

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 2015

PROVIDING FOR REAPPOINTMENT OF DR. HANNA H. GRAY AS A CITIZEN REGENT OF BOARD OF REGENTS OF SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on House Administration be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 27) providing for the reappointment of Dr. Hanna H. Gray as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

H.J. RES. 27

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in accordance with section 5581 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (20 U.S.C. 43), the vacancy on the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, in the class other than Members of Congress, occurring by reason of the expiration of the term of Dr. Hanna H. Gray of Illinois on April 11, 1999, is filled by the reappointment of the incumbent for a term of six years, effective April 12, 1999.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR REAPPOINTMENT OF WESLEY S. WILLIAMS, JR. AS A CITIZEN REGENT OF BOARD OF REGENTS OF SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on House Administration be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 27) providing for the reappointment of Wesley S. Williams, Jr., as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

H.J. RES. 28

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in

Congress assembled, That, in accordance with section 5581 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (20 U.S.C. 43), the vacancy on the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, in the class other than Members of Congress, occurring by reason of the expiration of the term of Wesley S. Williams, Jr. of the District of Columbia on April 11, 1999, is filled by the reappointment of the incumbent for a term of six years, effective April 12, 1999.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

STATUS REPORT ON CURRENT LEVELS OF ON-BUDGET SPENDING AND REVENUES FOR FY 1999 AND THE 5-YEAR PERIOD FY 1999 THROUGH FY 2003

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the Gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, to facilitate application of sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act, I am transmitting a status report on the current levels of on-budget spending and revenues for fiscal year 1999 and for the 5-year period fiscal year 1999 through fiscal year 2003.

The term "current level" refers to the amounts of spending and revenues estimated for each fiscal year based on laws enacted or awaiting the President's signature as of March 17, 1999.

The first table in the report compares the current level of total budget authority, outlays, and revenues with the aggregate levels set by the interim allocations and aggregates printed in the RECORD of February 3, 1999, pursuant to H. Res. 5 for fiscal year 1999. This comparison is needed to implement section 311(a) of the Budget Act, which creates a point of order against measures that would breach the budget resolution's aggregate levels. The table does not show budget authority and outlays for years after fiscal year 1999 because appropriations for those years have not yet been considered.

The second table compares the current levels of budget authority and outlays of each direct spending committee with the "section 302(a)" allocations for discretionary action made under the interim allocations and aggregates submitted pursuant to H. Res. 5 for fiscal year 1999 and for fiscal years 1999 through 2003. "Discretionary action" refers to legislation enacted after adoption of the budget resolution. This comparison is needed to implement section 302(f) of the Budget Act, which creates a point of order against measures that would breach the section 302(a) discretionary action allocation of new budget authority or entitlement authority for the committee that reported the measure. It is also needed to implement section 311(b), which exempts committees that comply with their al-

locations from the point of order under section 311(a).

The third table compares the current levels of discretionary appropriations for fiscal year 1999 with the revised "section 302(b)" sub-allocations of discretionary budget authority and outlays among Appropriations subcommittees. This comparison is also needed to implement section 302(f) of the Budget Act, because the point of order under that section also applies to measures that would breach the applicable section 302(b) sub-allocation.

The fourth table compares discretionary appropriations to the levels provided by section 251(c) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985. Section 251 requires that if at the end of a session the discretionary spending, in any category, exceeds the limits set forth in section 251(c) as adjusted pursuant to provisions of section 251(b), there shall be a sequestration of funds within that category to bring spending within the established limits. This table is provided for information purposes only. Determination of the need for a sequestration is based on the report of the President required by section 254.

REPORT TO THE SPEAKER FROM THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET—STATUS OF THE INTERIM ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES FOR FISCAL YEARS 1999 AND FOR FISCAL YEAR 1999 TO 2003

[Reflecting Action Completed as of March 17, 1999 (On-budget amounts, in millions of dollars)]

	Fiscal year 1999	Fiscal year 1999–2003
Appropriate Level (as authorized by H. Res. 5):		
Budget Authority	1,444,851	NA
Outlays	1,393,291	NA
Revenues	1,368,374	7,284,605
Current Level:		
Budget Authority	1,443,553	NA
Outlays	1,393,074	NA
Revenues	1,368,396	7,284,616
Current Level over(+)/under(–) Appropriate Level:		
Budget Authority	–1,298	NA
Outlays	–217	NA
Revenues	22	11

NA=Not applicable because appropriations Acts for Fiscal Years 2000 through 2003 will not be considered until future sessions of Congress.

BUDGET AUTHORITY

Enactment of any measure providing new budget authority for FY 1999 in excess of \$1,298 million (if not already included in the current level estimate) would cause FY 1999 budget authority to exceed the appropriate level set by the interim allocations and aggregates submitted pursuant to H. Res. 5.

OUTLAYS

Enactment of any measure providing new outlays for FY 1999 in excess of \$217 million (if not already included in the current level estimate) would cause FY 1999 outlays to exceed the appropriate level set by the interim allocations and aggregates submitted pursuant to H. Res. 5.

REVENUES

Enactment of any measure that would result in any revenue loss of FY 1999 greater than \$22 million (if not already included in the current level estimate) would cause revenues to fall below the appropriate level set by the interim allocations and aggregates submitted pursuant to H. Res. 5. Enactment of any measure resulting in any revenue loss greater than \$11 million for FY 1999 through 2003 (if not already included in the current level) would cause revenues to fall below the appropriate levels set by the interim allocations and aggregates submitted pursuant to H. Res. 5.

DIRECT SPENDING LEGISLATION—COMPARISON OF CURRENT LEVEL WITH COMMITTEE ALLOCATIONS PURSUANT TO BUDGET ACT SECTION 602(a) REFLECTING ACTION COMPLETED AS OF MARCH 17, 1999

[Fiscal Years, in millions of dollars]

House Committee	1999		1999–2003	
	BA	Outlays	BA	Outlays
Agriculture:				
Allocation	28,328	27,801		
Current Level				
Difference	(28,328)	(27,801)		
Armed Services:				
Allocation				
Current Level				
Difference				
Banking and Financial Services:				
Allocation				
Current Level				
Difference				
Education & the Workforce:				
Allocation	610	367		
Current Level				
Difference	(610)	(367)		
Commerce:				
Allocation				
Current Level				
Difference				
International Relations:				
Allocation				
Current Level				

DIRECT SPENDING LEGISLATION—COMPARISON OF CURRENT LEVEL WITH COMMITTEE ALLOCATIONS PURSUANT TO BUDGET ACT SECTION 602(a) REFLECTING ACTION COMPLETED AS OF MARCH 17, 1999—Continued

[Fiscal Years, in millions of dollars]

House Committee	1999		1999–2003	
	BA	Outlays	BA	Outlays
Difference				
Government Reform & Oversight:				
Allocation			14	14
Current Level				
Difference			(14)	(14)
House Administration:				
Allocation				
Current Level				
Difference				
Resources:				
Allocation				
Current Level				
Difference				
Judiciary:				
Allocation				
Current Level				
Difference				
Transportation & Infrastructure:				
Allocation	1,205		10,845	
Current Level				
Difference	(1,205)		(10,845)	
Science:				
Allocation				

DIRECT SPENDING LEGISLATION—COMPARISON OF CURRENT LEVEL WITH COMMITTEE ALLOCATIONS PURSUANT TO BUDGET ACT SECTION 602(a) REFLECTING ACTION COMPLETED AS OF MARCH 17, 1999—Continued

[Fiscal Years, in millions of dollars]

House Committee	1999		1999–2003	
	BA	Outlays	BA	Outlays
Current Level Difference				
Small Business:				
Allocation				
Current Level				
Difference				
Veterans' Affairs:				
Allocation			4,503	4,342
Current Level				
Difference			(4,503)	(4,342)
Ways and Means:				
Allocation			19,551	17,310
Current Level				
Difference			(19,551)	(17,310)
Select Committee on Intelligence:				
Allocation				
Current Level				
Difference				
Total Authorized:			1,205	63,851
Allocation				
Current Level			(1,205)	(63,851)
Difference				

DISCRETIONARY APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1999—COMPARISON OF CURRENT LEVEL WITH SUBALLOCATIONS PURSUANT TO BUDGET ACT SECTION 302(B)

[In millions of dollars]

	Revised 302(b) Suballocations				Current Level Reflecting Action Completed as of March 17, 1999				Difference			
	Discretionary		Mandatory		Discretionary		Mandatory		Discretionary		Mandatory	
	BA	0	BA	0	BA	0	BA	0	BA	0	BA	0
Agriculture, Rural Development	13,587	14,002	41,058	33,087	19,608	19,784	41,058	33,087	6,021	5,782	0	0
Commerce, Justice, State	32,931	31,660	554	555	34,750	32,067	554	555	1,819	407	0	0
District of Columbia	491	484	0	0	620	619	0	0	129	135	0	0
Energy & Water Development	20,909	20,631	0	0	21,696	21,253	0	0	787	622	0	0
Foreign Operations	16,188	12,546	45	45	31,625	12,793	45	45	15,437	247	0	0
Interior	13,370	14,029	58	58	14,071	14,324	58	58	701	0	0	0
Labor, HHS & Education	81,927	80,556	220,443	221,446	83,767	82,542	220,433	221,446	1,840	1,986	0	0
Legislative Branch	2,360	2,340	94	94	2,559	2,365	94	94	199	25	0	0
Military Construction	8,235	9,061	0	0	8,660	9,157	0	0	425	96	0	0
National Defense	250,311	245,031	202	202	257,897	249,071	202	202	7,586	4,040	0	0
Transportation	11,939	39,933	682	678	12,344	40,261	682	678	405	328	0	0
Treasury-Postal Service	13,343	12,558	13,439	13,439	16,809	13,344	13,439	13,439	2,746	1,786	0	0
VA-HUD-Independent Agencies	70,681	80,411	21,540	21,254	71,311	80,512	21,540	21,254	450	101	0	0
Reserve/Offsets	0	0	0	0	(2,400)	(2,400)	0	0	(2,400)	(2,400)	0	0
Unassigned ¹	36,346	13,237	0	0	0	0	0	0	(36,346)	(13,237)	0	0
Grand Total	572,798	576,479	298,105	290,858	572,597	576,692	298,105	290,858	(201)	213	0	0

¹ Unassigned refers to the allocation adjustments provided under Section 314, but not yet allocated under Section 302(b).

SET FORTH IN SEC. 251(C) OF THE BALANCED BUDGET 7 EMERGENCY DEFICIT CONTROL ACT OF 1985

[In millions]

	Defense		Nondesign		Violent Crime Trust Fund		Highway Category		Mass Transit Category	
	BA		0		BA		0		BA	
	BA	0	BA	0	BA	0	BA	0	BA	0
Statutory Caps ¹	280,287	272,192	287,550	274,702	5,800	4,953	NA	21,991	NA	4,401
Current Level	279,891	271,202	286,708	274,196	5,798	4,951	200	21,939	1,138	4,404
Difference	—396	—990	—842	—506	—2	—2	NA	—52	NA	3

¹ As adjusted pursuant to sec. 251(b) of the BBDCA. Statutory caps include contingent emergencies not yet released by the President, but appropriated by Congress.

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, March 18, 1999.

Hon. JOHN KASICH,
Chairman, Committee on the Budget,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.
DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to section 308(b) and in aid of section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act, as amended, this letter and supporting detail provide an up-to-date tabulation of the on-budget current levels of new budget authority, estimated outlays, and estimated revenues for fiscal year

1999. These estimates are compared to the appropriate levels for those items contained in Section 2 of House Resolution 5, which has been revised to include an allocation for the funding of emergency requirements, and are current through March 17, 1999. A summary of this tabulation follows:

[In millions of dollars]

	House current level	House resolution 5	Current level +/- resolution
Budget Authority	1,443,553	1,444,851	—1,298

PARLIAMENTARIAN STATUS REPORT—106TH CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION, HOUSE ON-BUDGET SUPPORTING DETAIL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1999 AS OF CLOSE OF BUSINESS MARCH 17, 1999

[In millions of dollars]

	Budget authority	Outlays	Revenues
Enacted in Previous Sessions:			
Revenues	913,530	867,389	1,368,396
Permanents and other spending legislation	820,708	814,808
Appropriation legislation	—294,953	—294,953
Offsetting receipts			

PARLIAMENTARIAN STATUS REPORT—106TH CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION, HOUSE ON-BUDGET SUPPORTING DETAIL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1999 AS OF CLOSE OF BUSINESS MARCH 17,

1999—Continued

[In millions of dollars]

	Budget authority	Outlays	Revenues
Total previously enacted	1,439,285	1,387,244	1,368,396
Entitlements and Mandatories: Budget resolution baseline estimates of appropriated entitlements and other mandatory programs not yet enacted	4,398	7,839
Totals:			
Total Current Level	1,443,533	1,393,074	1,368,396
Total Budget Resolution ¹	1,444,851	1,393,291	1,368,374
Amount remaining:			
Under Budget Resolution	1,298	217
Over Budget Resolution			22

¹ Includes \$1,030 million in budget authority and \$430 million in outlays for the funding of emergency requirements.

Source: Congressional Budget Office.

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

EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to claim the special order time of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Brown).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

PUTTING PATIENTS BEFORE PROFITS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, since arriving in Congress over a year ago, I have been fighting for a real Patients' Bill of Rights. I am an original cosponsor of this landmark legislation to rein in health maintenance organizations, the HMOs, and to return decision-making power to patients and their doctors. I am committed to seeing that Congress take decisive action and pass this bill now.

The only way to make comprehensive HMO reform a reality is to work together in a bipartisan way. That is why I was so disappointed last July when powerful special interests overpowered patients and blocked efforts to bring such a comprehensive HMO reform bill to the floor. Instead, they rammed through a Band-Aid that would have done nothing to actually protect patients. Our health care system needs serious medicine, not a political placebo.

The American people deserve better. As a nurse, I know firsthand the importance of health care that is accessible, of high quality, patient-centered health care. Basic patients' rights can often mean the difference between life and death.

As a Member of Congress, I was recently appointed to the House Committee on Commerce which oversees much of our Nation's health policy. If we are to accomplish anything in the field of health care, passing comprehensive managed care reform must be at the top of our agenda this session of Congress.

Medical decisions need to be made by patients and their doctors, and patients should have all of the information they need to make these critical decisions. These are the plain truths about health care.

Mr. Speaker, this historic measure will guarantee patients basic rights by allowing people to choose their own doctors, ending oppressive gag rules so patients have access to all critical treatment options and establishing health care quality and information standards which we can all follow. Most importantly, this bill will hold HMOs accountable by giving patients critical legal recourse when insurance companies deny necessary medical coverage. If patients can sue their doctors for poor care, they should be able to sue the big insurance bureaucrats who determine these cost-cutting decisions.

Mr. Speaker, last weekend I was privileged to join my colleagues on both sides of the aisle at the bipartisan retreat in Hershey, Pennsylvania. There people of many different philosophical political backgrounds talked about the need to restore civility to government and make our constituents proud. In the spirit of Hershey, I sincerely hope that all of our colleagues will work together to pass in this session a real Patients' Bill of Rights. By putting patients before profits, we can be a Congress that does something real and finally passes comprehensive managed care reform legislation now while we have the opportunity before it is too late.

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

(Mr. CALVERT 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 California (Mr. FILNER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. FILNER 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.)

PASS A PATIENTS' BILL OF RIGHTS

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

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about reforming HMOs.

Last year I met a young mother in my hometown of Santa Fe. She was a single mother in her late twenties who was trying to raise a 7 year-old son while working full-time and attending school full-time as well. Now, as anyone will tell you, any young mother in this position would have her hands full. But what made this young woman unique was that her son had a serious medical condition that required access to very specific medical equipment and medication. She met with a family doctor who told them that her child could not lead a normal life without this very specific care. But when she went to her HMO to help pay for it, she received a letter saying her request had been denied. For months she tried to appeal, but it was to no avail. It was not until she threatened to wage a public relations campaign against the HMO and the local press that they reluctantly agreed to pay for the treatment. In the end it worked out for her and her young son, but for many, many more it does not.

Far too often, Mr. Speaker, we hear stories of patients who are left seriously ill or injured as a result of medical negligence by HMOs. These people find their lives in upheaval, not because of a medical mishap on an operating table, but rather because a profit-driven insurance company bureaucrat was more concerned with the bottom line than their well-being.

This must stop. We have got to put our partisan bickering aside and work towards a true bipartisan Patient Bill of Rights. The Patient Bill of Rights must allow doctors and patients to make the medical decisions. We must make sure that doctors and patients are once again allowed to make the medical decisions rather than insurance company bureaucrats. Provide the doctors, not the HMOs deciding the appropriate drugs for patients in their care. We must ensure that patients