

Efforts to privatize Medicare are, of course, nothing new. Medicare beneficiaries have long been able to enroll in private Medicare plans. Their experience, however, does not bode well in a full-fledged privatization effort.

□ 1245

These managed care plans are already calling for higher government payments, they are dropping out of unprofitable markets, they are cutting back on benefits to America's elderly.

Managed care plans obviously are profit-driven and they simply do not tough it out when their profits are not realized. We learned this the hard way last year when 96 Medicare HMOs deserted more than 400,000 Medicare beneficiaries because the HMOs were not meeting their profit objectives.

Before Medicare was launched in 1965, more than one-half of the Nation's seniors had no health insurance. Private insurance was then the only option for the elderly. But insurers did not want seniors to join their plans because they knew that seniors would use their coverage. The private insurance market has changed considerably since then but it still avoids high-risk enrollees and, whenever possible, dodges the bill for high cost medical services.

The problem is not malice or greed, it is the expectation that private insurers can serve two masters: the bottom line and the common good. Logically looking at the bottom line, our system leaves 43 million people without health insurance, 11 million of whom are children. Only Medicare can insure the elderly and disabled population because the private market has failed to do so.

If we privatize Medicare, we are telling America that not all seniors deserve the same level of health care. We are betting on a private insurance system that puts its own private interests ahead of health care quality and ahead of a balanced Federal budget.

The goal is simple, Mr. Speaker. Let us keep Medicare the successful public program it has always been.

THE PEOPLE'S RIGHT TO KNOW

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 19, 1999, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I rise this afternoon, and first let me offer a debt of gratitude to my friend from Ohio who, in very Orwellian fashion, has offered the rhetoric of fear rather than facts that we will hear in Campaign 2000. Indeed, it is very revealing to now hear the "Mediscare" tactics of the left, to deny the fact that the very reason the Medicare trustees say that Medicare's life has been lengthened was because of the new majority's plan to save Medicare that we successfully enacted after the jihad that was waged against us, politically speaking, in 1996 with a liberal Mediscare plan.

It is also worth noting, while we are in the neighborhood, Mr. Speaker, that the bipartisan commission, headed by the gentleman from Louisiana in the other body, and the gentleman from California with whom I am pleased to serve on the House Committee on Ways and Means offered a variety of avenues that give seniors, our most honored citizens, a variety of choices. It is revealing that there are those who would like to limit the freedom of Americans to make choices in their own interests.

But I rise today, Mr. Speaker, to speak of another matter that goes directly to the core of our survival as a constitutional republic. It is, Mr. Speaker, the people's right to know. Mr. Speaker, in the very near future, it is my understanding that Johnny Chung will testify before the House Committee on Government Reform about contributions, political contributions the Communist Chinese Government made to the Clinton/Gore campaign and to the Democratic National Committee in 1996. It has been interesting, Mr. Speaker, to note the coverage, or perhaps lack thereof, of this important issue in the Nation's press.

Now, to be sure, Mr. Speaker, I understand full well the nature and the scope of the first amendment to the Constitution, Congress shall make no law abridging freedom of the press, nor would I ever advocate such a dereliction or disruption of our first amendment rights. But it is fair, Mr. Speaker, in the marketplace of ideas to ask my former colleagues in television, where will they be when Johnny Chung comes before the congressional committee to testify about these contributions?

We should also say in passing, a tip of the rhetorical hat is necessary to many publications, whether the New York Times, the Washington Times, the Los Angeles Times, the Washington Post, many mainstream publications who have chronicled the abuses.

But now, Mr. Speaker, it is time for my former colleagues in television to step up, specifically those news networks that are available via cable with 24-hour-a-day coverage. Without trying to set their agenda, but in the spirit of constructive criticism and open dialogue in a free republic, I would challenge the cable news networks, I would challenge public broadcasting, to follow the example of C-SPAN.

And from this vantage point I can say, Mr. Speaker, that we congratulate C-SPAN on 20 years of service to the American people, bringing to the people of our Nation an unvarnished, straight conduit of what happens in the halls of Congress, what happens on the floor of this House and what happens in the many committee rooms.

But I would welcome far more exposure of these hearings. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, one is tempted to look at the recent promotional campaign of the Public Broadcasting Service and the rhetorical question that is asked: "If PBS won't do it, who will?"

Indeed, I think of the recent past when I was a private citizen in the 1980s, the mid- to late-1980s, seeing on public television gavel-to-gavel coverage of the confirmation hearings of Judge Bork, the confirmation hearings eventually of Mr. Justice Thomas, and all the mainstream media scrutiny. How much more important it is then, Mr. Speaker, that the media devote its considerable energies and its agenda-setting ability to checking into these disturbing allegations that go to the very fabric of our constitutional Republic.

For, Mr. Speaker, if there are those both within and outside government who seek to influence decisions and policy for another government that wishes us ill, the consequences for our national survival are grave indeed.

COMPREHENSIVE ELECTRIC RESTRUCTURING BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 19, 1999, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, deregulation of the airlines, natural gas, railroads, telecommunications, and trucking industries yields annual savings equal to nearly 1 percent of America's gross domestic product. This Congress, we will attempt to craft a measure that will finally and successfully unleash competition and savings from utility reform, electric deregulation.

In recent years, competition has replaced regulation for the electric power industry in a number of nations, including the United Kingdom, New Zealand, Norway, Chile and Argentina. Many took a very long-term approach to this process. The United States faces a unique situation in that our electric power industry is largely already privatized. So we must focus on alternating our current system and effectively fostering more competition.

This should not be done through a Federal mandate. Clearly, we would be wise to make the State-mandated restructuring more efficient instead of imposing a separate Federal mandate. I see the ideal measure as one that fosters competition, avoids Federal mandates and lowers rates for all consumers. To create this legislation, we must eliminate outdated laws, inject fairness into the process, and delineate the proper roles of the Federal Government and State governments. But do not misunderstand me: Reforming the electric industry is no simple matter. This is an enormous undertaking. Congress considers the livelihoods of entire industries constitutional questions and the interests of the entire rate-paying public in addressing this very complex issue. Accordingly, we must address these points to fully realize the benefits of energy reform. Every consumer must benefit from this deregulation, not just the large industrial users of electricity. I am concerned that any

rush in reforming the electric utility industry could result in large industrial users seeing greater benefits while residential users and small businesses would pay for that benefit.

We must honor past regulatory schemes and commitments and allow recovery of stranded investments. Electric utilities incurred "stranded costs" under a regulatory scheme not of their choosing. These utilities made long-term decisions based upon decades of regulation. To deny industry the recovery of these costs would go against the fairness I spoke of earlier. That being said, lower costs should be fostered by real deregulation and industrial and regulatory innovation, not by simply shifting costs. We should not merely "reshuffle the deck" to see who pays.

A significant hurdle to deregulation is the diverse nature of power generators, including public power providers, municipalities, investor-owned utilities, and power marketing associations. Reconciling these disparate views will be a monumental task, yet fairness demands that we produce a level playing field for all energy providers and transmitters.

So reforming the energy industry on a Federal level demands clarifying, simply clarifying the roles of the Federal and State governments. Where does the Federal responsibility end and the States' begin? The diverse situation among the States adds to these reform difficulties. Some States have always supported regulation, others have taken progressive stances, while still others, like my home State of Florida, enjoy the benefits of moderately priced electricity and see little need for major reform.

Eliminating the barriers to entry into the electric market is fundamental to this reform. We must repeal the Public Utilities Regulatory Policy Act, PURPA, and the Public Utility Holding Company Act, PUHCA, to ensure that any transition to retail competition is truly competitive. The entire efficacy of PURPA centered on the supposition that producing electricity would become more expensive. In fact, Mr. Speaker, it has become cheaper. Thanks to PURPA, Americans will pay \$38 billion in higher electric bills over the next 10 years than they should.

Deregulation of the electric industry requires consideration of a myriad of factors. The stakes are very high, but so are the benefits. To that end, I am introducing today a piece of Federal legislation that will change all that. It is called the Electric Energy Empowerment Act of 1999. It will not mandate the States to act, but instead will empower and encourage them to enact measures providing these customers retail competition and choice.

My legislation amends the Federal Power Act to clarify jurisdictional boundaries between state and federal authorities, thus empowering the states to enact competitive retail electricity markets. As an incentive for the states to move forward, the legislation includes a reciprocity condition. Further, the legislation elimi-

nates the existing federal barriers to competition: it encourages the establishment of independent transmission system operators, and it deregulates the wholesale market by making the FERC wholesale open access rules applicable to non-jurisdictional entities.

I think everyone will agree that we are inevitably moving toward an electricity industry based on competition, market force, and lower rates. This is certainly my goal as I introduce this legislation today.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m. Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 58 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until 2 p.m.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. STEARNS) at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

The Reverend Charlie Martin, Indian Rocks Baptist Church, Largo, Florida, offered the following prayer:

Lord, we humbly pray for Your blessings upon our people today. America needs what only You can provide. We want Your will, we need Your direction, we desire Your peace, and we ask Your protection for all people. We read where You said, "If my people which are called by my name shall humble themselves and pray, and seek my face and turn from their wicked ways, I will hear from heaven and will forgive their sins and heal their land."

Please bring healing to America and to all of our world. For our leaders, O God, grant wisdom for each decision and bless their families with Your love. This we pray in the name of Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. TRAFICANT led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

WELCOME TO PASTOR CHARLIE MARTIN

(Mr. YOUNG of Florida asked and was given permission to address the

House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am very proud to introduce today the chaplain who delivered our opening prayer. Pastor Charlie Martin is the pastor of the First Baptist Church of Indian Rocks, which is in Largo, Florida, which is right in the heart of the Tenth Congressional District that I have the privilege to represent.

Like many of my colleagues, I have an opportunity to visit with many churches throughout the district and throughout our State, and I must say that I have found no one who is more inspiring in their message and delivery of the Bible than Pastor Charlie Martin. He is a dynamic religious leader, and he makes going to church a lot of fun.

He delivers his messages in such an entertaining way that people clamor to come to the church to the effect that he has to have at least three services every Sunday morning. He is respected and loved in our community. His ministry is very unique. He reaches out to everyone. He has a community outreach program that goes far beyond the county limits of our county back home. It is worldwide, in effect.

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to mention an example of the worldwide outreach. Many of us know the problems of the people in Bosnia, the refugees and orphans that are housed with very little clothing, very little supplies. We called this to the attention of Pastor Charlie and he and the members of the church turned out in large numbers, collected an airplane full of shoes and sweaters and supplies for babies, and we had it delivered to Bosnia to the orphanages. That is just one example of many, many more.

As I said, Pastor Charlie is the pastor of our people, he is our pastor at home, and wherever I go throughout my congressional district, people are approaching me constantly saying, "Congressman, it is nice to see you in Pastor Charlie's church," or "Congressman, I am a member of Pastor Charlie's church," and everyone knows who Pastor Charlie is.

Now my colleagues have had an opportunity to meet him and have him here today. I am very proud to have him as our guest here today, Pastor Charlie Martin of the Indian Rocks Baptist Church in Largo, Florida.

THE TIME IS NOW FOR PRAYER IN OUR SCHOOLS

(Mr. TRAFICANT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, another school tragedy, another scapegoat. This time it is guns. Littleton is not just about guns, parents or discipline. Littleton is much to do with Congress.

That is right. A Congress that allows God to be banned from our schools while our schools can teach about