

Dulles Airport which, instead of having its competitive advantage increased, would lose millions of dollars' worth of business.

In our subcommittee, we reached a reasonable accommodation with the addition of only six slots, and those going at only two per hour for underserved airports with no increase in the perimeter, that is, the number of miles from Washington that can be traveled, so there will not be increased noise in our neighborhoods. Remember, we are talking about an airport that is essentially located in downtown Washington.

We have also succeeded in getting \$200 million released that was held up irrationally because in 1996 a link between getting nominations to the Metropolitan Airport Authority and the release of this money appeared in a bill. Our subcommittee delinks this so that when Members go to National Airport, they in fact will see the whole airport being renovated. We are to the point where if we do not proceed, the burden will be very great and we simply cannot wait much longer.

The other body has a provision in its reauthorization of the FAA, that is what is here, H.R. 2000, they have in S. 82, the companion bill, an additional 48 slots. I just want to say to this body here and now that the one thing National cannot accept is 48 new slots. That is unacceptable special interest legislation. It is this body that some years ago instituted a slot rule because National is one of the most dangerous airports in the country to fly into. It is greatly overcrowded. We hope that we can reach out in accommodation with the other body.

This is an airport for the world and for the country. In its wisdom, this body gave oversight of this airport to a metropolitan regional authority a few years ago. That authority has done a spectacular job. You can see it with your own eyes in the additions that are being made at Dulles, with the renovation of National Airport. Nevertheless, it is not a state of the art airport. It can never be a state of the art airport. We can make it more comfortable for people coming in. We must not overcrowd the air and make an airport that is now safe only because of a restriction on the number of slots unsafe because without thinking through this issue we have bowed to the Senate. I am sure that when we get into conference we can reach the kind of accommodation that all can live with.

To the Members I say, welcome to National Airport, welcome to Dulles Airport. Let us pass H.R. 1000 and get them both finished and safe.

---

IN MEMORY OF JOE DIMAGGIO,  
THE YANKEE CLIPPER

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KINGSTON). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. FOSSELLA) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FOSSELLA. Mr. Speaker, yesterday our Nation lost a bit of its soul when the Yankee Clipper, Joe DiMaggio, waved good-bye for the last time. Unlike many, Joe DiMaggio deserved the accolades he received. Joe DiMaggio was more than just a great baseball player, I think we would all admit. Some argue he was simply the best. Clearly he was one of the best. For me and I believe many, it was not the hitting streak, the way he glided around the bases, the outfield he roamed effortlessly, or the many world championships he helped to secure. Heck, I never even saw Joe DiMaggio play. He retired 14 years before I was born. Certainly it was on the field where Joe DiMaggio earned his glory but it was off the field where he earned his respect and the everlasting admiration of millions. Joe DiMaggio lived a life with grace, dignity, integrity and humility. This is what I believe made Joe DiMaggio so very, very special.

Over time, celebrities puncture our culture or splash onto the scene only to disappear after what seems like a moment. These fleeting "stars" that society grabs and lets go so quickly grab the big headlines, go to the best parties, or are seen with the "right people." Joe DiMaggio, on the other hand, was timeless. He grabbed a part of an era, the World War II generation, that some think is the best, and carried it with class until the day he died. Unlike many of those celebrities, Joe DiMaggio enjoyed universal love. Why the spontaneous standing ovations when he walked into a restaurant 47 years after he left the game of baseball? Because the people of this country still acknowledge greatness in their own special way. To many, Joe DiMaggio represented the wonders and goodness of man and this great country, America. You see, to many in this country, our country, character still matters.

Let me also take a moment to pay tribute to that city that Joe DiMaggio called home, and the city where Joe DiMaggio was one of its favorite sons, New York. In some parts, New York City gets a bad rap. That is a shame. New York City is unlike any other city in the world. Its pace may be too fast, crowds too large, streets too congested, but with all of this comes millions of people who love life, the United States of America, baseball and yes, the Yankees. And not necessarily in that order. And these folks loved Joe DiMaggio. Mr. DiMaggio embraced New York City and made it special and New York City embraced Joe DiMaggio and will never let him go.

And also what Joe DiMaggio represented, son of an immigrant from Italy who personified all the goodness of the great contributions Italians have made to build this great country. He was proud of his Italian heritage but he loved this country.

When Joe DiMaggio retired from baseball, he still had what others would argue is a few good years left.

But not for Mr. DiMaggio. He walked away because he had standards. History will record those standards along with the hitting streak, the grace, the quiet dignity and integrity which will forever be the hallmark of one of the greatest baseball players of all time. So no more opening days, just memories and a celebration of a wonderful life. I wish I could say it ain't so, but the Yankee Clipper has set sail.

Mr. Speaker, in closing I guess he will forever be immortalized in a song written by the songwriter Paul Simon. In today's New York Times, Mr. Simon, in an op-ed piece, talks about those words, "Where have you gone Joe DiMaggio? A Nation turns its lonely eyes to you."

Mr. Simon says,

In the 50's and the 60's, it was fashionable to refer to baseball as a metaphor for America, and DiMaggio represented the values of that America, excellence and fulfillment of duty, he often played in pain, combined with a grace that implied a purity of spirit, an off-the-field dignity and a jealously guarded private life.

Mr. DiMaggio was truly a great American and will forever be missed.

---

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DEMINT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DEMINT 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 Tennessee (Mr. FORD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. FORD 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 Florida (Mr. MILLER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. MILLER of Florida 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. NADLER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. NADLER 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 Florida (Mr. SCARBOROUGH) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. SCARBOROUGH addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

---

HOME HEALTH CARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to talk about an issue which is of great importance to my State of Vermont and to I believe virtually every State in the country, and that is the crisis that is currently occurring with regards to home health care.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, in 1997 the Congress, against my vote, without my vote, passed the so-called Balanced Budget Act which cut \$115 billion from Medicare, including \$16 billion from home health care. Of course, those savings were used to provide tax breaks, most of which went to the very wealthiest people in this country. So we cut Medicare, we cut home health care, and we gave tax breaks to the rich and to the very rich.

The result of that is that since 1997, cuts in home health care agencies have forced about 20 percent of those agencies to close, and agencies that are still open such as the 13 efficient nonprofit agencies in the State of Vermont are now struggling to meet the home health needs of their constituents with fewer resources.

Last year, we put a band-aid on the problem and passed limited home health relief. We took a small step forward, but clearly nowhere near enough. Right now we have got to stop the upcoming 15 percent across-the-board cut in home health care. We need to increase home health care per visit cost limits, we need to reform per beneficiary limits so that the sickest patients who need many home health visits have access to them. I am hopeful that Congress this year will do the right thing and pass comprehensive home health reforms this year that will truly help our agencies and equally as important Medicare beneficiaries who need home health care.

There is one particular aspect of the debate about home health care that concerns me very, very much, and, that is, that the Medicare commission is proposing a 10 percent copayment for home health care which would result in out-of-pocket payments for the average senior of \$470 a year. Now, some people may say, "Well, \$470 is not a lot of money." Well, it is a heck of a lot of money if you are an elderly person, if you are frail, and if you have an income of \$8,000 or \$9,000 or \$10,000 a year. That is 4 percent or 5 percent of your total income. At a time when many of our seniors cannot afford the prescription drugs that they need, when their out-of-pocket health care costs are soaring, it would be an absolute outrage to ask the elderly, sick, poor people to be paying \$470 a year more for a program which they now receive for nothing and which they should continue to receive without cost.

It is beyond my comprehension, Mr. Speaker, that at this moment at the same exact time that people are talking about imposing an horrendous copayment on low-income, sick senior citizens, these same people are talking about tax breaks for millionaires and billionaires. In other words, in all es-

sence you raise taxes for the poor, the sick and the elderly, those people who are too frail to leave their homes, and you take that money and you give tax breaks to millionaires and billionaires. That is unconscionable and it is beyond my comprehension that any Member of the United States Congress would support such a regressive and reactionary approach. What kind of country are we if we would do that?

I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that we will not go that route. I am proud to say that I will be sending a letter to the Medicare commission which contains the names of 69 Members of the House who are going to say to that commission, "Don't impose a copayment on the elderly and the sick and the frail."

Let us support home health care, let us understand that home health care is an integral part of long-term care, that it is something that is vitally needed, that it is something that is cost effective. If people do not receive the home health care that they need, they are going to end up in the hospital at far greater expense to Medicare.

I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that this body will go on record as saying no to any copayments and let us protect some of the most fragile people in our country, and, that is, those people who cannot leave their home, who are old, who are sick and who are poor.

#### RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE 106TH CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the requirement of clause 2(a) of rule XI of the Rules of the House, I submit herewith the rules of the Committee on Appropriations for the 106th Congress. The committee rules were approved by the full committee on February 2, 1999.

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, COMMITTEE RULES EFFECTIVE FOR ONE HUNDRED SIXTH CONGRESS, APPROVED FEBRUARY 2, 1999

Resolved, That the rules and practices of the Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, in the One Hundred Fifth Congress, except as otherwise provided hereinafter, shall be and are hereby adopted as the rules and practices of the Committee on Appropriations in the One Hundred Sixth Congress.

The foregoing resolution adopts the following rules:

##### SEC. 1: POWER TO SIT AND ACT

For the purpose of carrying out any of its functions and duties under Rules X and XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Committee or any of its subcommittees is authorized:

(a) To sit and act at such times and places within the United States whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, and to hold such hearings; and

(b) To require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, reports, correspondence, memorandums, pa-

pers, and documents as it deems necessary. The Chairman, or any Member designated by the Chairman, may administer oaths to any witness.

(c) A subpoena may be authorized and issued by the Committee or its subcommittees under subsection 1(b) in the conduct of any investigation or activity or series of investigations or activities, only when authorized by a majority of the Members of the Committee voting, a majority being present. The power to authorize and issue subpoenas under subsection 1(b) may be delegated to the Chairman pursuant to such rules and under such limitations as the Committee may prescribe. Authorized subpoenas shall be signed by the Chairman or by any Member designated by the Committee.

(d) Compliance with any subpoena issued by the Committee or its subcommittees may be enforced only as authorized or directed by the House.

##### SEC. 2: SUBCOMMITTEES

(a) The Majority Caucus of the Committee shall establish the number of subcommittees and shall determine the jurisdiction of each subcommittee.

(b) Each subcommittee is authorized to meet, hold hearings, receive evidence, and report to the Committee all matters referred to it.

(c) All legislation and other matters referred to the Committee shall be referred to the subcommittee of appropriate jurisdiction within two weeks unless, by majority vote of the Majority Members of the full Committee, consideration is to be by the full Committee.

(d) The Majority Caucus of the Committee shall determine an appropriate ratio of Majority to Minority Members for each subcommittee. The Chairman is authorized to negotiate that ratio with the Minority; *Provided, however*, That party representation in each subcommittee, including ex-officio members, shall be no less favorable to the Majority than the ratio for the full Committee.

(e) The Chairman and Ranking Minority Member of the full Committee are authorized to sit as a member of all subcommittees and to participate, including voting, in all its work.

##### SEC. 3: STAFFING

(a) Committee Staff—The Chairman is authorized to appoint the staff of the Committee, and make adjustments in the job titles and compensation thereof subject to the maximum rates and conditions established in Clause 9(c) of Rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives. In addition, he is authorized, in his discretion, to arrange for their specialized training. The Chairman is also authorized to employ additional personnel as necessary.

(b) Assistants to Members—Each of the top twenty-one senior majority and minority Members of the full Committee may select and designate one staff member who shall serve at the pleasure of that Member. Such staff members shall be compensated at a rate, determined by the Member, not to exceed 75 percent of the maximum established in Clause 9(c) of Rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives; *Provided*, That Members designating staff members under this subsection must specifically certify by letter to the Chairman that the employees are needed and will be utilized for Committee work.

##### SEC. 4 COMMITTEE MEETINGS

(a) Regular Meeting Day—The regular meeting day of the Committee shall be the first Wednesday of each month while the House is in session, unless the Committee has met within the past 30 days or the Chairman considers a specific meeting unnecessary in the light of the requirements of the Committee business schedule.