

savings, we need to get rid of the waste, the fraud and the abuse in the system. And we are committed to do that. But we are not committed to destroy a program that has provided for our seniors in this country.

And I thank my colleague for his determination, for his leadership on this issue and for raising this issue tonight for the American people to focus in on because in fact we are in another battle, and it is a battle to save Medicare for our elderly in this country.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Michigan and just point out again, you know, I know that our colleagues on the other side always say, well, people will have choice, they do not have to go into managed care. But the reality is the way the system is set up by the Republican leadership, people are forced into managed care. You have a rate differential, which means basically that doctors will get reimbursed more or less depending on which system seniors opt for, and then you have this balanced billing. So essentially what happens is seniors find that since they have to spend a lot more money out of pocket to pay the doctor, if they stay in the traditional system where they can choose their own doctor, they are literally forced into the managed care system because under that system they do not have to pay the extra money out of pocket to their doctor.

So when the Republicans say, oh, you have a choice, the reality is you do not have a choice. You are forced into managed care. Otherwise you have to stay in a system where the cost and how much you have to pay out of pocket just gets to be more and more. And so in reality you do not have a choice. You lose your choice of doctor and also maybe your choice of hospital in a lot of cases, and I think that is important to point out.

I yield now to the gentlewoman from Connecticut, who has done so much on this Medicare issue and made the point so well on it.

Ms. DELAURO. It is a pleasure to join my colleagues here tonight, and I just like to pick up a comment that our colleague from Michigan pointed out, and that is, if you need to put the Medicare debate in a context, we live in a great country, we really do, and in 1965 we passed a Medicare system. As a matter of fact as an aside, it was the current Republican candidate for President, BOB DOLE, who said that he was proud of his vote back then and he voted against Medicare because he did not believe that it was a system that worked. And we ought to keep that in mind. This was not a comment that he did not believe it would work in 1965. In 1996, when he was running for President of the United States, he does not believe that this is a system that works. We ought to keep that squarely in mind.

But the fact is that it was passed, and it was a stroke of genius in terms of health care for seniors in this country.

□ 2330

Before Medicare, less than 50 percent of seniors in this Nation had health care coverage in any way. Today, 99 percent of seniors are covered. They have health care. They do not have to worry that they are going to be wiped out because of an illness that they did not create but they were unfortunate enough to get.

I think we need to talk about this debate on Medicare and Medicaid in the context of what this system has meant to people in this country. As my colleagues have pointed out, last year in the Republican budget they intended to make a \$270 billion cut in Medicaid to pay for tax breaks, \$245 billion in tax breaks for the wealthiest in this country.

What happened around the Nation, the hue and cry of seniors, of their families, of people who believed that this was the wrong thing to do, stopped them from doing the kinds of things that my colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey, has pointed out in his chart. What they wanted to do was to double the premiums, to increase the copayments, increase the deductibles, do away with choice, make it more difficult for hospitals, make it more difficult for rural areas.

Quite frankly, we thought we had beat back the barbarians. But instead, what we see is in the 1997 budget the very same set of premises, the very same policy being brought forward again. This is a new budget, but it is the same set of policies with regard to Medicare and Medicaid and the same sweeping and dangerous cuts.

To quote the gentleman from Georgia, Mr. GINGRICH, he said "We can't do it all at once." The goal for Mr. GINGRICH, he would like to see Medicare wither on the vine, but "we can't do it all at once. We need to do it in pieces." So we tried in 1995 and we got pushed back, so we are going to try again in 1996, and God help us in 1997, because it will come back again.

The Republicans got a little trickier this time in this budget. They learned a lesson: Don't let anything sit around for too long so that the American public has some time to notice what is going on and to learn about it, because if they learn about it and they know about it, they are very smart and they will rise up and they will say that we are not going to do this. Sixty percent of the public said to the President of the United States that they wanted him to veto that budget because it contained these kinds of Medicare cuts.

This new budget, and I put "new" in quotes, moved through this House in a week, moved through this House in 1 week because they knew that if they let it stay around long enough, we would see the exact same set of premises, the exact same policy with regard to Medicare and Medicaid that they tried to impose on the American public in the last budget, last year. It is \$168 billion in Medicaid and Medicare cuts this time around. It is done in 6 years

versus 7 years. It would have sliced 19 percent last year from Medicare. This year it is 17 percent, a 2 percent difference. The American public should not be fooled. It is the exact same policy.

Let us contrast the cut with the amount of the tax break for the wealthy. It is \$168 billion in a tax cut in Medicare and it is \$176 to \$180 billion in a tax break that will benefit the wealthiest in this country. It is the same exact equation that was set up in the last budget. The public should not be fooled.

If we move to Medicaid, or as my colleagues has pointed out, in these areas we have the same things that exist. The restrictions that are now on doctors and hospitals not to overcharge people beyond what Medicare will take care of will be removed: increased bills, out-of-pocket costs for seniors; nursing home standards not enforced. And we know what that means in the quality of life and the quality of care for those we love who go into nursing homes. We know also what they want to do to spouses and children in being able to attack their assets.

The long and the short of it is that we are going to make this fight day in and day out in the next several weeks, in the next several months, because the public should not be fooled by the same set of policies that would foist upon American seniors a second-rate health care system. It is wrong, it is unfair, it is not what this Nation is about. It is not what our values are. It is not what our priorities are. We are going to make the same fight and the same cases that we did over the last several months. This is not going to rest until we turn this policy around and do what is right and do what is best for America's seniors and the American people.

THE ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE 104TH CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NEY). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOX] is recognized for the balance of the time remaining before midnight as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to address my colleagues and speak to the House regarding some important issues. I think it is important at this time, as we approach the end of the week here in the second session of the 104th Congress, to really look at the fine record of achievement in a bipartisan House that we have to this date brought about.

We only have to look at the fact that we have passed \$250 billion in reductions of taxes for families here in the United States. We only have to look at the fact that we have reduced Federal spending in duplicative programs, not in worthwhile programs, obviously. We have passed the first balanced budget since 1969, very important to this economy and to this country.

We only have to look to Alan Greenspan, who is the individual who told this Congress and this Nation that if we reduce our interest costs we will help each American be able to buy a car, pay for those interest payments. If we have a balanced budget we will be able to better handle the mortgage and the cost of education.

We have gotten tough on crime, limited criminals' endless death row appeals in cases where there are baseless appeals, where there has been no wrongdoing at the time of trial. We have passed victim restitution, we have passed truth-in-sentencing grants, strengthened the antiterrorism statutes, strengthened sexual crimes against children statutes.

We have also passed private health care reform. Our legislation will provide portability, accessibility, availability.

Look to the student loan program, where we have increased student loan volume by 50 percent, from \$24 billion in 1996 to \$36 billion by 1997. We have had real congressional reform. We have passed the Congressional Accountability Act, signed into law by the President, which provides that every law we now pass in the Congress, as we have in prior Congresses, there have been laws passed, but this is the first time in this Congress that when the laws are passed by also will apply to Congress. Whether it be the fair labor standards or civil rights law, they also apply to our employees as well.

We have passed lobbying reform and gift ban, cut committee staff by one-third, and required a two-thirds vote for any tax increase in this House for this Congress.

We have also passed an increase in the amount senior citizens can earn without losing Social Security benefits. That was brought by a Republican majority proposal. Currently, Mr. Speaker, seniors are frozen at \$11,038, those under 70 are frozen at that amount without deductions being made from Social Security. But under the legislation we have passed here, that will rise to \$30,000.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard a lot of distortions tonight from the other side of the aisle trying to talk about what we are doing here in Congress. The facts are far different from the distortions we have heard. The fact is, when it comes to Medicare reform, our proposal was bipartisan and the best we could actually come up with, a very positive program, considering the fact that it was the President who said that if we do nothing with Medicare it will go out of business in 7 years. It will go bankrupt.

You might say to yourself, how did it get to this point? Why would it go bankrupt? But we got to this point because, frankly, there has been fraud and abuse and waste up to \$30 billion a year. Frankly, that can be stopped, but it will take legislation which has been introduced in this House. For the first time those who commit fraud under

the Medicare or Medicaid system, health care fraud is a crime, and if you commit that kind of offense you will no longer be a provider and you can go to jail for 10 years.

That is the kind of forward thinking legislation that has been introduced in this House, and frankly should be adopted and signed into law by the President. If we take out the fraud, abuse and waste that is in Medicare, we will be able to preserve Medicare and preserve for each senior the right to have their choice of doctor and choice of hospital. Very important.

In addition, the proposed legislation is going to increase the current payment about \$5,000 per senior, up to \$7,100 by the year 2002. We also offer for the first time, choice besides fee-for-service, giving you a choice of doctors and hospitals, and also medical savings accounts and, as well, managed care. That is, what the seniors want in their particular case, to have eyeglasses and pharmaceuticals included at no extra charge.

But the proposal went further. We think it is a very, very wise proposal. In addition to limiting fraud, waste, and abuse, the proposal from the House calls for making sure that the medical education component, which is now under Medicare, will be a separate line item in the budget, so we make sure that our interns and residents have that quality education without cutting away from our senior citizens' health care benefits what they need.

We also call for reductions in the cost of paperwork. Right now we spend about 12 percent of Medicare dollars in paperwork. That should mostly go to health care for our seniors. Under our proposal, that is what will happen.

We also make sure that this whole program is based on the fact that whatever savings we have in Medicare, whatever savings are achieved, whether it is \$30 billion a year in fraud, waste, and abuse, it has to go back for health care and not for some other item in the U.S. Budget.

We can see, Mr. Speaker, that working together we can have Medicare reform that is going to be helpful to our seniors, and make sure we have a system that is for this year's seniors and the next generation's seniors and something that is going to be good for this country.

We, as well, have been working on tax reform, and tax reform that is fair to all Americans, not from the distortions that you have heard from the other side of the aisle about how it is only for the rich. The tax reform we are talking about is for the middle class, a \$500-per-child tax credit. We are talking about an adoption tax credit of \$5,000. We are talking about tax credits for small businesses to start up, to provide jobs for our citizens.

These are real proposals that will make a real difference. We are talking about a \$2,000 new IRA for each individual, \$4,000 for each married couple. These are proposals that were adopted

by the Kennedy administration and made a difference. They could happen again here in this Congress.

It is also important to note that our welfare reform proposals will make real difference. Of course, there are people in the safety net who must get welfare. That is undeniable. But there are people who are able-bodied, and under our proposal what will happen is able-bodied individuals, through job counseling, job training, and job placement will have the opportunity to obtain employment, to have the pride of work, to make a difference in their lives, and instead of the welfare as we have it now being a hammock, it will be springboard, Mr. Speaker, to a new class of individuals getting involved in the world of work, more people paying taxes, more people who are employed and stabilizing those taxes. That is the kind of true welfare reform that will make a difference.

Under that proposal as well, it calls for us, Mr. Speaker, to have new enforcement procedures for child support. We have a situation in this country where probably the most unpaid bills we have are child support. We can make a difference by adopting plans like they have in the State of Maine.

There they require, Mr. Speaker, that every person who is not paying their child support would lose their license if it was not paid. Ninety-five percent paid their amounts owed on child support, once they knew they could lose their driver's license. It is recommended under our welfare reform proposals that States adopt plans like Maine's or an alternative which will, again, get us the enforcement that we want.

We can achieve this, and it is certainly meaningful, and it is something that can make a big difference.

We also called for improvements in our child nutrition programs and our WIC programs, women, infants, and children programs, by increasing the amount of money that is going to be spent on the school lunch programs, and in fact making sure that the States administer them.

Mr. Speaker, currently under our school lunch programs we spend 50 percent of the funds just to administer them. Under the proposals that the Governors have talked to Congress about, they said they will only spend 5 percent on administration, but with the extra 10 percent we will still provide in this program, they would be able to feed more children more meals, but by Federal standards. If they did not adhere to those standards, then we as a Congress would take it back.

So working in partnership with local governments, which are closest to the people, we can provide the kinds of services that people want without bankrupting the Nation, without making people pay until July 1 every year through taxes and regulations all that money to Uncle Sam. We want to make sure there is more money in their pocket to spend as they want to, to spend as their families need.

I think it is very important that we continue trying to find the bipartisan effort, instead of the rhetoric we have heard previously tonight about how this party, the Republican Party, does not care about seniors. Nothing could be further from the truth.

The two major proposals that have come before this Congress in this session have been raising the income eligibility for seniors' earnings, and No. 2, the other proposal was to roll back in 1993 the unfair tax on Social Security. The Republican majority brought both those forward and they were both adopted in this House.

Now it is incumbent upon us to continue fighting for seniors to make sure Medicare provides the health care benefits they need, but removing the waste from the system, and that is the key feature here. We will make sure that we eliminate the waste, the fraud and abuse that has gone on for so many years and must end.

Part and parcel of our making sure that health care is improved for our seniors is that we provide FDA reform as well, to make sure that for all citizens we speed up the approval of life-saving, life-extending drugs and medical devices in this country.

□ 2345

This can and will be done under legislation that has been introduced in the Committee on Commerce under the leadership of JIM GREENWOOD as the task force chairman, the Commerce Committee chairman TOM BLILEY, the subcommittee chairman MIKE BILIRAKIS, and the three sponsors of the bill, Congressman KLUG, Congressman BARTON and Congressman BURR of North Carolina who has the pharmaceutical bill.

Together the bills dealing with pharmaceuticals, medical devices, and food will in fact move this country forward in such a way that the discoveries we have in the United States will be kept here. If we do not speed up the FDA reform process, then the discoveries for medical benefit and the jobs will go overseas. We cannot afford that as a Nation both from an employment point of view or from a health care point of view.

So I am pleased to see that the leadership is moving forward with FDA. What we are going to do is work with the Commissioner of FDA and the White House to make sure this legislation is bipartisan, is passed, and we do make a difference in the lives of the people we are representing.

Mr. Speaker, as I know from the hearing I had in my own district in Montgomery County, PA, in the county seat, we had victims who have diseases, patients who are waiting for a cure, a vaccine. They tell us that if we can speed up the approval of these drugs, they will live longer, others will have a chance to live longer and frankly their families are waiting for this kind of relief.

We need to fast track this legislation. I am very appreciative that the

individuals who brought forward the vehicle in the Committee on Commerce folded my legislation which was introduced last year into the majority bills and I am hopeful that together with other Congressmen and the Senate we will be able to get this passed in this session and make a real difference in people's lives.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. HOUGHTON (at the request of Mr. ARMEY), for today, on account of attending a funeral.

Mr. QUINN (at the request of Mr. ARMEY), after 12 noon today, on account of attending a funeral.

Mr. GUTKNECHT (at the request of Mr. ARMEY), after 12:30 p.m. today, on account of attending his daughter's graduation.

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for today, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. FILNER) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, for 5 minutes today.

Mr. VENTO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. CLAYTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FILNER, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. PELOSI, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DOGGETT, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. JONES) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. EWING, for 5 minutes today.

Mr. JONES, for 5 minutes on June 5.

Mr. DELAY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CHRYSLER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ROHRBACHER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. KINGSTON, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. FILNER) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. LANTOS in three instances.

Mrs. MALONEY.

Mr. TORRICELLI.

Ms. WOOLSEY.

Mr. JACOBS.

Mr. BONIOR.

Mr. TRAFICANT.

Ms. KAPTUR.

Mrs. LINCOLN.

Mr. KANJORSKI in two instances.

Mr. RUSH.

Mr. KLECZKA.

Mr. FAZIO of California.

Mr. CONDIT.

Mr. SANDERS in six instances.

Mr. LIPINSKI.

Mr. MASCARA.

Mrs. SCHROEDER.

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. JONES) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. FIELDS of Texas.

Mr. OXLEY.

Mr. RIGGS.

Mr. QUINN.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana.

Mr. HORN in two instances.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

Mr. LIVINGSTON.

Mr. SHAW.

Mrs. ROUKEMA in two instances.

Mr. GEKAS.

Mrs. VUCANOVICH.

Mr. CRANE.

Mrs. MORELLA.

Mr. ZIMMER.

Mr. CHRYSLER.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. HOSTETTLER.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio.

Mr. HALL of Texas.

Mr. MCINNIS.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

Mrs. SMITH of Washington.

Mr. FOLEY.

Mr. VENTO.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 47 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, May 31, 1996, at 9 a.m.

OATH OF OFFICE OF MEMBERS, RESIDENT COMMISSIONER, AND DELEGATES

The oath of office required by the sixth article of the Constitution of the United States, and as provided by section 2 of the act of May 13, 1884 (23 Stat. 22), to be administered to Members, Resident Commissioner, and Delegates of the House of Representatives, the text of which is carried in 5 U.S.C. 3331:

"I, A B, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely; without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God."

has been subscribed to in person and filed in duplicate with the Clerk of the House of Representatives by the following Members of the 104th Congress,