

in this Chamber claimed they would do given the status of those contributions and the apparent illegalities involved. Does the gentleman from Indiana have a comment on that?

Mr. SOUDER. Yes. Hopefully later today we will be talking further about that. In fact, this is interesting, the board that I chose to put the national testing on is one I had earlier of 94 witnesses who have fled the country or pled the fifth.

The problem is that you have to change this part up here a lot. It is now 116 or 118 people. We know that a number of these witnesses, they have had to refund the money, but others are still pending. If they would talk to us, we probably would have a lot more money that has been illegal. As Chairman HOEKSTRA'S oversight investigation of the Teamsters, he sees the same money laundering pattern there. As these things move up, you start to see the same names pop up in different places. They have some real problems. They would like to make this whole discussion of what Congress has been focusing on just about the legal questions or about personal affairs of the President or people in the White House, but the truth is that it is a lot more complicated. It would be nice if some people helped come forward to clean up the process that this government has sunk into.

Mr. HAYWORTH. I thank the gentleman for his comments. Again, I am somewhat amazed and chagrined that now over 100 people, almost 120 people have either taken the fifth amendment or fled the country with regard to this investigation. It only compounds the difficulty that sadly we see in this city within this government, within the executive branch.

As I was looking at the report card offered the President by my colleague from Indiana, Mr. Speaker, I thought about my own children, their educational experience and the fact that our youngest, John Micah, not to be confused with the gentleman in the chair from Florida tonight, but John Micah with an "h" at the end of his middle name, is fond of a new endeavor at school, being a year out of kindergarten and being 4½, something called connect the dots. And it is a metaphor for what is transpiring within the executive branch of this government, to the point where we have moved past connecting the dots in some areas of conduct and, to mix metaphors, we have moved from that endeavor of connecting the dots to Hans Christian Andersen's fairy tale of the emperor's new clothes or the lack thereof.

It is amazing, again, to see the willingness of people to turn away, to actually try, through the punditocracy to distract us, to suggest that constitutional procedures should not be followed, that it really would be better to try and find an unconstitutional or extra constitutional third way that is just as devoid of reality as any fanciful tale you could find in children's literature.

Mr. DELAY. The gentleman is right. I think he has expounded on his premise of where he quoted Paul Greenberg, do not watch what the President says, watch what he does. The gentleman from Indiana, as he says, is on the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

My question is, who is in charge? We do not know who to deal with anymore. We have been here all weekend. We are going into more negotiations tomorrow, and who knows how long we will be here. And again, I tell my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, we will stay here until we get it done. But this whole notion of who is in charge and what he says and how he backs up what he says, we have already talked about the fact that having 100,000 teachers being paid for by the Federal Government would be as successful as the 100,000 cops that they have not funded yet. There are only 58,000 that have actually been put on the streets because nobody, most people do not want to participate.

The gentleman is on the Education Committee. I seem to remember that along with that, the President wants to improve the technology, put computers in every classroom, those kinds of things. In fact, I think his quote was, the budget should also bring cutting edge technology to the classroom, the library.

Does not the Department of Education have a trust fund and they have had a trust fund to bring technology to the classroom and it has been in place for over 2 years. And not one dime has been spent on improving technology in the classroom. So they have this bunch of money sitting out there. That was not good enough.

The President of the United States got the phone companies to raise taxes on phone calls, we call it the Gore tax on long distance, to help fund this effort, and that was not even part of the agreement, when the bill was actually passed a couple of years ago. Another almost shutdown where the President demanded new programs and things like that. But there is money there. There is a trust fund set up, and they cannot even spend it. So they propose a program for rhetorical reasons. They get what they want by negotiating out the final outcome of spending, yet when they are given it, they cannot even implement it. They are so incompetent they cannot even implement those programs.

Mr. SOUDER. I think it is important for those who may not be real C-SPAN junkies who may be watching today, you did not say the President is trying to provide Gortex to people. It is a Gore tax. The vice president has proposed a tax on all American consumers to pay for one of their pet programs. A lot of times when we say it real fast, it sounds like Gortex.

I think you have hit the fundamental point. There is a difference. In my heart of hearts, I believe that the President and the First Lady have a

sincere commitment to education. I believe, however, they want to nationalize it. Furthermore, the way they do that is they poll test. I had the unusual experience, when I was working with Senator COATS for 2 years, to work with Dick Morris, who is a very brilliant pollster, but he tests different things to see, and these things get the highest response, even down to the words with the little things on your arm where you try to see which words get the response.

My daughter is an elementary ed and her secondary emphasis in education is preschool education. And as I mentioned, I am on the committee. I also am more of a neoconservative than a particular libertarian. We may have some differences on this, but there is a framework for the Federal Government within to work. That is, if certain school districts, say, in inner city Chicago or New York do not get covered or do not have the property tax base and they do not get covered at their State, we have developed programs at the Federal level, chapter 1, TRIO accounts and so on, to say for the very poor there is a Federal role. We also, because a lot of States and local governments ignore the handicap, have developed a program called IDEA. We developed Head Start. It is not that the Federal Government is not in education.

Quite frankly, almost everybody in this body votes for those particular programs every year. The question is that that was a very particular need. These, I believe, as you stated, are poll driven. Even when the money is there, they do not use it. There is no reason that every school district has to surrender their sovereignty on computers and that type of thing, that there can be, there are plenty of targeted funds that can be better used.

We did far better for this country by balancing the budget, getting interest rates down, getting taxes down in local communities and giving families more money to work with so they can try to make the decisions at the local schools. If we are going to fund Federal programs, it takes a lot of gall for the President of the United States to propose new programs when he has not funded the programs for the handicapped children in this country. If he is going to spend money, he ought to give it to those who are hurting and where we have a consensus, not come up with new gimmicks.

Mr. DELAY. I appreciate the gentlemen from Arizona and Indiana participating in this special order. The insight was very valuable.

□ 1830

#### MANAGED CARE REFORM AND OTHER TOPICS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MICA). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to start out this evening by pointing out that the problem that I as a Democrat and I think most of the Democrats have with what has been happening here the last 2 years is not necessarily that we are not willing to debate with the Republicans on these issues because in many ways I think that what happened today in the discussion that we have had today on both sides of the aisle has been rather interesting. The problem is that on most of the Democratic initiatives which I think are the initiatives that the average citizen is concerned about, we have not had the opportunity to bring them up. We have talked as Democrats about how we want to bring up before the Congress adjourns education concerns, money to modernize our schools, to hire additional teachers, 100,000 new teachers. We are going to talk this evening in the next hour quite a bit about HMO reform. We have talked about the need to address Social Security because we know that eventually down the road there is not going to be enough money in the Social Security trust fund. But what we have found is that the Republican leadership does not allow these things to come up. They do not even allow, and the very debate that we have had tonight in the context of these special orders is not a debate that we are allowed to have on legislative issues because the legislation that deals with these education or HMO, health care concerns or Social Security concerns, we do not get an opportunity to deal with it. The Republicans control the House. The Republicans decide what comes to the floor. And they have basically stalled and not allowed most of these concerns that the American public has to even be considered. That is why we are here tonight on Sunday to debate this, why we are demanding that these issues be addressed before we go home, and all we keep hearing from the other side of the aisle is that they want to get out of here quickly, they think they have completed their business. Well, they have not completed their business. We would like to point that out.

I yield to the gentlewoman from Connecticut who started the special orders earlier this afternoon and who has been our leader on so many of these issues.

Ms. DELAURO. I thank the gentleman from New Jersey. I just wanted to make a couple of points before we start our hour's time here. The gentleman who led the previous discussion here this evening is the third-ranking leader in the House of Representatives, the majority whip. I think it was interesting to note that he commented about the government shutdown 2 years ago. What is quite extraordinary to note is that the government was shut down twice, unheard of in the history of the United States, by the Republican majority because, as my colleague from New Jersey has rightly said, and sometimes people do not understand this, when the party is in

power and they have the majority, they control what happens here. You can say anything that you want about the Democrats were in the majority and you could agree or disagree on what they have, but the fact of the matter is that the Republicans control both the House and the Senate. But an interesting point, because he talked about how terrible a government shutdown would be and that is not what they were looking for and that it was the President looking for a government shutdown. Well, I was so stunned by a comment that the majority whip made when the government was shut down 2 years ago that quite honestly I had it blown up and I have it in my office because I could not believe anyone who held such an honor and held a position in this body would say such a thing. It was in a Texas newspaper and I am happy to provide it to anyone who would like to see it. I am not making this up. He said that when he heard that the government was reopened, that it was the worst moment, and I am paraphrasing, the worst moment of his life. He was grilling steaks on his balcony with some other Republican members, and he said, "We should have kept the government closed for as long as it was necessary."

Now, he has the luxury of saying that because he was earning a salary while the government was closed and people who were furloughed or laid off had no idea whether or not they were going to get their salaries, and the hundreds and hundreds of services that are supplied by this United States Government were shut down. So that he truly is someone who, in fact, was pleased that the government was shut down in the past, and I hasten to view that he would not mind if that happened again. That is where they are going.

I might also make just one more point. We are talking about how this Republican majority, how they legislate and the reasons for what they do and how that is tied in to special interest money. There is a big argument, if you will, a feud, GOP Feuding About Lobbyists. The point here, and it is in the papers here, again the majority whip is locked in a feud with the chairman of the Republican Conference because what they want to do is to dump the choice of president of something called the Electronic Industries Alliance. The long and the short of it, the person that is scheduled to become the president of this organization is a former Member of the House, Representative Dave McCurdy, who is a Democrat from Oklahoma. Essentially what they want to do, and this is by their own admission here, this is a quote, they want to send a message to this EIA that Republicans will not deal with trade associations and lobbying groups run by Democrats. Now, this is a quote by John Linder who is the head of their Republican Congressional Campaign Committee who says, quote, we think they, "they" being the trade associations, et cetera, ought to look

back and see who won the last couple of elections. And Mr. Linder confirmed that Republican leaders held intellectual property legislation, that means that our patents, all of our inventions, that laws restricting foreign governments, speaking of foreign governments, Chinese, everywhere where they are stealing our intellectual property around the world. What he is saying is that they held the legislation hostage that would have restricted foreign governments from stealing our intellectual property. He confirmed, "Republican leaders held intellectual property legislation favored by these EIA members hostage, quote, to send a message, that if you don't play by the Republican rules and don't do business with the Democrats, we are not going to pass legislation and you are not going to be able to get anything done up here." That is the way this Republican majority is dealing, fast and loose, fast and loose with the lives of the people in this country. It is on intellectual properties, it is on tobacco, 3,000 of our kids start to smoke every single day, a thousand of whom die. And they refused to pass tobacco legislation in this body. They are the single biggest recipients of tobacco dollars in the country. So who are they kidding when they talk about what they want to do for the American public? It was Mr. DELAY, it was Mr. GINGRICH who said, "There isn't enough money in our system. That's why we cannot pass campaign finance reform." And it was the Republican leadership of this House who said take Social Security dollars and squander them away.

Mr. PALLONE. "And let Medicare wither on the vine."

Ms. DELAURO. That is right.

Mr. PALLONE. That was Speaker NEWT GINGRICH's quote.

Ms. DELAURO. I believe it was Mr. ARMEY, the second-ranking member, who said Social Security is not a system that ought to be in existence or that we ought to have a part of. We need to remember some of those things.

In terms of public education, what we were talking about before, they would just as soon see public education come crumbling down and take public education and take those dollars and put them in the hands of the very few and the very rich and take away our birthright to education in this country.

Mr. PALLONE. I want to introduce the gentlewoman from California, but I just wanted to follow up on one of the things that the gentlewoman from Connecticut said. I am glad that she brought up this issue of Mr. DELAY, his remarks that he made when the government had been shut down by the Republicans and he regretted the fact that it was not shut down longer. There is a basic difference of philosophy here, or ideology, and, that is, that this Republican leadership does not believe in the government essentially, and they believe that it is better if the government does nothing. I have had

many Republicans on the other side of the aisle the last couple of days say, "Well, it doesn't matter if we're labeled as the do-nothing Congress because a do-nothing Congress is better." Many of them actually believe that. They do not look at the concerns that we have for the health and the safety and the protection of the average American as something that is actually positive. Remember that the issues that we feel that they should be raising, managed care reform, as far as many of them are concerned, there is no need for managed care reform because they do not have a problem with the insurance industry basically running roughshod over the American people and not providing medically necessary procedures and operations and length of stay in the hospital that a person needs to provide for adequate health care.

As far as education issues, I think the gentlewoman is right when she says that for many of them they would just as soon not have public education. So when we talk about modernizing school or class size, that is not their concern. They want more students to go to private schools. They are not concerned about public education. When we talk about Social Security, we have heard some of these same leaders say that Social Security was a bad thing from the beginning, so they are not concerned about whether or not we bring up efforts to try to shore up Social Security. She mentioned teen smoking. The same thing. Let the tobacco interests sell whatever they want to whomever. That is *laissez faire*. They believe that. They are not going to have us play some role in trying to protect young people or teenagers from smoking. And on down the line. Minimum wage. They do not want to raise the minimum wage. We have had to fight that so many times. Every time it has been raised here, it has been a battle by the Democrats to try to raise minimum wage. As far as they are concerned, there is no need to deal with that. For them to talk about how they really care about these issues, they do not care about these issues, they want to go home and they are proud of the fact, many of them, not all, but many of them that this is a do-nothing Congress. I yield to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. WOOLSEY. I thank the gentleman from New Jersey and I thank the gentlewoman from Connecticut for this day of standing up for the rights of the minority party. I was listening to the majority whip yammer along about the fact that blaming everybody else for this being a do-nothing Congress. Of course if he had anything to say about what they had achieved, they would have stood there and told us what they had done. Instead, they talked and talked and talked about why nothing had happened and pointed fingers and blamed others. If they had managed this Congress any better than the Soviets managed Chernobyl, they would

have something to say. If they had been working on the American public's needs instead of trying to raid Social Security, trying to cut taxes so the wealthy could benefit, trying to give education tax breaks for private schools, cheating the public education funding and threatening our national resources with anti-environmental riders, maybe they would have achieved enough that they could have stood up there earlier and said, "But this is what we did." But instead they had to say, "Oh, it's everybody else's fault, not ours." I will quote the Vice President in his saying, "The right hand does not know what the far right hand is doing," if they had their ranks together. They are the majority. And at what cost have they left this country without really anything except renaming National Airport to the Ronald Reagan Airport. They have not produced a managed care bill. There has been no bill to train and hire more teachers so we can reduce class size. They have no bill to modernize our schools, no safeguards for our Social Security, nothing to reduce teen smoking, no increase in minimum wage for working families, and the campaign finance bill that passed the House over their dead bodies, if Members can remember what Majority Whip DeLay said and what the Speaker said about campaign finance reform. And then when we did pass it, it could not get through the Republicans in the other body. They forget. They forget that children, 25 percent of our population are 100 percent of our future. Because of that, they are setting a record, a record that has not been broken for generations, for the least amount of days worked, the least number of bills enacted and the first time since the budget process was created, they have failed to pass a budget. This is not management. This is disaster. That is why they are complaining over there and trying to blame somebody else. But our families deserve better. It is time for a change.

Let me tell you how this has affected our children. 71,682,000 of our population in the United States are children. 10,000,743 more American children have no health insurance, that is up over 10 million from the start of this Congress. This number has continued to rise during the 105th Congress. It continues. Five thousand schools in the United States are in desperate need of repair and many are unfit learning environments.

□ 1945

Zero, none, of the 100,000 teachers needed to reduce class size and improve education quality have been approved; 14,113,000 children are living in poverty. This is in the richest Nation in the world. Despite a very strong economy, children continue to represent 40 percent of the impoverished while compromising only 20 percent of the Nation's population, and yet we have to remember 100 percent of the Nation's

future. Seventy-three percent more children have taken up a daily smoking habit. Each day 3,000 kids become habitual smokers. Of these 1,000 will die of smoking-related illnesses.

It is time that we turn the debate to the needs of our children, our seniors, our environment. Enough about politically inspired investigations, and excessive partisanship and wasteful spending on duplicative and wasteful Republican committee investigations that have ended in dead ends, costing millions of American dollars. Instead, we have to do something about managed care reform. We have to have campaign finance reform. We have to have bills that will reduce teen smoking. We have to have bills that will enhance environmental protections. And we must raise the minimum wage. Then our children will be considered our number one priority. But most of all, making them our number one priority, we must invest in their education. We cannot leave here without an agreement for 100,000 more teachers and new and improved classrooms.

Twenty-five percent of our population are our children. One hundred percent of our future are those same children.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman, and I wanted to point out tonight, if we could just spend a little time on the issue of HMO reform, because all three of us went over to the Senate; I believe it was a couple days ago now when the democratic majority leader Mr. DASCHLE tried for the last time, and he has tried many times, to bring up the issue of HMO reform or the Democratic, really bipartisan, proposal that we call the Patients Bill of Rights. And many of us in the House, the three of us included, went over to the Senate and basically stood in the back of the room to show our support for the effort to bring up HMO reform, and, as you know, it was a defeated. We had a couple of Republicans that joined all the Democrats, but not enough because we do not have the majority to bring it up and to discuss it.

Again, we were only asking that the Senate take up the issue on the floor. The issue of whether they passed something, the Patients' Bill of Rights or any kind of managed care reform, never came up. Again, we are just asking that they consider these things as part of the debate, and that was denied, and that unfortunately probably means the death knell of that issue in the Congress for this year.

What I wanted to point out very emphatically, if I could, is that what the Democrats and some Republicans, this is not just a Democratic issue, but it is something opposed by the Republican leadership; what the Democrats are asking for are very simple common sense protections.

Most people, when I discuss this with them, unless they have had a problem with their HMO, you know, because maybe they have been healthy and

have not had to deal with this, they think that these things are already there. They are surprised to learn that these protections do not already exist, and just to give you an idea, I just listed some of the main ones here that we would like to have provided for all patients, all Americans, is guaranteed access to needed health care specialists; if you need a specialist, that you should be able to get one; access to emergency room services. Many people go to the emergency room and are either turned away or find out later that their health insurance will not cover the emergency room care. Continuity of care protections, access to timely internal and external appeal; if the HMO or insurance company denies you a particular procedure, then you should be able to appeal that and have it overturned. Limits on financial incentives to doctors. Unfortunately, and many people are surprised to learn, that doctors in many managed care organizations are actually encouraged and given extra money if they limit the number of people that are provided care, assuring doctors and patients can openly discuss treatment options. Can you imagine? I do not think there is anybody probably who thinks that there is anything out there that would deny doctors and patients the right to openly discuss treatment options. We live in a free society, we value the first amendment, and yet many of the HMOs tell their physicians that they cannot talk about treatment options that are not covered by the health insurance. It is called the gag rule, which is un-American. Assuring that women have direct access to OB/GYN; I know that Congresswoman DeLauro has been very much involved with that and some of the other issues that women have been denied by their insurance companies, various types of care, and lastly an enforcement mechanism that insures recourse for patients who are maimed or die because of health plan actions. Many people do not know that if their HMO denies them a particular type of care and they are seriously insured or die from it, that they cannot sue the HMO. Well, they should be able to.

We are just pointing these things out because we think that every American should be guaranteed these basic protections. But if we do not enact them into law, if we just proceed with this do-nothing Congress that says that the government does not have to do anything, you know *laissez-faire*, or whatever the term is, then we have a situation where these insurance companies simply deny care, decide what is medically necessary, and you have no recourse, and that is what we are trying to prevent.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman again.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Well, you said that maybe some of our colleagues have never experienced the shortcomings of managed care because they are healthy. Well, oops, maybe it is because they can afford other coverage.

It might have something to do with people being wealthy, and I think we have to remember that, and we have to continually remember that if an appeal process does not have real teeth, it is not an appeal process.

There is some very good managed care providers in my district, the Sixth Congressional District in California. I mean they are models for the Nation. But I tell you we can be assured that even these good managed care providers are going to have to give up some of their quality, some of their standards if we do not have real reform because they will have to compete, and they will be competing against providers that do not do as well, do not do as much, do not have protections, and everybody is going to lose because we will be slipping sliding to the lowest rung of the ladder; there is no question about it.

We have to have real managed care reform, and the doctors in my district want it. They want to be part of making the decision about health care with their patient. They do not want to have to be listening to what a clerk in an insurance company is telling them that they can to or not do for their patient. The patient and the doctor want to make those decisions, and the insurance company is responsible for paying for it.

Mr. PALLONE. I want to thank the gentlewoman and yield to the gentlewoman from Connecticut.

Ms. DELAURO. I think that this is such an appropriate discussion, and it is such an issue that is on the minds of the American people, and that is what is being flaunted here. It is not us. It is about what the American people have talked about in terms of the whole managed care system which they find is out of control.

There was a recent Times CNN poll that found that 76 percent of Americans support managed care reform. Only 41 percent said that they were very confident that their health care plan would pay for their treatment if they really got sick. And now you have another, and most people, and I think everybody saw it, *As Good As It Gets*, the movie where there is the great applause line when Helen Hunt expresses her frustration with the HMOs and managed care because people feel that that is out of control, that they, in fact, have no way of being able to handle this system.

More recently we have found that the HMOs are pulling out of Medicare and leaving seniors on their own. It has happened in my State of Connecticut where we have 12,000 people now who are, you know, trying to scramble around for what they are going to do for their health care. Now, it is not only happening in Connecticut, it is happening all over the country. So, the fact is that the public truly knows that the managed care system is out of control.

Now we tried to address that, as both my colleagues have pointed out, with a

very simple set of guidelines, if you will, in which my colleague from New Jersey mentioned about emergency room care, and speciality care and continuity of care if your employer changes plans, and employers change plans every year now.

Just interesting to note that that was a bipartisan piece of legislation. There are lots of folks said if we can put the bickering aside and do something on behalf of the American public, let us set the record straight. It is a bipartisan piece of legislation. Dingell, Ganske, a number of other folks including the gentleman from New Jersey who worked very hard on this issue that could have passed this House in a heartbeat. But go back to the notion that who was in charge? Who has the jurisdiction to bring up the legislation? Who has the jurisdiction to hold hearings?

Three days of hearings on the issue of managed care reform; contrast, 63 days of hearings on politically-motivated investigations. More to the point: 2 days of hearings on renaming National Airport the Ronald Reagan Airport.

Now for 3 days, only 3 days for our health care system, they finally passed; they brought up after months and months, they passed this sham bill, sham bill, and I just want to mention it because they will come up and claim that they passed a HMO bill, but let me just say that it makes things worse, the bill that they passed. It does not guarantee coverage of emergency care, it does not guarantee privacy of medical records. That is your medical records which today is such a problem with regard to employment or with regard to insurance coverage can be given away to anyone without your knowledge. It would not guarantee access to specialists, it does not guarantee the continuity of care if your doctor is arbitrarily dropped from the plan, does not hold health plans accountable for their decisions when things go wrong. And above all, above all, it will not give the power to decide what is medically necessary to your doctor.

That is the fundamental reason people want to see health, managed care reform because of they want doctors to make the decisions along with them, with themselves.

Again, this is thwarting the will of the public, it is thwarting the will of the majority in both the House and in the Senate, and they recently, just 2 days ago, defeated managed care. That is not the way that this place should be operating. We are here to represent people's interests. We are not for political reasons to thwart the will of the people particularly on their health care and their health and their safety.

Mr. PALLONE. The gentlewoman points out, makes a very good point I should say, with regard to the HMO reform, and that is that, as we know, back in August, there was so much heat, if you will, on the Republicans to deal with the issue of managed care reform, so many constituents who were

clamoring that they take up the issue that they finally did just on one day with a very brief debate on the House floor allow the issue to come up. But what they did as a result of that was to pass a bill that was actually worse than the status quo.

I have not been dwelling that much on that, although I think we should talk about it a little bit because when it went over to the Senate, they would not even take that sham bill up. So we are faced in a situation now where they will not even bring it up again because they think that, you know, circumstances have changed and the public is not paying as much attention to that, which I think is garbage. There is no question that the public is still very much concerned about it.

But if we can just take a minute to elaborate a little more on this sham bill that they brought up, and I think you pointed out this issue of medical necessity which is really the heart of this debate because when we say that a person is not getting care, it is usually because they are not allowed to have a certain operation or they are told they cannot stay in the hospital more than 2 days for a certain procedure, and so the decision about what is medically necessary in that case, just to have the operation or to stay the extra few days, is essentially made by the insurance company.

□ 1900

What the Democratic or bipartisan, if you will, Patients' Bill of Rights says is that medical necessity will be based on generally accepted principles of professional medical practice.

So it goes back to what the physicians and the physician groups say is necessary, as opposed to what the insurance companies say. They do not change that in their bill. They simply say it is up to the insurance company to decide what is medically necessary.

This kind of trickery goes on for just about everything in their bill. Emergency room care is another example. You can theoretically go to any emergency room under the Republican bill, but there is no guarantee that the insurance company is going to pay for it.

We use this example of severe pain, because under the Democratic bill, we use a lay person's standard, a prudent layperson. Obviously the prudent or typical citizen, if you will, if they get severe pain in their chest, figures they had better go to the emergency room because they may be having a heart attack.

Under the Republican bill there is no guarantee that severe pain is a basis for your getting emergency room care. You could go to the emergency room with what you think is a heart attack because you have severe pain, and, if it turns out you do not have a heart attack, they do not pay the emergency room.

Ms. DELAURO. If you survive, they do not pay. Only if you die.

Mr. PALLONE. I just want to mention one more example. We laugh, but

it is not funny; but it is ridiculous when you think about it. I talked about the gag rule before where they do not allow or many of the HMOs do not allow the physicians to talk about procedures that are not covered by the insurance plan. In the GOP bill, a health plan would still be allowed to restrict communications between doctors and patients, because their bill only prohibits gagging doctors who contract directly with the HMO plan. What they do not tell you is that most doctors subcontract with health plans and their bill does not prohibit plans from gagging doctors who subcontract with plans.

So here again we have got all these little quirks in their legislation, little exceptions and things that turn out to be big exceptions that still impact the majority of the people.

There are similar things with the financial incentives, where most insurance companies can still create financial incentives for doctors who do not provide care.

So, again, I have not stressed this too much, because I would have at least appreciated if the Senate would bring up any managed care reform bill and let us debate the issue the way we have tonight in this special order. But we did not even get that. So there is almost no point in talking about what should or should not be in the bill, because they will not let us bring the bill up.

I yield to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. WOOLSEY. We should not be surprised, because a year ago, November 1997, let me read to you from the New York Times.

Business and insurance lobbyists who helped kill President Clinton's health plan in 1994 are mobilizing a new campaign to block more modest proposals that would set Federal standards for quality of care. Republican leaders of Congress are urging the lobbyists to step up their activities against an array of managed care reform bills, backed by consumer advocates as a way to protect patients in a turbulent medical market.

That was the first. Then the times reported on October 22, 1997 that Melody Harnad, a Federal Affairs Counsel at the Health Insurance Association of America, summarized the situation in a confidential memo to her supervisor, the vice president of the association, and she said,

The message we are getting from the House and Senate GOP leadership is that we are in a war and need to start fighting like we are in a war. Republican leadership is now engaged on this issue and is issuing strong directives to all players in the insurance and employer community to get activated.

Well, I would like to say that there was a lot of fear in 1993 when I was first sworn into the House of Representatives, a fear of a single payer national health care system.

Well, I think we are going to get there sooner than we ever thought, because, with attitudes like this, the public has to be fearful that they will have health care in their future, a national

health care system could protect them and will.

Ms. DELAURO. If the gentlewoman will yield for one second, because I think it is interesting, and this is a quote, because we started talking earlier about how special interest money plays into this effort. It happened, as we pointed out, with tobacco, and there was a \$40 million ad campaign by the tobacco companies to defeat tobacco legislation, and they succeeded. They succeeded.

Now, this is what Senator LOTT said, that the Senate Republicans need a lot of help from their friends on the outside. "Get off your butts; get off your wallets."

Then we see another \$40 million ad campaign by the group of votes here.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members must not make personal references to members of the Senate.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, then the leader of the other body, that was his quote, so that in fact what you understand here is that they wanted their folks to get up, get their money out there, and defeat managed care reform. Another \$40 million ad campaign to defeat managed care reform, one of the single biggest issues that the American public is trying to grapple with today. It just reinforces the point of how this Republican-controlled Congress is dealing with legislation that faces people.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Taking my time back, it worked. Did it not work? We do not have managed care health reform in this Congress.

Now we have to change it. The people of this country have to know what is happening, and I thank both of you for making this possible so we can speak to the issues and the people who are listening can hear the issues, and we can be moving forward. We need a Congress that cares about health care, our seniors, our children and our environment, and this Congress and its majority does not.

Mr. PALLONE. I want to thank the gentlewoman. Let me talk a little bit more about health care, if I can, and then maybe we could also bring up this whole debate over Social Security, if you would like, because I think that is another one of the major points that I feel needs to be addressed and that the Republicans have gone on off on a totally different course.

I was so glad when you mentioned about the President's health care plan a few years ago, because, if we remember, at the time the President brought up his proposal for universal health care, it was a different proposal. It was not a single payer system, it was a different approach. But, nonetheless, he was responding to the fact that so many Americans, and more Americans every day, did not have health insurance.

Many of the issues that we have brought up are sort of aspects of that. We talk about managed care reform, we talk about portability, we talk

about preexisting conditions, about people being denied care. But, most important, the President was addressing the fact that more and more Americans do not have health insurance.

What we have found since the President's plan was defeated by the special interest lobbyists and their multi-million dollar campaign was the number of people that have no health insurance has gone up. There was a report that came out just a few weeks ago that had an all-time high, it was over 40 million Americans, 42 or 43 million Americans have no health insurance. So we know the concern he had then was a legitimate concern, and, in fact, the situation is getting much worse.

Now, we have tried sort of dragging and kicking to get this Republican Congress over the last few years to address some of these concerns. We did manage to get a kids health initiative passed last year. But what we found, in fact, we had a hearing just a couple of weeks ago in the Committee on Commerce and the kids health initiative, because that initiative came out of the Committee on Commerce and was also another focus of our Democratic Health Care Task Force, is that although we were now on the way to ensuring about 5 million more young children, that the number of uninsured children is rising at a much more dramatic rate than it was when we were trying to address this kids health initiative. So as fast as we are with this new program trying to ensure more kids, the number of children uninsured is growing even larger.

The main reason for that is because so many people who are working, and we are not talking about people who are on welfare or eligible for Medicaid, we are talking about families that are working, who cannot get health insurance for their kids because more and more employers are not providing for health insurance, are not given the opportunity for health insurance on the job.

I have always felt what we needed to do was somehow encourage more employers to provide health insurance. I do not know how you do that, whether it is a mandate or through some tax incentives or whatever, but the HMO reform, as important as it is, only helps those who already have insurance. The numbers who do not have insurance continues to grow.

This Republican Congress, it just ignores this whole health insurance debate, and essentially, as Ms. DELAURO said, is basically just in the pockets of the insurance industry, and they do not want any of these reforms to take place. They just do not want to hear it, every aspect of this health insurance debate.

We are at the end of this session. We are not going to be able to address most of these things. But we cannot let them go home, we cannot let them go home without addressing some of these concerns, whether it is HMO reform or the education initiatives or some of the

other concerns that we have brought up here.

As I said before, with all the things I think should have been done in this Congress, if I was able to say that I only stayed here a few more days and was at least able to get the school modernization program passed, I would be happy and say okay, "let's go home." But, right now, they are not willing to address any of these things, and we just have to keep pointing it out over and over again.

Ms. DELAURO. I think the gentleman is right. Also, just because of what they will say on the other side of the aisle, I would just say this: There are reasonable people, as I said, because the managed care reform bill was a bipartisan piece of legislation. It was the leadership who will not bring it to the floor. I think that is critical, because this is not bickering back and forth. We could have done this. We had enough votes.

Mr. PALLONE. If I could just take my time back a second, you remember that we have our Democratic Health Care Task Force, but the Republicans had set one up also, and they had come forward at some point in the summer, early in the summer, with a patient protection bill that was very similar to the Patients' Bill of Rights. Some of the people on there had actually endorsed the concept of our Patients' Bill of rights. But when Speaker GINGRICH got a copy of that thing, he immediately said, "No way. We are not going ahead with this." He obviously showed it to the insurance industry and they said, "No way, this is much too protective of the interests of the patients," and he told them literally, "Go back to the drawing board."

They went back, two or three more weeks, and they came out with this awful bill that they eventually brought up in one day.

Ms. DELAURO. That is precisely the point. Let us listen to the public. We reflect their interests here. We put a piece of legislation together. Let us get it passed.

The other thing they would say is that this was going to drive the cost of health insurance sky high and make it unable for people to pay for.

Wrong. The CBO analysis, Congressional Budget Office analysis of the Patients' Bill of Rights of 1998, was it would have only a minimal effect on premiums, with most individuals paying only about \$2 more per month for all of the protections that have been cited in the past. So they should not have said that.

Mr. PALLONE. If you remember, we had many of the Members of the Texas delegation, and these are not ideological liberals by any means, Democrats, many of them of conservative ideology, who had the experience in Texas where Texas passed a Patient Protection Act, and it was very similar to what we want at the Federal level. The results are already in and show that the cost is practically nothing. I think it was like

34 cents a month or something like that.

One of the reasons that the cost was so minimal, and this was brought out by one of our task force hearings where we had someone testify from some of the Texas organizations that were involved, was because it led to prevention. In other words, it was sort of like what Congresswoman WOOLSEY was saying: Once the HMOs have this sort of floor that they have to provide these basic protections, they are very careful to make sure that the level of health care that is provided is of good quality, and you have preventative measures taking place so that you do not get lawsuits, you do not get all these problems that result from the current system, because they know they are being watched, and it actually cuts the costs down considerably.

Ms. WOOLSEY. One thing I would like to call to everybody's attention is that these 10 million children that are not covered, more than 80 percent of them live in families with at least one working parent.

□ 1915

That is a huge number. We are not talking about welfare recipients, we are talking about the working poor who work every day as hard as everybody else, or harder, at maybe more than one job, and they cannot afford health care for their children. One of the reasons that businesses do not provide it is that health care costs are going up again.

One of the reasons we supported HMOs in the first place, and HMOs were going to be the savior for health care, is because the cost of health care leveled as the number of HMOs grew in this Nation. Now we have passed that nexus. Health care costs are going up in rapid, rapid numbers, and the quality of the HMO is going down, so we have to put that floor. That is what HMO reform would do, managed care reform. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I know we only have about 10 or 15 minutes left, but if we could just spend a little time talking about the Social Security issue and what the Republicans tried to do a few weeks ago with regard to these tax breaks for the wealthy versus Social Security, because this was very disturbing to me.

We passed the Balanced Budget Act last year. For the first time in a long time, this year there was a bit of a surplus in the budget. However, when we look at the budget, we realize very clearly that that surplus is totally the result of money that has been set aside in the Social Security trust fund, because at some time down the road that trust fund money is going to be needed to pay out benefits to senior citizens. We know that at some point, even more money is going to have to be available than what is set aside in the trust fund years down the road.

But they had the audacity a few weeks ago to suggest and to actually

pass on the House floor a bill that would take money from the surplus for tax breaks, a lot of which, from what I can see, would just help wealthy corporations. But regardless of who it helps, they would be taking this money out of the Social Security Trust Fund. They actually had to change the House rules or get around the House rules because the money was coming directly from the Social Security Trust Fund.

When I talk to the senior citizens in my district, I do not even have to explain this to them. They know it right off the bat. They understand. They become very upset, because if we start skimming this trust fund, we are going to aggravate the problem that we already have in not having enough money to pay out benefits in the future.

Then what is going to happen is the pressure is going to be on to reduce benefits, either by raising the age or eliminating the COLA or somehow changing the Social Security program. That gets back to what the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) was saying again; this Republican leadership does not care about Social Security anyway, so that probably fits into their scheme.

I am thankful at least, in this case, that the Senate did not take up this terrible bill. It just goes again to show the kinds of things we have had to deal with and the kinds of things we have wasted our time with in this Republican Congress.

Ms. DELAURO. When we voted, I know the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) did and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) and I did, we voted for tax cuts. We all support tax cuts. We voted for the tax cuts, and we said that they would go into effect when there was a law in place that would make sure that the Social Security system was solvent. Because in fact with this opportunity for a surplus, the Social Security Trust Fund surplus allows us to have the surplus, so in fact you are using the surplus and then shortchanging Social Security.

We vetoed four tax cuts. I support tax cuts. Men and women are working hard today. Families are literally throwing every hour that they have into the workplace, and they are barely staying even. We need to do that.

However, the point was, let the tax cuts go into effect when we are sure that Social Security is solvent, so the beneficiaries today will keep getting their benefits, and, if you will, my generation, the gentleman's kids' generation, will have the opportunity.

I want to just tell the gentleman why, because this is critical. Social Security is 60 years old. It has been one of the major success stories of this country. We have men and women who are working hard all their lives, and now for their financial security and their retirement years they rely on Social Security. Today two-thirds of America's seniors rely on Social Security for over one-half of their income.

That is staggering, and is why we cannot be political with Social Security. Social Security, we cannot play fast and loose with it. It has to be a thoughtful and reflective process. We have the opportunity immediately to take a look at this potential surplus in order to be able to make it solvent over the next 75 years. This is going to be the critical issue in the next session of the Congress.

There are going to be a number of issues that are going to come up, such as privatizing Social Security, which is something that I lean against, because the other piece, which is important to note, Social Security provides for a guaranteed annual income for these two-thirds of seniors who rely on Social Security for over half of their income. There is a guaranteed annual income.

The privatizing solutions remove that guaranteed annual income, so we need to be very, very careful with it. That is what we were saying by that vote a couple of weeks ago in this body: Let us not raid Social Security, let us make sure it is safe for the next 75 years. Then, yes, let us move to tax cuts, targeted tax cuts for working families today in this country.

Mr. PALLONE. Again, the biggest concern I have is that so much time was wasted on this debate. The Republicans basically knew this was going nowhere, so what happens? We are back here again today. They have not accomplished anything in terms of trying to achieve any of these goals relative to education, HMOs, or Social Security.

The issue is how to deal with Social Security in the long run and try to shore up Social Security for the future. Instead, they waste all this time again, forcing us into a situation where we are going to be back in session here tomorrow. There is no budget, there is so little time, and basically they are saying, look, do not worry about it. Go home. A do-nothing Congress is fine with us. We take pride in it.

It is just very upsetting. I think the only thing we can do is keep doing what we are doing now, keep demanding something be done. Mainly, I think the education initiative is something we can try to achieve over the next few years.

I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I, for one, am embarrassed at how little this Congress has produced. I would think the leadership of this Congress, of this House, would be red in the face when they look at themselves in the mirror.

I, too, voted for Social Security first and tax cuts afterward. But I want to tell the Members, I represent if not the, one of the best-educated districts in the Nation. They know about this stuff. They have been saying to me since the day I was elected in 1992, when is the Congress going to pay back what this country owes our Social Security Trust Fund? I have said, it is

going to be paid back. We are on our way to a surplus. It will happen then.

I am telling the Members, it had better happen, because if we do not, not only are we putting the Generation Xers and the baby boomers at risk, we are putting our national debt at risk, because a great percentage of that national debt is what we owe back to the Social Security trust.

It is a win-win. It is a two-fer, if we take care of Social Security. We need to get Social Security off-budget. Social Security deserves to stand on its own. It must be secure. I will not fool around with privatizing Social Security, but I certainly would encourage people to have a base, and we have to find a way to encourage people to invest more. We cannot just depend on Social Security for our retirement, because that is not enough. It is not intended for that. It is intended for a safety net. So, Social Security first; tax cuts, yes, particularly for middle-income working families, next.

Mr. PALLONE. My fear is that in the same way, and I do not know when it was, I think it was in the seventies or maybe eighties before any of us were here in Congress, that the Congress actually passed a law raising the payroll tax on Social Security to make sure that there were enough benefits. That is my fear.

In other words, what is going to happen here is if this money from this trust fund keeps getting siphoned off for these tax breaks or whatever it happens to be, then 10 or 20 years from now, the next Congress or future Congresses will be faced with actually having to raise taxes in order to pay for the benefits.

What we are doing now, or what the Republicans are doing now, is taking that money away, or they are not succeeding, but they are trying to take it away for tax breaks, and they are going to make future generations possibly pay more taxes to make sure that money is there. That is the possibility we could have down the road.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Connecticut.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I just want to say, and it kind of sums it up for me about this Congress, it is really the political equivalent of the Maytag repairman. The Maytag repairman's phone never rang because nobody ever needed his help.

Our phones are ringing off the hook here, but we have a Republican Congress that refuses to pick up the line. All the Democrats are saying on these issues is, let us answer the call from the American public.

First and foremost, we have talked about HMO reform, we have talked about saving Social Security, but what we are asking for in these next several days while we are here is education reform. Let us reduce the size of classrooms, 100,000 teachers in grades 1 through 3, and let us in fact modernize our classrooms, provide those tax credits to local government, so that they

□ 1930

PRIDE IN THE UNITED STATES  
CONGRESS

can float the bonds to build the schools, and it will bring down their own property taxes, if you will. Let us do that for the good of our children. That is what we are claiming to want to do in the next several days.

We can talk all we want about what has not been done. We have a few more days. This we can get done. I think we have an obligation to go for it.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the gentlewoman. I regret to say that HMO reform is dead, and that there is no opportunity here to really deal with the Social Security issue anymore, because they have run the clock.

But at least over the next few days if we can get the budget to include these two education initiatives, the modernization of the schools and the 100,000 additional teachers, then at least we can say that we have accomplished something before this do-nothing Congress goes home. We are just going to be out there every day saying that. We are not leaving. We are not leaving this place until we get some response from the other side of the aisle on these two issues.

Again, I started off today by saying that when I was back in New Jersey in my district and I was at an event, this is what the people were talking about. I had a lot of educators there, I had a lot of elected officials on the local level, and as the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) was saying, they were saying they need to modernize their schools, and they cannot do it. They cannot get the bonding. The cost of the interest rate on the bonding is so excessive that they either cannot do it, or the taxpayers are upset because of the amount of money that is involved.

We need to address these issues. I know the gentlewoman has the dozen education initiatives that they failed to do. I wish the gentlewoman would go over that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I would be happy to. This is the dirty dozen that the Congressional Republicans wanted to do to our public schools: eliminate the Department of Education; divert billions of dollars in public school funds for private school vouchers; cut school lunches for poor children; block-granting critical education programs, and when we block-grant those programs, we eliminate programs, and there is no accountability by the Governors as to where that money is being spent; ending equal opportunity in higher education; tax cuts for wealthy taxpayers who send their children to private schools; eliminating summer jobs; eliminating school-to-work; ending school interest subsidies for student loans; eliminating safe and drug free schools. That is the litany, that is the legacy of this Republican Congress.

Mr. PALLONE. Hopefully, we can get something done before we adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SCARBOROUGH) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, before I begin and respond to a lot of things we have heard, and there is an awful lot to respond to, I want to say a couple of words about two people that were in the news today that all America needs to remember.

First of all is Clark Clifford, who was a wise man to many Presidents. He helped Harry Truman in dealing with the union crisis also certainly helped LBJ in Vietnam. He was a good public servant. He was a wise man. Any clouds that may have come over his life in his waning years certainly are insignificant compared to his public service.

Also we need to be thinking about Matthew Shepherd. He was a young college student who was brutally beaten a few days ago. I find it kind of ironic that Amnesty International this past week issued a report talking about human rights in America the same week that this happened.

While it certainly was not sanctioned by this government, I believe all of us who are public officials must do all we can to publicly condemn these type of actions. Certainly all of America's prayers need to be with Mr. Shepherd today.

There is also obviously strife in the District of Columbia as we have heard. It has always been that way, I guess, from the time that our President Adams, our second President openly loathed our third president Thomas Jefferson. This is a bit of tradition in Washington, but those two gentlemen learned how to disagree without being disagreeable.

Unfortunately, as we have heard today, that has just not been the case. We need this honest debate. There are differences. But I am continually disappointed by the tone of the rhetoric from the other side.

This is what I heard just about 15 minutes ago, quote, "the Republican majority does not care at all about America's health care, about our children's education, or about the environment." This is not quite as bad as the last session when I think I was called a Nazi because I was a Republican probably about 5 or 10 times by the minority because they disagreed with our efforts to balance the budget. This shrill rhetoric does nobody any good.

I have a question to ask. Who says I do not care about our children's educational system, when I have got two boys in public schools back in Pensacola, Florida, just because I do not believe that bureaucracies in Washington, D.C. should have more money, more power, and more authority, and just because I believe that the teachers that I meet when I take my children to

student night, to open house night at Cordova Park Elementary School, just because I have faith in the principal that oversees my children every day, just because I have more faith in local school boards than bureaucracies in Washington, D.C., does that really mean that I hate public education? Of course it does not.

But we are 3 weeks away from the election, and this shrillness. It is offensive. We also hear that we hate the environment because we do not agree with their form of regulatory burdens that they have thrown on America for over 40 years while they were in the majority.

Listen, I have got a stream in my backyard. I have got blue skies overhead. My children drink from the water supplies that Democratic parents' children drink from. Who says we do not care about the environment? Again, it is the shrillness.

They have lowered the level of public discourse, and I think it is shameful. We do not need to disparage Democrats just because they believe in a centralized bloated bureaucracy. I can disagree with them without being disagreeable.

I am not going to say that they hate their children just because their policies failed in education from 1954 to 1994. I am not going to say that they hate their grandparents because, over the past 40 years while they were in control, they did not put aside one cent for Social Security.

But after four years, we have already put a plan together to save \$1.6 trillion to save for senior citizens and keep Social Security solvent. I am not going to say that they hate senior citizens. I am just going to say that they are misidentified, that their way was the way of LBJ and FDR and generations past.

But we are going into a new era, and we need to go into that era with a bit higher public discourse. They say that we take pride in doing nothing in Washington, D.C. in this do-nothing Congress. Well, I do not want to get into this partisan wrangling, but facts are stubborn things, and the American people have been misled.

I think the American people need to hear the facts. Four years ago, when we got here, Americans had a \$250 billion deficit that was strapping them down and strapping the economy down. We had Alan Greenspan, Fed chairman, say, if we balance the budget like the Republicans are proposing in 1995, we will see unprecedented growth in America.

Four years later, we have a \$70 billion surplus the way that Washington calculates the surplus. And true to the Fed chairman's prediction, we have unprecedented growth in America. Interest rates did come down. America's economy has been stronger over the past 4 years than ever before.

Am I proud of that? Yes, I am proud of that. I am proud of the fact that we