

Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inlee

Isakson
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Klecza
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuykendall
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Largent
Larson
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Mica
Millender-
McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz

Ose
Packard
Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Salmon
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Scarborough
Schaffer
Schakowsky
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shinkus
Shows
Shuster
Simpson
Siskiy
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Sweeney
Talent
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman

Tiahrt
Tierney
Toomey
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)

NAYS—3

Duncan Paul Sanford

NOT VOTING—16

Chenoweth Metcalf Radanovich
Deal Miller, Gary Saxton
Gekas Nethercutt Souder
Hastings (FL) Nussle Young (FL)
Klink Owens
Lantos Oxley

□ 1315

Mr. DUNCAN changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. GARY MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 95, I attempted to return from lunch to vote; however, there was an accident and I arrived one minute after the vote was taken. This was unavoidable and beyond my control. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, today, April 21, 1999, I was unavoidably detained during rollcall No. 95, and thus my vote on the passage of H.R. 1184 was not recorded. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" in support of the legislation.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 1184, the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 850

Mr. HOLDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 850, the Security and Freedom Through Encryption Act.

My name was erroneously added as a cosponsor to this legislation.

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

There was no objection.

VIOLENCE AMONG OUR YOUTH, AND THE INCIDENT IN LITTLETON, COLORADO

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to address

the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as we have heard my colleagues rising to the Floor of the House, I, too, stand with a heavy heart to offer my sympathy and concern to the families of the deceased, to the children, to the students, to all who have been impacted by yesterday's tragic incident in Littleton, Colorado. We are shocked by the sheer randomness of it.

We realize that our schools in America should be safe places for our children to learn, and we are disturbed that these shootings were out of revenge, and because someone made fun of these young people.

Let us now not point the finger of blame, but let the people of America like and organizations like the National Rifle Association, children's advocacy groups, churches, synagogues, and parishes, let us look to solutions such as more health services for juveniles. Two-thirds of our children in America are denied real mental health counseling services when they need it. Let us, on Friday, April 23, 1999, Children's Memorial Day, commemorate the thousands of children and youth who are killed by violence.

As one who works with the Congressional Children's Caucus and chairs it, I ask that all of the caucuses in this House that are concerned about children gather for one meeting to begin a real agenda that deals with safety in schools, getting mental health services to our children, counseling to the families, and stop the blame game.

This is an American crisis. We must heal our Nation. To the people of Littleton, Colorado, my prayers are with you.

Mr. Speaker, I stand today with a heavy heart to talk about the tragic incidents of yesterday in Littleton, Colorado. First of all, I would like to extend my deepest sympathy to the families of the victims of yesterday's horrific shootings.

Along with being shocked by the sheer randomness and senselessness of the violence yesterday, I am dismayed by the string of violent incidents that have occurred in our schools within the past 18 months.

The statistics on adolescent death trends are startling: homicide deaths for teenagers between 15–19 accounted for 85 percent or 2,457 deaths by firearms and suicide rates have increased by more than 300 percent in the last three decades. In yesterday's shootings, more than 20 people were killed including the two suspects who killed themselves.

Schools should be safe and secure places for all students, teachers and staff members. All children should be able to go to and from school without fear for their safety.

According to news reports, these young suspects were outcasts in the school community. During the shooting, the suspects reportedly said that they were "out for revenge" for having been made fun of last year. This is truly a cry for help that was not heard in time.

This incident underscores the urgent need for mental health services to address the needs of young people like the suspects from

yesterday. Without concerted efforts to address the mental health disorders that affect our children, we may witness more terrifying violence in our schools.

Friday, April 23, 1999 is Children's Memorial Day to commemorate the thousands of children and youth who are killed by violence each year. On that day, the governors of every state have been asked to fly the Children's Memorial Flag.

As chair of the Children's Caucus, I would like to urge my Colleagues to remember Friday as a national day to honor children whose lives have been cut short by violence. I also ask that we pray for the families who have been devastated by the violence of Monday.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). 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.

MEDICARE TRUTH IN BILLING ACT OF 1999

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

Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of hospitals and Medicare beneficiaries across this country who have a vested interest in changing the way the Health Care Finance Administration, HCFA, and its financial intermediaries itemize the explanation of Medicare benefits and Medicare summary notices, both of which are statements each Medicare beneficiary receives from HCFA for services rendered them that they are reimbursed by Medicare.

Unfortunately for hospitals and Medicare beneficiaries, these statements all too often contain inaccurate and misleading information; specifically, information that overstates the amount that Medicare reimburses hospitals for inpatient services, and understates a hospital's contribution to financing any shortfall in Medicare reimbursements for such services; information that clouds the truth for Medicare beneficiaries instead of clarifying the truth.

At a time when hospitals' margins are shrinking due to changes in Medicare reimbursement rates, at a time when hospitals have been plagued by the inappropriate use of the False Claims Act and at a time when the President in his fiscal year 2000 budget has proposed further cuts in Medicare, it is about time that hospitals be given the credit they deserve for financing part of the inpatient expenses as a result of Medicare's underpayment.

Moreover, at a time when seniors are barraged by vague billing information, it is about time that they be given the full truth regarding the amount Medicare reimburses hospitals for services provided them.

I am happy to announce that I have introduced the Truth in Medicare Bill-

ing Act, a measure that will ensure that HCFA reports the correct amount Medicare reimburses hospitals for inpatient services. The Medicare Truth in Billing Act, in addition to requiring HCFA to report the actual amount it reimburses hospitals for inpatient services, will require that HCFA add a line to all Medicare summary statements disclosing the amount equal to the difference between the amount of total inpatient charges incurred and the amount Medicare reimbursed the hospital for those charges.

It is a simple fix to a problem that I believe should be resolved in the very near future.

The initial level of support that the Medicare Truth in Billing Act has received has been tremendous. The measure has been endorsed by the American Hospital Association. In addition, numerous State hospital associations, staff and hospital administrators in my district and throughout the country have contacted my office to express their overwhelming support for the bill. Furthermore, seniors in my district, during my most recent round of town meetings, were very supportive of the measure.

I hope that my colleagues in the House on both sides of the aisle will join me in working with the House leadership, the Committee on Ways and Means and its Subcommittee on Health, HCFA, and most importantly, the hospitals and seniors to ensure that the changes set forth in the Medicare Truth in Billing Act will become law.

AIRBUS, THE EUROPEAN AIRCRAFT MANUFACTURER, A COMPANY THAT CANNOT FAIL

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

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise this afternoon to bring an important trade issue to the attention of my colleagues. Within the past 2 years, Boeing's share of the aircraft market has fallen from 70 percent to 50 percent. Boeing is losing market shares to Airbus, the European aircraft manufacturer.

Airbus was created in the early 1970s for the sole purpose of maintaining and fostering a European role in the production of large commercial jet aircraft. It is a combination of the major aerospace companies of France, Germany, the United Kingdom and Spain. Airbus, which is 60 percent owned by private companies, is not the property of the four European nations. However, it is still hard to view Airbus as a private business just like any other business.

First of all, Airbus does not operate as a public corporation but, rather, it has special legal status under French law. This special status allows member companies to pool resources without having to disclose specifics about their

combined financial activities. Therefore, Airbus remains a financial mystery.

Also, France still has not completed the privatization of its aerospace firm, Aerospatiale. Given France's long history of substantial support to Aerospatiale, it is hard to believe that the French government will give up complete control of the company any time soon.

Perhaps most importantly, the European Commission has the ability to save Airbus from bankruptcy if the need ever arises. Therefore, Airbus, due to its government backing, is a company that cannot fail. This gives Airbus a tremendous advantage because it has the luxury of making its business decisions with very little risk compared to Boeing, which must defend its business decisions to questioning stockholders, not supportive government officials.

Airbus contends that it has earned its increased market share against Boeing by simply building the type of aircraft the airline industry wants to buy. It is important to note, however, that Airbus' success was achieved with significant governmental assistance. Because Airbus does not publish financial statements, it is difficult to know exactly how much government support it has received over the course of the years. However, it is known that the largest amount of financial support was provided in the 1980s when Airbus launched major development programs for new aircraft such as the A-320, the A-330 and the A-340. Therefore, Airbus was able to make new and different types of aircraft which helped attract new customers only because of increased, direct governmental aid.

Although most of the government aid was in the form of repayable loans, it was still a subsidy because it would have cost Airbus much more to raise money on the private market. It would be nearly impossible for a private company to obtain aircraft development funds at a government borrowing rate. It is true that Airbus must repay the government aid with interest, but only as aircraft are sold. Therefore, there is no risk for Airbus when it develops new products, because if customers do not buy their new product, Airbus does not have to repay the loans.

Again, Airbus, due to its government backing, is a company that cannot fail. It is no wonder that Boeing continues to lose market shares to Airbus. Airbus enjoys a tremendous competitive advantage because of the substantial and direct government aid it receives from four European nations.

Airbus is no longer a young company trying to enter the aircraft market. It is number two in the market and gaining on Boeing each and every day, yet Airbus still relies on substantial government support. This is not right. We should not sit idly by as Boeing continues to lose out simply because it does not enjoy the same protectionist treatment as Airbus.