

Isabel's family my best wishes for the success of their event; and I applaud their desire to honor such an able scholar and true visionary: Isabel Briggs Myers.

SUPPORT OF BIPARTISAN PATIENT PROTECTION ACT, H.R. 2563

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

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to voice my strong support of the Ganske-Dingell-Norwood-Berry patients' bill of rights. I am a proud cosponsor of this bill which our wise counterparts in the Senate passed more than 1 month ago.

Over 800 organizations endorse the Ganske-Dingell-Norwood-Berry patient bill of rights, and numerous surveys show overwhelming support for the kind of bipartisan commonsense protections this bill provides. We must pass this bill and not delay or deny the American public what so many of us have promised them time and time again since 1998.

More than 160 million Americans receive health services through managed care. Sixty-three percent of the insured population in this country have employment-based insurance. This patients' bill of rights would not only ensure a basic minimal level of health care for these Americans but also ensure that doctors, and not bureaucrats, are making decisions when it comes to patient care.

We must pass the newly revised Ganske-Dingell-Norwood-Berry patients' bill of rights, H.R. 2563. This bill gives HMO patients the right to choose their own doctor, covers all Americans with employer-based insurance, ensures that external reviews are conducted by independent and qualified physicians, and holds a plan accountable when it makes a decision that harms or kills someone. It also provides access to emergency room care, OB-GYNs, pediatricians, specialty care providers, and clinical trials and prescription drugs.

And while it does allow patients to sue in Federal and State courts, the newly revised bill makes it clear that employers will not be sued for wrongs committed by health plans. It limits employer liability by providing an exemption for self-employed plans and permitting employers to appoint a decisionmaker to immunize them from lawsuits.

Mr. Speaker, furthermore, this legislation narrows the scope of defined violations to provide meaningful protections for employers trying to provide the best care they can for employers and employees.

Mr. Speaker, an understandable and equally important concern for many of

America's hardworking employers is the increased cost of providing health care for their employees. H.R. 2563 has been crafted to minimize this risk as well. The Congressional Budget Office issued a cost analysis of the McCain-Edwards-Kennedy bill, which is virtually identical to H.R. 2563, and concluded it would increase health insurance premiums by only a de minimis amount.

Moreover, a cost increase may never occur, since many HMOs have changed their policies over the past 3 years to ensure that patients can obtain medically necessary care. I applaud these HMOs and hope that others will follow, especially since some Members of the House seem determined to never let H.R. 2563 be considered on the House floor. I think that would be a travesty, Mr. Speaker. This patients' bill of rights represents a critical step toward improving our health care system by placing control of patient care firmly in the hands of patients and their doctors.

I implore my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to think of their constituents and the promises that we have made to improve health care in America. We must pass meaningful health care reform. We must pass this patients' bill of rights, and we must do it now.

RURAL CLEANSING

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

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, we can never satisfy government's appetite for money or land. If we gave every department or agency up here twice what they are getting now, they would be happy for a short time but then they would be coming back to us crying about a shortfall in funding. But it is this threat to land and to private property that especially concerns me tonight.

The Federal Government today owns over 30 percent of the land in this country, and State and local governments and quasi-governmental agencies own another 20 percent. So that half the land today is in some type of public control.

□ 2015

The alarming thing is the rapid rate at which that government control of land has been increasing in the last 30 or 40 years. Then on top of that, we continue to put more and more restrictions on what people can do with the private property that remains in their hands.

We have to realize at some point, Mr. Speaker, that private property is one of the few things that has set us apart from countries like the former Soviet Union and Cuba and other socialist and

communist nations. We need to recognize that private property is a very, very important part of our freedom and our prosperity.

I have talked about these restrictions on what people can do with their land. There are groups all over the country that protest any time anybody wants to dig for coal, drill for any oil, cut any trees, or produce any natural gas. What they are doing is hurting the poor and lower- and middle-income people most of all by destroying jobs and driving up prices on everything.

I want to bring to the attention of my colleagues tonight a column that was in the Wall Street Journal a few days ago called "Rural Cleansing" by Kimberley Strassel, who is an assistant editor and columnist for the Wall Street Journal.

She wrote a column, most of which I want to read at this time. She talks about the cut off of water to 1,500 farm families in Oregon and California's Klamath Basin in April because of the sucker fish: "The environmental groups behind the cut off continue to declare that they were simply concerned for the welfare of a bottom feeder. But last month these environmentalists revealed another motive when they submitted a polished proposal for the government to buy off the farmers and move them off their lands. This is what is really happening in Klamath. Call it rural cleansing. It is repeating itself in environmental battles across the country.

"Indeed, the goal of many environmental groups from the Sierra Club and others is no longer to protect nature. It is to expunge humans from the countryside.

"The strategy of these environmental groups is nearly always the same. To sue or lobby the government into declaring rural areas off limits to people who live and work there. The tools for doing this include the Endangered Species Act and local preservation laws. In some cases, owners lose their property outright. More often, the environmentalists' goal is to have restrictions placed on the land that either render it unusable or persuade owners to leave of their own accord."

The column continues that there was a court decision in this case. "Since that decision, the average value of an acre of farm property in Klamath has dropped from \$2,500 to about \$35. Most owners have no other source of income. So with the region suitably desperate, the enviros dropped their bomb. Last month they submitted a proposal urging the government to buy the farmers off.

"The council has suggested a price of \$4,000 an acre which makes it more likely the owners will sell only to the government. While the amount is more than the property's original value, it is nowhere near enough to compensate people for the loss of their livelihoods and their children's future.