every week. By Lenard's senior year, he went on to become Orange County's student of the year.

In his senior year, Lenard won a raffle at Jones High School. The winner got two tickets to the Orlando Magic basketball game, great seats. He called his mentor and said, ''Hey, I just won two tickets to the Orlando Magic game tonight.'' His mentor replied, ''That is great. Why don't you ask your best friend?'' Lenard said, ''That is why I called you.'' Mentoring makes a difference, one child at a time.

Finally, I would like to discuss the crime prevention benefits of this important legislation. In Florida, 70 percent of the inmates in our jails and prisons are high school dropouts. It costs the taxpayers $25,000 a year for each of these prisoners in our Federal prisons, compared to only $5,000 a year to educate a child in the public schools.

Clearly, making this small investment in mentoring now will save us hundreds of millions of dollars down the road in reduced prison and welfare costs.

In summary, the Mentoring for Success Act sponsored by Coach Osborne and myself will make a meaningful difference in the lives of young people, will improve education, will prevent crime, will save us money, and I urge my colleagues to cosponsor this legislation and vote yes on this important bill.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GRAVES). Without objection, and pursuant to clause 11 of rule X and clause 11 of rule I, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Member of the House to the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence to fill the existing vacancy thereon:

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.

There was no objection.

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

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

SHIPBUILDING

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

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, events are once again turning the world's eyes to the Pacific. Indonesia continues to be unsettled. North Korea is abandoning its move towards conciliation. And every American is aware of the provocative actions recently undertaken by China in holding 24 Americans captive.

Secretary Rumsfeld has stated that this administration will put a new emphasis on the Pacific. That is wise. But to carry out that intention across such a broad expanse of water will require ships.

Demand for naval forces has not gone away with the Cold War; it has increased. Yet, at current build rates, the overall fleet will sink below 300 ships before the decade is out, on a course for Davy Jones' locker. We are already missing missions today. How dire will the situation be with a 200-ship fleet?

I am not much given to dramatic statements, Mr. Speaker, but let me say this clearly: America should rebuild its Navy, and we should begin now.

To rebuild requires far more than simply stabilizing the size of the fleet. The Navy does not get anywhere by treading water. Instead, we have to reverse the trend in shipbuilding. A wise man used to say that the Navy is moving to a smaller fleet to meet its worldwide commitments, but the world is just as wide. That man's name was Norman Sisisky, and nobody in this House, nobody was more dedicated to reversing the trend in shipbuilding than our good friend from Virginia.

By the way, I believe that ''Norman Sisisky'' would make an excellent name for a capital ship.

Why build more ships? Because it is presence, American presence, that helps avoid war: presence in peacetime, at pierside, showing our allies tangible proof of American support; and presence in the theater, exercising, working with allied navies, and serving notice to all that America is not thousands of miles away, it is just over the horizon. Naval presence is an open hand that can quickly become an iron fist should the need arise.

We can focus on the Pacific all we like, but maintaining a strong naval presence there requires more ships than we have now. Then, what of our commitment to Europe, the Atlantic, the Mediterranean, the Middle East?

Ships require sailors. Sea duty is hard and challenging. It can be heartbreaking. The sailor is the backbone of the Navy. While some question whether sea duty is still that service's highest calling, there is no doubt in the mind of this son of a sailor that it should be.

It is not just the duties at sea that make the sailors so valuable, it is their presence in foreign ports, showing citizens around the world that Americans are open, friendly, and interested in their country. That is as much a benefit of naval presence as the speedy response to crises that may emerge.

A rebuilt Navy should be able to operate from shoreline to shoreline, on the surface, above, and below. That will require a range of ships: small ships, to operate in close; medium ships, to provide cover for the smaller ships in shore, but able to keep station with battle groups as needed; submarines, capable of operation in all waters and able to carry land attack missiles and support special operations forces; and heavy capital ships, to maintain freedom of the seas.

Ships do not just happen, we must build them. We must equip them. We must provide a trained and ready crew. That all takes resources and commitment, resources from Capitol Hill and a commitment, beginning with the CNO and including every sailor in the fleet.

That is why a larger Navy must be in the budget from the start, particularly this year. The Navy cannot rely on Congress to add money above the top line to make up for its own budget shortcomings. For years, we in Congress added money to the administration's defense budget. I do not believe that we will so readily revise the new administration's plans.

But I do not doubt that with support in the administration budget, Congress will follow. As Members of Congress, the purse is our responsibility. Without a doubt, ships are expensive. Building more ships is more expensive, but not being where we are needed when we are needed there is the most costly of all.

I believe in my heart that one ship flying the American flag alongside one foreign pier makes friends, warns enemies, and ultimately reduces the need to send many more ships out on the high seas.

To provide presence, we need hulls. To engage in littoral, we need hulls. To do the job we ask the Navy to do, we need hulls.

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

(Mr. JONES of North Carolina 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 gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

URGING MEMBERS TO SUPPORT LEGISLATION TO CLARIFY LAW REGARDING FUNDRAISING BY NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONS

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

Mr. EHRLICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to announce the introduction of legislation that would help clarify the law regarding fund-raising by nonprofit organizations.

I want to first recognize and thank the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON), the chairman of the Committee on Government Reform, who is sponsoring this bill with me for his leadership on this important issue.

Congress recognized the many important and worthwhile activities of nonprofits by establishing a nonprofit mail

rate for charities, churches, educational advocacy, and other nonprofit organizations. These are enumerated in the Postal Reorganization Act of 1970.

One of Congress's objectives was to make it more affordable for nonprofits to collect donations to fund their activities. For a mail piece to be eligible for the lower rate, Congress prescribed two requirements: First, the organization or mailer must be qualified to mail at the nonprofit rate; and second, the qualified organization must own the mail piece.

Over the last several years, Mr. Speaker, the United States Postal Service, which has made great strides under Postmasters Runyon and Henderson, has increasingly applied the statutory standard of ''ownership'' in a way that may have a chilling effect on the use of nonprofit mail rates to obtain donations for charity, education, and advocacy.

The purpose of the bill that the gentleman from Indiana (Chairman BURTON) and I are sponsoring is to clarify ambiguities existing in both law and postal service regulations with respect to fund-raising.

The bill clarifies the law so the postal service does not read the statutory ''ownership'' test so literally as to disqualify fund-raising mail sent by otherwise eligible nonprofit organizations that negotiate a risk-sharing agreement with respect to their fund-raising mail.

In my view, Mr. Speaker, it is imperative that otherwise qualified nonprofit organizations be able to secure donations at the lowest possible cost. When nonprofits conduct activities that further purposes enumerated in the statute, for example, to provide safety net social services, they ease the burden on taxpayers and deliver high quality services to all Americans.

This Congress is asking nonprofits to provide services the government has traditionally been ineffective and inefficient in providing. Given this purpose, it would be irrational for Congress to limit use of the nonprofit bill rate only to fund-raising campaigns that raise donations sufficient to pay mailing costs.

It is important to point out that our bill is not a back door to allow unauthorized parties to mail at the nonprofit rate. Current law restricts an otherwise qualified organization from utilizing the nonprofit rate to sell goods or services. Seeking a donation, however, is different from promoting the sale of a product or service.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, Congress has instituted reforms limiting a nonprofit's use of the special mail rate to sell products and services. This bill does not affect the reforms Alaska Senator Ted Stevens set in motion in the 1980s in that regard.

This bill also recognizes the subsequent reform Congress enacted to require sales promoted at the nonprofit rate to be substantially related to the purpose for which the nonprofit qualified for the nonprofit rate.

More importantly, Mr. Speaker, this bill does not limit the postal service's authority to enforce any other section of the Federal postal statutes. Accordingly, the postal service retains all of its tools to discover and prosecute fraud, a mission I strongly support.

The problem addressed by this bill is the postal service's present interpretation of the statutory ''ownership'' standard, which is causing litigation and inconsistent application in nonprofit fund-raising cases.

Respectfully, I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting this important legislative measure.

□ 1630

MANAGED CARE REFORM, PATIENT ACCESS TO SPECIALTY CARE

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

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to continue what is a series of speeches or Special Orders on the need to reform our Nation's managed care industry. In the past I have discussed external and internal appeals processes, medical necessity, and the need for accountability. Today I would like to discuss patient access to specialty care.

Specialists fill an invaluable role in our Nation's health care system. And many of us have sought the services of a specialist because of high blood pressure, a broken arm, or migraine headaches. But oftentimes, HMOs refuse patients access to specialists because they do not have such specialists in their network or they are across town or literally unavailable.

Such is the case of Sarah Peterson from San Mateo, California. She was born with a brain tumor that required her to see a physician who specialized in brain tumors. But her HMO, which was obtained through her father's employer, told her mother that she would not be able to see a pediatric specialist. She was told, what difference does it make, cancer is cancer.

Well, it does make a difference if you are the parent of a child with a potentially deadly tumor. While Sarah was fighting for her life, her parents were fighting an HMO to get her the quality health care they were paying for. This situation could have had dire consequences; but fortunately for Sarah, her parents changed plans during the middle of this medical crisis. Sarah is now 8 years old and is doing well. But she still has a tumor and will still need to see a specialist. Hopefully, her health insurance will let her continue to see that specialist.

The prognosis is not as promising for young Kyle of Bakersfield, California. Kyle began having ear problems when he was 6 months old. After months of corrective measures, antibiotics, infections, and finally a ruptured eardrum, Kyle's HMO referred him to an ENT. The ENT performed surgery to put tubes in Kyle's ears which would allow for the drainage of the infected fluids, but that surgery was too little too late. After 10 days, Kyle's ears began to bleed. Had the HMO followed the advice of the ENT, they would have given Kyle a CAT scan to provide evidence of cholosteatoma, a severe infection that destroys the bone in the inner ear. But again, the HMO denied this vital test, and Kyle's ear problems continued along, undiagnosed.

Finally, after losing all patience with the HMO, his parents changed plans and were advised that their son needed this exploratory surgery. It was then that they learned of the severe nature of the cholosteatoma and that Kyle would need another surgery. After all of the waiting, surgeons had to remove all of the bones in Kyle's middle ear. Because of the delay in specialty care, combined with the HMO's denial of a simple test, Kyle's doctors anticipate he will suffer significant hearing loss as he reaches his adolescence.

A denial of specialty care was deadly for Glenn Neally, who lost his life because an HMO denied him direct access to specialty care. When Glenn's employer changed plans in March 1992, he made sure that the managed care plan would continue to cover treatment of his cardiac condition, unstable angina. His cardiologist had prescribed a strict regime of nitrates, calcium blockers, and beta blockers. He was assured that he would be able to see his cardiologist. But his HMO required him to obtain a referral for follow-up treatment by his cardiologist. Bureaucratic paperwork problems gave Glenn the run-around for 2 months, while he tried to get the proper ID cards, referrals and pharmacy cards. Even after obtaining all of this paperwork, his HMO formally denied his request that he receive follow-up visits with his previous cardiologist and instead was forced to see their participating cardiologist in May of that year.

That turned out to be one day too late for Glenn. He died of a massive heart attack on May 18, leaving behind his wife and two sons.

Mr. Speaker, I stand here today and tell story after story of the damage that occurs when people are denied access to specialty care. But what this really tells us, we need managed care reform on a national basis like the Bipartisan Patient Protection Act, H.R. 526.

This legislation ensures that patients who need specialty care can reach that specialist. It would ensure that children like Kyle and Sarah have direct access to their pediatrician.

This plan could have helped Glenn Neally because it would have ensured that plans cover specialists even outside the network. It ensures that patient care is continuous, and if provider networks change, a patient is not forced to change doctors in midstream.