied promises they have broken this year.

The Congressional Budget Act says the House cannot go on recess for more than 3 days in July until the House has initially considered the appropriations bills. Well, we've only finished 2 out of 13 appropriations bills. Well, we've only finished 2 out of 13 appropriations bills, and those were 2 of the easier ones. The law tells Congress not to take a vacation until its work is done and, with this resolution, Republicans are saying they are above the law.

The reason Congress is not supposed to go on vacation until the appropriations bills have gone through the House is because unless the House is finished by July 4, we will be unable to avoid a continuing resolution on October 1. Because Republicans tied up the House with their contract—cutting taxes for the rich at the expense of school lunches and Medicare, and refusing to attend to the business at hand—the Government may very well shut down at the beginning of the fiscal year.

And that's not all. The Congressional Budget Act also requires Congress to complete action on any necessary reconciliation legislation before going home for the July recess. This year, committees won't report until the end of September.

But not to worry. The Republican majority will just pass this resolution and ignore that law too. I can think of a lot of people who would love to change a law they wanted to break, but for most Americans it doesn't work like that.

And let me remind my colleagues on the other side of the aisle of another rule they are breaking today. I quote:

Whenever the Committee on Rules reports a resolution providing for the consideration of any measure, it shall, to the maximum extent possible, specify the object of any waiver of a point of order against its consideration.

But this resolution doesn't specify the object of any waiver at all. Instead they put in words like ''to the maximum extent possible'' which creates a loophole big enough to drive a truck through.

For all the reform hoopla on opening day—just 6 months ago—Republicans have trampled their own rules time and time again. And today is no different. Every single day of the week that we are in the Committee of the Whole they waive the new requirement that committees will not sit during the 5-minute rule. They've waived that rule more than a flag on a 4th of July parade.

The same Republicans who demanded fairness in committee ratios last Congress are now skewing them so badly that even we look good.

Mr. Speaker, with this resolution, House Republicans are handing themselves a big get-out-of-jail-free card. They are saying ''we didn't do the things we were supposed to do but we want to go on vacation anyway.''

I urge my colleagues to defeat this rule and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. WALDHOLTZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would simply say in response to my colleague from Texas, that while some people may consider it a vacation to go home for 10 days, a number of us consider it a good opportunity to go home and talk to the people whom we are here to serve and many of us have town meetings scheduled.

We have opportunities to go home and talk to the people at home about the work that we are doing here. And much as I consider it a vacation to get out of Washington and return home to Utah, this is not simply for convenience of the Members; it is an opportunity to go home and continue the work that we have to do representing the people of our district.

I will also say, Mr. Speaker, that I think a lot of people recognize at home that having completed a balanced budget resolution for the first time in nearly 30 years is completing a great deal of work. We are well on our way toward accomplishing the work that is required of us in the appropriation process to complete that balanced budget in the time prescribed by law.

Mr. Speaker, we would have had two more bills finished this week, but for some unfortunate decisions by some people to try to slow down the process. Hopefully, we are past that, Mr. Speaker, and that when we come back from work in our districts over the next 10 days, we will have an opportunity to let the process move forward expeditiously as it is intended to.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, is it against the House rules for Members to wear buttons while speaking on the floor?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members should not wear badges trying to communicate a message while they are addressing the House.

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Chairman, I have a further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, would the Speaker not assume that a member of the Committee on Rules would know the rules of the House when he speaks on the House floor?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is not stating a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. LAHOOD. Would the Speaker please advise Members that they are not allowed to wear pins or buttons when they are speaking on the House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has just so informed the House.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the information, because I recall my Republican colleagues wearing buttons on the floor of the House day in and day out when they were in the minority.

I gather what was OK when they were in the minority is not OK now that we are in the minority. I appreciate the information and I will be happy to remove my button. I do recall speaker after speaker wearing buttons on the Republican side during the last 2 and 4 years.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER].

(Mr. VOLKMER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, here we go again. You know, it has been a very interesting 6 months. And I can still remember the very first day when we sat here adopting changes in the rules of the House.

□ 1315

And we went through each one individually, 20 minutes of debate and then a vote, 20 minutes of debate and a vote, and how we heard from the majority how this House was going to be reformed, how it was going to more adequately represent the people of this great country.

But lo and behold, let us see what has happened since January 4. Let us go through this 6 months and see what has happened.

How about the provision under the rules, the very new rule, that a Member could only serve on four subcommittees? How about that? Well, lo and behold, what do we find out? We have got 30 Members, most of them freshmen, the ones that held the charge for reform on five or six subcommittees. The heck with the rules of the House. I am better than the rules of the House. I do not have to abide by the rules of the House. I am a freshman in the majority. I can serve on five or six and the to heck with rules of the House. That is one of the things that has happened.

What else has happened? Well, what is very interesting to me is this rule we have here today. Not only is it the rules of the House, but the Budget Act, a statutorily enacted law on the books that says that you have to do your appropriation bills and your reconciliation bills before you take over 3 days' recess over the fourth of July. But we are not going to do that. This rule right here before us waives that and other rules so that the majority members, instead of finishing up the appropriation bills as we are supposed to do, and we have only got two done out of here, and I would like to remind that great majority, that outstanding majority, the Gingrich Republicans, and I know I cannot blame the gentlewoman from Utah for not knowing, because she was not here, but last year at this time, before July 4, under the then chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, all 13 appropriation bills were passed by the House, all 13 of them, not 2—13. But not the majority, not the Gingrich majority. They do not have to do it. They can take their good old time.

In fact, I understand it will probably be near the end of July before we get through the last appropriation bill. Now, that does not strike me as getting the job of the Congress done.

The majority has made a great big thing about all of the bills that they passed in the hundred days. Three of them have become law. One of them did not amount to a hill of beans. Two of them amount to a little bit, and that is about all we have done.

Now, they talk about this great big budget that we just passed. Wait a minute folks, read the Budget Act. When are we supposed to have done that budget? Hey, anybody in the majority know when they were supposed to pass the budget? About 2½ months ago. That is all, a little late folks, way late. About time you got things on track. It is about time. I do not think they are ever going to get things on track. I think the train is going to eventually come to a grinding halt here around the 1st of October, and I think that is a deliberate activity of the Republican majority in order to do that.

I am tired of these reformers talking about all of these great rules changes and things they do, when all they end up doing is violating the rules of the House.

I would also like to point out it is going to be interesting to me because I think we ought to have a rollcall vote on this resolution. The reason is because for years from that side, from the more senior Members on that side, anytime you had a waiver of the Budget Act, man, they exploded. They had to vote against it. They talked against it. You could not vote for a rule that waived the Budget Act, could not do it. I am going to be interested to see how many of them vote for the waiver of the Budget Act under this rule.

In closing, I would like to make a quote that I have before me from Will Rogers. He said it way back in 1927. I think it applies probably a little bit to me right now and what I am going to be doing back in my district, since the Republicans are going to vote to send me on a vacation. This is Will Rogers:

> From now on I am going to lay off the Republicans. I have never had anything against them as a race. I realize that out of office, they are just as honest as any other class and they have a place in the community that would have to be taken up by somebody. So I want to apologize for all that I have said about them and henceforth will have only a good word to say of them. Mind you, I am not going to say anything about them for a while, but that is not going to keep me from watching them.

Mrs. WALDHOLTZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, my colleague just said that the budget was late, and we happen to agree with the gentleman that the budget was late. A balanced budget is about 40 years late.

We were here for 93 days and passed the Contract With America, which was the most bipartisan Congress in the history of this body. And they have had 40 years to balance a budget, and they have not done it.

We kept our word. We are here. We are going to balance the budget by 2002, and it will happen.

So we do agree it was late, 40 years late.

Mrs. WALDHOLTZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, simply to respond to the previous speaker, Mr. Speaker.

There are a couple of points I think need to be clarified. The gentleman noted that he believed that all the appropriations bills had been passed before the July 4 district work period last year. In fact, the D.C. appropriation bill had not been passed. It is a small point, but one I think requires correcting as we are going to talk about appropriations bills on the floor.

Second, Mr. Speaker, I think it is also important to note that that same Congress that was seated last year, in 1993, did not complete their reconciliation bill until October, well past the time it was supposed to be completed by law.

The budget that was passed in those 2 years of the preceding Congress, Mr. Speaker, inflated our deficit to record levels. I think the people of our Nation would rather we take our time and get it right and get it balanced than hurry through and continue a legacy of deficit spending that has continued unabated since 1969.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would simply say that the irony of the previous speaker complaining about us not getting our work done will not be lost on those who worked on this floor or people across the country who have observed what has been going on for the past several days as we have wasted precious moments coming in to vote on procedural matters. I would simply point out, while he now complains about us going home so we can talk with the people in our districts over the coming week, the previous speaker voted in favor of a motion to adjourn just earlier this morning.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WATT].

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

My distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER] ended his presentation with a quotation from the distinguished American, Will Rogers. I want to start mine with another quotation from another distinguished American, Yogi Berra. Yogi Berra said, ''This is deja vu all over again,'' and that is really what I want to talk about, because this is deja vu all over again.

You have not seen me on the floor recently very much. Earlier in this term, during the first 100 days, I rose time after time after time to protest procedural shortcomings that my Republican colleagues had engaged in. They want to take credit for all of this reform, yet they do not want to comply with their own rules that they are taking credit for among the American people.

Let me give you some examples. On the opening day of this Congress, my colleagues passed a new rule which bars proxy voting in committees. They argued that proxy voting makes a mockery of the committee process and concentrates power in committee leaders. Well, I happen to agree with them.

So what do they do on a regular basis in committee? We cannot vote by proxies, but anytime a vote comes out in a way that they do not like, then they simply go back and ask for reconsideration so that when their Members are not there, they always have a fallback position to come back in and get the results that they are looking for anyway.

They talked about the value of proxy voting. Well, I believe in no proxy voting, too. I think it makes for better deliberation to have the Members in the committee doing work. But they also passed a rule on the opening day of this Congress which talked about waiving the 5-minute rule in the House. Well, what is the 5-minute rule in the House? We debate things on the House floor under a 5-minute rule, and they passed a rule which says you cannot have a committee meeting while we are under the 5-minute rule in the House.

Well, just about every day we have been in this session of Congress, my colleagues, after they passed that rule, have come back to this House of Representatives every single day and asked for a waiver of that rule so that committees can continue to meet while we are doing debate, important debate, right here on the floor.

There was a day last week when I had two markups going, one in the Committee on the Judiciary, one in the Committee on Banking and Financial Services, and a bill that I was involved in on the floor right here, and they said, ''Well, you can be in three places at one time because we waived the rule that allowed the committees to meet even though we are doing something that is important to you on the floor of the House of Representatives.''

Well, let us hasten along to talk about why this is deja vu all over again, because my colleagues on the Republican side also on opening day passed this rule, and it says, ''No Member of the House can serve on more than four subcommittees of this House.'' Well, look at the record, if you will. There is not a single Democratic Member of the House of Representatives who serves on more than four subcommittees, because the rule says that.

But look at my friends on the other side of the aisle, 30, 30 Republican Members are violating this House rule. Two-thirds of the Members who violate this rule are the same freshmen Republicans who came into this House saying they support reform and honesty with the people of the American electorate, but they themselves will not abide by their own House rules that they have adopted.

Well, is it deja vu all over again?

Let me make the other points, as I have got only 2 minutes.

They passed a rule on opening day of this House which said that the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will be a verbatim transcript of what actually happens in the House.

□ 1330

Well, my colleagues have not complied with that rule either. They have come right back and, on numerous occasions, have changed, changed the transcript of what has happened in the House to reflect what they would like to have happened rather than what actually happened.

Well, one final thing. They said on opening day, and they went out into the public and took credit for it as an important issue of reform, that a three-fifths vote, a three-fifths vote is required, to pass any new taxing provision. But on several occasions my colleagues have come into this House and violated their own rules.

So why is this deja vu all over again? Because it is a systematic practice on this side of the aisle to come in and violate the rules of the House and have us try to sanction their own violations.

I say to my colleagues, if you are going to take credit for reform, then at least live up to the standard that you set for yourselves. You ask us to comply with the law. We comply with the law. You asked us to comply with the rules. We complied with the rules. All we are simply asking you to do is to comply with the very same rules that we must comply with that you are telling the American people that you are complying with, and, if you do that, then maybe you can have a better audience in the future.

Mrs. WALDHOLTZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, it seems that our previous speaker is complaining about reforms that have resulted in open rules.

Mr. Speaker, there is no question that the previous rule structure, voting by proxy, was more convenient for Members of the House, but it was not good government. When the new majority took over this year, we inherited a bloated committee structure that had so many committees and subcommittees that proxy voting was basically the only way that things could happen around here if the Members did not want to have to move quickly at times. To start on our reforms we cut out 3 whole committees, 25 subcommittees, in an attempt to make it easier for Members to completely fulfill their obligations, which I believe, Mr. Speaker, includes physically going to our committee meetings and voting rather than handing a proxy to someone else who votes on their behalf without them having to consider what is coming before their committee.

We are continuing, Mr. Speaker, to try to work out the problems that had been created. It is true that having people have to actually be in their committees and vote is resulting in us having to hurry at times. It is true that it is less convenient for Members than the old proxy voting was. But I believe, Mr. Speaker, that we have a better Government and a better deliberative process for the difference.

Mr. Speaker, we are going to continue in our working to continue to find better ways to work out the scheduling problems to see if there are other ways to streamline the committee structure, but I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the people at home have every right to expect us to exercise our voting privileges personally and not by proxy.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we are being asked to waive all kinds of rules so we can go on our vacation for the Fourth of July.

Mr. Speaker, I just wonder what kind of rules we will be asked to waive in August so that Members can go on book tours.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 6½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOGGETT].

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOGGETT. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I am just wondering what good does it do to do reform of the rules if they then turn around and violate the rules that they have reformed. I do not know what good that does.

Mrs. WALDHOLTZ. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield and allow me to respond?

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield back to the gentleman from Texas.

Mrs. WALDHOLTZ. Is the gentleman not allowing me an opportunity to respond?

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, the gentlewoman will have plenty of time to him, and I have got a few things for her to respond to, too, but let me pose them first.

Mr. Speaker, I think there are many Americans who are out there saying when they watch the proceedings in this House that there ought to be a law against what is happening up there. There ought to be a law against some of the things that are not happening up there.

I say to my colleagues, Well you know what? There is a law. It is called the Congressional Budget Act, and the Congressional Budget Act is what these folks propose in this resolution to just suspend, to say that they, unlike other Americans, don't have to comply with some of the laws in the statute books, that they can kind of pick and choose the laws of this great country that they wish to comply with. You see the Congressional Budget Act says that we are to have a budget resolution passed and approved in this Congress so we have the guidelines for the budget that will govern the American people with trillions of dollars of expenditure, and it sets a date for doing that, and that date is not yesterday. That date is April 15. Can you imagine what would happen if the American citizens didn't pay their taxes on April 15 when they are due? Would someone permit them to say, ''Well, we'll just suspend that this year; it just doesn't feel good to pay taxes on April 15. We'll just suspend that.''

Mr. Speaker, that is what these good folks have done, and then they tell us in this law that applies to every American and to this Congress that it is our obligation to complete something called the Reconciliation Act, which when this Congress was in the hands of Democrats in 1993, they followed that law. It says:

> You complete the Reconciliation Act on the budget, and you do it before you go home on July the Fourth. You cannot recess for more than 3 days during the month of July until you have completed the Reconciliation Act.

Mr. Speaker, where I come from, down in Texas, people understand that. They either do their work or they do not get their break. They either do their work or they do not go on vacation. But apparently our colleagues in the majority, the Republicans, do not understand that because, instead of complying with the law and completing reconciliation, what do they come before this House today to do? They asked us to suspend the law for them. They want to go home instead of doing the work that the law charges them with doing.

I do not declare that, if this Republican majority has to suspend any more of the law on the budget, every one of them ought to have to come out here in suspenders because they have been suspending this and suspending that, and they are not doing the people's work to complete this budget on time.

What difference should all that make other than just this example of flouting one law after another to the American people? Well, as a matter of fact, I think it is going to make a big difference when they pay their taxes, when they reach in their pocketbook, to wonder what has happened on Medicare, when they reach in their pocketbook to wonder what has happened in the way taxes are paid in this country, because, I ask, ''What happens when you delay, and you delay, and you delay, and you got those suspenders on, and you're suspending one law after another instead of complying with it?'' It is that it finally all comes home to roost, and it is all going to come home to roost around here after these big vacations are over with and we are faced with the problems of the fall because, my colleagues, we are only about 3 months from the time that the train wreck is going to occur.

Mr. Speaker, we are going to be down to the end of this fiscal year. We are going to be facing a debt limit, and it is all going to back up, and it is going to pile up, and we will have all these last-minute proposals that say from the Republicans: ''Well, Mr. and Mrs. Senior American, we're going to need a little more help out of you. If you want to see your own doctor next month instead of the one that some organization picks out for you, pull out a twenty out of your pocket because it is going to cost you about $20 more a month to do that.''

They are going to say, ''Well, Mr. and Mrs. Senior American, are the young people that are trying to care for their parents and honor their father and mother,'' they are going to say to them, ''Well, if you want to stay at home with home care instead of going into a nursing home, it is going to cost you more money.''

They are going to say, as one of the Members of the Republican leadership does, ''If you're about to turn 65 and retire, don't look to Medicare to cover you health care because you're going to have to wait until 67. Oh, your employer won't cover it anymore? Well, that's tough. You'll have to come up with thousands of dollars to provide yourself medical insurance if you get it at age 65 or 66.''

And there is one other thing that needs to be said:

As a State judge, I saw one defendant after another who, lacking a meritorious defense, would come forward and would use delay as their shield. It is not surprising when a defendant does that; it is surprising when the judge gets in a partnership with the defendant to use delay as a defense, and on one very critical matter in this House we have heard action would be taken after the Contract. We have heard action would be taken after Memorial Day. We have heard action would be taken at the end of June, before the July Fourth recess, and yesterday a story in the New York Times put a lie to all of that when it reported how little work the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct had done. It is an outrage for this House to adjourn without the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct acting on the complaint against Speaker GINGRICH.

Mrs. WALDHOLTZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, first I would like to respond to the question that I was asked but that I was not allowed an opportunity to respond to. The gentleman asked why it is all right to waive our own rules. Well, as the gentleman well knows, in order to expedite the business of this House, to keep it rolling, we have to make some decisions about what is the most important requirement that the people at home expect of us. It is true, Mr. Speaker, that by doing away with proxy voting and expecting people to actually go and vote in the committee that they are assigned to, that we have had to allow those committees to carry out their work while there has also been business moving forward on the floor of the House. Mr. Speaker, we have not waived that most important rule of requiring people to go and exercise their own vote in the committee to which they are assigned. It is critical, Mr. Speaker, that we continue to hold fast to those rules that represent real reform in this body, and we have done so. Rules that are created, however, for the convenience of Members sometimes will have to be suspended in order to allow us to do what needs to be done.

□ 1345

So, Mr. Speaker, I would submit that the people of this country will judge us on whether we are keeping the commitments that we have made to do our work, to vote ourselves rather than allowing someone else to vote for us. And I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the people of this country will support us in continuing to keep the business of this House moving forward at the same time we expect people to do their work themselves instead of handing off their decisionmaking ability to someone else.

Let me also say, Mr. Speaker, that, while people keep talking about us somehow being derelict in our duty by going to our districts this week, I would submit that the decision as to how we are going to spend this Nation's money, which is what the budget process is all about, that decision should not be made solely in Washington, DC. The people at home in our districts have every right to have the opportunity to tell us how they want us to spend their money.

And this district work period, while, yes, I plan to go see my family on the 4th of July, this district work period is an opportunity for us to go home and talk with the people who sent us here, to ask them what it is they want us to

do, how they want us to spend their money, because we can never forget, Mr. Speaker, it is not our money, it is theirs.

It is appropriate for us to go home in the midst of this budget process and ask them what they would like us to do with their money. This is a district work period, Mr. Speaker. It is an opportunity for us to go home and see what it is that people want us to do. I think that there is no better use of our time for a period during this budget process.

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. WALDHOLTZ. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. I was just going to inquire what the gentlewoman did during the April recess when we were out for 3 weeks and you all seem to have spent all your time parading around bragging about what you did in the first 100 days; why did you not do it during that period?

Mrs. WALDHOLTZ. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, I am happy to show the gentleman exactly what I did during the April recess, meeting with my constituents, talking with people at home. There is never enough time, Mr. Speaker, to talk with the people who sent us here. I am perfectly happy to go home and have another opportunity to meet with them even if the gentleman does not think he needs it.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, we urge a ''no'' vote on this.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. WALDHOLTZ. Mr. Speaker, I think we have said all that needs to be said on this matter. I urge my colleagues to support this rule.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOBSON). The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 242, nays 157, not voting 35, as follows:

[Roll No. 468]

YEAS—242

Allard
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bereuter
Bilbray
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Brewster
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Calvert
Canady
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clinger
Coble
Coburn
Collins (GA)
Combest
Cooley
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis
Deal
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dixon
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Flanagan
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Funderburk
Ganske
Gekas
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Holden
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jacobs
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kasich
Kelly
Kim
King
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Lincoln
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Longley
Lucas
Manzullo
Martini
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McDermott
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Meehan
Metcalf
Meyers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Minge
Mink
Molinari
Moorhead
Morella
Myers
Myrick
Nadler
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Oxley
Packard
Parker
Paxon
Petri
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Riggs
Rivers
Roberts
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Royce
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Schiff
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stockman
Stump
Talent
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Thornton
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Traficant
Upton
Vucanovich
Waldholtz
Walker
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NAYS—157

Abercrombie
Andrews
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentsen
Berman
Bevill
Bishop
Bonior
Borski
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Cardin
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Danner
de la Garza
DeFazio
DeLauro
Deutsch
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Durbin
Edwards
Ensign
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Ford
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green
Gutierrez
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hoyer
Jackson-Lee
Jefferson
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Klink
LaFalce
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McHale
McKinney
McNulty
Meek
Menendez
Mfume
Mineta
Mollohan
Moran
Murtha
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Orton
Owens
Pallone
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Poshard
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Richardson
Roemer
Rose
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sawyer
Schumer
Scott
Skaggs
Slaughter
Spratt
Stark
Stokes
Studds
Stupak
Tanner
Taylor (MS)
Tejeda
Thompson
Thurman
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Tucker
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Ward
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Williams
Wise
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates

NOT VOTING—35

Ackerman
Ballenger
Bateman
Bilirakis
Boucher
Bryant (TX)
Callahan
Camp
Clement
Collins (MI)
Dellums
Dicks
Fields (LA)
Fields (TX)
Gallegly
Goodlatte
Hayes
Hefner
Johnston
Lantos
Miller (CA)
Moakley
Montgomery
Ortiz
Pickett
Pryce
Quillen
Reynolds
Roukema
Schroeder
Sisisky
Stenholm
Walsh
Watts (OK)
Young (AK)

☐ 1409

Ms. DANNER and Mrs. KENNELLY changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONDITIONAL RECESS OR ADJOURNMENT OF THE SENATE ON THURSDAY, JUNE 29, 1995, OR FRIDAY, JUNE 30, 1995, UNTIL MONDAY, JULY 10, 1995, AND A CONDITIONAL ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE ON THE LEGISLATIVE DAY OF FRIDAY, JUNE 30, 1995, UNTIL MONDAY, JULY 10, 1995

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 179, the Chair lays before the House the following concurrent resolution from the Senate:

S. CON. RES. 20

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That when the Senate recesses or adjourns at the close of business on Thursday, June 29, 1995, or Friday, June 30, 1995, pursuant to a motion made by the Majority Leader or his designee, in accordance with this resolution, it stand recessed or adjourned until 12:00 noon on Monday, July 10, 1995, or until such time on that day as may be specified by the Majority Leader or his designee in the motion to recess or adjourn, or until 12:00 noon on the second day after Members are notified to reassemble pursuant to section 2 of this resolution, whichever occurs first; and that when the House of Representatives adjourns on the legislative day of Friday, June 30, 1995, it stand adjourned until 2:00 p.m. on Monday, July 10, 1995, or until 12:00 noon on the second day after Members are notified to reassemble pursuant to section 2 of this resolution, whichever occurs first.

SEC. 2. The Majority Leader of the Senate and the Speaker of the House, acting jointly

after consultation with the Minority Leader of the Senate and Minority Leader of the House, shall notify the Members of the Senate and the House, respectively, to reassemble whenever, in their opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Senate concurrent resolution is concurred in.

There was no objection.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1883

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be withdrawn as a cosponsor to H.R. 1883. It was inadvertently placed on that list.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOBSON). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I inadvertently missed two rollcalls. On rollcall vote No. 463 I would have voted ''aye,'' and on rollcall vote 464 I would have voted ''no.''

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. GEPHARDT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to inquire of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY] regarding the schedule for next week, July 10.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEPHARDT. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, July 10, the House will meet at 12:30 p.m. for morning hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business. We plan to take up four bills under suspension of the rules: H.R. 1642, extending most-favored-nation status to Cambodia, H.R. 1643, extending MFN to Bulgaria, H.R. 1141, the Sikes Act Improvement Amendments of 1995, and S. 523, the Colorado Basin salinity control amendments.

Members should be advised that there will be no recorded votes taken before 5 p.m. on Monday, July 10. After any recorded votes on suspensions, we will consider a committee naming resolution before taking up the second rule and continued debate on H.R. 1868, the fiscal year 1996 Foreign Operations appropriations bill.

On Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for legislative business. We will continue consideration of fiscal year 1996 appropriations bills, including the Energy and Water, Interior, and Agriculture appropriations bills.

It is our hope to have the Members on their way home to their families and their districts by no later than 6 o'clock on Thursday evening. There will be no recorded votes on Friday of that week.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, the majority leader indicated his intent to bring up a committee naming resolution before considering the Foreign Operations appropriations bill on Monday, July 10.

Am I correct, Mr. Speaker, In assuming the gentleman is referring to the majority party's intent to seat the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LAUGHLIN] on the Committee on Ways and Means?

Mr. ARMEY. The gentleman is correct. At this time, that is the only committee designation that would be made. I suppose it is possible something else might pop up in the meantime, but that right now is the only designation that I know of.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, as I have said to the gentleman, and all Members should understand, there may be a large number of votes that evening after the starting time, and Members should be advised of that possibility.

Mr. ARMEY. I thank the gentleman. I think it is very helpful to all our Members, in the interests of doing their district work period and then returning, that we are able to assure them there will be no votes until after 5 o'clock, but I think the gentleman is absolutely correct. After 5 o'clock, we can most assuredly expect that there will be some votes, and they will be important votes that they will want to participate in.

□ 1415

Mr. GEPHARDT. I wish the distinguished majority leader and all Members a productive, successful, and restful Fourth of July district work period.

Mr. ARMEY. I thank the gentleman from Missouri. I, too, would like to encourage all our Members to have a good break, get some good work done, rest, relax, and we will all come back happy and congenially ready to go back to work on some of the material we did not finish today.

AUTHORIZING THE SPEAKER AND THE MINORITY LEADER TO ACCEPT RESIGNATIONS AND TO MAKE APPOINTMENTS AUTHORIZED BY LAW OR BY THE HOUSE, NOTWITHSTANDING ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding any adjournment of the House until Monday, July 10, 1995, the Speaker and the minority leader be authorized to accept resignations and to make appointments authorized by law or by the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. HOBSON). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY, JULY 12, 1995

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday, July 12, 1995.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS TO FILE A PRIVILEGED REPORT ON DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 1996

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight tonight to file a privileged report on a bill making appropriations for the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All points of order are reserved on the bill.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS TO FILE A PRIVILEGED REPORT ON AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 1996

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight tonight to file a privileged report on a bill making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and related agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All points of order are reserved on the bill.

SAVING LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS' LIVES ACT OF 1995—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 104–90)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

To the Congress of the United States:

Today I am transmitting for your immediate consideration and passage the ''Saving Law Enforcement Officers' Lives Act of 1995.'' This Act would limit the manufacture, importation, and distribution of handgun ammunition that serves little sporting purpose, but which kills law enforcement officers. The details of this proposal are described in the enclosed section-by-section analysis.

Existing law already provides for limits on ammunition based on the specific materials from which it is made. It does not, however, address the problem of excessively powerful ammunition based on its performance.

Criminals should not have access to handgun ammunition that will pierce the bullet-proof vests worn by law enforcement officers. That is the standard by which so-called ''cop-killer'' bullets are judged. My proposal would limit the availability of this ammunition.

The process of designating such ammunition should be a careful one and should be undertaken in close consultation with all those who are affected, including representatives of law enforcement, sporting groups, the industries that manufacture bullet-proof vests and ammunition, and the academic research community. For that reason, the legislation requires the Secretary of the Treasury to consult with the appropriate groups before regulations are promulgated. The legislation also provides for congressional review of the proposed regulations before they take effect.

This legislation will save the lives of law enforcement officers without affecting the needs of legitimate sporting enthusiasts. I urge its prompt and favorable consideration by the Congress.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 30, 1995.*

REPORT ON PROGRESS CONCERNING EMIGRATION LAWS AND POLICIES OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 104–91)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed.

To the Congress of the United States:

On September 21, 1994, I determined and reported to the Congress that the Russian Federation is in full compliance with the freedom of emigration criteria of sections 402 and 409 of the Trade Act of 1974. This action allowed for the continuation of most-favored-nation (MFN) status for Russia and certain other activities without the requirement of a waiver.

As required by law, I am submitting an updated Report to Congress concerning the emigration laws and policies of the Russian Federation. You will find that the report indicates continued Russian compliance with U.S. and international standards in the area of emigration.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 30, 1995.*

DESIGNATION OF MEMBER AS SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS THROUGH MONDAY, JULY 10, 1995

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC, *June 30, 1995.*

I hereby designate the Honorable FRANK WOLF to act as Speaker pro tempore to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions through July 10, 1995.

NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DEFAZIO] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. RIGGS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from American Samoa [Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. KINGSTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. KINGSTON addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

A FAIR DAY'S PAY FOR A FAIR DAY'S WORK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. FILNER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 363, a bill that would increase the Federal minimum wage from $4.25 to $5.50 an hour, and equally important, automatically adjust the wage up or down annually as indexed for inflation.

Historically, our Nation's lowest wage earning positions were reserved for new immigrants and the young. Both of these groups, especially with increased education, could expect to advance in our society. But as Bob Dylan used to sing, ''the times, they are a changin.'' Indeed, the times are changing. No longer are the lowest paying jobs occupied solely by the young and uneducated; they are held by parents, seniors, students supporting themselves, and millions of other Americans.

The minimum wage labor force has drastically changed over the past decade. What was once a mere passageway to the ''American Dream,'' minimum wage jobs have become a permanent way of life for an increasing number of citizens. Today, nearly 50 percent of working Americans earn the minimum wage. Not only do many of these working people have college diplomas and master's degrees—but most have to support families on their minimum wage.

Now, more than ever, we need to pass legislation that will allow working Americans to earn a real and meaningful income. We have all heard the arguments that unemployment and inflation will increase with a higher minimum wage. These arguments are completely unfounded, as shown by study after study done in a wide variety of areas that have increased their minimum wage. A higher minimum wage stimulates our economy because it allows more consumer needs to be met.

Each day that the minimum wage remains at its current low level, the real buying power of that wage decreases. In order for workers to remain above the poverty level, they would have to be earning over $6 an hour. Do we want to condemn so many working people to poverty?

Mr. Speaker, hard working Americans deserve the security and stability that come with being able to provide for oneself and one's family. Let's raise the minimum wage, let's index it automatically for inflation, and let's give every working American the promise for a better tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. MORELLA). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CHAMBLISS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. CHAMBLISS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

WHY CORRIDOR H IS A NATIONAL HIGHWAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WISE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WISE. Madam Speaker, as the Congress adjourns and shortly Sandy and I will get in the car with our two children and begin heading home to the western side of West Virginia, about a 7-hour drive away, we are going to ask ourselves once again: Why is it that we have to drive north to drive so far south? Or why is it that we can take the alternate route and drive so far south and then west and then we get to go north again? Why is there not a direct route, a direct route called Corridor H, a route that has been torn by controversy for many, many years but a highway that should be built.

This is going to begin a series of statements on why Corridor H should be built. Today I am going to entitle this, ''Why Corridor H is a National Highway.''

It is not, as some say, a narrow West Virginia road or a State interest. It is not just of local concern, nor is it a pork-barrel project. Corridor H is a vital project that has been on the books for 25 years.

Let's take a look at the map, Madam Speaker. Here we are roughly in Washington, DC. I–66 goes out toward the Virginia line and intersects with Interstate 81. The logical thing, if you were going to continue going to the west, would be to go straight, would it not? That is what Corridor H does. But instead our traffic, economic, and tourist and all other traffic, is required to go to the north to 68 or down to the south to 64 and keep going down.

Were Corridor H to be completed, and indeed 40 miles of Corridor H, 4-lane Corridor H is already completed from I–79, 40 miles to Weston, to Buckhannon, to Elkins, West Virginia. But were Corridor H, the 100 and some miles left, to be completed, what you would have is an extension of Interstate 66, a major east-west corridor that goes to I–79 and then permits you to continue going to the west, either down Interstate 79 or up and over on Route 50, another 4-lane road.

What you would have is a straight east-west corridor running all the way from the Washington metropolitan area to Ohio, Kentucky and points west.

This is truly a national highway. Indeed, it would also connect, Madam Speaker, with the inland port at Front Royal, an increasingly commercial development that is showing more success in getting goods to the port at Norfolk. But the problem is that if you are trying to bring anything from the west to the east, you are confronted by extremely mountainous and difficult terrain. Corridor H would end that. It is a major economic development corridor as well as a national highway, a highway truly of national significance.

I think it should also be pointed out that some argue that it is too expensive or environmentally damaging. What they fail to acknowledge is that the four routes that were considered, two running to the south, one running to the north and now the route that has been adopted this way, that those routes were considered and rejected. Indeed, the least expensive route and the one that causes the least environmental disruption is the one that has been adopted.

The two southern routes threaten great environmental problems and were the most expensive to construct. So out of consideration and to meet the concerns of many who raised these objections, the fourth route, the one that is presently proposed, is the one that was adopted.

Madam Speaker, I would urge this Congress to get on about the business of constructing Corridor H and to look at I–66 as it ends at Interstate 81 and to recognize the important national significance of this road. It does not get any cheaper to build a road. The least expensive route has been selected and indeed to provide a major east-west corridor, Corridor H is the answer.

Yes, Sandy and I are going to spend 6 to 7 hours driving and we could spend far less were Corridor H constructed. It should not be constructed for our driving ease. What it ought to be constructed for is the economic growth of this entire region, not only West Virginia but parts of Virginia, Ohio, and Kentucky as well.

Madam Speaker, I will be revisiting the issue of Corridor H a good deal more in the future.

MORE FREEDOM, INDEPENDENCE, AND BANG FOR THE BUCK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. GUTKNECHT] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Madam Speaker, I probably will not take the full 5 minutes. As we adjourn today and Members begin to return to their districts to celebrate the Fourth of July, I think we should remember what we are really celebrating is Independence Day.

There were two events, two news items this week coming out of Washington that I think deserve some attention and may seem in some respects disparate but I think they are related. Like the fireworks displays that we are going to see in communities all across America next Tuesday, we should be talking about independence, we should be talking about freedom, but more importantly I think as it relates to government programs, we ought to be looking for ways that we can get the most bang for our buck.

□ 1430

And so I would like to talk about a couple of news items. First of all, we have an expression back in the Midwest, ''When pigs fly,'' which is another way of saying that that is never going to happen. And I think if you would have asked people several years ago, Do you think the Congress will really get serious about balancing the budget? I think a lot of people would have said, ''When pigs fly.''

This week the House and Senate conferees came together and we now have a budget blueprint which will, in fact, balance the Federal budget.

Second, I want to talk about something and congratulate Marion Barry, who many times we found reasons to disagree with, and the DC school superintendent, Franklin Smith. There is an article in today's Wall Street Journal where they have agreed to support a local voucher plan for the local schools and privatize up to 11 of the most troubled schools.

I think that is terrific news. I think that is terrific news for the students in Washington, DC. I think it is about independence, I think it is about freedom, and I think it is about getting more bang for the buck.

And so when we talk about the budget, some people are saying we should take 10 years instead of 7 years to balance the budget. When I talk to my constituents, they think we ought to balance it in 3 or 4 years, rather than 7 years. There is criticism no matter what you do.

Frankly, as it relates to the Washington, DC, public schools, I would like to see them open the system up even more so that parents could choose from private, religiously affiliated schools as well, but they are taking the most important first steps, as we are with the budget.

And so, Madam Speaker, when we see pigs beginning to fly, I do not think we should criticize them for not staying up too long or taking too long to get the job done. These are important news items. It is all about more freedom, more independence, and getting more bang for our buck.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. MORELLA). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

AMERICANS WANT FASTER FDA DRUG APPROVALS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOX] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, life-saving new drugs do take too long to reach the people who need them. From my district in Montgomery County, PA, I have heard many a compelling story from constituents with cancer, A.L.S., Lou Gehrig's disease, epilepsy, or AIDS, who speak of the difficulties in obtaining these life-saving, life-extending drugs. They need them because the approval process in our country is so prolonged and, in effect, they have to turn to other countries where the products are available.

Is it not ironic that most of the life-saving drugs that are produced in the

world are produced here in the United Stats, but our patients and our constituents are the last to receive them because of over-regulation and delays in the system which can be cleared up.

Do not get me wrong. The Food and Drug Administration serves a valuable purpose in maintaining high safety and efficacy standards. However, it is important to note that the FDA's actions directly affect the lives of patients and the ability of physicians to provide state-of-the-art care for their patients. What we need to have is a speeded up process to approve or disapprove drugs so that the investments made by biotech and pharmaceutical companies can result in having saved lives and the quality of those lives extended for many years to come.

In addition, the FDA regulates businesses that produce 25 percent of America's gross national product, so the agency's actions also impact on our country's economic well-being. The United States is far and away the world leader in pharmaceutical and biotech discovery, but many firms are moving clinical trials overseas because of needless trends that do not bode well for the economic future of the United States.

This can all be changed by legislation; by making sure that we speed up the process of FDA approval so that our constituents will have the benefit of these life-extending and live-saving drugs.

In my 13th Congressional District of Pennsylvania alone, we have 10 facilities of 4 major pharmaceutical companies that employ 11,000 people. Here they are at work very hard every day to make sure that we save lives and improve those lives. I would not want to see any of those companies or constituents lost their jobs because FDA regulation is so overburdened and so over-regulated that we delay, in fact, the service and the medical care for our constituents.

Americans want safe medicines. They want a strong FDA that will keep unsafe products off the market. But they also want to see more emphasis on quicker access to medicines, faster clinical trials, and the delivery of those services and devices to them. That is why I am introducing, working with colleagues on both sides of the aisle, to have the Life Extending and Life Saving Drug Act passed here in this 104th Congress. We need to take the action as soon as possible for the great benefit of our Nation's patients and our constituents. I look forward to working with my colleagues and the chairmen of the important committees, like Commerce's THOMAS BLILEY, to make sure we act critically, quickly, and in an efficient manner so that our constituents will be served and, in fact, an industry that is so vital to the country moves forward with economic stability.

WAKE UP, CONGRESS; WAKE UP, AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FOLEY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FOLEY. Madam Speaker, first I would like to thank the employees of this House of Representatives who endured hours and hours of debate while this House went into 24-hour session the other evening: The cloakroom staff, the individual staff of the Members of Congress, the Clerk's office, the stenographers that had to take down every word, the pages that have come from around our Nation that have helped the Members, the whip teams and everyone else.

It was quite a spectacle. It was sad for me as a freshman Member of Congress to watch the delay after delay, the motions to rise, the various tactics in order to stall the progress of this House.

I came here to make a difference, to make change. And I know at times there are disagreements and I am certain at times the Republicans did it last time to a Democratic-controlled Congress, but I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to stop this nonsense.

The American public is watching and they are sick and tired of watching Congress go into the night, go into the early morning hours, go 24 hours a day, spending taxpayers' dollars while these fine employees of the House of Representatives have to be away from their homes, while the young pages 16 and 17 years old are up all night long. That is wrong.

So the Democrats and Republicans have to become more responsible in this process and they have got to stop the nonsense and start doing the people's business. Start working on legislation that will change America's problems. I mean we must have had seven motions to rise the other day, which takes over 17 minutes per vote to do that work.

So we spent hours of wasted time coming back and forth to the Chamber. People think it is funny in the Chamber. They laugh. How long can this go on? Let us take to the mattresses. The American public who are watching on C–SPAN or reading in the newspapers of Congress' action are embarrassed. I am embarrassed as a Member of Congress for the actions we took the other day.

Let me talk about another problem that is confronting America and we have got to deal with it, and that is child abuse. The other day we may have read in the national newspapers about a young child named Wolfie whose parents abandoned him at a mall. A husband and wife abandoned their 3-year-old child and left him wandering in a mall thousands of miles away from their home.

In South Carolina a woman allows two young children to be driven into a lake and drowned. In Florida two parents killed their 7-year-old daughter and left her in a closet for 4 days.

To those out there that have that type of mental illness, put your child up for adoption. Do not take that child's life. You know, children are being taken advantage of. Sexual abuse of our children, this has got to stop.

Members of Congress cannot legislate the protection of children, but neighbors have to be careful and watch out for those around them, the vulnerable children of our society that are falling prey to the sick individuals that would take their lives.

Reading the story of young Wolfie, I can only imagine the terror in his mind when his parents leave him in a mall and drive off in a car and they are found in a park in Maryland 3,000 miles away. Left in California, a 3-year-old child in a mall.

Many of you may have remembered the story of Adam Walsh, who was kidnaped from a mall in Florida, who was beheaded. They still do not have the killer. I understand they are pursuing somebody who may have been involved.

I think it is important that America wake up. The children are our future. When we talk about balanced budgets, we keep talking about children, saving the children's future, taking away the debt that is being piled on our children's future.

Madam Speaker and Members of this Congress, it is time to stop talking about the children in abstract and start talking about protecting their very precious lives, start talking about protecting children from the sick individuals that would destroy their futures and destroy their opportunities.

I ask God to bless the parents of children and, again I say to them, if you are not happy with your child, if you are not happy being parents, put your child up for adoption and let somebody love your child the way that they need to be loved to become responsible citizens.

Again, my hats are off to the dedicated employees of the House of Representatives who have endured many, many hours of debate and their willingness to put in that time to make America the great and strong Nation that it is.

WHY AMERICANS ARE ANGRY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SANDERS. Madam Speaker, I want to just briefly this afternoon touch on two issues: One, maybe offer some explanation as to why the American people are so angry. We keep reading in the media about the angry white male, but I think it is not only the angry white male. A whole lot of people of all colors and ages are angry, and also on the floor of this House we hear a lot about class struggle. Class struggle. Let me say a word about that also if I might.

Madam Speaker, I think that the average American is in fact angry, and I believe that that average American has every reason in the world to be angry. What concerns me is very often our anger is taken out against the wrong opponent. But let us focus on why we should be angry.

Madam Speaker, in 1973, the United States reached a high point of its economic life with regard to the wages and benefits that middle-income and working people reached. Since that time, approximately 80 pecent of the American working people have seen either a decline in their standard of living or economic stagnation. That means after 20 years of hard work, those people have gone nowhere economically.

Furthermore, what we are seeing is that the American worker, in order to compensate for the decline in his or her standard of living, is working longer hours. We are making lower wages. We are working longer hours. When you want to know why Americans are stressed out, why they are angry, why they are furious, we should understand that the average American today is working an extra 160 hours a year more in order to compensate for our falling standard of living.

Now, if middle-income people and middle-aged people should be worried, they are working longer hours, they are making less money, what about the younger people? And that is where the economy in the United States today looks extremely frightening.

The real wages of high school dropouts, that means people who did not graduate high school, plummeted 22 percent between 1973 and 1993.

For high school graduates who are entering into the job market, there has also been a precipitous decline in those wages. So what is going on is that as the standard of living of American workers declined in general, for the young workers it is becoming even worse.

But, Madam Speaker, we talk about increase in poverty in America, decline of the standard of living of American workers, the shrinking of the middle-class, the fact that 80 percent of our people are going nowhere economically except perhaps down. Is the economic crisis impacting all people? And the answer of course is no, it is not.

One of the very scary and unfair and unjust aspects of the American economy right now is that in many ways we are becoming two nations. The New York Times a few months ago reported that the wealthiest 1 percent of our population now owns 40 percent of the wealth of America. The richest 1 percent owns more wealth than the bottom 90 percent.

The gap between the rich and the poor is growing wider, and in fact it is today wider and we have a more unfair distribution of wealth than any other industrialized nation on Earth. For the richest people, these times are great times and we can understand why the columnists, who themselves make millions of dollars, or the owners of the TV stations are talking about a booming economy.

□ 1445

It is booming, if you are making a whole lot of money. It is not booming if you are a middle-income or working-class person.

What I am also concerned about is that the nature of the new jobs that are being created are not only low-wage jobs, they are often part-time jobs. What we are seeing now is a proliferation of part-time jobs because companies would rather pay two workers at 20 hours a week without benefits than one worker 40 hours a week with benefits.

I wonder how many Americans know who the largest private employer is right now. People say, ''Well, maybe it is General Electric, maybe it is General Motors, IBM.'' Wrong. The largest private employer today is Manpower, Incorporated, which is a temporary agency.

Very briefly, let me make some recommendations as to what we might want to do to address this very serious economic problem. No. 1, we have got to raise the minimum wage. Workers in America cannot continue to work for $4.25 an hour. That is why so many of our working people are living in poverty.

No. 2, we need, in fact, a massive jobs training, jobs program, to rebuild this country. In my State of Vermont, all over America, there is an enormous amount of work to be done. Let us put people back to work at decent wages and rebuild this country.

A POSITIVE VIEW OF ROMANIA AND THE ROMANIANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. MORELLA). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FUNDERBURK] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FUNDERBURK. Madam Speaker, while the Romanian Government has sometimes gotten bad press in the United States for its slow transition to democratic government and privatization, and its part-free elections and media—the Romanian people deserve recognition for their long suffering struggles and their contributions. This afternoon I want to give a tribute to the Romanian people.

There are over one million people from Romania living abroad in Western Europe, North and South America, and Australia/New Zealand. They have made a name for themselves in all fields with some winning Nobel prizes. One of my colleagues in this House, Congressman MARTIN HOKE, has a Romanian mother. Nearly half a million people originally from Romania settled in America, living in every State. One Romanian—Dr. Nicholas Dima—assisted me in preparing this historical sketch.[1] There are Romanian settlements in North Carolina and Romanian professionals living in Durham, Buies Creek, Roanoke Rapids and other towns in the 2d district. Duke University has a Duke in Romania program, and professors and students from Romania can be found at many of our universities. Many Tar Heels have happily adopted lovely Romanian babies.

All of us in the Western World owe a debt of gratitude to the people of Romania because they provided a buffer zone which helped protect civilized Europe from the barbarians. When marauding hordes from the east threatened Europe, it was Romanians who almost alone in southeast Europe defended the west during the Middle Ages. They thus helped insulate western European civilization from destruction.

There are some 25 million Romanians living mainly in present-day Romanian and in the neighboring Republic of Moldova, formerly Bessarabia. Descending from the Dacians, one of the most ancient peoples in Europe, the Romanians have their linguistic roots in Rome (hence the name Romania), have deep cultural affinities with the west, and an unshakable admiration for America.

The country fell under the influence of the Romans almost 2,000 years ago, and the Romans gave the local population a new language, culture, and identity. When Roman soldiers withdrew from Dacia in the 3d century, the inhabitants of the country remained and survived as farmers and shepherds especially in and around the Carpathian mountain arch.

While the culture and language tied the Romanians to the west, the location of their land and the adoption of the eastern orthodox church connected them to the east.

The results of Romania's unique location and history are rich traditions and a beautiful culture. The Romanians developed an exquisite folk art, a fascinating folk music, and became one of the friendliest and most hospitable peoples in Europe. Unfortunately, the geo-political location of Romania has caused a lot of suffering for the people.

The Hungarians came to central Europe during the ninth century. They settled in current-day Hungary and began to move eastward into Transylvania, considered the cradle of the Romanian nation, between the 11th and 13th centuries.

While most Transylvanian Romanians stayed in their ancestral land, others crossed the Carpathian mountains where they met their brethren and founded Wallachia to the south around the beginning of the 14th century, and Moldova to the east in the mid-14th century. During the middle ages, these two principalities became the most important Romanian cultural and political centers. And while Moldova fortified the Dniester River to defend the country against the Tartars, Wallachia fought many wars to defend itself against the Ottoman Turks. In the end, however, both principalities had to sign special treaties with the Turks and to pay them tribute to keep their integrity.

During the late 18th and 19th centuries Tsarist Russia began to expand toward the Balkans. Claiming to liberate the christians from the Turks, the Tsars were in fact aiming at Constantinople and the Mediterranean sea. After a war against Turkey, in 1812 Russia annexed the eastern half of Moldova, which later changed hands several times between Romania and Russia.

In 1859, Wallachia and Moldova united under the name of Romania, and the country

[1] One Romanian hero, Father Calcin, who spent 16 years in Communist prisons for his religious faith is here today.

became the magnet for all Romanians. During World War I, Romania sided with her traditional friends, and fought against the central powers. In 1918, Transylvania, which at the time was annexed by Hungary, North Moldova (Bukovina) which was under Austria, and eastern Moldova (Bessarabia) which under Russia, joined with Romania. At long last, Romania became a modern nation ready to claim its place in the new Europe.

During the interwar years, Romania tried to build democracy and to modernize its economy. Nevertheless, the ascent of communism and fascism put an end to stability and hopes for a better future all over Eastern Europe. In 1940, following the Nazi-Soviet Pact, the U.S.S.R. invaded Romania and annexed again Bessarabia and for the first time northern Bukovina. One year later, Romania joined Germany and attacked Russia to reclaim its land.

At the end of the war, Romania was occupied by the Soviet Union which brought about the darkest era in the entire history of the nation. Romania with fewer native Communists than other countries suffered more than almost any other country under the Communist yoke. The full story of the misery, gulags, death and damage done by communism has not yet been reported and exposed. And most of those responsible have not yet been held accountable. Mercifully, the worst of the Communist era ended in December 1989. Many changes have followed, some of them positive and hopeful. Nevertheless, the economic, moral and spiritual damage caused by communism was staggering and will probably haunt Romanians for generations. [Now that Ceausescu's communism is gone from Romania, the only Romance-language speaking Latin country in the world remaining with a Communist dictatorship is Cuba under Castro].

Things have not been very good in Romania since the 1989 demise of the evil Ceausescu regime. The old Communists are still in power under a different name, but the country has made efforts to befriend the United States and to rejoin the West.

As one who spent 6 years of his life in Romania, as a student, research professor, USIA guide and United States Ambassador, I am a friend of the freedom-loving people who is concerned about their fate and their country's relationship with the United States. It is time to support the people of Romania. We should assist the true democrats in their efforts to democratize and privatize the country and bring the country closer to the United States and West. Democracy, stability, and prosperity in Romania would also be in America's best interests. I wish the Romanian people well and thank them for their contributions to America. May God bless the Romanian people and may God bless America, as we enter Independence Day week.

HANOI VISIT CANCELED

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

Mr. DORNAN. Madam Speaker, I come to the floor today under unprecedented circumstances. I had signed up for this special order earlier in the week, had moved to cancel it this morning, because at this moment I was supposed to be taking off from Andrews Air Force Base on a congressional delegation to Hanoi. It was a delegation led by minority Members in the other body, the U.S. Senate.

Any minute, a page, Madam Speaker, is going to bring out my passport stamped this morning with a visa by the Vietnamese section, we do not have diplomatic relations with Vietnam, with a visa to go to Hanoi on this trip. Across my visa, I have just been informed by one of my staffers who speaks Vietnamese is the word ''canceled'' and my visa was canceled by a telephone contact of a U.S. Senator, a minority Senator, who was elected to this House in 1974.

Now, I have the press waiting for me out on the grassy triangle following the press conference by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] on abuses in Communist China. I hope it goes long enough that I can finish this special order and there will still be some press waiting.

Within a few feet of where the press conference will take place is my automobile with all of my bags in it. I packed five suits and enough clothing for 5 or 6 days in Vietnam, Hanoi. I had packed only one piece of reading, McNamara's disgraceful, evil book on Vietnam and how he knew before he even sent the first Marines in there that he had no plan or strategy for victory and would be squandering lives for whatever length of time it took, and it took 5 years under him and another 5 years before we had decided we were going to desert the democracy in South Vietnam.

Here is the press release which I will read, Madam Speaker, and that I am giving to the press in a few moments out in front: ''For immediate release, June 30, 1995,'' precisely 20 years and 2 months since the Communist forces out of Hanoi conquered South Vietnam. We were unable to do for South Vietnam what we did for South Korea or France twice.

''Dornan denied visa for Vietnam. Washington, D.C. U.S. Rep. Robert K. Dornan, Republican, California, was denied a visa today by the Vietnamese Government after Senator,'' I am going to leave his name out at this moment, ''instructed the Vietnamese to deny Dornan's visa, according to Vietnamese officials at the Vietnamese interest section in Washington, D.C.''

I have just spoken to three eyewitnesses. One of them is an Air Force sergeant, an E–6, who was at the Embassy 9 o'clock this morning until 11:30, when the Senator's call intervened, a minority Senator, and this majority chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Personnel had my visa canceled. ''Dornan, chairman of the Committee on National Security Subcommittee on Military Personnel, conducted oversight hearings last Wednesday,'' 11 hours and 35 minutes of hearings, about a 30-year record, I understand, four different panels, brilliant testimony, ''on the conditions that the Clinton Administration had set for normalizing political relations based upon resolving the remaining 2,202 cases of Americans still missing in Southeast Asia. Dornan had requested to participate in the minority Senator's led delegation, traveling to Vietnam over the July 4 recess, in order to gauge the level of Vietnamese cooperation and efforts to resolve the MIA issue, to investigate human rights abuses and the severe crackdowns on the advocates of democracy in now combined North and South Vietnam,'' all of it under communism, ''and the crackdowns on religious leaders. During his Wednesday hearings, Congressman Dornan received testimony from U.S. Government officials, missing-in-action family members, former government investigators,'' and here is the passport, Madam Speaker. Thank you, Nathan, ''and a former prisoner of war which cast doubts over administrative claims, Clinton administrative claims, of superb Vietnamese communist cooperation or unprecedented Vietnamese cooperation. U.S. Government officials from the Defense Department, from the U.S. State Department admitted to Congressman Dornan's committee that the Vietnamese were continuing to hold back key documents, key records and the remains of prisoners who are known to have died in captivity. The Senator who is leading a congressional delegation to Vietnam during the July 4, recess,'' now I am quoting from the Senator's own press release carried on the Associated Press wires at this moment, ''to celebrate the 25th anniversary of this then-Hill staffer's efforts to expose the so-called tiger cages where Vietnam War,'' an old French prison out on an island in the mouth of the Saigon River, used extensively after Saigon fell, for the torture, death and abuse of people whom we had befriended and who had worked for us and trusted the world's leading democratic superpower that they would never be deserted.

They were put in these very small tiger cages years later. They are called tiger cages because they are below the ground, similar to French prisons all over their now-disappeared French colonial empire.

But, ''On Friday, Vietnamese officials in Washington informed Dornan's office that the Senator,'' the minority Senator, ''leading a single-party delegation now, because two staffers were also canceled off this trip.'' A senior staffer of the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] was denied his visa. Again, Vietnamese were forthcoming at the interference of the Senator's office, and a senior staffer of Colonel ROHRABACHER, a Marine major in the Reserve, who had been just recently put on Chairman GILMAN's staff, full chairman of International Relations, he was denied a visa. They had been going for a week. They are here on the Hill with their bags also.

I go to the back of the visa, I mean my passport, my official passport. Here is the visa, today's date, and stamped across it in three black blocks, the Vietnamese words for ''canceled,'' Da Hue, ''canceled,'' thanks to the U.S. Senator. That is what is unprecedented. Their cooperation is not unprecedented. This is an unprecedented act of treachery on this Hill. I have never heard of such a thing.

I would never deny the most liberal Member in this Chamber, even if I knew something about his personal conduct, I would not deny him coming on a balanced codel anywhere in the world at taxpayer expense.

Having given up my Fourth of July with my nine grandchildren, a tenth on the way, everybody that follows politics knows that I am running for the Presidency back in the pack.

□ 1500

This was my first real trip to New Hampshire, and when relatives of POW's and missing in action begged me to go on this trip to Hanoi to give it balance, I talked to my wife, and she said, ''Your job, my husband, is to be in Hanoi, to try and seek some honorable resolution to this, the most hurtful scandal in this Nation since the abuse of Union prisoners at Andersonville in the Civil War.''

''This is an outrage,'' said DORNAN. Yes, it is an outrage all right. Who had been asked by veterans organizations, including the executive director of the American Legion telling me to go, Carol Hrdlicka, who I have known for 30 years. Her husband was my best friend in the Air Force. I checked him out in the F–100 Super Sabre. He was the first F–105 pilot shot down in Southeast Asia in Laos. He was only TDY from McConnell Air Force Base, KS. He was shot down on May 18, 30 years ago, last month. Carol begged me to go on this trip.

Victor Pockus' sister, Delores, begged me to go in testimony in front of my committee. ''Why can't you, as a chairman, go on this Senate CODEL, Congressional delegation, to Hanoi? Please go.'' She stayed after the hearings imploring me to go.

I was rushing through visa status this morning, a visa for Garnett, William Bell, a retired full career airborne ranger, fluent in Vietnamese, that Lao language, the Thai language, who had been assigned to greet our POW's from captivity on the ramp at the airport in Hanoi when they were released. Every one of the four flights of—freedom-flights we call them—came home. Bill Bell was there in February and in March 1973.

Then years later, because of his intelligence knowledge and his language skills, he was the first chief of office in Hanoi throughout almost all of 1991, from its establishment date, through all of 1992, the missing in action and POW office in Hanoi, and the best, the most knowledgeable, chief that office has ever had.

He testified before. I asked him, ''Please call your wife who happens to be Vietnamese down in Arkansas.'' This is a loyal son of Arkansas who wore his Nation's uniform as an expert for over 20 years.

He said, ''My wife will understand. I'll have my baggage flown up here,'' and his visa was denied at the Vietnamese communist section in northwest Washington at the intervention of this same Senator's office.

I finish my press release saying:

I was asked by MIA families, Vietnamese-American constituents. I represent as many Vietnamese as anyone in this country. I used to represent more than anybody else, but, after the census I split them with the gentleman from California, DANA ROHRABACHER, who holds the seat to the west of mine. It was one of DANA ROHRABACHER's senior staffers, I repeat, a reserve marine major that was also denied a visa this morning, a few hours ago.

At this critical time, before this Congress, where we are debating normalizing relations, for this Senator to deny the chairman of the subcommittee of National Security and the chairman of an Intelligence subcommittee—I am one of only two double chairmen in the whole House, either party of course, and when I am responsible for the well-being of our service people, to deny me to opportunity to investigate the level of Vietnamese cooperation is certainly a slap in the face of all of the families of our missing in action.

DORNAN announced today that he is going to try to lead a delegation to Vietnam. Now he is going to put later in the week. It seems to be impossible. It is always up to the Vietnamese to do what they want with or without diplomatic recognition, so I will try and put something together in the August recess.

Now I want to tell my colleagues a story so that I can strictly follow House rules and not upset our three parliamentarians, honorable men, all of them; one of them an Air Force Academy graduate. I will refrain again from using the name of the said Senator, but here is the article from ''Life'' magazine where he violated House rules and used Government film, and I checked it again with an honorable Member, the minority, who is a two-star general in the reserve and who repeated his words to me of 20 years ago.

Should I have gotten in a fist fight with this hill staffer who was elected to Congress 2 years later to take back the Government film that he had shot with a Government camera and that he sold to ''Life'' magazine for about $25,000, funding his victorious Watergate baby face in 1974?

Here is the ''Life'' article, July 17, 1970. How they unearth the tiger cages. There is his rather handsome face, a ex-naval officer and, like me, a fighter pilot who straddled a J–57 Pratt-Whitney engine. Like me, because we are the exact same age, peacetime pilots. Eisenhower was our commander in chief when this Senator and I were on active duty, so we never were in combat, although I flew 14 missions as a journalist. He never flew one. But he told tall stories to Dave Broder. It is in Dave Broder's book that he flew combat patrols in Vietnam, and, when nailed for lying during his Presidential race at one point in history, he said all fighter pilots exaggerate and lie.

No, we do not.

So, here are the pictures, the infamous tiger cages in 1970. Looks like military barracks to me. All right; there is one of the below-ground prisons. You know what we held in there? Terrorists who had tried to kill the Secretary of State of the United States who had blown up a restaurant. Remember that cover of ''Life'' magazine? Everybody coming across the little gangway bridge to the Saigon River restaurant, blood dripping off them, looking for all the world like Oklahoma City. That was a bomb attempt to kill the Secretary of Defense of the United States. They caught the man who set that bomb. They executed him. Compatriots went to prison, and Jane Fonda named her son after the captured assassin who was executed, Troy, T-r-o-i. That is Jane Fonda's oldest son.

U.S. adviser, you have no right to interfere.

This was a big congressional delegation. Some of the Members whose predecessors were on this trip told me about them. Never a word by this member about the killing fields in Cambodia, 2 million people killed. Never a word about the 68,000 people who were executed by death lists. He probably does not believe it. Never a word about——

He is in the air right now, climbing out over Virginia, heading for Hickam Air Force Base, HI, and then Guam, and then into Hanoi, a total one-sided delegation with two key House staffers stripped of their visas and a chairman of a military personnel subcommittee. Unbelievable.

I will not put this in the RECORD because it may give the House a problem, but I sure want people to go to their local libraries and read this article of July 17, 1970.

Now, Madam Speaker and our excellent parliamentarians, let me use a Jonathan Swiftian style here. The canon of St. Patrick's Cathedral in Dublin, Ireland under an oppressive British Government, Protestant Irishman who wrote ''Gulliver's Travels'' and always used metaphors in a stylized way of getting his political points across, one of the modern fathers of political satire, and a Swiftian style that was used very well by CYNTHIA MCKINNEY of Georgia, one of our more eloquent lady Members, or Members of either gender, she quoted ''Animal Farm'' once to get at our Speaker's lucrative prior book contract before he very honorably, because he is an honorable man, canceled it all for a dollar.

But I told CYNTHIA, ''Very clever to use 'Animal Farm' to describe this place so the parliamentarians couldn't gavel her down as Mrs. MEEK'S, CARRIE MEEK'S, had been gaveled down a few days before.''

So in the style of Jonathan Swift of the 1700's and in the style of Mrs. MCKINNEY of Georgia, let me use a series of supposes:

Suppose you had a House Member who came using money from ''Life'' magazine to this Chamber by selling Government-owned film because a senior Member and a hero of the crusade in Europe under General Eisenhower was not willing to get in a fist fight with him to get the film back; suppose that Member came here and was a key man to cut off not only military aid to the struggling—flawed, yes, but not as flawed as the Communist government. When I left Saigon in August 1972, there were 44 newspapers. To this day there is only one Communist paper. That is what happens when Communists win.

Oh, to be sure, there was corruption, as we have had corruption in our Government here from the Teapot Dome scandal, to Watergate, to Whitewater. We have had scandals in our governments here in this country. It is hard for us to point fingers at emerging democracies given our background of slavery.

So, this new Member—suppose a new Member came here and worked to cut off the economic aid with a Senator from California who is long gone, who left in a cloud of controversy and scandal, corrupting money and politics. Suppose this Member cut off all aid and cheered when, quote, Saigon fell, unquote.

Suppose when I got here 2 years later I came to this very lectern and talked about an honorable retired Marine who worked for the CIA who was caught in Saigon April 30, 1975, was taken to the Saigon jail and tortured for a year.

I went to his funeral in Arlington when his remains were returned. His name was Tucker Gugerman.

Suppose I came to this well, did a tribute to Tucker Gugerman and talked about how there was a live American in Saigon prison when they were—when they were shutting down—when they were shutting down the POW–MIA committee with a half a million dollar budget—shut down in December 1976. This man was being tortured to death, his screams could be heard all throughout Saigon jail, and I told his story here.

I went to Hawaii in middle 1977, my freshman year, with Congressman ''SONNY'' MONTGOMERY. We picked up the first small boxes of our heroes' remains, watched these boxes opened up at the central investigative laboratory on the western edge of Hickam Air Force Base. I watched Tucker Gugerman's box opened up, CIA, ex-U.S. Marine. It has not been touched. He had not even unpacked. Yes, he went back to get his fiancee out. He was already home free in Bangkok, and here was $265 and some change. I remember that figure. Here was his trench coat fresh from the cleaners, all of his civilian clothes all pressed neatly, all kept in a box with his bones. When his bones were analyzed, the signs of torture were so bad that some of the bones were damaged. It is hard to tell when the flesh has been tortured and you have been tortured to death if the bones are not broken.

And I came to the well and told that story, and suppose a U.S. Congressman who had been a naval officer rushed to that lectern and said in so many words he got what he deserved because he went back chasing a girlfriend. That is why he went back into Saigon after the Communists take over.

And suppose I had a confrontation at that desk right there and said, ''Your naval officers' white uniform is covered with the blood of these MIA's.''

Suppose that man had been on that 10-member select committee that turned back over $200,000 and shut down in December 1976, 3 weeks before I raised my hand at that desk and took the oath of office planning on doing something to the best of my ability to find out why we left live Americans behind in Laos?

Suppose during the Sandinista debate the Communist Sandinistas, who were running 16 concentration camps—suppose a Member came to that lectern and said the Communist Sandinistas—he would not have called them Communists—were the moral equivalent of the Boy Scouts of America and then would begin to rattle off the Boy Scout attributes: kind, obedient, gentle, trustworthy, and then his memory broke down and he could not remember the other attributes of a Boy Scout.

Suppose I, together with DAN BURTON, caught a Congressman down in Nicaragua who had an Air Force airplane at your tax expense, all by himself with an Air Force crew of three, a C–121 Learjet, all by himself, and was going in to meet with the Ortega brothers, and suppose I were to tell you that DAN BURTON of Indiana said, taking the Lord's name in vain understandably, you are not going into that blankeddy-blank place without Congressman DORNAN and Me, or I am going back to the States, and having a press conference, telling the world that you are licking the boots of these communist killers down here.

And suppose this congressman said, ''All right,'' by then a Senator—''all right, you can come with us.'' and then told the Vietnamese—excuse me, Freudian, told the Nicaraguan Communists, ''Don't let Congressman DORNAN and Congressman BURTON come into our briefing. You deny them, and I will pretend I want them in.''

And then suppose I told you that a Communist official with no accent, bilingual, raised in San Francisco, named Robert Vargas, came out and told me, ''We wanted you to come in. It was the Senator who didn't want to you guys in there. We don't care if you come in. It's always your Members who come in and tell us to block the State Department people.''

And suppose I told you that our intelligence people were able to listen to conversations inside the Communist headquarters in Nicaragua, and suppose I were to tell you, Madam Speaker and Mr. Parliamentarians, that I have read the transcripts of what some sitting Members here and this former Member now—supposedly a Senator talked over with Daniel Ortega and Humberto Ortega, who were running 16 reeducation camps, euphemism for concentration camps.

□ 1515

Suppose I told you I read those transcripts and suppose I told you that if we had had a declared war in Central America, which we did not, which we did not in Korea and did not in Vietnam, that it would have constituted high treason.

Suppose I told you that a former Member on this side who became a Secretary of Defense and a former Member on this side who is now chairman of one of our most important, key committees here filed charges to investigate violation of security oaths by some of the highest ranking people in this place down to some other people who had been here and were serving in other bodies.

Suppose I told you there has been a pattern of such treachery by some Members here that three Members of the minority party this morning in this aisle, in those seats on this side of this aisle told me that this Member was flat out a pro-Communist Marxist and the best thing that ever happened to this Chamber was that he is gone from here.

Suppose I told you that that was the truth and I was willing to polygraph on it.

Suppose I told you that you taxpayers and you, too, Madam Speaker and the parliamentarians who all pay taxes, suppose I told you that on the Fourth of July that I was willing to give up there is going to be drinking and embracing and celebrating of the Communist victory over poor pathetic South Vietnam, 68,000 people executed, some of them for only typing on American GSA-supplied typewriters and believing in us.

Suppose I told you that there is going to be a celebration in Saigon, and it will be Saigon some day again, just like Leningrad is St. Petersburg and Stalingrad is Volgagrad, some day it will be Saigon again, it will not be Ho Chi Minh City forever, as soon as the bamboo wall falls like the Berlin wall in North Korea, the palm-covered prison of Cuba goes free, some day China will go free, thanks to the efforts of people here like NANCY PELOSI, we will see these remaining four Communist countries in our lifetime, shortly now, within 10 or 15 years, they will all be free. You cannot stop democracy now and liberty, it is on the rise.

Suppose I told you everything that I have just said is true and that there is such a Member, that his own colleagues call him Marxist. And suppose I told you at taxpayers' expense, with honorable Air Force officers and enlisted men carrying luggage, is going to celebrate meeting with General Giap and with the so-called liberated prisoners from the tiger cages with much drinking and celebrating and hugging. That is like Tom Hayden and Jane Fonda arriving at the airport during the war. Again, if there was a declaration of war, do you think she would not have been tried for treason? What does constitute aid to the enemy? Comfort to the enemy? What is an enemy without a declared war? What is aid and comfort to the enemy? Is it leading a demonstration in a foreign country? Is it traveling to a so-called peace banquet in Moscow at the height of the war during one of the bloodiest periods of the war? Is it what McNamara did, resigning on leap year day, February 29, 1968, the single bloodiest month of the entire conflict? Does that constitute treason to say you are killing thousands of Americans and it just was not worth it and then to have other people say they were vindicated by this poisonous book that has ripped open the hearts and the memories of mothers and fathers now in their 70's and 80's and widows who have never remarried and children who are now in their 30's that were little 8-year-old children when the war ended, like Colleen Shine who testified so heartbreakingly in front of my committee on Wednesday?

My colleagues, obviously everything I am telling you is not McKinneyish; it is not Jonathan Swiftian. It is fact. I feel like Mount Saint Helens on May 17, 1980, the day before the big explosion.

I am going to get justice here. I am going to get justice for all the Vietnamese who were tortured to death in those so-called reeducation concentration camps. I am not going to forget our noble cause, as Ronald Reagan called it, to keep South Vietnam as free as South Korea, flawed but much better than a Communist tyranny.

I got an urgent release that the press conference has started without me out on the grassy triangle. I want to close by thanking the staff again. I have done this as much as anybody I guess, but you folks are the greatest to stay all night and take us through 38 votes in 3 days, amazing. It will be back to this well. I am going to seek justice.

I will tell you this: This ex-member here, now a Senator, is from a Bible Belt State. The first State through a caucus probably that will probably pick the next President of the United States. I am back in the pack. I know who will win in Iowa on Lincoln's birthday in 1996, this coming February.

I will tell you, if you are from Iowa, you know most of this material. I cannot believe what you have sent to represent your country. I hope you enjoy your Fourth of July in Iowa and New Hampshire, because you are going to have U.S. Senators and, God forbid, the three House Members from the minority, one of them a distinguished Army captain from the D-Day period. I hope they are not toasting the terrorists and the Communist victors who brought such human rights abuse and grief to all of Southeast Asia, including Cambodia and Laos. Including Laos, where I swear to you on my honor we left live Americans behind. Three by name: Gene DeBruin, CIA; my best friend, David Hrdlicka, U.S. Air Force; Charlie Shelton, shot down on his 33d birthday, April 29, 1965, a prisoner of war, so declared until a few months ago, last prisoner of war, prisoner of war moved to presumptive finding of death without a shred of evidence. I guess I go to my grave and, if I live as long as my father at 84, that is going to be 22 more years of trying to find justice for what we tried to do in Vietnam.

I tell you now that Adm. Tom Moore is correct when he called Robert Strange McNamara a war criminal. I do not have to treat him with kid gloves, because he has never been elected to anything in his life and is not a member of this or the other body or ever has been.

I tell you that the greatest military writer extant today, Col. Harry Summers is correct when he called Robert Strange McNamara ''raw evil.'' The only person, with all the mistakes, he even criticized the great West Pointer General Westmoreland, but he said they all made mistakes of judgment. He said McNamara was raw evil.

When a commander in chief, who avoided the draft three times, I am not using the word ''dodged'' although that is in my heart, who avoided the draft three times and had his draft induction day, July 28, 1969, politically suppressed, when a person like that who loses 19 rangers in Somalia without their gunships or one lousy tank, when he had four tanks at Waco, two Abrams, two Bradleys, when a person like that says he is vindicated by a war criminal, what does that make that person?

I am going to go over with the parliamentarians how I can recoup my honor from January 25 of this year, when I used the expression ''aid and comfort to the enemy.'' I know it is in the Constitution. I know there is a technicality when war is not declared. But I am going to discuss every dictionary definition, British and American, of aid, of comfort and of what constitutes an enemy.

I will be back to relive that moment. And if the parliamentarians, who we were nice enough to hold over from the Democratic 40 years, rule against me, I will appeal the ruling of the Chair. And if I do not win a vote from my side of the Chamber, the majority, as a double chairman, I will resign from this Congress on the spot, if I do not win a vote from my own colleagues on appealing the ruling of the Chair.

When I tell you that Clinton gave aid and comfort to the enemy in Hanoi by his Moscow trip and his demonstrations in London, where they were called the fall offensive, so named by the same Communists in Hanoi that will be toasting Americans today——

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. MORELLA). The Chair would caution the Member to be very cautious of any statements about the President of the United States.

Mr. DORNAN. Thank you, Madam Speaker. I know I am pushing the envelope, but then I used to fly supersonically. I will revisit this floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would like to also point out for the RECORD something that the Representative does know, just to remind him, that personal references to Members of the other body, even though not mentioned by name, when it is very clear to whom the references are made, should be avoided, and this is something that had been mentioned on February 23, 1994, by the Chair.

ASSAULT ON THE VOTING RIGHTS ACT

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

Mr. OWENS. Madam Speaker, yesterday the Supreme Court began the process of dismantling the Voting Rights Act. I think it is very important to note, however, that in that process it was a 5-to-4 decision. All hope is not lost. Since it was a 5-to-4 decision, I urge all Americans to take a close look at the issue from the point of view of Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg, who offered a brilliant dissent from the majority opinion.

It is very important that we understand what Ginsburg is saying. The hope for the future lies in the following of the line of reasoning laid down by Justice Ginsburg. This decision will not stand like many other misguided Supreme Court decisions. One day we expect it to be overturned. But it is here now. It is most unfortunate. It is a very serious matter at this point.

Even with the decision of yesterday still alone, it would be a serious matter because, after all, it goes to the heart of the civil rights progress over the last 20 years. It deals with voting. It deals with representation. The Voting Rights Act has been a huge success. The Voting Rights Act by any measure has been a huge success all over the Nation at every level, whether you are talking about municipal offices or State offices, school boards, certainly at the level of Congress, representation under the Voting Rights Act has greatly increased for people of African descent, for people of Latino descent and for some other minorities also.

It has been a great success in the Congress. We now have 40 persons of African descent. If we had a numerical formula of the 435 people in Congress, if you had a numerical formula that every group should be represented in proportion to its size in the population, and we do not have such a formula, I am not asking for such a formula, but if you had such a formula, the African American population is approximately 13 percent of the 260 million Americans; 33 million people. So the 13 percent would not be, if you had 13 percent, you would have a little more than 40. Ten percent would give you 43, of course; maybe 44, but 40 is pretty close. The act has accomplished its purpose. It goes a long way in the direction of accomplishing its purpose toward giving representation which reflects the population.

So it is a serious matter to begin to roll this act backwards. Yesterday, of course, it should be remembered, the Supreme Court did not throw out the Voting Rights Act. The Voting Rights Act is not nullified. The Voting Rights Act has not been declared unconstitutional. The Voting Rights Act has been merely handicapped, strangled a little bit; the process of strangling has begun. But it is not dead. It is not destroyed.

I will talk more about that in a few minutes. If the decision with respect to the Voting Rights Act had come along, it would be serious enough, but the Supreme Court also moved on matters related to race and civil rights in this particular session to strike down the setaside contracts that the Federal Government has sponsored in the Adarand decision. The Supreme Court also backed away from school integration in a case that was also passed on.

□ 1530

The direction is to declare that the 14th amendment, the 14th amendment is for the purpose of establishing a color blind society. The 14th amendment may have that as one of its purposes, but the 14th amendment first of all, most important of all, is an amendment which was designed to bring the newly freed slaves into the mainstream of American society legally.

The 14th amendment was developed at the end of the Civil War, after the Emancipation Proclamation. There is no question, it is very crystal clear what the first intent of the 14th amendment was. The first and the most important intent of the 14th amendment was to deal with the fact that legal status as citizens must be assigned and given to the newly freed slaves. That was the one clear intent from the very beginning.

If we expand that to cover other minorities, if we expand that to cover other groups that are discriminated against, there is nothing wrong with that, of course. Interpretation can be so much broader. However, the first and most important purpose of the 14th amendment was to make it clear once and for all, in the Constitution of America, that all of the ex-slaves were to be considered as full citizens of the United States of America.

What was the history of the Constitution before the 14th amendment? Before the 14th amendment, the Constitution was not silent on slavery. The Constitution was not silent on slavery. Unfortunately, the Constitution stated earlier that in counting for representation in the House of Representatives, slaves in the States would be considered three-fifths of a man, male slaves, of course, would be considered three-fifths of a man. After all, women did not have the right to vote, whether they were free or slave. Each male slave would be considered three-fifths of a man. That is in the Constitution.

The Constitution spoke again in the 14th amendment and made it clear that nobody should be considered anything other than a full-fledged citizen. It was done by the same people who had fought slavery. The spirit of the abolitionist was on the floor of the House of Representatives, so it is crystal clear what the first and most important intent of the 14th amendment was. The misinterpretation of the 14th amendment is at the heart of what went wrong with the Supreme Court. Justice Ginsberg clearly understands that. The other Justices choose not to understand it.

Mr. Speaker, I have been on the floor before and I have talked about the need for a truth commission. The whole dark period of slavery in the history of America has been pretty much ignored. In the textbooks, nobody wants to talk about such unpleasant things. However, slavery existed in the United States of America for 232 years. People chose to call slavery the peculiar institution. It was not an institution. Slavery was a criminal industry. Slavery was a criminal industry. Slavery was designed to exact as much labor from human beings as possible.

Some people have compared 232 years of slavery with the holocaust perpetrated by Hitler. I do not think that is an appropriate comparison. We do not need to borrow words like that. We are to give a clear designation to what happened in slavery. Slavery was an attempt to obliterate, obliterate the soul and the humanity of the African-Americans who were transported here against their will. They wanted to obliterate their souls, they wanted to obliterate their humanity, in order to make them more efficient beasts of burden, in order to make them work better, harder, and derive more profits from their work. That is what slavery was all about.

I think we need a truth commission to make the story of slavery known to all Americans. We have glossed over it. We cannot have a Nation exist in a healthy state that chooses to ignore a segment of its history that went on for 232 years. Unless we come to grips with recognizing what slavery was all about, we are always going to be making the kinds of mistakes that the Supreme Court makes in its interpretation of the 14th amendment. We need a truth commission. South Africa has a truth commission that is set up. In Haiti they are talking about setting up a truth commission.

Horrible things happened in South Africa. South Africa was a situation where the minority population, minority white population, almost enslaved but later on forced into second class citizenship the majority black population, so South Africa, in order to move ahead, in order to progress, refused to try to punish the people who were responsible for the crimes during the era of apartheid. Instead of trying to punish them, they are trying to seek reconciliation. The process of reconciliation is being driven by a truth commission.

They said, ''We cannot punish everybody. If we tried to punish everybody, we would probably end up devoting resources that would be badly needed to build the country.'' If we tried to punish everybody, we would probably inflame situations among groups and individuals which would only lead to more violence. It would only make it more difficult for the country to come together, so we do not want to try to punish. We do not want justice. We cannot afford justice.

What the South Africans have said is that reconciliation is more important than justice. They have gone forward. However, they said we do want the truth known. We are not going to go forward as a nation unless we have a commission that goes back and examines the crimes that were committed, and tells the story. They will name names, but nobody named, nobody found in the telling of the story to be guilty of a crime, will be punished, no matter how heinous the crime is. If it took place during the period before the new constitution came into effect, they will not punish anybody. They have decided that vengeance belongs to God. Probably only God is powerful enough to really take vengeance. It would destroy their nation if they sought justice. Reconciliation becomes more important than justice in South Africa.

The same pattern has been reproduced in Haiti. The Haitians have decided they do not have enough jails, they do not have enough courts. They cannot pursue the people responsible for 5,000 murders over the last 3 years. They cannot pursue, except to a limited extent, the people who perpetrated the crimes that were so heinous during the period of time that Jean-Bertrand Aristide was kicked out of Haiti and had to remain in exile here in the United States. They do not want to destroy their nation by using their resources to seek justice. They do not have the capacity to seek justice. They chose reconciliation, instead, because it is the only positive way to go.

However, they wanted a truth commission. They want the story told.

They want it known who did these terrible deeds, who was responsible for those awful murders and mutilations. They want this truth to be known. They will not punish anybody, but they want the truth to be known.

The United States of America needs a truth commission about slavery, about slavery and the implications of slavery for the African-American population of this Nation. The truth should be told; a full commission to look at the whole 232 years, and also to examine the 100 years after the 232 years, where slavery was followed by an oppressive effort to keep the descendants of the slaves from enjoying full citizenship; the lynchings, the murders, the systematic denial of due process.

There were laws on the books which denied the right to vote. There were laws on the books which made it clear that they did not want African-Americans to have the right to have a trade, to be able to earn a living as a carpenter, as a contractor, as a person who had a trade that they could use. They could not get licenses. They had to work for somebody else. On and on it goes. It all needs to be examined. When we are talking about affirmative action and voting rights and the necessity for special situations, we need to know the background. We need a truth commission that establishes that.

The consequences of the Supreme Court's misguided decision are great, as I said before. The Supreme Court, on the surface it sounds like common sense, of course, would dictate that, of course, America is a color blind society, and the 14th amendment for equal protection would tell you that nobody, nobody should be given any special consideration.

Common sense dictated the Dred Scott decision, the Dred Scott decision. Common sense dictated the Plessy versus Ferguson decision, which said separate but equal schools is all you need to guarantee that there is equal protection. The Plessy versus Ferguson decision endured for many years before common sense was subordinated to an interpretation of the law which clearly established the fact that you cannot have separate but equal. The very fact that they are separate means one of the two parties will not be equal. Therefore, the common sense that appears to be so obvious to certain commentators on the radio, on television, it is obvious that they could reach no other conclusion. Common sense.

Read Justice Ginsburg's decision and learn about common sense as interpreted by another scholar, by another person who is on the Supreme Court. You will find common sense is not so obvious. There are consequences that are immediate for the African-American community. The consequences are great, indeed.

The consequences of this decision by the Supreme Court mean there will be litigation. Already a district has been challenged in New York State, in New York City. The gentlewoman from New York City, New York, NYDIA VELÁZQUEZ, her district is being challenged, and of course there will be litigation connected with that.

If any district in any part of the country is ordered to redraw its lines, of course it affects all the other districts that are nearby, so in Georgia, you will have all the districts in Georgia affected by the decision yesterday with respect to the 11th Congressional District in Georgia. In New York, if any one of the districts in downstate New York are affected, all of the districts will be impacted. They have to be redrawn.

The consequences will be great. The consequences will be great in terms of political terms, partisan political terms, because it allows a situation for a great deal of mischief. The Supreme Court has said that politics is war without blood. If politics is war without blood, then no general will pass up an opportunity to take advantage of whatever situation opens up, so the generals in the Republican Party will take advantage.

All kinds of things are about to happen in the African-American community. We have always enjoyed certain kinds of privileges in terms of certain groups have never been very popular. The public has never supported certain parties. Therefore, you can expect that people who think one way will not declare themselves to belong to a certain party, or they will not declare themselves to be conservative or to be in favor of certain kinds of policies which are detrimental to the masses of people that they represent in a given congressional district.

We can expect more subterfuge. We can expect Edridge Ames types in the political arena, pretending that they are in favor of certain kinds of policies, but using the unsettled situation to take advantage of it, and running candidates in the primary as well as in the general election; all kinds of scenarios will be unleashed as a result of this tampering with the Voting Rights Act.

There is a great challenge to the black leadership that is being set forth here. The Voting Rights Act brings it home, makes it crystal clear, that there is a state of emergency in the black community. In the African-American community there is a state of emergency. I have said this several times before on the floor of this House. The state of emergency now should be clear to everybody everywhere in the African-American community.

The state of emergency relates to the attack on affirmative action, the attack on the Voting Rights Act, the attack on school integration. Those are minor compared to the attack on the poor population of the African-American communities. African-Americans still are predominantly poor. Sixty percent of African-Americans in the United States of America could be classified as poor.

There is another marginal group that if they miss one paycheck at their job, they will fall into the poverty category, also, so poverty and the consequences of poverty are experienced regularly by an African-American community that came out of slavery after 232 years of slavery, and found no help, no Marshall Plan. The Freedmen's Bureau that was set up was a tiny little operation for a few years, but no effort was made to help millions of people in a transition from slavery to full citizenship, so the consequences of that have come down from one generation to another. It is not surprising that they are poor.

The economic consequences have generated other problems. When people have decent incomes, they can take care of most of their own problems. When people have decent incomes they do not need welfare, public housing. When people have decent incomes, they can take care of their family problems to a greater degree.

Every family has problems: middle class, the rich, working class, poor. Everybody has problems. However, what gives the middle class and the rich great advantages is they have money that can help to deal with their problems, and they do not have to have their problems become public, a public consideration.

The black community does not have that. Large amounts, the great, predominant percentage of the African-American community are poor. There is a book that was written in the 1930's called Black Bourgeoisie, by E. Franklin Frazer. For many years this was a textbook for black college students and black leaders. Everybody had to read it, the Black Bourgeoisie. It was a scathing criticism of the mores and values of the emerging black middle class. It talked about how they were preoccupied totally with themselves, preoccupied totally with their own concerns, and they engaged in activities which were unproductive. They spent large amounts of money on consumer products in an attempt to demonstrate that they were affluent.

A number of criticisms were made, and sometimes, perhaps, maybe they were too harsh. The black bourgeoisie emerging out of the 1930's needs to be congratulated. Things were so difficult, there were so many obstacles and so many rules. You could not become, as I said before, an electrician, a plasterer. You could not be a contractor. Those people who were able to make some headway against all the oppression and all the roadblocks, they deserve credit for being able to economically improve themselves, no matter what problems they had.

□ 1545

If they were not generous and they were not magnanimous in reaching out to their communities and providing leadership, then they can be forgiven to some degree.

There was a new effort that started with Martin Luther King, however. In the 1960's, the middle class provided

the leadership which reached out to the masses of African-Americans and said, ''We are all in this boat together, we all have these problems, and we are going to join to wage an assault to obtain our civil rights.''

The spirit of the 1960's and the spirit of Martin Luther King that went forward was a spirit that was cradled, nurtured by the black middle class, the African-American middle class, the so-called black bourgeoisie, you might say, if you want to stay with the terminology of E. Franklin Frazier. That black bourgeoisie provided magnanimous, generous, courageous leadership in the fight to get the Voting Rights Act, to get the school integration, to end employment discrimination, to get affirmative action. They are to be applauded.

They came in large numbers to the Congress. It was clear that the congresspeople who came here and were parts of the Black Caucus were graduates from a movement that cared about the majority of African-Americans.

The danger with this present situation, one of the dangers that we will have to deal with is the fact that there will be Benedict Armolds in great numbers. There will be large numbers of people who will masquerade as being concerned about the masses, but they will take advantage of the situation.

We may have an elected black bourgeoisie that cares only about itself, only about the deals that they can make, only about their own status, and deceives the great masses. We have a possibility of large numbers of Judas men and Judas women, betraying, deceiving. That is one of the consequences of the process that has been set in motion, the domino, rolling, in respect to the Voting Rights Act, an unsettling number of situations, making it possible for opportunists to come in.

Let me go back to the very beginning, the Supreme Court decision that set in motion all of this. I said the Supreme Court decision began the process of dismantling the Voting Rights Act. It was a continuum of an assault on civil rights legislation, civil rights laws. By itself it is dangerous enough, but in that context it is even more dangerous.

We should think very seriously about what is taking place. I think God must spend many days weeping when He observes the United States of America. God must spend many days weeping when He observes that He has given so much to this land of plenty, beautiful and spacious skies, law and order for long periods of time, no great war to devastate our cities and destroy our countryside, prosperty.

We are the richest Nation that ever existed on the face of the Earth, and the riches have not ceased. Profits are being made on Wall Street, profits are being made by corporations at a greater rate than ever before. People with jobs and wage earners are not benefiting from that. There is no correlation anymore, no association between the profits made by corporations and the welfare benefits received by the working people of America.

They are downsizing and taking away jobs at the same time they are making big profits. Automation, computerization, a number of things allow them to make big profits, increase their investments, increase their activities, produce more products, while at the same time they reduce the number of jobs.

There is a problem there, but in general this is still the richest Nation in the history of the world. The Fortune 500 corporations, most of them have budgets greater than most of the nations of the world. Unparalleled wealth. Never before did such wealth exist.

God must spend a lot of time weeping when He looks at all of this that He has bestowed on the United States Of America and then look at the pettiness that is driving many of our political activities, the pettiness which makes affirmative action a critical problem. Affirmative action is not a critical problem.

Affirmative actions has not resulted in any great movement of African-Americans anywhere. They are not in large numbers in the boardrooms of corporations. They are not in large numbers, I assure you, in the top executive suites. They are not in large numbers, or any credible number, in the management structures after all these years of affirmative action, less than 30 years of affirmative action.

When you look at the statistics, it is appalling how little has been accomplished for the people who were supposed to be the first beneficiaries. Going back again to the first intent of the 14th amendment, the first affirmative action programs were designed and fashioned to deal with the descendants of slaves, to deal with the situation of righting past wrongs. But what has been accomplished? There has been no great move forward.

Consider the shoeshine boys when you go through the airports and places where people are prosperous and they pay a lot for a shoeshine. There was a time when a shoeshine boy was a stereotype and people though most of the shoeshine boys in the country were black, black men, black boys. The shoeshine boy was a subject of humor or subject of ridicule.

But when you travel from now on, look at the shoeshine attendants in the airports. When you go to a fancy club where they are paying $3 for a regular shine and $5 for an executive shine, which means if you can do 4 shines per hour, for $3 a shine, you can make $12 an hour; for $5 a shine, you can make $20 an hour. That is not a bad pay.

When it was 35 cents per shine and 5 cents per shine and even $1 a shine, most of the shine boys and the shine men were African-American, people of African descent. But if you look now, do your own survey and you will see that not only have we not made it to the boardrooms of corporations, not only have African-Americans not made it to the executive suites, not only have African-Americans not made it to middle management, but they are declining even in the area of the shoeshine industry, because as the benefits of the industry go up, the wages go up, other people have displaced the African-Americans.

Take a look for yourself and you will see a most interesting phenomenon. If you look at waiters in hotels, it used to be predominantly expected, especially in the South, the waiters were predominantly African-American waiters, but as the standard of living has risen and the wages of the waiters have risen, you find fewer and fewer African-American waiters in the hotels.

Not only are we not in the boardrooms and the executive suites, we have not held on to the waiting jobs, waiting tables in hotels and restaurants. Take a look for yourself. Do your own survey.

Unfortunately, ladies and gentlemen, even in the professions where the black middle class has striven so consciously to try to move, there was a time when 5 percent of the teachers in America were black, were African-Americans. The percentage of teachers who are African-American has gone down. The percentage of law enforcement personnel, policemen, who are African-American has gone down. The percentage of doctors who are African-American has gone down in the last 20 years.

Not only is affirmative action not succeeding in the industrial sector, in the corporate sector, in the areas that were targeted, overall black employment, blacks climbing up the ladder in terms of wealth, in terms of responsibility in industry or in academia, it has decreased and declined.

God must be very upset and spend a lot of days weeping when He looks at so little having been done for those who need help most, and sees the outrage, and the amount of energy and effort being poured into criticism of affirmative action and criticism of those tiny, very tiny gains that have been made. As I said before, many of the gains have turned into losses.

God must spend a lot of days weeping when He sees that so much has been given to the United States of America and they behave in such petty ways. We have a history of being a country that I am sure God must appreciate a great deal and the world must appreciate a great deal.

We have been celebrating 50 years after World War II. As I watch the documentaries and get educated in greater detail than ever before about what went on in World War II, I am sure the whole world applauds the courage and the generosity, the lack of selfishness of Americans the men who died in Normandy on D-Day or the men who stormed Iwo Jima; Okinawa. All of that kind of courage and that kind of

going forward to save the world from totalitarianism and Naziism and tyranny, I am sure God must applaud a great deal.

But here we are at a point where peace reigns basically, and instead of moving on to build a new society, a society where the wealth of this great Nation can be shared, where the wealth can be used to take care of the needs of everybody, instead of moving in that direction, we have chosen to move in the opposite direction and to hunker down and begin to hoard the benefits and hoard the wealth, and begin to throw overboard a certain segment of society and say, ''We don't care what happens to them. We don't really care.''

As I said before, God must spend a lot of days looking at all this and be very upset that we are so petty and moving in such a negative direction so rapidly.

But all hope is not lost, because there are great things happening all over the world. The accumulation of all these great things may begin to have an impact on what is happening here in this country.

Even in this country, the Southern Baptist Church last week apologized for their position on slavery, the Southern Baptist Church, which was created as a result of a schism at the time of the Civil War. The big issue in the Southern Baptist Church was that they wanted to label African-Americans, Negroes, as being less than human and not worthy of God's blessings, that they were not to be considered in the Christian church as equals.

They apologized. The Southern Baptists apologized. They voted, large number of delegates, to apologize and to take note of the fact that the evils that were generated by slavery still exist and they must work to eradicate them. The Southern Baptists did that.

Some people say, well, their membership is declining. There is some ulterior motive. I do not care. They did it. For one glorious moment, they rose to the occasion and they admitted that they wanted to tell the truth, they wanted to be a part of the truth, they wanted to get away from the doctrine of obliteration. The doctrine of obliteration said that the African-American, the African transported here, was not a human being, and therefore they could be made beasts of burden, more efficient beasts of burden, by treating them like beasts. The Southern Baptists represent just one of those many areas where there is hope.

There is hope in the Supreme Court, too, when Ruth Bader Ginsburg writes the decision of the kind that she wrote. Justice Ginsburg took just the opposite approach of Justice Kennedy, who wrote the decision for the majority. Justice Kennedy based his ruling on the Shaw versus Reno case. I think the majority opinion for that was written by Justice O'Connor, with Justice Clarence Thomas, of course, supporting it in great measure.

Justice Ginsburg says that it is not common sense. It is not obvious to her, as the law is made and the intent of the constitutional amendment is examined, it is not at all clear to her that the 14th amendment is primarily concerned with being colorblind and not concerned with remedying past wrongs, which the full legal integration of the African-Americans, the former salves and their descendants into American life.

Let me must read a few excerpts from Justice Ginsburg's dissenting opinion. As you know, it was a 5–4 decision, and Justice Ginsburg was joined in her dissent by Justices Stevens, Bryant and Souter.

> Legislative districting is highly political business. This Court has generally respected the competence of state legislatures to attend to the task. When race is the issue, however, we have recognized the need for judicial intervention to prevent dilution of minority voting strength.

□ 1600

> Generations of white discrimination against African-Americans as citizens and voters account for that surveillance.

In other words, what she is saying is that we have generally kept our hands off, the judiciary has kept its hands off the reapportionment process.

There was a series of cases that established clearly that it was better to leave it to the State legislature and the only regular, systematic intervention of the courts came with the Voting Rights Act for the purpose of dealing with the problem of giving African-Americans their full voting rights and avoiding the dilution of the voting strength of minorities.

I go back to Justice Ginsburg's dissent, and I quote:

> Two years ago in Shaw versus Reno this Court took up a claim analytically distinct from a vote-dilution claim. Shaw authorized judicial intervention in extremely irregular apportionments.

In other words she is saying that we started something 2 years ago when we considered the North Carolina case, Shaw versus Reno. For the first time we moved away from the voter-dilution concern of the Court and we moved into a new era. We moved into an area where extremely irregular apportionments, the way the district looked, or the circumstances under which the district was created, became a concern of the Court. And she does not agree, of course, that that movement was justified.

To continue quoting Justice Ginsburg:

> Today the Court expands the judicial role announcing that Federal courts are to undertake searching review of any district with contours predominantly motivated by race. Strict scrutiny will be triggered not only when traditional districting practices are abandoned, but also when those practices are subordinated to, given less weight, than race.
>
> Applying this new ''race-as-predominant-factor'' standard, the Court invalidates Georgia's districting plan, even though Georgia's Eleventh District, the focus of today's dispute, bears the imprint of familiar districting practices. Because I do not endorse the Court's new standard and would not upset Georgia's plan, I dissent.

Continuing to quote Justice Ginsburg:

> At the outset it may be useful to note points on which the court does not divide. First, we agree that federalism and the slim judicial competence to draw district lines weigh heavily against judicial intervention in apportionment decisions; as a rule, the task should remain within the domain of state legislatures.
>
> Second, for most of our Nation's history, the franchise has not been enjoyed equally by black citizens and white voters.

I want to just repeat; I am quoting from Justice Ginsburg and I want to read that again:

> For most of our Nation's history the franchise has not been enjoyed equally by black citizens and white voters.
>
> To redress past wrongs and to avert any recurrence of exclusion of blacks from political processes, Federal courts now respond to Equal Protection Clause and Voting Rights Act complaints of state action that dilutes minority voting strength.
>
> Third, to meet statutory requirements, state legislatures must sometimes consider race as a factor highly relevant to the drawing of district lines.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gallery is admonished that there should be silence in the Chamber so that the Representative may continue with this special order.

Mr. OWENS. Returning to quote Justice Ginsburg:

> Finally State legislatures may recognize communities that have a particular racial or ethnic makeup, even in the absence of any compulsion do so, in order to account for interests common to or shared by persons grouped together. When members of a racial group live together in one community, a reapportionment plan that concentrates members of the group in one district and excludes them from others may reflect wholly legitimate purposes.
>
> Therefore, the fact that the Georgia General Assembly took account of race in drawing district lines—a fact not in dispute—does not render the State's plan invalid. To offend the Equal Protection Clause, all agree the legislature had to do more than consider race. How much more, is the issue that divides the Court today.

Continuing to quote Justice Ginsburg, her dissent:

> We say once again what has been said on many occasions: Reapportionment is primarily the duty and responsibility of the State through its legislature or other body, rather than of a Federal court.
>
> Districting inevitably has sharp political impact, and political decisions must be made by those charged with the task. District lines are drawn to accommodate a myriad of factors, geographic economic, historical and political, and State legislatures, as arenas of compromise, electoral accountability, are best positioned to mediate competing claims; courts, with a mandate merely to adjudicate, are ill-equipped for this task.
>
> Federal courts have ventured now into the political thicket of reapportionment when necessary to secure to members of racial minorities equal voting rights, rights denied in many States, including Georgia, until not long ago.

The 15th amendment, which was ratified in 1870, declared that the right to vote shall not be denied by any State on account of race. That declaration, for many generations, was often honored in the breach; it was greeted by a near century of unremitting and ingenious defiance in several States, including Georgia.

I am quoting from the dissenting opinion of Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg, and I want to repeat this sentence.

The 15th amendment, ratified in 1870, declared that the right to vote shall not be denied by any State on account of race. That declaration, for many generations, was often honored in the breach; it was greeted by a near century of unremitting and ingenious defiance by several States, including Georgia.

After a brief interlude of black suffrage enforced by Federal troops but accompanied by rampant victims against blacks, Georgia held a constitutional convention in 1877. Its purpose, according to the convention's leader, was, to fix it so that the people shall rule and the Negro shall never be heard from.

In pursuit of this objective, Georgia enacted a cumulative poll tax, requiring voters to show they had paid past as well as current poll taxes; one historian described this tax as the most effective bar to Negro suffrage ever devised.

In 1890, the Georgia General Assembly authorized white primaries; keeping blacks out of the Democratic primary effectively excluded them from Georgia's political life, for victory in the Democratic primary in those days was tantamount to election.

Early in this century Georgia Governor Hoke Smith persuaded the legislature to pass the Disenfranchisement Act of 1908. True to its title, this measure added various property, good character, and literacy requirements that, as administrated, served to keep blacks from voting. The result, as one commentator observed 25 years later, was an almost absolute exclusion of the Negro voice in State and Federal elections.

Disenfranchised blacks had no electoral influence, hence no muscle to lobby the legislature for change, and that is when the Court intervened. It invalidated white primaries and other burdens on minority voting.

It was against this backdrop that the Court, construing the Equal Protection Clause, undertook to ensure that apportionment plans do not dilute minority voting strength. By enacting the Voting Rights Act of 1965, Congress heightened Federal judicial involvement in apportionment, and also fashioned a role for the Attorney General. Section 2 creates a Federal right of action to challenge vote dilution. Section 5 requires States with a history of discrimination to preclear any changes in voting practices with either a Federal court or the Attorney General.

And on and on it goes to show that the Voting Rights Act was in response to a definite, long-range oppression of the rights of African-Americans at the ballot box. Justice Ginsburg makes it quite clear that the Equal Protection Clause does not rule out extraordinary measures being taken by the Federal Government to deal with past wrongs and to compensate for what happened in 232 years of slavery and the period of disenfranchisement that followed. She argues with the basic principle that is established by Justice O'Connor in Shaw versus Reno. She does not accept that premise.

But then Justice Ginsburg moves on to another area. She says that even if you accept the reasoning of Shaw versus Reno, even if you accept Justice O'Connor's contention that race cannot be the predominant consideration in drawing districts, political districts, even if you accept that and apply it, the 11th District in Georgia meets the standards. The 11th District in Georgia is no more a district drawn with predominant race considerations than any other district in Georgia. It considers other factors also. It does not cross but a few county lines, and some districts cross a number of county lines. The 11th District of Congresswoman CYNTHIA MCKINNEY of Georgia is more regular than 28 districts in the country that are cited as being the 28 most oddly-drawn districts in the country.

So Justice Ginsburg applied the standard of Shaw versus Reno and still concludes that even if you applied that standard, the 11th Congressional District should not have been invalidated.

I urge all Americans who really want to take a close look at what the Supreme Court did to not just read the majority opinion; read the dissenting opinion. It was a 5-to-4 decision and that 5-to-4 decision means that some day the reasoning of Justice Ginsburg may be the basis for overturning that decision.

I also said before this was a serious matter. I want to address myself particularly to the African-American community. This is a serious matter. We have a situation where on that same Court, rendering several of the decisions that have affected school integration, affirmative action and now voting rights, is a justice who happens to be African-American.

Justice Clarence Thomas is on that Supreme Court. Justice Clarence Thomas is an African-American, and there are some who believe that the Court is emboldened even more in its pursuit of the dismantling of voting rights and affirmative action, and set-asides as a result of Justice Thomas being there as an African-American.

There are some who say that Justice Clarence Thomas is the most powerful African-American in the country, and there are some who say, being the most powerful African-American in the country, he is the most dangerous African-American in the country. There are some who say that his presence and his continued support for the opinions which are destroying affirmative action, set-asides, and voting rights constitute a special kind of problem.

There are some who say that at least Justice Thomas is honest and he is clearly on the side of the conservatives, and, therefore, we have to respect his opinions. The greater danger they say may not be Clarence Thomas, but those who do not openly say they are conservative, who are masquerading as leaders in the African-American community, and they share the same opinions as Justice Clarence Thomas.

Justice Clarence Thomas's case was well-known to most of us. The vote on Justice Thomas in the Senate got a great deal of publicity, and there were a number of us in Congress, including all of the members of the Congressional Black Caucus, who opposed the appointment of Justice Clarence Thomas at the very beginning, long before there was any discussions of his private life, which we think was wholly out of order. Long before that had happened, a position had been taken by the members of the Congressional Black Caucus against the appointment of Justice Clarence Thomas to the Supreme Court.

As a member of the Education and Labor Committee, Justice Thomas in his previous employment as the head of EEOC had been before our committee numerous times, and Justice Thomas had clearly sabotaged the law he was hired to implement.

□ 1615

Justice Thomas defied the intent of Congress. He ignored the intent of Congress. He ignored the directions of the committee. So we had a clear position, and I adamantly opposed the appointment of Justice Clarence Thomas long before any question was raised about his personal life. I make that distinction because so much confusion resulted from the fact that an unprecedented situation developed where the personal life of an official seeking public office was aired in public.

I totally agreed with Justice Thomas on one point. It was a high-technology lynching. It should never have been considered in public. It should have been an inquiry held behind closed doors. It should have proceeded as all personnel matters proceed. It was a circus which was most unfortunate.

Of course, there were many people who opposed him because of his record, opposed him because of his ideology, who were swayed by the problem that he faced, and later changed their opinion. But steadfastly we insisted that a record like the record of Justice Thomas in Government made it clear that he would be an enemy of the forces of civil rights, the forces of civil liberties, and of the African-American people.

I mention this because in these critical days when there is an attempt to dismantle all of the gains that have been made by the African-Americans over the last 50 years; in these critical days when the second reconstruction is being trampled, the one reconstruction was trampled, and all of the Members of Congress who were black were removed from Congress, we are not facing a situation quite that bad, but in many ways the economic impact of the decisions that are being made will be even harsher on the African-American population in general.

So here we are in a critical situation. There is a state of emergency. Our leadership and people we select as leaders is critical, and what I am moving on to and what I am leading up to is

the fact that there were many in the leadership who knew very clearly what the positions of Justice Thomas were, yet they supported him because he was an African-American.

The danger in the African-American community now, the danger with respect to the leadership at this critical time is that we are going to again be taken in by the fact that the old standard of the black bourgeoise is allowed to predominate. Anybody who is educated, any, African American who achieves becomes a person we look up to, becomes a person we will not criticize. The standards within the African-American community for leadership, the standards get diluted.

You do not have to clearly stand for policies, public policies, which are in the interests of the masses of African-American people. People who back away from those standards can still serve as leaders. They can enjoy the status of leaders. They can pronounce themselves as leaders and get away with it.

It is important that at this critical moment we understand that many people who made the error of supporting Justice Thomas because he was an African American are the kind of people we must avoid in the future, the kind of people who have to come to grips with what are the basic policy provisions that should be set forth in the African-American community at a critical time like now.

Can we have people voting for B–2 bombers which may cost $31 billion over a 7-year period and at the same time they are cutting Medicaid, at the same time they are cutting school lunches and at the same time draconian measures in the area of housing? The rescissions bill that was passed today cuts low-income housing by $7 billion. Can we have leaders who fail to understand that those are the public policies that impact on the greatest number of African-American people? And they have a duty to fight to see to it that those policies which are detrimental to our people do not go forward.

Can we understand that there must be an evaluation of leadership so that we do not have an elected bourgeoisie carrying out their own private personal agenda while they ignore the public agenda of the African-American community?

This decision by the Supreme Court and all the other things that have happened in the last few months are a warning. If we do not understand that there is a state of emergency now, we will never understand that. The Clarence Thomases have clearly proclaimed where they stand. There are some Members of the Congress, some black Members, who clearly proclaim they do not want to be part of the Black Caucus. They do not want to represent black interests.

I admire people who clearly say where they stand. On the other hand, the Benedict Arnolds we must worry about.

I want to close with a statement that I sent out to all of the African-American leadership. It is kind of a convoluted, indirect statement because during the time when Justice Clarence Thomas was under consideration for the appointment, even after the congressional Black Caucus was taking a position opposed to his appointment even after the NAACP had taken a position, even after the leading civil rights organizations had taken a position, there were leaders who came forward and said because he is black, we should not oppose him.

One of those leaders wrote an article in the New York Times, and it particularly struck me at that time as being devastating to our position One of those leaders in the cultural field wrote a very piercing op-ed piece for the New York Times where she said, ''I know that he is guilty of not running the EEOC in accordance with the law. I know he has trampled on our interests on many occasions. I know this, I know that. All of this is true, but, still, he should be given a chance.'' And I have that ringing in my ears every time a Supreme Court decision comes down, ''Still, he should be given a chance. He will change.''

That was Maya Angelous, a poet I respect a great deal, a poet that has become more famous since her famous poem was recited at the presidential inauguration. I think Maya Angelous and the other leaders who supported Clarence Thomas now need to go talk to Clarence Thomas. They need to also let the rest of the African-American community understand the implications of what is happening.

So I have written a little statement here, Maya Angelous, I am addressing it to:

GO TALK TO CLARENCE THOMAS

Maya talk to Clarence please
He's knocking us down to our knees
Clarence is talking real loud
Running with the wrong crowd
Dangerous opinions he always writes
Hurling our people toward long poison nights
Maya talk to Clarence please
In the name of Black ancestors who drowned in the seas
Talk to Clarence
End his heathen roam
Haul him to his heritage home
Maya you recognized his record of public sin
You promised that Clarence would be born again
The miracle of Hugo Black and Earl Warren would be repeated
Maya you promised ideological addiction would be defeated
Maya time to make your move a sacred point you still have to prove
Maya talk to Clarence please!

I would say that to all the other leaders who supported Justice Clarence Thomas. I would say that to all the other leaders who support compromise and are ready to forget about the interests of the thousands of African Americans out there who are suffering because public policies are being perpetuated, public policies are being perpetuated which will hurt them directly.

The rescission bill, with all of its cuts of low-income housing, would hurt African Americans directly. The B–2 bomber, being taken as a priority over Medicaid, over free lunches, will hurt African-Americans directly.

It is time we all understood that there is a state of emergency in the African-American community. The African-American leaders will have to rise to the occasion and lead in the interests of all African-Americans.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska (at the request of Mr. ARMEY), for today, on account of personal reasons.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ENGEL) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FILNER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WISE, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GUTKNECHT) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. GUTKNECHT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FOLEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH, for 5 minutes, today.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 483. An act to amend the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990 to permit medicare select policies to be offered in all States.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 962. An act to extend authorities under the Middle East Peace Facilitation Act of 1994 until August 15, 1995.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. OWENS. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. MORELLA). Pursuant to the provisions of Senate Concurrent Resolution 20, 104th Congress, the House stands adjourned until 2 p.m. on Monday, July 10, 1995, for morning hour debates.

Whereupon (at 4 o'clock and 20 minutes p.m.), pursuant to Senate Concurrent Resolution 20, the House adjourned until Monday, July 10, 1995, at 2 p.m.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized by a committee of the U.S. House of Representatives during the first quarter of 1995 in connection with official foreign travel, pursuant to Public Law 95–384, as well as the 1994 supplemental expenses of a miscellaneous group, U.S. House of Representatives, concerning foreign currencies expended by them in connection with official foreign travel, are as follows:

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 1995.

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. John Conyers, Jr	3/10	3/11	Haiti		150.00		(3)				150.00
Hon. Jack Reed	3/10	3/11	Haiti		150.00		(3)				150.00
Committee total					300.00						300.000

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Air transportation was provided by the Department of Defense.

HENRY J. HYDE,
Chairman, May 16, 1995.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL NORTH ATLANTIC ASSEMBLY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1994.

Name of member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Delegation expenses:											
Visit of Subcommittee on Defense Security to Wash, DC, California, and New York:											
Luncheon	1/23	1/28							875.00		875.00
Interpreters	1/23	1/28							350.00		350.00
Ground transportation	1/23	1/28							2,546.00		2,546.00
Peter Abbruzzese	1/23	1/28			376.43		643.00				1,019.43
NAA delegation to Ottawa, Canada—Rose/Roth Seminar:											
Hon. Sherwood Boehlert	1/16	1/18			41.70		195.60				237.30
NAA delegation to Belgium:											
Breakfast	2/18	2/18							427,33		427.33
NAA delegation to Oslo, Norway:											
Ground transportation	5/26	5/30							362.54		362.54
Representational functions	5/26	5/30							4,040.74		4,040.74
Visit of political committee to Washington, DC, California											
Interpreters	6/19	6/24							2,100.73		2,100.79
Luncheon	6/19	6/24							1,028.50		1,028.50
Ground transportation	6/19	6/24							402.40		402.50
Representational functions	6/19	6/24							394.10		394.10
Peter Abbruzzese	6/19	6/24			927.77		935.00				1,862.77
NAA delegation to Rose/Roth Seminar in Romania:											
Stuart Goldman	7/12	7/19			968.00		1,738.25				2,706.25
Visit of Subcommittee on Future of Armed Forces:											
Luncheon	8/8	8/8							800.90		800.90
NAA 40th Annual Session in Washington, DC:											
Representational function	11/14	11/18							317.22		317.22
Ground transportation	11/14	11/18							1,437.50		1,437.50
Miscellaneous expenses	11/14	11/18							125.55		125.55
Miscellaneous expenses									18.90		18.90
Committee total					2,313.90		3,511.85		15,228.17		21,053.92

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

Charlie Rose,
June 14, 1995.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1140. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's first semiannual report to Congress, as required by section 403 of the Mexican Debt Disclosure Act of 1995, and the second monthly report to Congress, as required by section 404 of the same act, pursuant to Public Law 104–6, section 403(a) (109 Stat. 89); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

1141. A letter from the First Vice President and Vice Chairman, Export-Import Bank of the United States, transmitting a report involving United States exports to Columbia, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 635(b)(3)(i); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

1142. A letter from the Secretary of Education, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled, the ''Individuals with Disabilities Education Act Amendments of 1995''; to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities.

1143. A letter from the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, President and CEO, transmitting the triennial assessment of the needs of minority and diverse audiences, and the Corporation's annual report on the provision of services to minority and diverse audiences by public broadcasting entities and public telecommunication entities, pursuant to Public Law 100–626, section 9(a) (102 Stat. 3211); to the Committee on Commerce.

1144. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting copies of international agreements, other than treaties, entered into by the United States, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b(a); to the Committee on International Relations.

1145. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a copy of Presidential Determination No. 95–28: Drawdown of commodities and services from the inventory and resources of the Departments of Defense, Justice, the Treasury and State to support accelerated training and equipping of Haitian police forces, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2348a(c)(2); to the Committee on International Relations.

1146. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 11–81, ''Closing of a Public Alley in Square 2567, S.O. 93–47, Act of 1995,'' pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1–233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

1147. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 11–82, ''Prevention of Transmission of the Human Immunodeficiency Virus Temporary Amendment Act of 1995,'' pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1–233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

1148. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 11–83, ''Closing of a Public Alley in Square 368, S.O. 94–52, Act of 1995,'' pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1–233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

1149. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Election Commission, transmitting proposed regulations that define express advocacy and describe those nonprofit corporations that are exempt from the independent expenditure prohibition (11 C.F.R. 100.17, 100.22, 106.1, 109.1, 114.2, and 114.10), pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 438(d)(1); to the Committee on House Oversight.

1150. A letter from the Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting the 1995 annual report on the financial status of the railroad unemployment insurance system, pursuant to 45 U.S.C. 369; jointly, to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure and Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska: Committee on Resources. H.R. 39. A bill to amend the Magnuson Fishery Conservation and Management Act to improve fisheries management; with an amendment (Rept. 104–171). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SKEEN. Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 1976. A bill making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes (Rept. 104–172). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. REGULA: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 1977. A bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes (Rept. 104–173). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

SUBSEQUENT ACTION ON A REPORTED BILL SEQUENTIALLY REFERRED

Under clause 5 of rule X the following action was taken by the Speaker:

Referral to the Committee on Science of H.R. 1175 extended for a period ending not later than July 11, 1995.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CHRISTENSEN (for himself, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. DELAY, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. HYDE, Mr. KASICH, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. WALKER, Mr. CRANE, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky, Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. CAMP, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. ZIMMER, Mr. SAM JOHNSON, Ms. DUNN of Washington, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. ENSIGN, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BLUTE, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. BROWNBACK, Mr. BRYANT of Tennessee, Mr. BUNN of Oregon, Mr. BURR, Mr. CANADY of Florida, Mr. CHRYSLER, Mr. COBLE, Mr. COX of California, Mr. CRAMER, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. DICKEY, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. DREIER, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. EWING, Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. GANSKE, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. HEINEMAN, Mr. HILLEARY, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, Mr. JONES, Mr. KIM, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. LARGENT, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. LINDER, Mr. LONGLEY, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. MCINTOSH, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. METCALF, Mr. MICA, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. NEUMANN, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. PORTER, Mr. RIGGS, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. ROTH, Mr. SCARBOROUGH, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. SMITH of Michigan, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mrs. SMITH of Washington, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. STUMP, Mr. TALENT, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. UPTON, Mr. WALSH, Mr. WAMP, Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. WICKER, Mr. WOLF, and Mr. ZELIFF):

H.R. 1972. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify the standards used for determining whether individuals are not employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DEFAZIO (for himself, Mr. NEUMANN, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. BROWNBACK, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Ms. FURSE, Mr. GUNDERSON, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. MEEHAN, Mrs. MALONEY, and Mrs. SCHROEDER):

H.R. 1973. A bill to reduce the number of operational support aircraft of the Department of Defense; to the Committee on National Security.

By Mr. BASS (for himself, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Ms. DANNER, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. KLUG, Mr. SMITH of Michigan, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. KASICH, Mr. SOLOMON, and Mr. HOSTETTLER):

H.R. 1974. A bill to amend title XVI of the Social Security Act to require periodic reapplications with respect to the continued receipt of supplemental security income benefits, to require that the administrative criteria regarding mental impairments be modified, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CALVERT (for himself, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. DOOLEY, Mr. TAUZIN, and Mr. LUCAS):

H.R. 1975. A bill to improve the management of royalties from Federal and Outer Continental Shelf oil and gas leases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. SKEEN:

H.R. 1976. A bill making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes.

By Mr. REGULA:

H.R. 1977. A bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes.

By Mr. COX (for himself and Mr. WYDEN):

H.R. 1978. A bill to encourage and protect private sector initiatives that improve user control over computer information services; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. DUNCAN (for himself and Mr. TALENT):

H.R. 1979. A bill to protect the rights of small entities subject to investigative or enforcement action by agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Small Business, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FARR (for himself, Mr. MINETA, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Ms. PELOSI, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD):

H.R. 1980. A bill to provide for demonstration projects throughout the United States in order to celebrate the process of becoming and being an American citizen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, Mr. CANADY of Florida, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. KLUG, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. LUTHER, Mr. PAXON, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. RIGGS, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. SMITH of Texas, and Mr. ZIMMER):

H.R. 1981. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to require executive agencies to procure property and services related to motor vehicle pools or systems only under contracts awarded under competitive procedures in accordance with rules issued by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget and to report to the Director regarding costs associated with agency operation of motor vehicle fleets; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

By Ms. FURSE:

H.R. 1982. A bill to provide grants to the States to encourage the reporting of blood alcohol levels that exceed the maximum level permitted under State law after vehicular accidents; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GEKAS:

H.R. 1983. A bill to provide that certain hearings functions of the Merit Systems Protection Board be performed only by administrative law judges, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

By Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina (for himself, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. SOLOMON,

Mr. FIELDS of Texas, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. MICA, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, and Mr. MCCOLLUM):

H.R. 1984. A bill to phase out funding for the death penalty resource centers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts (for himself, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. MATSUI, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. BRYANT of Tennessee, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. FROST, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. EVANS, Mr. PETE GEREN of Texas, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Mr. FATTAH, and Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin):

H.R. 1985. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from gross income employee and military adoption assistance benefits and withdrawals from IRA's for certain adoption expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KILDEE (for himself, Mr. CLAY, Mr. OWENS, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. SAWYER, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. WILLIAMS, and Mr. MARTINEZ):

H.R. 1986. A bill to reauthorize and improve the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act; to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities.

By Mr. KIM:

H.R. 1987. A bill to limit congressional travel to North Korea; to the Committee on House Oversight.

By Ms. MOLINARI:

H.R. 1988. A bill to amend the United States Housing Act of 1937 to provide for more expeditious evictions from public housing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

By Mr. MOORHEAD (for himself and Mrs. SCHROEDER) (both by request):

H.R. 1989. A bill to make improvements in the operation and administration of the Federal courts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OBERSTAR:

H.R. 1990. A bill to provide for the exchange of certain lands in the Superior National Forest for certain lands owned by Cook County, Lake County, and St. Louis County, MN, in the Boundary Water Canoe Area Wilderness; to the Committee on Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. STUPAK:

H.R. 1991. A bill to change the authorized depth for the project for navigation at Manistique Harbor, MI, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mrs. THURMAN:

H.R. 1992. A bill to modify the Suwannee River navigation project, FL, to authorize dredging of the McGriff Pass instead of the East and Alligator Passes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. TIAHRT (for himself, Mr. BROWNBACK, Mr. BASS, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. COBURN, Mr. CREMEANS, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. DELAY, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. KASICH, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. SCARBOROUGH, Mr. NEUMANN, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. EWING, Mrs. WALDHOLTZ, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. SMITH of Michigan, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. PARKER, Mr. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. CRANE, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. WICKER, Mrs. SEASTRAND, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. CHRYSLER, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. KLUG, Mr. FUNDERBURK, Mr. LINDER, Mr. HOKE, Ms. DUNN of Washington, Mr. TATE, Mr. WHITE, Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. METCALF, Mrs. CUBIN, Mrs. CHENOWETH, Mr. SAM JOHNSON, and Mrs. SMITH of Washington):

H.R. 1993. A bill to abolish the Department of Energy; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on National Security, Science, Resources, Rules, and Government Reform and Oversight, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. VUCANOVICH:

H.R. 1994. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for future cost-of-living adjustments for military retirees on the same basis as applies to Federal civil service retirees; to the Committee on National Security, and in addition to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FOX (for himself, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. MCINTOSH, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. BLUTE, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. FRISA, Mr. COX, and Mr. COOLEY):

H.R. 1995. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to make improvements in the regulation of drugs; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. FIELDS of Texas:

H.R. 1996. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a mechanism for taxpayers to designate $1 of any overpayment of income tax, and to contribute other amounts, for use by the U.S. Olympic Committee; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.J. Res. 99. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to prohibit the death penalty; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA (for himself, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. LEACH, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. KIM, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. DEFAZIO, and Mr. MINETA):

H. Con. Res. 80. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the United States should recognize the concerns of the peoples of Oceania and call upon the Government of France to cease all nuclear testing at the Moruroa and Fangataufa atolls; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas (for himself, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. ROHRABACHER, and Mr. SOLOMON):

H. Con. Res. 81. Concurrent resolution expressing the policy of the United States with respect to the normalization of relations with the Socialist Republic of Vietnam; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. ROYCE (for himself and Mr. MINGE):

H. Res. 182. Resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to require the reduction of section 602(b)(1) suballocations to reflect floor amendments to general appropriation bills, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

124. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska, relative to Taiwan; to the Committee on International Relations.

125. Also, memorial of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, relative to memorializing the U.S. Postal Service to issue a coal miners' postal stamp; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 46: Mr. EMERSON and Mr. BATEMAN.

H.R. 65: Mr. OLVER, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. HOLDEN, and Mr. MENENDEZ.

H.R. 218: Mr. STOCKMAN.

H.R. 262: Mr. POSHARD.

H.R. 303: Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. HOLDEN, and Mr. MENENDEZ.

H.R. 359: Mr. YOUNG of Florida and Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina.

H.R. 390: Mrs. WALDHOLTZ.

H.R. 394: Mr. BROWDER, Mr. CAMP, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. HUTCHINSON, and Mr. BONILLA.

H.R. 427: Mr. HAYWORTH, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. HEFLEY, and Mr. SOUDER.

H.R. 436: Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. KIM, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. DORNAN, and Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.

H.R. 497: Mr. BRYANT of Texas.

H.R. 540: Mr. WYDEN, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. TORKILDSEN, and Mr. TOWNS.

H.R. 662: Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. ZELIFF, and Mr. WELLER.

H.R. 670: Mr. FROST and Mrs. MEEK of Florida.

H.R. 743: Mr. CANADY and Mr. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 747: Mr. HANCOCK and Mr. ZIMMER.

H.R. 752: Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. LUTHER, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. LONGLEY, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. WILSON, and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

H.R. 789: Mr. MCINNIS.

H.R. 797: Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 803: Mr. BURR and Mr. BONILLA.

H.R. 820: Mr. FROST, MR. HEINEMAN, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. ROYCE, Ms. FURSE, and Mr. TANNER.

H.R. 868: Mr. CLEMENT and Mr. MCHUGH.

H.R. 899: Mr. CHAMBLISS and Mrs. MINK of Hawaii.

H.R. 957: Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. FOX, Mr. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. BOROSKI.

H.R. 963: Mr. LINDER, Mr. BARCIA of Michigan, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. GILLMOR, and Mr. MINGE.

H.R. 974: Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. FROST, and Mr. CLEMENT.

H.R. 1003: Mr. STENHOLM.

H.R. 1061: Mr. DREIER.

H.R. 1100: Mr. REED.

H.R. 1114: Mr. KINGSTON.

H.R. 1162: Mr. HERGER.

H.R. 1222: Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 1226: Mr. WICKER and Mr. KING.

H.R. 1242: Mr. WICKER.

H.R. 1254: Mr. DELLUMS.

H.R. 1264: Mr. CONYERS.
H.R. 1289: Mr. DOOLITTLE.
H.R. 1339: Mr. WILLIAMS and Mr. KLUG.
H.R. 1406: Mr. WILSON.
H.R. 1448: Mr. HANCOCK.
H.R. 1458: Mr. HALL of Texas.
H.R. 1460: Mr. REYNOLDS and Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota.
H.R. 1506: Mr. FATTAH.
H.R. 1513: Mr. UNDERWOOD and Mr. HOLDEN.
H.R. 1532: Mr. GREENWOOD.
H.R. 1533: Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. NEY, Mr. FOX, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. CHRYSLER, Mr. EHRLICH, Mr. COOLEY, Mr. WELLER, Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. FUNDERBURK, and Mr. DAVIS.
H.R. 1539: Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. WYNN, Mr. OBERSTAR, and Mr. MATSUI.
H.R. 1552: Mr. MARTINI, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. MINGE, Mr. TATE, Mr. PETRI, Mr. COX, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Mr. MCINTOSH, Mr. LUTHER, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, and Mr. TEJEDA.
H.R. 1580: Mr. MCINNIS.
H.R. 1591: Mr. REYNOLDS.
H.R. 1594: Mr. FIELDS of Texas.
H.R. 1640: Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. WICKER, Mr. HOKE, Mr. LARGENT, Mrs. CHENOWETH, Mr. ENSIGN, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. MCKEON, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. SALMON, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. NEUMANN, Mr. HUNTER, and Mr. PAXON.
H.R. 1649: Mr. OBERSTAR and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
H.R. 1666: Mr. DINGELL and Mr. KNOLLENBERG.
H.R. 1709: Mr. CONYERS, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Ms. FURSE, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. STARK, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, and Mr. ZIMMER.
H.R. 1711: Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky, Mr. JACOBS, and Mr. BARCIA of Michigan.
H.R. 1732: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.
H.R. 1733: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.
H.R. 1739: Mr. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 1742: Mr. DOOLEY, Mr. CLEMENT, and Mr. FRANK of Massachuetts.
H.R. 1744: Mr. COBURN and Mr. HOSTETTLER.
H.R. 1745: Mrs. CHENOWETH, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. COOLEY, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. STUMP, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. ALLARD, Mr. JONES, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. HERGER, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. METCALF, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. POMBO, Mrs. SMITH of Washington, Mr. ENSIGN, Mr. TORKILDSEN, Mr. CREMEANS, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. LONGLEY, and Mr. SCHAEFER.
H.R. 1749: Mr. DORNAN, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. SCARBOROUGH, Mrs. ROUKEMA, and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.
H.R. 1753: Mr. REGULA, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. DIXON, Mr. FROST, Mr. BRYANT of Texas, Mr. BARCIA of Michigan, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. REED, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. SKAGGS, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. OBERSTAR, and Mr. PETE GEREN of Texas.
H.R. 1758: Ms. RIVERS and Mr. FATTAH.
H.R. 1776: Mr. FLAKE.
H.R. 1787: Mr. QUILLEN.
H.R. 1818: Mr. GOODLING, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. DREIER, and Mr. BONILLA.
H.R. 1833: Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. ENSIGN, Mrs. CUBIN, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. BOEHNER, and Mr. THORNBERRY.
H.R. 1856: Mr. FROST, Mr. KLECZKA, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. LANTOS, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. PETE GEREN of Texas, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. STARK, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. YATES, Mr. NADLER, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. FLAKE, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. MASCARA, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. EHLERS, and Mr. CLINGER.
H.R. 1889: Mr. WALSH, Mr. OBERSTAR, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. HAYES, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. SCHUMER, and Mr. FROST.
H.R. 1915: Mr. MCKEON, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. LAUGHLIN, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, and Mr. KASICH.
H.R. 1952: Ms. WATERS, Mr. GREENWOOD, and Mr. FAZIO of California.
H.R. 1955: Mr. PALLONE, Mr. YATES, Mrs. LOWEY, and Mr. MURTHA.
H.J. Res. 89: Mr. CRAMER, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. FROST, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. UPTON, and Mr. DOYLE.
H.J. Res. 96: Mr. HALL of Ohio, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. FUNDERBURK, Mrs. SEASTRAND, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. YATES, Mr. DELLUMS, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. ROSE, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and Mr. STOCKMAN.
H. Con. Res. 78: Mr. FILNER, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. RUSH, Mr. FROST, Ms. RIVERS, and Mr. SANDERS.
H. Res. 39: Mr. YATES, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. FILNER, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. RUSH, and Mr. FRAZER.
H. Res. 132: Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. HAMILTON, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. MEEHAN, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. THOMPSON, Mr. TORRES, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, and Mr. YATES.
H. Res. 150: Mr. HILLIARD and Mr. STUPAK.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 1289: Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 1883: Mr. WHITE.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 6 of rule XXIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 1868

OFFERED BY: MR. FRANK OF MASSACHUSETTS

AMENDMENT NO. 86: Page 78, after line 6, insert the following new section:

LIMITATION ON FUNDS FOR INDONESIA

SEC. 564. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for assistance for Indonesia.