

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BUNN of Oregon). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

CERTAIN POLITICAL METHODS DESTRUCTIVE TO CONGRESS

(Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, recently it became publicly known about an e-mail directive from the leadership of the Republican Party that sheds light on the political methods being used as we work on our agricultural portion of reconciliation. It lays bare political methods which, frankly, are destructive to this institution, destructive far beyond simply the agricultural issues which it directly addresses. It is the leadership saying, "You've got to pass our version of agricultural reconciliation, one that involves three times the cuts that are needed to reach a zero deficit, and if you don't, individual Members will lose committee memberships. The committee chairmanships will be lost. In fact, the entire House Committee on Agriculture could be abolished."

This is the sort of heavy-handed leadership that does not serve this institution well. We have difficult decisions to be made, but if we pull together in a bipartisan fashion, using the strengths of House Committee on Agriculture, I am confident that through the course of the debate this year we can in fact arrive at a point where we are helpful to family farms, helpful to the budget deficit, and it is done in a fair and open manner.

THE GINGRICH MEDICAID PLAN WILL PAY FOR TAX CUTS FOR THE WEALTHY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, late last week the Committee on Commerce passed the Gingrich Medicaid plan. There were no hearings on this bill similar to the restricted small number of hearings, one hearing in fact, on Medicare. There were no hearings on the Gingrich Medicaid plan. The plan was given to us, the actual legislative language, was given to us less than 24 hours before the hearing. There was no public input, because no one anywhere from the country really knew much about the plan, and members of the committee on both sides, Republicans and Democrats, had little opportunity to read the bill and to become familiar with the details of the Gingrich Medicaid plan.

Unfortunately, though, Mr. Speaker, that Gingrich Medicaid plan cuts Medicaid money that goes for nursing homes for the middle class and all of

our parents, many of our parents and grandparents. It is money for children in Health Hill Hospital in Cleveland, many poor kids, many middle-class kids, upper-class kids that have been injured in tragic accidents, with serious brain damage, whose families are saddled with \$20,000 a month hospital bills. That is paid for with Medicaid. It is funding for poor children for prenatal care, for well baby care, for all the kinds of things that are important in our society.

Nonetheless, that \$180 billion cut in the Gingrich Medicaid plan is going to be used to pay for tax cuts for the rich. Equally as unfortunate, this bill and this Gingrich Medicaid plan in the committee on commerce, everything passed by a party line vote. They eliminated quality care standards in nursing homes on a party line vote, coming down from Gingrich's plan that was simply approved on a party line vote. They eliminated breast cancer services, mammograms and other breast cancer services, again on a party line vote. They eliminated prenatal care and well baby care and protection for children, again, those programs on a party line vote, all ratifying what the Gingrich Medicaid plan had written.

There is an old Mark Twain line said many years ago, that when two people think alike all the time, one of them ain't doing much thinking. Unfortunately, that is what this Gingrich Medicaid plan is all about. It was a plan not written by the committee, not written with public input, not having any hearings held for the public to understand it, to learn about it, to talk about it, to persuade Members of Congress that this might be good or that might be bad. It was simply a piece of legislation handed down and voted on quickly.

What is particularly of concern to a lot of us on that committee that oppose this \$180 billion in cuts for Medicaid in order to pay for tax breaks for the wealthiest Americans is that these quality care standards for nursing homes were eliminated; where we can remember 10 years ago, 20 years ago, reading in the paper almost every month some scandal in a nursing home, some number of patients were abused and restrained and medicated, and people that were about as defenseless as anybody in society, people that are typically very old in nursing homes and cannot take care of themselves, and the Federal Government enacted standards to make sure that those kinds of abuse do not take place in nursing homes.

Now we are saying it is OK for the States, it is OK for local governments, it is OK for these nursing homes, to not live up any longer to these Federal standards.

The same with breast cancer services. My part of America, northeast Ohio, has one of the highest breast cancer rates in the country. I am concerned when the Federal Government says, "No longer is Medicaid going to

cover breast cancer services, mammograms." First, that is inhumane, not to cover mammograms. Second, it is just stupid. The Republicans simply have failed Economics 101. If you do not detect breast cancer early, you are going to pay a lot more for a lumpectomy or a mastectomy, and the Government is going to end up paying for it. It is inhumane, and it is just bad economics not to move forward and continue to cover those breast cancer services.

This money will be turned over to the States in the form of block grants, this money, again this shrinking number of dollars, in order to pay for tax breaks for the wealthy. This shrinking number of dollars will be grabbed up by as many interest groups in the States as possible. Nursing homes will have the first round, the first shot, at so many of these dollars as they shrink. And because nursing homes are better organized and better lobbyists and more effective and a stronger interest group on the State level than are groups that might advocate breast cancer services or groups that might advocate on behalf of nursing home patients, that money will likely go to those interest groups that fight for a wealthy group of people rather than people that really do represent those women that have breast cancer, represent those people that are victims of problems and care in nursing homes.

Mr. Speaker, it simply does not make sense to make these cuts all to pay for tax cuts for the wealthy.

WITHDRAWAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS C ps that fight for a wealthy group of people rather than people

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be withdrawn as a cosponsor of H.R. 497.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington [Mrs. SMITH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mrs. SMITH of Washington addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MCINTOSH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. MCINTOSH addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. OWENS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

HONORING DR. DON JOHNSON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. NORWOOD] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. NORWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I come to the well today for a very pleasant task, to honor a friend of mine, but I cannot even come and do that without correcting the comments of the previous speaker.

I, too, am on the Committee on Commerce. We held so many Medicaid hearings, I am not sure of the number, but I think it was 8 to 10, somewhere in that area. The gentleman talked of cuts in Medicaid. Let me tell the Members something. The State of Georgia is going to get a 7.2-percent increase next year in Medicaid spending, and in 1997 a 9-percent increase in Medicaid spending, so I apologize that I have to bring that up, but I would like for the American people to hear the truth.

Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor today to talk about a great American. Next week, Dr. Don Johnson will end his reign as president of the International College of Dentistry. It is the crowning achievement of one man's tremendous career, a man I am very proud to call my friend.

Don is a Georgian through and through. He was born and raised in Atlanta. He graduated from the Emory University School of Dentistry in 1961 and has been a practicing dentist ever since. He continued to contribute to his alma mater as a member of Emory's Board of Visitors.

There are two things that have always amazed me about Don. He has been a visionary in the dental field, and he has a boundless energy to contribute to his profession.

I recently had the opportunity to go back and read an interview with Don that appeared in the Georgia Dental Association's Newsletter. I was astounded at how insightful his comments were. Don was able to see in 1986 where the dental profession needed to be in 1996. He foresaw the problems in dentistry today that were only smoldering 10 years ago.

Don is a man with tremendous energy. He has run a successful dental practice for many years, yet he has still found the time to volunteer in service to his profession. He is a former president of the Georgia Dental Association, a former president of the Northern District Dental Society, and a former president of the Hinman Dental Society. He is a fellow of the American College of Dentists, the International College of Dentists, and a member of the eminent Pierre Fauchard Academy. In 1988, he was

named the "Man of the Year in Dentistry" by the Northern District Dental Society. He has published numerous scholarly articles and presented many technical papers at dental conferences. He has done all this while running his practice and raising two daughters, serving in his church, and on top of all that he is an accomplished airplane pilot.

Mr. Speaker, It is my pleasure today to bring before you the accomplishments of Dr. Don Johnson of Atlanta, GA, president of the International College of Dentists, and a great American.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Ms. BROWN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Ms. BROWN of Florida addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

TOO MUCH GOVERNMENT DOESN'T WORK

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

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago Ann McFeddars, of the Scripps-Howard newspaper chain, wrote this: "Americans are right to be disgusted with government right now. Events of recent days are alarming. They should be a warning to all politicians, police officials, and anyone hired by government." That woman has walked the straight and narrow, do not take short cuts, do not rationalize. She said, "It is time to rethink the role of government." She was writing primarily about the horrible events at Waco and Ruby Ridge. But let me read her words again. "Americans are right to be disgusted with government right now. Events of recent days are alarming." She said, "It is time to rethink the role of government."

William Raspberry, the very fine syndicated columnist for the Washington Post, wrote several months ago about some travels he had made around the country. He said, what were the people saying to him as he went around the Nation. He said this:

It sounds very much like it doesn't work. Government doesn't work. It costs more and becomes more intrusive with each passing year, but hardly anywhere can it be said that it is performing better. The trash cans get bigger, the refuse separation rules more onerous, but the streets and alleys aren't any cleaner. Criminal justice costs keep going up, but the neighborhoods aren't safer. Schools become increasingly expensive, and increasingly ineffective. Government doesn't work.

□ 1745

Those are the words of William Raspberry. These are not the words of any conservative Republicans.

I grew up in a political family, and I have been following governing and politics closely since my early teenage

years. I do not believe; in fact, I am certain that I have never seen a time where there has been so much dissatisfaction, disgust, disappointment, disenchantment, frustration, resentment, even anger, toward government, in general, and toward the Federal Government, in particular, as there is today.

As a conservative Republican, I have two reactions to this. First, I am sorry that things have gotten to the point that they have that so many people feel this way. But secondly, I also must tell you that in a way, I believe this is a good sign for our future. If government can solve all of our problems, the Soviet Union would have been heaven on Earth. Instead, every place where the people have allowed the government or their governments to get too big, they have ended up suffering and living under horrible conditions.

So perhaps it is a good sign that so many people in such a clear, strong majority no longer believe in big government or no longer believe that government can solve all of our problems.

Why are people so angry toward government today? Well, I believe it is because the Federal Government has become one that is of, by and for the bureaucrats instead of one that is of, by and for the people. Too often today our public service has become public high living, high salaries, high pensions, plush offices, short hours. Most importantly, and perhaps worst of all, unaccountability for huge and very costly mistakes. Our servants have become our rulers. The people are really fed up today. They are disgusted with the waste, the lavish spending, the arrogance.

Paul Greg Roberts, another nationally syndicated columnist, wrote this recently. He said:

Six months after the inauguration of the new Republican Congress, it has become apparent that the most important issues facing the country are not economic. Without a doubt, high taxes, profligate government spending and welfare dependency are problems sorely in need of the attention focused on them. But the real question is whether Congress can reclaim the law from unelected bureaucrats and judges.

He also said this:

In the 20th century, there has been a coup against self-rule by bureaucrats and judges. Federal bureaucrats have usurped statutory law with regulations that lack legislative basis.

I think these words of Paul Greg Roberts are right. He went on in this column to say:

In the coming months we will discover whether the Republican Congress can do something that the Democratic Congress failed to do for 40 years: Hold government accountable to the people. This, not the size of the Federal budget, is the ultimate test of whether it matters which party controls Congress.

He said:

The problem in America is not that the budget is out of control, but that the government is.