those who use private mail boxes explaining how their privacy would not be invaded if they used a government box. Coincidentally, this regulation will also raise the operating cost on the Post Office’s private competitors for private mailbox services. Some who have examined this bill estimate that it could impose costs as high as $1 billion on these small businesses during the initial six-month compliance period. The long-term costs of this rule are incalculable, but could conceivably reach several billion dollars in the first few years. This may force some of these businesses into bankruptcy.

During the rule’s comment period, more than 8,000 people formally denounced the rule, while only 10 spoke generally favor of it. However, those supporting this rule will claim that the privacy of the majority of law-abiding citizens who use commercial mailboxes must be sacrificed in order to crack down on those using commercial mailboxes for criminal activities. However, I would once again remind my colleagues that the Federal role in crime, even if the crime is committed in “ interstate commerce,” is a limited one. The fact that some people may use a mailbox to commit a crime does not give the Federal Government the right to treat every user of a commercial mailbox as a criminal. Moreover, my office has received a significant number of calls from battered women who use these boxes to maintain their geographic privacy.

I have introduced this joint resolution in hopes that it will be considered under the expedited procedures established in the Contract with America Advancement Act of 1996. This procedure allows Congress to overturn onerous regulations such as the subject of this bill. Mr. Speaker, the entire point of this procedure to provide Congress with a means to stop federal actions which pose an immediate threat to the rights of Americans. Thanks to these agency review provisions, Congress cannot hide and blame these actions on the bureaucracy. I challenge my colleagues to take full advantage of this process and use it to stop this outrageous rule.

In conclusion Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in cosponsoring the Mailbox Privacy Protection Act, which uses the Agency Review Procedures of the Contract with America Advancement Act to overturn Post Office’s regulations requiring customers of private mailboxes to give the Post Office their name, address, photographs and social security number. The Federal Government should not force any American citizen to divulge personal information as the price for receiving mail. I further call on all my colleagues to assist me in moving this bill under the expedited procedure established under the Congressional Review Act.

CONGRATULATIONS TO THE CITY OF LEBANON ON ITS SESQUICENTENNIAL BIRTHDAY

HON. IRENEK SKELETON
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 25, 1999

Mr. SKELETON. Mr. Speaker, let me take this opportunity to congratulate the City of Lebanon and Laclede County on its Sesquicentennial birthday.

Through the 1830’s and 1840’s pioneers chiefly from North Carolina, Tennessee, and Kentucky filtered in to fertile little valleys along streams and creeks in an Laclede County, Missouri. These settlers were farmers with only the bare necessities, and few tools, who relied upon their energy, efficiency and resourcefulness to overcome deficiencies. In 1849 Laclede County was organized out of three neighboring counties, Pulaski, Wright, and Camden. A donation of 50 acres of land by Berry Harrison and James Appling established the county seat on what is now Old Town hill. A courthouse, jail, general store, and various office buildings were eventually added to this beautiful setting.

The county changed with the arrival of the Frisco railroad. The railroad was established three quarters of a mile out on the muddy road, which was located a quarter of a mile outside of the town. Businesses eventually moved toward the railroad and in a couple of years a new business center grew up and Old Town became simply the first ward of new Lebanon. Small towns grew up and along the railroad each taking its quota of trade that the first years had given to Lebanon.

After 150 years Laclede County can boast of prosperous farms, schools within the reach of every child, churches for every community, and prosperity over the entire county.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to extend my congratulations to the residents of the city of Lebanon and Laclede County. It is with great pride that I honor their achievements on their Sesquicentennial birthday.

CRISIS IN KOSOVO (ITEM NO. 5)
REMARKS BY DAVID SWARTZ, FORMER AMBASSADOR TO BELARUS

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 25, 1999

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, on May 6, 1999, I joined with Representative JOHN CONyers, Representative PETE STARK, and Representative CYNTHIA MCKINNEY to host the third in a series of Congressional Teach-In sessions on the Crisis in Kosovo. If a peaceful resolution to this conflict is to be found in the coming weeks, it is essential that we cultivate a consciousness of peace and actively search for creative solutions. We must construct a foundation for peace through negotiation, mediation, and diplomacy.

Part of the dynamic of peace is a willingness to engage in meaningful dialogue, to listen to one another openly and to share our views in a constructive manner. I hope that these Teach-In sessions will contribute to this process by providing a forum for Members of Congress and the public to explore alternatives to the bombing and options for a peaceful resolution. We will hear from a variety of speakers of different sides of the Kosovo situation. I will be introducing the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD transcripts of their remarks and essays that shed light on the many dimensions of the crisis.

Presentation by David Swartz to Congressional Teach-In on Kosovo

I think my role today is going to be controversial. And if ever there was a conflict that was controversial this one certainty. So I'm pleased to be here. Some of what I'm going to say is going to offend some people and possibly some of it will offend everybody, I don't know. But at least is may serve as a catalyst to help get the discussion going as we move along. But I am being deliberately provocative in some places so I warn you in advance and ask your indulgence.

I do wish to express my thanks for the opportunity to present may statement this afternoon on U.S.-Kosovo policy. My statement, while critical, is non-partisan. It reflects the general reality, my view at least, that U.S. policies in the Balkans over the past eight years have reflected bipartisanism, just as criticisms of Administration policy particularly with regard to the Yugoslavia war, have also tended to be bipartisan.

The two key decisions driving my views on U.S. actions in that region and in the Kosovo region are these: First, human suffering must be minimized. And that's way ahead of any other. But the second one is: clear U.S. national interests justifying involvement must be present. Our policies in my view reflect deficiencies on both counts. I will very briefly touch on three aspects of that problem. One, how we got to where we are. Two, why current policy is wrong. And three, what next. Three is perhaps being developed as well speak.

First, how we got where we are. American involvement in the post-communist Balkan turmoil stems in large part in my view from a questionable policy of premature diplomatic recognition of groups asserting sovereignty, particularly Bosnia, in the early 1990’s. Some groupings in the then-Yugoslavia could genuinely be considered ripe for independence, most especially Croatia, and Slovenia, possibly to a lesser extent Macedonia. Bosnia, however, could by no reasonable standard be considered a nation-state.

What is Bosnia? Who are Bosnians? What is their history, language, literature, religion? What can we point to that is uniquely Bosnian? It seems to me that creation of a multi-ethnic state is complicated under the best of
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Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, in the Balanced Budget Act of 1997, Congress provided that for 10 hospital diagnosis related groups (DRG's), we would not pay the full DRG if the patient was discharged too soon to a nursing home, home health agency, or to a rehab or long-term-care hospital. I include at the end of my statement the conference report language describing this provision. Note that as originally passed by the House and Senate, it applied to all hospital discharges—not just 10 DRG's.

The administration and the Congress were worried that some hospitals have been gaming the Medicare hospital prospective payment system. They have been discharging patients early to downstream treatment facilities (which they often own), collecting the full DRG payment, and requiring Medicare to pay for longer and more expensive treatments in these downstream facilities.

Many of the nation's hospitals are lobbying for the repeal of this discharge provision—even though repeal would cost Medicare billions of dollars in the years to come. The intensity of the lobbying on this issues shows that early discharge to subsidiaries has become a major strategy of many hospitals. It may have been part of the Columbia/HCA scheme to maximize Medicare revenues.

Mr. Speaker, I think we should return to our earlier decision and apply the policy to all discharges, not just 10 DRG's.

The HHS inspector general has found that hospitals that own nursing homes discharge patients much earlier than average, and the patient then stays in the nursing home longer than average—an extra 8 days (OEI—02–94–00320). The OIG has also found that patients' stays are shorter when they are discharged to a home health agency. With about half the nation's hospitals owning a home health agency, this is another way to double dip.

The bill I am introducing will save Medicare billions of additional dollars in the years to come, and it will remove a temptation to abuse patients by pushing them out of hospitals too soon.

I hope that this legislation—one of a series of bills I am introducing to modernize Medicare and make it more efficient—will be enacted as part of our efforts to save Medicare for the Baby Boom generation.