

Eliminating the concern about reprisals by insurance companies will facilitate more effective use of genetic tests as they are developed and, therefore, promote cures and treatments. This will sustain the global leadership of the biomedical research industry in the United States.

However, if you can lose your health insurance because your genes show that some day you might require that insurance, clinical trials will become impossible to conduct and new treatments and cures may not be developed. Consequently, it is important to have this protection, which will ultimately lead to improved health care for all Americans.

Congress is moving rapidly now on legislation to reform the American health insurance system. It is likely that a bill could pass the House this month and the Senate next month. A conference agreement between the House and Senate could put the bill on the President's desk well before this Congress adjourns. The House bill is H.R. 3070, the Health Coverage Availability and Affordability Act of 1996. Sponsored by Congressman MICHAEL BILIRAKIS, this measure is a well-thought-out piece of legislation, and I am proud to be a cosponsor.

The bill prohibits denying insurance coverage to an employee or beneficiary on the basis of health status, which is defined as an individual's "medical condition, claims experience, receipt of health care, medical history, evidence of insurability, or disability." Fortunately, I was able to add two simple words to this list under health status—"genetic information." As medical science discovers what secrets our genes carry, the potential misuse of that information, whether through insurance or some other venue, becomes an ever-increasing possibility.

It is imperative that the strongest possible statutory protections exist against applying this information toward genetic discrimination. In the future, these discoveries of genetic information could lead to employment discrimination. That is why we need to conduct hearings on my bill and to pass the rest of this important legislation. Discoveries of genetic information could be the civil rights battle of the next century.

These two words make a good piece of legislation better, and I hope this language remains in the final health care bill. It is vital to ensure that all Americans, like those two little boys in California, do not have to go without health insurance because of a misspelling in a genetic script that they could not control and did not choose.

Mr. Speaker, I might point out that similar efforts have been made in some 20 States, including Florida, and they have either enacted or are studying laws that would limit the use of genetic information by insurance companies. According to the Council for Responsible Genetics, a nonprofit group that monitors social issues in bio-

technology, a genetic underclass is being created by employers and insurers who use genetic tests to deny coverage or jobs.

THE 78TH INCREASE IN NATIONAL DEBT CEILING

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

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, day after tomorrow, on Thursday, this Congress is expected to pass its 78th increase in the debt ceiling of this country. Seventy-seven times, so far, we have increased the debt ceiling since the 1940's. We are now at \$4.9 trillion of debt. A lot of people in this country, Mr. Speaker, do not really think that they are responsible for this excessive debt. What has happened in the last 40 years is Congress has lost control of spending.

Under section 1 of the Constitution, Congress is responsible for the purse strings. Congress is also responsible for how deep this country goes in debt. We have not only lost control of spending, but we have also lost control of how deep we go in debt, because in the last 7 months we have seen Secretary Rubin and the President of the United States find a new way to drive us deeper in debt without the consent of Congress. That way, of course, was raiding the trust funds that we have in this country.

Day after tomorrow, we are considering tying yet another diminishing of congressional power and tying that to the debt ceiling increase. That is the Presidential line-item veto, and I just want to mention that before I talk about this chart, the Presidential line-item veto.

I served under three Governors in the State of Michigan. In Michigan we have a line-item veto. In every case with every Governor, they traded what they wanted because they had the power of vetoing out what the legislature wanted in particular spending. You know, philosophically, when you have got a liberal Congress and a conservative President, then a line item veto might make sense in terms of trying to reduce spending. But actually what is going to happen with a conservative Congress that is trying to get to a balanced budget and reduce spending and a President that has found it to his political advantage to continue helping people with taxpayers' money; in other words, not reducing spending, not achieving a balanced budget; is that we end up spending more. We end up giving additional congressional authority away to the President.

Let me note, Mr. Speaker, this pie chart that represents the roughly \$1.6 trillion expenditure of the Federal Government. If we start with the red triangle on this pie chart that represents about 18 percent of total Federal spending, that represents the 12

appropriation bills where Congress has control of the spending. In other words, if there is no bill passed by Congress, or if it is not signed by the President, then that reduced spending or no spending is what is going to happen.

Where the President has power is in the blue part of this pie chart that represents the welfare program spending and the other entitlement spending of this country. That represents now 50 percent of total Federal Government spending. So that there were some of us that thought it was reasonable to tie changes in the entitlement spending that is going to help us achieve a balanced budget, to tie that to yet another increase in the debt ceiling.

That now is not the plan in the bill that is going to be put before this body day after tomorrow, and I would suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, and through you to the American people, that we cannot balance the budget just by reducing the expenditures in the 12 appropriation bills where Congress now has full control. It just cannot be done.

I have studied this over the past several years. You cannot reduce that expenditure below about \$200 billion this next year. It cannot possibly be done and still have a viable operation and system within this country.

That means that, if we are going to balance the budget, we have got to move into the welfare changes in the welfare program and entitlement programs. They are called entitlement programs, Mr. Speaker, because if you are at a certain level of poverty, you are eligible for food stamps. If you are a certain level of income and you have children, you are eligible for AFDC. If you are a certain age, you are entitled to other taxpayer helps in paying your medical costs. There is no money appropriated. It is in the law.

The only way that a majority in Congress can change that law is the consent of the President. I would ask my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, to study the proposal that we are being asked to pass day after tomorrow very carefully. It continues to move us in a direction where we are not going to be able to balance the budget.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. There being no further requests for morning business, pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the House will stand in recess until 2 p.m.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 53 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until 2 p.m.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. UPTON] at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

How can we praise You, our God and our King,
How can we serve You with hands that we bring,
How can we love You with hearts that grow weak,
How can we cherish the gifts that we seek.
Yes we can praise You, for You lived us first,
Yes we can serve You, with faith be immersed,
Yes, we can love you, be deeds of good will,
Yes we can cherish Your peace to fulfill. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GILCREST] come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. GILCREST led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

RANK AND FILE OF AFL-CIO WILL CONTINUE TO REJECT THE OLD-STYLE LIBERAL POLICIES OF CLINTON ADMINISTRATION AND LIBERAL UNION BOSSES

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

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, I want to share with my colleagues news of the AFL-CIO's recent convention where the highest officials of the AFL-CIO, under newly elected union president John Sweeney, levied a \$35 million tax increase on the rank and file men and women of our Nation's unions. This \$35 million tax is being used to support an orchestrated, and highly political campaign to divide our Nation along class and income lines.

Needless to say, Mr. Speaker, the American people, especially the rank and file of our Nation's labor unions, will not allow Mr. Sweeney and the other liberal union bosses to turn back the clock on this Congress' pledge of fundamental change. We will continue our efforts to respond to the people of this great country. We will make the Federal Government smaller, more efficient and more user friendly. We will fight the bureaucrats here in Washing-

ton who refuse to let parents and families decide what should be taught in schools. And we will cut wasteful Federal spending so we can put more money back in to the pockets of working families.

Despite the rhetoric of the liberal, elite union leaders, I believe the working men and women of the AFL-CIO, will continue to reject the old-style liberal policies of Mr. Sweeney and the Clinton administration, and support of vision of a stronger, more prosperous America.

GOVERNMENT AND PRIVATE STUDIES, A LITTLE GOOFY?

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I thought the Federal Government was a little goofy when they studied bovine flatulence, but there have been a couple of private studies that got my attention. One was the dynamics of peeling adhesive tape. The private study found out that it is very difficult to peel off tape in just one piece.

The second one was the pigeon discrimination of paintings by Monet and Picasso. They determined that, really, pigeons do not discriminate. They may defecate, but no discrimination is involved.

Then there is the big one: the impact of wet underwear on thermoregulatory responses and thermal comfort in cold. What they determined was if you wear wet underwear in frigid weather, you freeze your buns off.

If we think this is a waste of money, check this out, Congress: The FDA has spent \$200,000 for tea tasters, \$200,000 for a tea-tasting commission.

Mr. Speaker, beam me up. I yield back the balance of all of this money, both private and public.

MAKING HEALTH CARE AFFORDABLE AND ACCESSIBLE

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

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, last Congress I introduced the only health reform legislation that truly had bipartisan support. The Rowland-Bilirakis bill focused on areas where there was widespread agreement about the need for reform. Unfortunately, this legislation never made it to the House floor.

I recently introduced the Health Coverage Availability and Affordability Act. This bill allows portability, thus permitting people to move from job to job without losing their health coverage.

The bill eliminates prohibitions on preexisting conditions so that individuals can change jobs and still have access to affordable health care. This simple change will dramatically improve the lives of millions of American

families. Right now, 25 million Americans are denied health insurance coverage because of a preexisting condition.

Mr. Speaker, we have the best health care system in the world—but there is room for improvement. Our plan improves health care in this country by making it both accessible and, just as important, affordable. I would encourage my colleagues to join me in eliminating job-lock by supporting the Health Coverage Availability and Affordability Act.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE HONORABLE EDMUND S. MUSKIE

(Mr. LONGLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. LONGLEY. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty this afternoon to inform the House of the passing of Senator Edmund Muskie of Maine this morning at about 4 a.m.

Senator Muskie was 81 years of age, a graduate of Bates College and Cornell University Law School, a very distinguished public servant of the citizens of Maine and of the United States. He served three terms in the Maine House of Representatives in 1946 and 1948 and 1950, including a final term as the Democratic floor leader. In 1955, he was elected Governor, he served a second term, and he followed that with a career in the U.S. Senate that began in 1958.

In 1968, he was Democratic candidate for Vice President of the United States and built and earned a tremendous national reputation for his decency, his compassion and his moderation during that difficult time during the end of the Vietnam war. He also served as Secretary of State in the Cabinet of President Jimmy Carter from 1980 to 1981.

While there are many distinctions that we can discuss, not the least among them is the Senator's accomplishment in creating a second party, making Maine a two-party State, which is in the best interest of all of our citizens, but certainly as his legislative accomplishments on the national level are beyond peer, particularly in the area of environmental protection.

Senator Muskie was the author of many of the first pieces of legislation that this body passed back in the early 1960's dealing with the need to protect the quality of our air and our water. There are other issues that I could mention, but I think none more important than the fact that Senator Muskie was a kind and decent man who exercised and practiced respect for all of his constituents and all those with whom he had dealings. His demeanor is going to be missed. Certainly his integrity and his honesty are universally respected.

So we mourn his passing and we also express to his wife, Jane, and his five