

the development of nuclear weapons could entail, he had felt compelled to work on the Manhattan project to develop the atomic bomb before Germany could do so.

When it became clear that Germany had given up working on the atomic bomb, he pulled out of the project and did not know the bomb had been completed until it was dropped on Hiroshima.

He was said to have been "devastated" by the consequences of its use on Japan in the dying days of the Pacific war and dedicated his life to campaigning against the nuclear arms race, urging other scientists to do so.

FRANCE UNEASILY CONGRATULATES ROTBLAT ON NOBEL

(By Alistair Doyle)

PARIS, October 13.—France uneasily congratulated ban-the-bomb scientist Joseph Rotblat on winning the Nobel Peace Prize on Friday, dodging the laureate's condemnation of French nuclear tests in the South Pacific.

"We congratulate the Nobel Peace Prize laureate," Foreign Ministry spokesman Jacques Rummelhardt told reporters. "France wants disarmament, including nuclear disarmament, in security."

"Security will permit disarmament," he told the ministry's regular daily press briefing, adding: "French policy aims to establish security."

Despite Paris's official congratulations, the award to the veteran nuclear physicist-turned-peace campaigner seemed set to make the French government squirm.

Pierre Lellouche, a member of parliament and former strategic affairs adviser to President Jacques Chirac, said he was "perfectly scandalised" and accused the group Rotblat heads of being a former tool of Soviet propaganda.

Both Rotblat and the Norwegian Nobel Committee wasted no time in urging France to cancel nuclear tests. Paris broke a three-year moratorium last month by detonating an underground nuclear device in French Polynesia.

Rotblat, 86, said he hoped the prize "is a message not only to the French but to the Chinese as well." China and France are the only official nuclear powers still testing.

Rotblat wrote to President Jacques Chirac last month protesting against the French tests. "I think it's very bad," he told Reuters in London on Friday.

"There is no reason at all in my opinion for President Chirac to resume tests. I can't see any tactical reason at all. I can only see this as an attempt maybe to make their bomb a little better, or develop perhaps a new type."

Nobel Committee chairman Francis Sejersted told Reuters Television: "The specific message to the French is a protest against the nuclear tests, as it is a protest against nuclear tests in general and nuclear armaments in general."

France has staged two tests since early September despite howls of outrage abroad. Chirac says tests are vital to check France's nuclear arsenal and plans as many as six more before banning testing for ever.

France's La Chaine Info television commented that the impact of the Nobel decision on French diplomacy would hardly have been worse had environmental group Greenpeace won.

Rotblat, who helped develop the first atom bomb in the United States in hopes it would never be used, shared the million-dollar prize with the Pugwash Conferences on Science and World Affairs which he chairs.

Lellouche said: "I am personally—and as a specialist in these matters—perfectly scandalised by the fact that an organisation which one knows was openly manipulated by

the Soviets should be honoured in this way at a time when everyone knows the controversy about the French tests."

The Pugwash conferences played a back-room role in the Cold War, bringing together scientists, scholars and public figures from East and West to discuss nuclear and other security issues.

AUSTRALIA LAUDS PRIZE FOR ANTI-NUCLEAR CAMPAIGNER

SYDNEY, October 14.—Australia, a fierce opponent of French nuclear testing in the South Pacific, welcomed on Saturday the award of the 1995 Nobel Peace Prize to anti-nuclear campaigner Joseph Rotblat.

A Foreign Ministry spokesman said Australia applauded Rotblat's remark that he hoped the prize would send "a message not only to the French but to the Chinese as well."

"We certainly welcome those remarks from someone as eminent as a Nobel Peace Prize winner and it reinforces the wide range of interests against the nuclear testing programmes," the spokesman told Reuters.

"It basically reinforces the need for a comprehensive test ban treaty, which Australia has been consistently working towards over so many years."

Rotblat, a nuclear physicist who devoted his life to trying to ban the bomb he helped create, won the Nobel Peace Prize on Friday and seized the opportunity to spread his anti-nuclear message.

The Norwegian Nobel Committee, which awarded the prize to the 86-year-old peace campaigner and the Pugwash organisation he founded, also made clear it was intended as a protest against French nuclear tests.

France, which is carrying out a series of tests in the South Pacific, and China are the only nuclear powers still carrying out tests.

Australia has said French and Chinese nuclear tests threaten to undermine negotiations for a Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty due for completion next year by encouraging more non-nuclear powers to develop atomic weapons.

Canberra is especially critical of French testing, arguing Paris should, like Beijing, test on their home soil. Having failed to prevent the resumption of tests in French Polynesia, Australia is now trying to embarrass France in world forums.

Australia will seek condemnation of nuclear testing at next month's Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting in New Zealand.

It is also lobbying with Japan and New Zealand for an anti-testing resolution within the United Nations.

OAS HITS FRENCH TESTS

French nuclear tests are detrimental to peace and international security, the Mexican ambassador to the OAS said as she assumed the rotating presidency of the organization's permanent council.

Ambassador Carmen Moreno de Del Cueto restated the Organization of American States' call for France to end its tests in the South Pacific.

"I deeply regret that the French government has ignored [our] call . . . to suspend the nuclear tests," she said. "I reiterate our call . . . and urge the French government to finally suspend their nuclear tests, which do not contribute to either peace or international security."

Mrs. Moreno de Del Cueto thanked the OAS for its gradual reforms.

"Little by little the OAS has moved forward in pluralism and tolerance and has begun to eliminate the radical bad habits of the Cold War," she said last week.

DO NOT USE SCARE TACTICS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. WHITFIELD] is recognized during morning business for 3 minutes.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I have in my hands today an article taken from yesterday's Wall Street Journal entitled "Clinton Recruits Campaign Team of Nasty Boys." I would like to just read the first paragraph:

Gearing up for 1996, President Clinton is fielding a motley crew of reelection strategists with reputations for shrewdness and ruthless tactics. A mainstay on his team, New Yorker Henry Sheikoph, readily boasts, "I subscribe to terror." Last year, in speaking to a convention of political consultants, Mr. Sheikoph told a gathering that terror works in political campaigns because it is so easy to make people hate.

What a sad commentary that is on the political system in America that political strategists would deliberately be trying to terrorize and scare people in America, and the efforts to terrorize have already started in the area of Medicare.

As you know Medicare will be bankrupt by the year 2002, according to the President's own board of trustees, and we are committed to preserving that plan, to make it a better plan than it is today. Under the Republican plan, we are going to be spending \$355 billion more over the next 6 years, 7 years, on Medicare than were spent in the past 7 years.

But more important than that, if you work in a major corporation today or if you work in the Federal Government today, or if you are in the U.S. Congress today, you have options to choose your health care from five or six different plans. But if you are a senior citizen in America today, you have one option, a fee-for-service option.

Some suburban areas and urban areas, you have an HMO that you can participate in. But we are going to provide senior citizens with additional options. If they want to keep the system they have today, they can do so. If they want to go to an HMO, they can do so. If they want to go to provider service networks, they can do so. If they want to be into a medical savings account, paid for by the Government, they can do so.

So I would urge the President, I would urge those Members of the Democratic Party who are trying to use this issue to scare the American people, to come forward and be honest and say, "Yes, this is going to be a better system."

We do not need nasty boys, so to speak, running political campaigns in America.

MEDICARE FRAUD AND ABUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, this week the House of Representatives will take up unprecedented cuts of \$270 billion from Medicare which has been a lifeline for over 37 million seniors. During its 30 year legacy, Medicare has provided our elders with the security of health care coverage and has lifted millions of our seniors out of poverty. Medicare is a solemn contract between this Nation and our elders. It should not be tampered with lightly.

Over the years, those of us genuinely concerned with strengthening the Medicare system have urged a crackdown on Medicare fraud. The Congressional Budget Office estimates that stopping the growing problem of fraud will reap billions of dollars in savings.

But you don't need some policy-wonk's study to tell you that the system is rampant with waste, fraud, and abuse. Just visit one of our Nation's senior centers and sit down for a senior lunch and ask one of our senior citizens to show you their bills.

However, the Republican bill we will take up later this week does not toughen enforcement. It does not even defend the status quo. Even worse, the Republicans turn back the clock on cracking down on Medicare fraud.

Sadly, I am not surprised. As Speaker GINGRICH said last week in this Washington Times article, in his feeble effort to defend GOP moves to reduce penalties and enforcement efforts against Medicare fraud: "murderers out after 3 years" and rapists who don't even get tried." "For the moment, I'd rather lock up the murderers, the rapists and the drug dealers," he said. "Once we start getting some vacant jail space, I'd be glad to look at it."

The Republican leadership is not interested in correcting and punishing the criminal elements in the Medicare system. Because that may hurt the special interest supporters in the medical industry.

Their priority is to ensure that the special interest supporters in the medical industry are taken care of, with minimal losses in this debate on cutting Medicare.

So, while the Speaker cuts a deal in a backroom with the American Medical Association to make sure that the interests of doctors are protected, while the health care cheats make a fast buck at the government's expense, seniors are being asked to pay more in out-of-pocket costs and deductibles.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle have abandoned the most obvious of the potential savings in the Medicare program: Combating Medicare fraud and abuse. I introduced legislation this Congress, the Health Care Prosecution Act, to do just that. My bill stops health care cheats in their tracks, retrieves the financial losses in restitution and fines, and puts the criminals behind bars so that they are unable to promulgate more health care scams in the future.

Further, my legislation establishes a temporary health care fraud and abuse

commission to study the nature, and extent of fraud in our system. The commission would make recommendations to Congress on innovative approaches to attack fraud.

Mr. Speaker, I think my bill is a good one but it is not the only effective way to crack down on fraud. There are lots of good ideas out there about how to rid our system of the scams that are ripping off our Nation's seniors and taxpayers.

I am sorry that my Republican colleagues have chosen to pursue none of them.

THE GOAL OF THE MEDICARE PRESERVATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOKE] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, on April 3, 1995, the Medicare trustees, which include three members of the President's Cabinet, issued the following warning: "Medicare begins going bankrupt next year, and unless prompt and decisive action is taken, Medicare will be completely out of money by 2002."

There is no reason to doubt the accuracy of the report or its conclusion, and I urge every American to obtain an official summary of the report from their Congressman's or Congresswoman's office to judge for themselves. They can get that by calling 202-225-3121, that is, 202-225-3121. Ask for an official 14 page summary of the Medicare trustees' report.

This week, the House of Representatives will take a giant step forward toward putting Medicare back on sound fiscal footing and giving our seniors the same choices enjoyed by Federal employees, including Members of Congress and all citizens in the private sector when it passes the Medicare Preservation Act of 1995.

The goal of the Medicare Preservation Act is to preserve Medicare for current beneficiaries, protect future beneficiaries, and strengthen it through reforms that have been tested and proven in the private sector. The bottom line is that if Medicare is not reformed, either seniors will be forced to accept sharply curtailed medical services or working Americans will be forced to pay increased payroll taxes estimated by the Heritage Foundation to cost my constituents in northeastern Ohio an average of an additional \$1,200 per year.

Under the Medicare Preservation Act, total Medicare spending will increase, will increase, will increase, will increase 54 percent from \$161 billion in 1995 to \$274 billion in 2002.

□ 1245

On an annual per beneficiary basis, average spending will increase, that was increase, from \$4,800 today to more than \$6,700 in 2002. Obviously not only is Medicare not being cut, but at an av-

erage increase of about 6.5 percent per year it will grow faster than the current 2.3 percent of private sector medical inflation and more than fast enough to accommodate all new entrants into the system. Only in the bizarre and convoluted world of Washington bookkeeping and partisan bickering can such an indisputable spending increase be called a cut.

The Medicare Preservation Act will give seniors the same four choices that all Federal employees, including Members of Congress, have. First, if they want to, seniors can stay with the current Medicare system exactly as it is today, and, if they choose another option and decide later they want to return to traditional Medicare, they can do that, too. No senior citizen will be forced to give up his or her current Medicare coverage, switch doctors, or be forced into a plan that they do not want.

Second, seniors can opt for managed care and join a health maintenance organization, or HMO, in which beneficiaries agree to receive their medical care from a defined pool of providers in exchange for lower out-of-pocket expenses and broader coverage, which might include prescription drugs, dental care, and eye wear. Many seniors, particularly those those private physicians are already associated with the HMO that they choose, will find this to be an attractive alternative.

Third, seniors can opt for a medical savings account plan which uses the beneficiary's Medicare stipend to fund both catastrophic health insurance plus an MSA, a medical savings account, out of which seniors would pay for routine medical needs. Seniors choosing this plan would have complete control over the money they spend on medical care, and any money left over in the medical savings account at the end of the year would belong to the senior, not to the insurance company nor to the Government. Seniors can join provider service networks similar to HMO's organized by doctors and hospitals themselves.

The Medicare Preservation Act will also aggressively attack waste, fraud, and abuse that has contributed so much to Medicare's rising costs. Incredibly, the Congressional Budget Office has estimated that as much as 20 percent of Medicare spending is fraudulent. The Medicare Preservation Act requires the Department of Health and Human Services to identify and eliminate these huge losses, including financially rewarding Medicare recipients who report abuses. It makes doctors and hospitals accountable for their actions, and imposes stiff new penalties on anyone caught defrauding Medicare.

Another important point is that the portion of Medicare part B costs paid by seniors through premiums, currently 31.5 percent, will not change. Over the past 7 years, part B premiums have nearly doubled, rising from \$24.80 in 1988 to \$46.10 today.