

a higher standard of ethics and social responsibility than other corporations?

From the earliest written history the role of the "healer"—or medical doctor in our modern terms had a special role. The Code of Hammurabi, which was practiced in Sumeria and Babylonia, clearly stipulated the physical penalties to be inflicted on the "healer" in cases of failed surgery. For example the Code states, "If a doctor operates on the eye of a gentleman, who loses his eye as a consequence, the hands [of the doctor] shall be cut off." This is a clear statement of medical responsibility and its consequences.

This is indicative of the value of human life and special responsibility of physicians. The Hippocratic Oath, taken by medical doctors at the end of their medical studies, states existence of a special relationship between the patient and the physician. In previous times, the physician was held in great respect, not because of the economic status, but because of the respect for the learned arts that the physician was trained in. This is the basis of the unique relationship between the patient and the "healer."

I am greatly concerned that in recent times this special relationship between the patient and the physician has radically changed. For example, I cite the concept of a distributive ethic which is widely promoted and used by health maintenance organizations. The distributive ethic may be stated as the principle to provide the greatest good for the greatest number of patients within the allotted budget. The problem is that it is not possible to simultaneously provide optimal care for an individual patient and for the entire group of patients at the same time. This is an example of the change in the relationship between the patient and the physician that has occurred with the development of our new business models to deliver health care; i.e. HMO's.

An example of the business practices of HMO's that are in conflict with the former respectful, sacred relationship between the patient and the healer is the use of a fixed sum of money for the annual care of a group of patients. If the physician can reduce the referrals to specialists, which would rapidly deplete the fund allocated by the HMO for the patient pool, then the physicians can take the remaining funds for themselves. How can anyone consider that this current business practice is in the interest of the patient?

Another area of current medical business practice is the financial involvement of the physician in the pharmaceutical industry. How can a clinical study be considered unbiased when the principle investigator is a share holder in the corporation that is financing the clinical study?

Can a corporation that owns a series of clinics and hospitals in a neighborhood decide to close one or more of them on the grounds that this will decrease competition? Is a hospital to be viewed in the same ethical way as any other corporation? As an extension of the patient-physician relationship and its special and sacred relationship that has existed from ancient time, it follows that the corporation that owns a hospital has a moral obligation to promote the general welfare.

In summary, current business models and practices are not consistent with the ideal "to

promote the general Welfare." Hospitals and HMO's have a unique role in our society, and with that unique role come unique responsibility. I believe that the only conclusion that reasonable people can hold is that hospitals and medical corporations must be held to a higher standard of ethics and social responsibility than other corporations.

NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL COMMUNICATORS OF TOMORROW CELEBRATES 30 YEARS

HON. LARRY COMBEST

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 18, 2000

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the National Agricultural Communicator of Tomorrow for celebrating 30 years. This organization, comprised of college students from across the nation, plays an important role in developing skills students need to excel in the communications field. ACT provides students with the opportunity to network with ag communications professionals and attend seminars and meetings to learn more about possible career choices. Individuals with an agricultural communications degree have the task of educating and informing the public about agriculture. As Chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, I know firsthand the value of having such advocates and voices promoting American agriculture, and ACT gives students a chance to expand upon these abilities.

Twenty-three students from seven universities formed ACT in July 1970 at Cornell University in Ithaca, New York. Currently, ACT has grown to include 21 chapters with over 351 members nationwide, including a chapter in Puerto Rico.

Many professional communication organizations support ACT. These "parent organizations" provide guidance, act as mentors, and serve as a resource for students to utilize when looking for employment. The National ACT organization holds a national convention each year in conjunction with one of its parent organizations and is participating in the U.S. Agricultural Communicators Congress occurring in Washington, DC July 23–26. At the convention, students are given the opportunity to compete in contest categories such as black and white photography, feature story writing, page layout and design, video editing, and present a public relations campaign. These contests allow students the opportunity not only to compete, but to showcase their work to future employers.

ACT has been instrumental in preparing our students for the future. As the population continues to grow and fewer people are involved with production agriculture, it is imperative that organizations like ACT play a prominent role in educating consumers. ACT members have the ability to inform the public about the value, diversity, and importance of American agricultural products in today's society.

I want to recognize the National Agricultural Communicators of Tomorrow on their 30th birthday, applaud them for their outstanding achievements, and wish them continued success in all of their activities.

INTRODUCTION OF H.R. 4857

HON. ROBERT T. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 18, 2000

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to join with Congressman SHAW to introduce bipartisan legislation to help restrict the use of individuals' Social Security Numbers by both the public sector and the private sector. Our legislation builds upon a number of bills introduced by House Democrats earlier this session. I'd like to thank Congressmen ED MARKEY, GERRY KLECZKA, and BOB WISE for their contributions on the privacy protection issue and for introducing exemplary legislation on the topic this Congress.

The Social Security number is almost as old as the program itself. Created in 1936 to keep track of workers' earning records, the uses of the Social Security number have since extended far beyond its original intent, to the point where it is now commonly used as a personal identifier.

Indeed, the Social Security number is increasingly used as the key to unlocking some of people's most vital—and most private—financial information. Its prevalence in today's society helps facilitate the host of private and public transactions in which people engage every day. That same prevalence, however, leaves people exceptionally vulnerable when their SSN's fall into the hands of those who wish to exploit that information for their own gain.

While we should be aware of the contributions that the use of the SSN makes to program administration and to business efficiency, we must be careful that we do not allow some of our most fundamental rights—the right to privacy and the right to control our personal information—to be abridged in the name of expediency. Our legislation strikes the correct balance.

Our bill would prohibit Federal, State, or local government entities from selling lists of people's SSN's and would prohibit government entities from displaying SSN's to the general public—for example, on drivers' licenses or on government checks.

Just as importantly, our bill would restrict private businesses' use of the SSN. Just as the Clinton Administration proposed earlier this year, our bill would authorize the Federal Trade Commission to ban the inappropriate sale or purchase of Social Security numbers.

Our bill also prohibits businesses from requiring that you disclose your Social Security number in order to do business with them.

Just as our bill enhances privacy protections, it also provides new protections for Social Security beneficiaries who rely on representative payees to manage their finances.

Social Security beneficiaries who rely on representative payees to receive their benefits and to complete financial transactions on their behalf represent some of the most vulnerable members of our society. They are the very young, the very sick, and the very old. They are individuals who live in nursing homes and in State mental hospitals.

Thus, when representative payees misuse the funds that have been entrusted to their

care, they are not simply defrauding the Social Security Trust Funds—they are harming the very people that Social Security was designed to help.

Our bill would help prevent the misuse of beneficiaries' funds and would make it easier for beneficiaries to be compensated in the event that their funds are misappropriated. Our bill would require SSA to re-issue benefit payments to beneficiaries in all cases in which "fee-for-service" representative payees have misused the funds entrusted to their care; strengthen the requirements fee-for-service organizations must meet in order to act as a representative payee; prohibit organizations from receiving fees for serving as a representative payee for any month in which that organization is found to have misused beneficiaries' funds; and finally, treat any misused benefits as an overpayment to the representative payee and, therefore, allow SSA to use the collection tools at its disposal to recover such overpayments.

I want to thank my colleagues again for this bipartisan effort and I urge my colleagues to join us as cosponsors of this important legislation.

A TRIBUTE IN THE MEMORY OF
MARSHA CORPREW OF OAKLAND,
CALIFORNIA

HON. BARBARA LEE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 18, 2000

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise with a great sense of loss as I pay tribute to Ms. Marsha Corprew, a prominent Oaklander and educational leader, who left us on July 3, 2000 at the age of 51.

Ms. Corprew was a resident of the West Oakland community for all her life. After graduating from Oakland public schools, Ms. Corprew attended Merritt Community College and California State University, Hayward. She completed her class work at the University of Hawaii and the University of California, Berkeley. After her years of education, Ms. Corprew returned to the community and through the course of her life, she donated a generous amount of time and energy to keeping her community alive.

After her education, Ms. Corprew went on to teach and counsel youth at McClymonds High School, Elmhurst Junior High School, and in a number of Oakland's public school programs. In addition to her educational efforts, she served as a volunteer to a number of community organizations concerning Oakland's educational and political life.

For 22 years, Ms. Corprew served as a volunteer on the Oakland Parks and Recreation Commission. During that time, she was also an officer for the Oakland Education Association, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, Black Political Action Committee, Friends of Parks and Recreation, and the Alameda County Education Association.

Through the course of the last two decades, Ms. Corprew's contributions have been honored. She won the Peralta College

Chancellor's Award in 1987 and College Bounders Award in 1983 for her volunteer work.

She will be missed by her family, friends, colleagues and the community. At Ms. Corprew's request no funeral was planned, but a "Celebration of Life" in her honor will be held on July 19, 2000, at the Lakeside Park Garden Center.

THE SCIENTIFICALLY-BASED EDUCATION RESEARCH, EVALUATION, STATISTICS AND INFORMATION ACT OF 2000

HON. MICHAEL N. CASTLE

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 18, 2000

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, today I am pleased to introduce legislation that I believe will vastly improve the quality, relevance, and objectivity of education research, program evaluations and statistical analyses supported through federal funds.

Educators and policymakers must have unbiased, reliable and responsive information to prepare our Nation's children for the challenges of this new century. Unfortunately, the federal government does not have a system in place to ensure that education research and other information is available to those that need it most—our teachers. At the same time, our states and school districts are adopting new accountability measures designed to hold teachers and students to new, higher standards of academic achievement. For these reasons, the need to know what works and what does not has never been greater.

Unfortunately, educators and policymakers have grown wary of education programs and practices that claim to be the "silver bullet" to improve student academic achievement until they fall out of favor with the community and a new fad comes along. As a result, schools find themselves blindly following a path they hope will lead to increased academic achievement without knowing if these programs are based on actual scientific research or just a hunch. Unfortunately, these fads not only fail to improve student academic achievement—they can actually be harmful to student learning.

To date, the federal government has done little to lessen this confusion and, in many cases, it has actually made things worse. Just last year, an "expert panel" convened by the U.S. Department of Education endorsed ten K-12 math programs as "promising or exemplary." Subsequently, two hundred mathematicians and scientists from leading universities sent a letter of protest to the department because of what they felt were "serious mathematical shortcomings" in the endorsed programs.

In fact, these experts were so concerned, they placed full-page advertisements in the nation's leading newspapers. In their collective expert opinion, mathematics instruction would be severely "dumbed down" if these particular programs were implemented in our Nation's schools. Despite their concerns, the programs—which lack rigorous scientific examina-

tion to validate their claims—continue to be widely disseminated to schools across the country by the Department of Education.

Not surprisingly, the dissemination of unproven or ineffective programs is not a new problem. From 1967 to 1976, the federal government managed the largest education experiment ever conducted in the United States—comparing more than twenty different teacher approaches on more than 70,000 students in more than 180 schools. At the end of the study, all of the programs, those that were successful and those that failed, were recommended for distribution to school districts. In fact, some of these programs, even those that were considered a failure in the study, were rated as "exemplary and effective."

While the wide dissemination of programs that have not been validated through scientific research is one problem—the lack of quality in research is also a major concern.

Recently, Congress established a National Reading Panel to evaluate existing research on the most effective approaches for teaching children to read. The panel examined more than 100,000 federally funded studies on reading—some written as far back as 1966. After an exhaustive review, the panel concluded that, of the 100,000 studies, only 10,000 met their standards for academic and scientific rigor.

Simply put, we can no longer tolerate flawed research that fails our children. For this reason, my legislation seeks to ensure the quality and integrity of the federal government's research, evaluation, and statistical activities. Specifically, the "The Scientifically-Based Education Research, Evaluation, Statistics and Information Act of 2000" provides clear standards and definitions for the extent of rigor that must be undertaken when conducting education research, evaluation and statistics with federal funds.

Under this Act, the Office of Educational Research and Improvement (currently located within the Department of Education) would be eliminated and replaced with a new national academy that provides the infrastructure for the undertaking of coordinated and high quality educational research, statistics gathering, program evaluation, and information dissemination. The academy would be separate from the Department of Education or any other federal agency as a means of ensuring its activities are carried out with the greatest degree of independence and integrity.

This academy would house three main centers, the National Center for Education Research, the National Center for Program Evaluation and Development, and the National Center for Education Statistics, as well as the National Education Library and Clearinghouse Office.

The National Center for Education Research, which would replace the five existing education institutes, would focus on a limited number of research priorities designed to address educational issues of national importance. Of course, all research funded by the center would be required to meet the rigorous requirements of "scientifically valid research" as defined in the legislation.

Next, the National Center for Program Evaluation and Development would provide truly independent program evaluations designed