

contracting with HHS to provide the drug benefit would be required to meet certain standards, including establishing an adequate formulary and an exceptions process to the formulary, as well as a 24-hour counseling program for enrollees, an education program for medical providers on appropriate prescribing and dispensation of covered drugs, and drug utilization review.

To stabilize employer-sponsored retiree health coverage, we're proposing to subsidize employer's coverage by paying companies a capitated amount that would otherwise be paid to a private entity—but only if that coverage is at least as good as what Medicare is offering. In return, employers would have to agree to pay the cost of their retirees' Medicare Part B prescription drug premium for at least a year.

Clearly, adding a prescription drug benefit to Medicare is not an inexpensive proposition. But the price of leaving pharmaceutical medications out of the programs' benefits package and instead paying for unnecessary hospitalizations for those who just 'try to do without' is also high. The Food and Drug Administration estimated that the cost of hospitalizations caused by inappropriate use of prescription medicines was \$20 billion annually higher in 1995.

There are several financing options that I hope will be considered as the Medicare prescription drug debate advances. One is to assess tobacco companies for what they cost the program to treat smoke-related illnesses. A second is to support a strategy of recouping Medicare expenditures on tobacco-related diseases through suits against Big Tobacco. A third is to consider dedicating a portion of projected budgetary surpluses to paying for Medicare drug coverage.

Debate about the financing options for a Medicare drug benefit will inevitably be contentious. But there is no better time to join this debate than today—when the program's solvency has been extended until 2015 even without an infusion of money from budgetary surpluses. With an infusion, the solvency timeline stretches far into the future—until 2027.

It is time to turn our attention to meeting the needs of the growing number of senior citizens who are being rapidly priced out of drug coverage. Adding a prescription drug benefit is an investment—one of the most important we can make—in the health of tens of millions of our citizens.

I recently sent out a survey to seniors in my district to assess the prices they pay for a range of specific prescription medications. Their responses were both revealing and sad. Asked what percentage of her monthly \$547 income is dedicated to prescription drugs, one elderly woman suffering from osteoporosis replied very simply: "I cannot afford them." Queried about how this makes her feel, she said: "I just try to cope."

Another of my constituents, who has asthma, wrote: "During the winter and spring my asthma is particularly bad and I have to use my inhaler quite often; and I sometimes am not able to purchase another, and I limit my use." Asked whether she has ever had to choose between paying for items like food or electricity because of the high cost of prescription drugs, she said: "Yes, and I felt frightened."

People who are sick need pharmaceutical treatment. Many who aren't take pharmaceuticals to stave off illness. In my case, taking Zocor lowers my blood cholesterol and helps reduce my risk of winding up in the hospital for costly bypass surgery.

There are millions more elderly Americans with similar stories in congressional districts across the country. There are people who suffer from lack of medically appropriate access to pharmaceutical treatment.

I submit that for a health plan in the year 2000 not to offer pharmaceutical care is preposterous.

In today's era of unprecedented prosperity, who would say "No" to legislation providing prescription drug coverage to the one group that would benefit most—our nation's seniors?

In the 105th Congress, we invested in children's health when we enacted the State Children's Health Insurance Program. Now we must fix the huge hole in Medicare's benefit package. If we don't a bolder future Congress will.

TRIBUTE TO HARRISON COBB

HON. BOB SCHAFFER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1999

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, few people I know have committed as much intellectual attention to the topic of natural resources as my long-time friend and constituent, Mr. Harrison Cobb, of Fort Collins, Colorado. My first acquaintance with Mr. Cobb was made in 1987. He invited me into his home and spent generous time allowing me the benefit of his vast education, experience, and passion for mining.

Supremely dedicated to preserving the environmental integrity of America's western heritage, Mr. Cobb's civic devotion is to influence public debate about natural resources issues with balanced opinion employing practical, logical, and scientific reason, and historical perspective. His persuasive treatment of natural resource questions is unmatched. Mr. Cobb is, in my opinion, a giant among his colleagues in the field of mineral extraction.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Cobb's contributions are bigger still in scope. His professional talents have been directed toward many of the broader topics confronting all Americans: Economics, national character, education, and cultural decay are issues about which Mr. Cobb has engaged his countrymen and to which he has held many public officials accountable.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the example of Mr. Cobb to my colleagues in the House, and hereby submit to the RECORD for their consideration some thoughts of Mr. Cobb's conveyed in a letter he recently posted to me.

HARRISON S. COBB,
Ft. Collins, CO.

The world's most important commodity, after air and water, is ROCK. Everything that we use, need and want comes out of rock. Even food, clothing and housing are taken from soil, which is disintegrated rock.

To get the autos, aeroplanes, trains, toothpaste fluoride, catalytic convertors, printing presses, electric power, running tap water and almost everything else out of the solid

rock, it HAS to be mined. Thus far there's no other way to produce it.

The primary purposes of mountains are not skiing, hiking or viewing. Mountains are the only places where you can walk directly into the inside of the earth and look for those things so necessary to our lives. There may be equally rich sources of gold, copper, iron, platinum, fluorite, tungsten, molybdenum under the Kansas-Nebraska prairie, but who can sink through 2000 feet of sedimentary rock in order to start prospecting for them?

Here and there natural forces have squeezed the somewhat plastic inside of the earth up through cracks in the sedimentaries, forming protuberances that we call mountains, giving us our only opportunities to see and search for those minerals that occur only inside the earth. This is the primary purpose of and use for mountains.

The enviros and the bureaucratic Lilliputians who aim to end mining through over-regulation, land withdrawals, Kyoto treaties and UN heritage sites demonstrate lack of education and complete ignorance of fact. In the end, the people will suffer—but who cares about that?

CONGRESSMAN BOB: This is just to add to your ammunition. Thanks for good work.

HARRISON.

Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to Mr. Cobb for his love of our mighty nation, for his consistent exhibition of patriotic spirit. He is truly an inspiration to me to continue on our important work advancing the freedom and liberty of our beloved Republic.

NATIONAL MONUMENT NEPA COMPLIANCE ACT

HON. JAMES V. HANSEN

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1999

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced 'The National Monument NEPA Compliance Act.' This Act would enhance public participation in the creation of national monuments.

Two and a half years ago President Clinton created the 1.8 million acre Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument in the State of Utah. This national monument was created in the dark of night. No one from Utah knew about it until just before it happened. The public was completely excluded from the process.

This is not the way that public land decisions should be made. The public should be allowed to participate in public land decisions.

This bill would do just that, it would allow the public to participate in the national monument designation process. It would require the President, through the Secretary of the Interior, to follow the National Environmental Policy Act when formulating a national monument proposal. Since the preparation of an environmental impact statement takes some time, it would call for a 2-year emergency withdrawal of the lands in question during deliberations on the monument proposal to ensure protection of the resources.

This bill would not affect the power of the President to create national monuments. It would just require him to involve the public in the decision process. It would eliminate the clandestine creation of national monuments in

April 20, 1999

smoke-filled back rooms. I believe this is a very good bill and I hope it will garner bipartisan support.

I urge my colleagues to cosponsor and support "The National Monument NEPA Compliance Act." We need to return public participation to public lands management.

TRIBUTE TO ROBERT M. "BOB"
MCLAUGHLIN

HON. JOSÉ E. SERRANO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1999

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Mr. Robert M. McLaughlin, an outstanding individual who has dedicated his life to education. He will be celebrating his retirement from Saint David's School, where he

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

has taught English and Latin, as well as 4th and 8th grade, since 1963. He will be honored on May 5 by parents, family, friends, and professionals for his outstanding contributions to the community.

Born in the Bronx in 1936, Mr. McLaughlin, known as Bob to his friends, attended Cardinal Hayes High School and Fordham University where he earned a bachelor's degree in English and a master's degree in Latin and Roman History.

As Rose Marie Gionta Alfieri eloquently reported in Saint David's Magazine: "A bibliophile is one of the terms most often used by McLaughlin's colleagues and friends at Saint David's to describe him. Others include 'loyal,' 'funny,' 'supportive,' 'argumentative,' and 'good sport.' But perhaps the most on-the-nose quality that captures the essence of this master teacher can be summed up in one word: passion."

7023

Mr. Speaker, I think that quote speaks volumes about Mr. McLaughlin's character.

Mr. McLaughlin will retire in May of this year after a fruitful career in public service. He will leave us with many lessons learned about leadership in education and about wisdom. A talented leader and educator, Mr. McLaughlin will continue sharing his knowledge and views with his family and friends.

Mr. McLaughlin is married to Mary McAndrews and they are the proud parents of five children, Robert, Matthew, Andrew—all three attended Saint David's School—Mary Joyce, and Kristin.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Robert M. "Bob" McLaughlin for his outstanding achievements in education and his enduring commitment to the community.