high out-of-pocket drug costs that threaten beneficiaries' health and financial security. This plan sets a monetary ceiling, what is called a stop loss, beyond which Medicare would pay 100 percent of the beneficiary's drug expenses.

□ 2320

This is one of the things I found most challenging about what we were trying to do is somehow protecting people against catastrophic drug costs where we hear about people having to exhaust their life savings or sell their home to pay their drug bills. We do that in our bill, and I think that is one of the best components of what we have done is have that protection out there, that stop loss, that once one gets to a certain level, then the beneficiary, the senior citizen does not have to go beyond that.

Our plan is available to all Medicare beneficiaries, and our public-private partnership ensures that drug coverage is available to all who need it by managing the risk and lowering the premiums. The plan calls for the government to share in insuring the sickest seniors, thereby making the risk more manageable, more affordable for insurers, and lower premiums for every beneficiary.

As I mentioned before, we protect the most vulnerable of our seniors and low-income beneficiaries. I could go on and on and talk about this.

I would just urge those in the House and those that might be viewing the proceedings otherwise to look at this bill carefully, study it, and see if we did not follow those principles that we talked about that we wanted choice, we wanted it to be universal, we wanted it to be voluntary, we wanted it to be affordable. We think we have done that.

We were very pleased to bring this bill to the House floor. As we move this process, I trust that we can do it in a Republican-Democrat fashion, do what is best for the American citizens. As again my colleague from Arizona says, even though it is an even number year, an election year, let us do the right thing.

Mr. ENGLISH. Mr. Speaker, let me say I appreciate the remarks of the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. BRYANT). Judging from his remarks, he would concede that we have managed to build a bipartisan product based on a Republican budget that set aside $40 billion to modernize Medicare and to improve benefits, and we have offered here the American people a bipartisan plan that would provide benefits that are universal, affordable, flexible and voluntary and allow them to get prescription drugs based on a model of choice, something lacking in the other plan.

I appreciate the gentleman's remarks because he has clearly elucidated the strength of our plan and the fact that we are offering something that the American people, hopefully, can unite behind.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH).

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ENGLISH) for yielding to me, and I thank the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. BRYANT).

Mr. Speaker, I think it is important just to summarize where it is we believe this bipartisan plan is headed and what it is we are trying to do.

Mr. Speaker, as we pointed out earlier, it is a sad fact that too many senior citizens and disabled Americans are forced to choose between putting food on the table and being able to afford the prescription drugs they need to stay alive. That is morally wrong.

So we want to take action in a bipartisan way to strengthen Medicare by providing prescription drug coverage for seniors and disabled Americans so that no one is left behind.

While ensuring that all Medicare recipients have access to prescription drug coverage, we must make sure our senior citizens and disabled Americans also maintain control over their health care choices.

It is fundamental that we cannot force folks into a government-run one-size-fits-all prescription drug plan because, in reality, that becomes one-size-fits-some. That type of approach would be too restrictive, too confusing, and would allow Washington bureaucrats to control what medicines one's doctor can and cannot prescribe.

It is our intent with our plan to give all seniors and disabled Americans the right to choose an affordable prescription drug benefit that best fits their own health care needs.

Our plan will help the sickest and the neediest on Medicare who currently have no prescription drug coverage while offering all others a number of affordable options to best meet their needs and to protect them from financial ruin.

By making it available to everyone, Mr. Speaker, we are ensuring that no senior citizen or disabled American falls through the cracks. Because our plan is voluntary, we protect seniors already satisfied with their current prescription drug benefit by allowing them to keep what they have while expanding coverage to those who need it. We will not, Mr. Speaker, we will not force senior citizens or disabled Americans out of the good private coverage they currently enjoy.

I would point out, again, nearly two-thirds of today's seniors have some form of prescription drug coverage. Again, our plan emphasizes individual freedom, giving individuals the power to decide what is best for them, not to rely on Washington bureaucrats.

The task is daunting. The details, we are in the process of hammering out as we move to markup in the Committee on Ways and Means shortly, but it is our intent to reach across the aisle as we have already done with sponsorship of this plan on a bipartisan basis because the stronger Medicare with prescription drug coverage is a promise of health security and financial security for older Americans. And it is our intent to work on a bipartisan basis to ensure that promise is kept.

Our parents and grandparents sacrificed much for this country. As we have been given charge by the people to come to this floor to do the people's business, to be about the work of preparing for a new century, we understand that America's seniors and disabled deserve no less.

THE WORLD TRADE ORGANIZATION—THE END OF GEOGRAPHY?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SWEENEY). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. METCALF) is recognized until midnight.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, during 1969, C. P. Kendleberger wrote that the Nation's State is just about through as an economic unit. He added that the U.S. Congress and right-wing-know-nothings in all countries were unaware of this. He added the world is too small. Two hundred thousand ton tank and ore carriers and air buses and the like will not permit sovereign independence of the Nation's state in economic affairs.

Before that, Emile Durkheim stated, ''The corporations are to become the elementary divisions of the state, the fundamental political unit.'' Now I am going to repeat that. ''The corporations are to become the elementary division of the state, the fundamental political unit. They will efface the distinction between public and private, dissect the democratic citizenry into discrete functional groupings which are no longer capable of joint political action''.

Durkheim went so far as to proclaim that, ''Through corporatisms' scientific rationale, it will achieve its rightful standing as the creator of collective reality.''

There is little question that part of these two statements are accurate. America has seen its national sovereignty slowly diffused over a growing number of international governing organizations.

The WTO is just the latest in a long line of such developments that began right after World War II. But as the protest in Seattle against the WTO ministerial meeting made clear, the democratic citizenry seemed well prepared for joint action. Though it has been pointed out that many, if not the majority of protesters, did not know what the WTO was, and much of the protest itself entirely missed the mark

regarding WTO culpability, in many areas proclaimed jurisdiction, responsibility, this remains but a question of education. It is the responsibility of the citizens' Representatives to begin that education process.

The former head of the antitrust division of the U.S. Justice Department was Thurman Arnold from 1938 to 1943. We may not entirely agree with him when he stated that the United States had, I quote, ''developed two coordinate governing classes. One is called business, building cities, manufacturing and distributing goods, and holding complete and autocratic power over the livelihood of millions.''

□ 2330

The other called government, concerned with preaching and exemplification of spiritual ideas, but so caught up in a mass of theory that when it wished to move in a practical world, it had to do so by means of a sub-rosa political machine. But surely the advocates of corporate governance today, housed quietly and efficiently within the corridors of power at the WTO, the OECD, IMF, and the World Bank, clearly believe. They really believe. Corporatism as ideology, and it is an ideology; as John Ralston Saul referred recently to it as a hijacking of first our terms, such as individualism, and then a hijacking of western civilization, the result being the portrait of a society addicted to ideologies, a civilization tightly held at this moment in the embrace of a dominant ideology: corporatism.

As we find our citizenry affected by this ideology and its consequences, consumerism, the overall effects on the individual are passivity and conformity in those areas that matter and nonconformity in those which do not. We do know more than ever before just how we got here. The WTO is a creature of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, that's GATT, which began in 1948 its quest for a global regime of economic interdependence. But by 1972, some Members of Congress saw the handwriting on the wall, and it was a forgery.

Senator Long, while chairman of the Senate Committee on Finance, made these comments to Dr. Henry Kissinger regarding the completion and prepared signing of the Kennedy round of the GATT accords, and I quote: ''If we trade away American jobs and farmers' incomes for some vague concept of a new international order, the American people will demand from their elected representatives a new order of their own which puts their jobs, their security and their incomes above the priority of those who dealt them a bad deal.''

But we know that few listened. And 20 years later the former chairman of the International Trade Commission argued that it was the Kennedy round that began the slow decline in America's living standards. Citing statistics in his point regarding the loss of manufacturing jobs and the like, he concluded with what must be seen as a warning, and I quote: ''The Uruguay Round and the promise of the North American Free Trade Agreement all may mesmerize and motivate Washington policymakers, but in the American heartland those initiatives translate into further efforts to promote international order at the expense of existing American jobs.''

We are still not listening. Certainly, ideologists of corporatism cannot hear us. They, in fact, are pressing the same ideological stratagem in the journals that matter, like Foreign Affairs, and the books coming out of the elite think-tanks and nongovernmental organizations. One such author, Anne-Marie Slaughter, proclaimed her rather self-important opinion that State sovereignty was little more than a status symbol and something to be attained now through transgovernmental participation. That would be presumably achieved through the WTO, for instance?

Stephan Krasner, in a volume, International Rules, goes into more detail by explaining global regimes as functional attributes of world order, that is, environmental regimes, financial regimes and, of course, trade regimes. In a world of sovereign states, the basic function of regimes is to coordinate state behavior to achieve desired outcomes in particular issue areas. If, as many have argued, there is a general movement toward a world of complex interdependence, then the number of areas in which regimes can matter is growing.

But we are not here speaking of changes within an existing regime, thereby elected representatives of free people make adjustments to new technologies, new ideas and further the betterment of their people. The first duty of elected representatives is to look out for their constituency. The WTO is not changes within the existing regime but an entirely new regime. It has assumed an unprecedented degree of American sovereignty over the economic regime of the Nation and the world.

Then who are the sovereigns? Is it the people, the nation, in nation state? I do not believe so. I would argue that who governs, rules. Who rules is sovereign. And the people of America and their elected representatives do not rule nor govern at the WTO but corporate diplomats, a word decidedly oxymoronic.

Who are these new sovereigns? Maybe we can get a clearer picture by looking at what WTO is in place to accomplish. I took interest in an article in Foreign Affairs, ''A New Trade Order,'' volume 72, number one, by Cowhey and Aronson. Foreign investment flows are only about 10 percent the size of the world trade flows each year, but intrafirm trade, for example sales by Ford Europe to Ford USA, now accounts for up to an astonishing 40 percent of all U.S. trade.

This complex interdependence we hear of every day inside the Beltway is nothing short of miraculous, according to the policymakers who are mesmerized by all this. But, clearly, the interdependence is less between the people of the nation states than between the corporations of the corporate states.

Richard O'Brien in his book entitled ''Global Financial Integration: The End of Geography,'' states the case this way: ''The firm is far less wedded to the idea of geography. Ownership is more and more international and global, divorced from national definitions. If one marketplace can no longer provide a service or an attractive location to carry out transactions, then the firm will actively seek another home. At the level of the firm, therefore, there are plenty of choice of geography.''

O'Brien seems unduly excited when he adds, ''The glorious end of geography prospect for the close of this century is the emergence of a seamless global financial market. Barriers will be gone, services will be global, the world economy will benefit, and so too, presumably, the consumer.''

Presumably? Counter to this ideological slant, and it is ideological, O'Brien notes the fact that ''governments are the very embodiment of geography, representing the nation state. The end of geography is, in many respects, all about the end or diminution of sovereignty.''

In a rare find, a French author published a book titled The End of Democracy. Jean-Marie Guehenno has served in a number of posts for the French Government, including as their ambassador to the European Union. He suggests this period we live in is an imperial age. And to quote, ''The imperial age is an age of diffuse and continuous violence. There will no longer be any territory to defend, but only older operating methods to protect. And this abstract security is infinitely more difficult to ensure than that of a world in which geography commanded history. Neither the rivers nor oceans protect the delicate mechanisms of the imperial age from a menace as multi-form as the empire itself.''

The empire itself. Whose empire? In whose interests?

□ 2340

Political analyst Craig B. Hulet, in his book entitled ''Global Triage: Imperium in Imperio,'' refers to the new global regime as imperium in imperio, or power within a power, a state within a state.

His theory proposes that these new sovereigns are nothing short of this:

''they represent the power not of the natural persons which make up the nations' peoples nor of their elected representatives, but the power of the legal paper persons recognized in law, the corporations themselves then are the new sovereigns. And in their efforts to be treated in law as equal as to the citizens of each separate state, they call this National Treatment, they would travel the sea and wherever they land ashore, they would be citizens here and there. Not even the Privateers of old would have dared impose this will upon the nation-states.''

Can we claim to know today what this rapid progress of global transformation will portend for democracy here at home? We understand the great benefits of past progress; we are not Luddites here. We know what refrigeration can do to a child in a poor country, what clean water means to everyone everywhere, what free communication has already achieved. But are we going to unwittingly sacrifice our sovereignty on the altar of this new God, progress? Is it progress if a cannibal uses a knife and fork?

Can we claim to know today what this rapid progress of global transformation will portend for national sovereignty here at home? We protect our way of life, our children's futures, our workers' jobs, our security at home by measures often not unlike our airports are protected from pistols on planes, but self-interested ideologies, private greed and private power? Bad ideas escape our mental detectors.

We seem to be radically short of leadership where this act of participation in the process of diffusing America's power over to and into the private global monopoly capitalist regime, today pursued without questioning its basis at all.

An empire represented by not just the WTO but clearly this new regime is the core ideological success for corporativism.

The only step remaining, according to Harvard Professor Paul Krugman, is the finalization of a completed Multilateral Agreement on Investment, which failed at OECD. According to OECD, the agreement's actual success may come through not a treaty this time but arrangements within corporate governments itself quietly being hashed out at the IMF and the World Bank as well as OECD. We are not yet the united corporations of America.

The WTO needs to be scrutinized carefully, debated, hearings and public participation where possible. If there is any issue upon which Congress must hold extensive and detailed public hearings, this is it. Yet few are planned that I know of.

We can, of course, as author Christopher Lasch notes, peer inward at ourselves as well, when he argued, the history of the 20th century suggests that totalitarian regimes are highly unstable, evolving toward some type of bureaucracy that neither fits the classic fascism nor the capitalist model. None of this means that the future will be safe to democracy, only that the threat of democracy comes less from totalitarian or elected movements abroad than from the erosion of its psychological, cultural, and spiritual foundations from within.

Are we not witness to, though, the growth of global bureaucracy being created not out of totalitarian or collective movements but from autocratic corporations which hold so many lives in the balance? And where shall we redress our grievances when the regime completes its global transformation, when the people of each nation and their state find that they can no longer identify their rulers, their true rulers, when it is no longer their state which rules?

The most recent U.N. Development Report documents how globalization has increased inequality between and within nations while bringing them together as never before.

Some are referring to this globalization's dark side like Jay Mazur recently in Foreign Affairs.

''A world in which the assets of the 200 richest people are greater than the combined income of more than 2 billion people at the other end of the economic ladder should give everyone pause. Such islands of concentrated wealth in the sea of misery have historically been a prelude to upheaval. The vast majority of trade and investment takes place between industrial nations dominated by global corporations that control one-third of the world's exports.''

With further mergers and acquisitions in the future, with no end in sight, those of us that are awake must speak up now.

Or is it that we just cannot see at all, believing in our current speculative bubble which nobody credible believes can be sustained much longer. We miss the growing anger, fear, and frustration of our people. Believing in the myths our policy priests pass on, we missed the dissatisfaction of our workers, believing in the God ''progress'' we have lost our vision.

Another warning, this time from Ethan Kapstein in his article ''Workers on the World Economy'' (Foreign Affairs: Vol. 75, No. 3):

''While the world stands at a critical time in post-war history, it has a group of leaders who appear unwilling, like their predecessors in the 1930s, to provide international leadership to meet economic dislocations. Worse, many of them and their economic advisors do not seem to recognize the profound troubles affecting their associates. Like the German elite in Weimar, they dismiss mounting worker satisfaction, fringe political movements, and plight of the unemployed and working poor as marginal concerns compared with the unquestioned importance of a sound currency and balanced budget. Leaders need to recognize the policy failures of the last 20 years and respond accordingly. If they do not, there are others waiting in the wings who will, perhaps on less pleasant terms.''

We ought to be looking very closely at where the new sovereigns intend to take us. We need to discuss the end they have in sight. It is our responsibility and our duty.

Most everyone today agrees that socialism is not a threat. Many people feel communism, even in China, is not a threat. Indeed, there are few real security threats to America that could compare to even our recent past.

Be that as it may, when we speak of global market economy free enterprise, we massage the terms to merge with manage the competition and planning authorities, all the while suggesting we have met the ''hidden hand'' and it is good.

We need to also recall what Adam Smith said but is rarely quoted. ''Masters are always and everywhere in a sort of tacit but constant and uniform combination not to raise the wages of labor above their actual rate. To violate this combination is everywhere a most unpopular action and a sort of reproach for a master among his neighbors and questions. We seldom, indeed, hear of this combination because it is usual and, one may say, the natural state of things. Masters, too, sometimes enter into particular combinations to sink wages of labor even below this rate. They are always conducted with the utmost silence and secrecy till the moment of execution.''

And now precisely, whose responsibility is it to keep an eye on the masters?

I urge my colleagues, Republicans and Democrats, left and right on the political spectrum, to boldly restore the oversight role of Congress in one stroke and join my colleagues and I in supporting H.J. Res. 90 in restoring the sovereignty of these United States.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for June 15 after 10:00 p.m. on account of official business.

Mrs. EMERSON (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today after 6:00 p.m. and June 20 on account of her daughter's graduation.

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. ALLEN) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)