

I have remaining, that for those who say, well, this is only a small reform, this does not address the larger issue of affordability for health insurance or the fact that so many millions of Americans now have no health insurance, well, that is true. And I would be the first to recognize the fact that we continue to have a problem with fewer and fewer people able to afford health insurance, and as a consequence more and more people do not have any health insurance. In fact, the Democratic Party, my colleagues on the Democratic side in the House, formed a health care task force, which I happen to be one of the cochairmen of last year. We put forward a set of Democratic principles on health care reform. Our two major principles are that we want to achieve more affordable health insurance and we want to expand the number of people in this country that have health insurance.

I would maintain that the Kennedy-Kassebaum bill in its pure form or in the form that passed the Senate does help in an incremental way to provide more Americans with health insurance, maybe 20, 25 million Americans who will be positively impacted by it. So, while we see the numbers of people who are uninsured continue to go up, we know that this bill, although modest, would help in the effort to try to cover more Americans and provide more Americans with health insurance.

Mr. Speaker, we also know that, if it is passed in its clean form and the way the Senate passed it without the medical savings accounts, that it certainly would not make health insurance less affordable. If in fact you include the medical savings accounts, in fact, that is what would happen. Health insurance would become less affordable for the average American.

□ 2030

Just in case, again just to give you an idea about the magnitude of the problem that we face in trying to achieve more coverage for Americans, just in my own home State of New Jersey within the last 2 weeks a new report came out, 124-page Healthy New Jersey 2000 report, that actually was released last month, and if I could just summarize some of the information that shows that the percentage of uninsured New Jersey workers, and I am talking about working Americans, working new Jerseyans, actually doubled in the last 4 years. This latest report statistically shows that 14.6 percent of New Jersey's full-time employed workers had no health insurance coverage in 1993, twice the percentage that was uninsured in 1989. About 15.5 percent of the overall population under the age of 65 was without insurance in 1993, working or not, up from 11.7 percent in 1989. That is about 1.1 million New Jerseyans. Now, you take that across the country. You will probably find about 40 million Americans now who do not have health insurance coverage, and the number continues to grow.

The statistics are even more significant when you look at minorities. The rate of insurance coverage is worse for blacks, among whom one in five is without coverage, insurance, and for Hispanics, among whom one in three is uninsured. And these figures take into account the fact that Medicaid covers the poorest families and the disabled, so we are primarily talking about working Americans because if you are below a certain income, you are eligible for Medicaid. But many people are not, and of course those are primarily working people.

I only mentioned that because again I feel very strongly that even though in the Kennedy-Kassebaum bill we are talking about a modest effort to try to increase the availability of health insurance to Americans, I think even that modest effort needs to be moved forward, and it is very wrong for the Republican leadership here in the House of Representatives to stop that reform from moving forward just because they want to include these medical savings accounts for special interests that support them. And even if they honestly believe that that is the way to go, they should drop the effort because it is going to make it virtually impossible for us to get this health insurance reform passed in this session of Congress.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, if I could just say as this health insurance reform, as the Kennedy-Kassebaum bill, goes to conference, the Republicans need to drop these controversial provisions and stop dragging their feet so we can get a bill passed this year, this Congress. I urge the House Republican leadership to follow the Senate lead and strike the special-interest tax-free accounts for the healthy and the wealthy.

The Republican leadership needs to quit stalling and pass bipartisan health insurance now so it can go to the President's desk and he can sign it, and we can all declare victory for the average American and help those people who find it more and more difficult to buy health insurance.

SUPPORT H.R. 2270

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GUTKNECHT). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. SHADEGG] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to address an issue of what I believe is of grave concern for this Nation, and that is an issue dealing with the fundamental law of the land.

I hold here the Constitution of the United States, and all of us as individuals learned about this document and studied it in grade school and high school civics. Some of us might have even gone back since then and read a provision or two. I want to focus on the importance of this document and on the importance of an issue that I think has become abused.

Mr. Speaker, this document sets forth the vision of our Founding Fathers for a powerful central Government, but with limited and specifically enumerated powers. Now, why did they spell out that? Why did they say that it should have certain powers and that they should be significant powers, but that they should be limited and specifically enumerated?

Well, if you reflect on your history, you will realize that the Founding Fathers of this Nation had themselves recently escaped an oppressive central Government, a central Government which took the form of a king, a king who could at will order whatever he wanted and command or demand what he chose. The Founding Fathers, fearing that we might return to that system, felt we should spell out in a single document which would bind the Nation forever those powers granted to the Federal Government and that they should be adequate and complete for that Government to do its jobs.

But they recognized that there were many States which would make up this Union and that those States would play a fundamental role, and they addressed and they considered the division of power between the Federal Government on the one hand and the States on the other, and to address that concern they spelled out in an amendment, which I want to call to the attention of my colleagues here in the House, the 10th amendment, which reads, and I think it is important for us to understand what it reads and to think through its meaning, the 10th amendment to the U.S. Constitution addresses this issue of what level of Government should exercise which powers. And it says specifically:

The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively or to the people.

Now, Mr. Speaker, many of those in my freshmen class were elected on a platform that has to do with that, the 10th amendment to the U.S. Constitution. We have watched through our lifetimes, and I have watched through my lifetime, as the Federal Government located here in Washington, DC, thousands and thousands of miles from my constituents at home in Arizona, has sought to bring to itself more and more and more power, and in doing that what it has done at the same time is to reduce by ever-growing amounts the power and the authority of all the good men and women who serve in State legislatures around this Nation, all the good men and women who serve on county boards of supervisors or city councils. Indeed as the Congress has arrogated unto itself all this power, it has left less and less power for individual citizens of this country.

Now, why should that be of concern? It really is kind of simple, and that is what this boils down to: The truth is my constituents back in Phoenix, AZ,

have a better chance of affecting a decision if they can go down to their city council or down to the board of supervisors or even down to the legislature and raise an issue, than if in order to affect that issue they have to come all the way here to Washington, DC, thousands of miles from my home.

I believe it is critical for this Congress to recognize that in ignoring the 10th amendment over the past several decades and in arrogating more and more power to ourselves in Congress, quite frankly so that politicians here can buy themselves back into office, what we have done is we have taken power away from the citizens. It is time to end that.

Now, how do we end that? I want to talk to my colleagues tonight about one simple idea, and that is the notion as set forth in a bill which I have introduced to this Congress, which would, I believe, restore meaning to the 10th amendment of the U.S. Constitution. I hold a copy of it here. It is H.R. 2270. It is for Federal legislation quite unique in that it is less than 3 pages long. It is a simple bill which simply says that before any one of our colleagues, before any one of us here on the floor, could introduce a new bill calling for the Federal Government to take on some new project or some new legislation, you would have to spell out the powers granted to it to do that under the U.S. Constitution. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this and to set the terms so that we could not debate on this floor legislation in areas that the Constitution did not grant us the authority.

It is a simple idea; it is H.R. 2270. It says, out of respect for the 10th amendment, before we introduce a bill, we must spell out the constitutional authority that gives us, the Congress, the power to legislate in that area. It is a critical first step.

THE MYTH OF THE MAGICAL BUREAUCRAT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOEKSTRA] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, before we start with our prepared remarks this evening, I would like to assure the gentleman from Arizona that as we move forward and as we get to another week of active reform in this Congress probably around the middle of July, we expect that that piece of legislation will have worked its way through the committee process and will be one of the items that this full House will have the opportunity to talk about.

Mr. SHADEGG. If the gentleman would yield briefly? I simply want to thank the gentleman for his assistance in moving this piece of legislation forward, thank him for cosponsoring the bill, and tell him that I spoke today with the gentleman from Florida [Mr.

CANADY], the chairman of the Constitution Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary. He has indicated to me just what you have indicated; that is, that we are hopeful that we will get hearings on this legislation in the near future and that it can move forward. I appreciate the gentleman's effort on its behalf. I appreciate your support, and I think it is a step in the right direction.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. And the issue that we are going to be talking about tonight builds very much off of the problem that you describe. We are going to be talking about the myth of the magical bureaucrat, the myth of moving all of this power and responsibility from parents, from local levels of government to State governments, that the best place to make these types of decisions is in Washington. And we are going to be going through a number of examples this evening which we hope expose that myth for what it really is. It is for a bunch of people in Washington making decisions, spending money in areas where they really cannot have a significant, positive impact or most importantly, where they are not the most effective agent for bringing about the types of results that we want.

Mr. SHADEGG. If the gentleman would yield again, let me just simply say I commend you for this effort, and I want to pass on something. One of the greatest influences in my life, as I suppose in, hopefully, many American boys' lives, is their own father. My father was a tremendous influence on me, and he was very fond in the later years of his life of saying that the problem with the Congress was that it had come to believe that it knew how better to run every American business and every American's life than those individuals themselves. And that is the kind of notion that I think your effort is going at.

The simple truth is that the 535 Members of this Congress, House and Senate combined, no matter how well-intended, and the huge army of bureaucrats that we control, and there are thousands, tens of thousands of bureaucrats that we control, simply cannot know better how to run the day-to-day lives of every American and the day-to-day businesses of every American business or of every American church or synagogue. We simply cannot run those organizations better than they, and the myth of the mystical bureaucrat that can do it better than we can is indeed dead wrong.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. As we move forward this evening, we are going to talk about this myth as it applies to education, as it talks about creating jobs, as we talk about Medicare, as we talk about environmental types of legislation, so that is one of the key areas.

We could not have had a better introduction to our topic tonight than the legislation that the gentleman talked about, and I again would like to just reaffirm that I expect that this House will take positive action on legislation like that this summer so that this Con-

gress can again begin focusing on the issues that Washington should be dealing with, that Washington is good at, in moving the other types of decisions, the other types of responsibility and the dollars back to State, local, and maybe even back to the taxpayers, parents and individuals who really are the driving force behind so much of what goes on in this country.

Mr. SHADEGG. I commend you for your efforts and wish you the best.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Thank you.

Let me just give a little bit of a brief introduction about what we want to accomplish this evening.

This is an election year. We are in the middle of a lot of rhetoric flying around. Those of us in Congress who want to focus on the real problems are finding it very difficult to break through what we call the clutter, the clutter and the noise. As Members of the Republican majority, we have grown accustomed to being called mean-spirited, radical. We are accused of being against women, children, and the elderly. We are accused of not caring for the poor or for the environment.

In the middle of all this rhetoric, what is really going on? Many of my constituents, many of the American people, seem to be very confused. We want to take this hour to really set the record straight on what we are trying to do in this Congress. We want to focus on what we believe is the core issue that is defining this battle in Washington, that has defined the battle, really, from January 1995 to the present point.

□ 2045

Many have thrown around labels. Some have called us extremists. But let us cast aside the labels for a little while. Let us cast aside the accusations and other typical Washington political jargon, and let us get down to the bottom of the debate. What are we really trying to do here? What is the core of the debate?

We can go back to the 1930's, the New Deal. Ever since the 1930's Congress has placed more and more of its faith in Washington, its bureaucracy, its bureaucrats, and in its money, in its programs, and in its services. As we have done that, we have moved much of the decisionmaking away from parents, individuals, entrepreneurs, small businesses. What we have done is we have created a myth that too many people have come to believe, the belief in the Washington bureaucrat: A belief in Washington money, a belief in Washington programs, and that Washington services can solve many, if not all, of this Nation's problems. This is really what all the fuss is about.

Since becoming the majority in Congress, Republicans have been attacking the myth that Washington can solve everyone's problems. We know that few Americans believe in Santa Clause. Even fewer believe in the tooth fairy. But here in Washington, everyone