

I do ask that you help me support this bill. It is a great bill. It is a broken promise that we have not kept to our military retirees.

I want to acknowledge the efforts of four organizations that have been instrumental in crafting this legislation: The Retired Enlisted Association, The Retired Officers Association, The National Association for Uniformed Services, and the Class Act Group of Military Retirees.

I also want to thank Congressman CHARLIE NORWOOD for his cosponsorship and his efforts.

Before I close, Madam Speaker, I want to pay special tribute to one man: Jim Whittington. I want all of my colleagues here in Congress to know that the introduction of this landmark legislation is living proof that democracy really works in our country, and that one American citizen really can make a difference.

Jim Whittington is the most tenacious individual I know. Last March, Jim organized a summit of military retirees in his hometown of Laurel, Mississippi. The summit attracted hundreds of retirees from the southeastern United States.

Madam Speaker, if you ever have the opportunity to meet Jim, be prepared to get an earful. He is articulate and passionate about this issue.

And he is selfless. Jim does all right for himself, but he cares about his fellow retirees, many of whom have been abandoned by their country and need help.

Madam Speaker, I would not be introducing this legislation today without the persistence of Jim Whittington. He is what democracy is all about.

In closing, Madam Speaker, I am proud to introduce today "The Keep Our Promise to America's Military Retirees Act."

Passing this bill will let America's military retirees know that we honor them, we respect them, we appreciate them, and that we will keep our word to them.

And passing this bill will get the attention of the next generation of Americans, who must not be discouraged from military service.

They must know that the American people will value the sacrifice they would make by devoting their lives to national service.

After all, Madam Speaker, we must face the fact that we will always need heroes who will be willing to make the ultimate sacrifice!

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

(Mr. HULSHOF 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 American Samoa (Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

BUDGET COMMITTEE REPORT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gen-

tleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KASICH. Madam Speaker, pursuant to Sec. 314 of the Congressional Budget Act, I hereby submit for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD revisions to the allocation for the House Committee on Appropriations pursuant to House Report 106-288 to reflect \$77,000,000 in additional new budget authority and \$13,000,000 in additional outlays for international arrearages. This will increase the allocation to the House Committee on Appropriations to \$543,200,000,000 in budget authority and \$582,478,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2000.

As reported by the House Committee on Appropriations, H.R. 2606, a bill making appropriations for Foreign Operations, export financing, and related programs for fiscal year 2000, includes \$77,000,000 in budget authority and \$13,000,000 in outlays for international arrearages.

These adjustments shall apply while the legislation is under consideration and shall take effect upon final enactment of the legislation.

ON AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Speaker, I rise to object this evening to the manipulation of the leadership of this body, particularly the Speaker, Mr. HASTERT, and the majority leader of the other body, Mr. LOTT, that is essentially disenfranchising the membership of this body with regard to one of the most important issues before us, and, that is, meeting the needs of rural America, the disaster affected regions of our country, our farmers, who are experiencing historically low prices and bad weather, sort of twin eviscerators, that we are witnessing the hemorrhaging of equity out of rural America.

For the record and for the American people and hopefully for my fellow Members, I come to the floor tonight to recount what has been happening here sort of below the surface where the press is generally not picking up on it.

Employing what certainly must be the most unusual committee process I have ever experienced in my 17 years here in the House, the Republican leadership of this House has basically taken the drafting authority of our appropriations agriculture subcommittee away from our membership. Last week, the Republican leadership of this House as well as the Senate subcommittee twice recessed our conference committee because they could not reach agreement on the Republican side of the aisle on at least three provisions relating to regional compacts regarding milk, sanctions on terrorist states, and the level of disaster assistance that is really necessary in our country to meet the needs of our farmers in rural communities coast to coast. Our subcommittee has not met since last

Wednesday due to that disorganization. Then over the weekend and early this week, Speaker HASTERT and Senator LOTT, their offices began drafting something for floor action. That effort is now being circulated in the form of a committee report that a majority of House subcommittee Republicans thus far, as of 5 p.m. today, had refused to sign, and which no Democrat had seen at all, certainly not those of the subcommittee of jurisdiction where we have legal responsibility to meet our obligations to the American people.

The Republican leadership appears to be deal-making on such matters as mandatory price reporting, for example, to try to get a majority of the members on their side of the aisle to sign on to that report. The difficulty is that if that happens, let us say they make enough deals to bring that bill to the floor, that will be brought to the floor without our subcommittee membership in conference being allowed to amend and discuss under regular order as is required by the rules of this institution. Thus, Democrats for sure will not be able to offer amendments on such critical issues as the fairness and the adequacy of the formulas and the commodities and sectors to be covered in the bill, as well as the economic level of assistance and disaster assistance titles of the bill, which are extremely expensive and depending on how they are drafted benefit certain regions of the country and certain sectors more than others. We will not be able to deal with the sanctions issue, we will not be able to deal with many of the other titles of the bill that our members wanted a chance to discuss. We will only be left with the option on this floor of taking that report and being given a moment in time to vote to recommit it back to conference, which obviously has been recessed, if we do not like something that is in that report.

As of Tuesday at 5 o'clock, now it is 6:25 here in Washington, the minority membership of the committee does not have a copy of the working document, at a time when rural America is in crisis. I have really been working with the leadership on our side of the aisle and I have pleaded with the leadership on the other side of the aisle to let us go back to regular order.

This is wrong, this is not the way to run the Nation, and really what you find out is in the end that good government is good politics. If we use the full membership of this institution, if we each bring our experiences to the table, which is what a conference committee is supposed to be for, in the end we produce legislation that meets the needs of all corners and all quarters of our country. This is really the wrong way to do business.

Today we had to pass a continuing resolution to keep this institution and the country operating for the next 2 weeks in order that these respective bills might be finished. The Agriculture appropriation bill this year is

one of the most important we will bring before this body. These procedures that have been used are completely atypical. I would beg the leadership to go back to regular order.

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

(Mr. METCALF 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 gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. BROWN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. BROWN of Florida addressed the House. Her 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. ROHRABACHER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2606, FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

Mr. SESSIONS, from the Committee on Rules (during the special order of Mr. PALLONE), submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106-345) on the resolution (H. Res. 307) waiving points of order against the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 2606) making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2559, AGRICULTURE RISK PROTECTION ACT

Mr. SESSIONS, from the Committee on Rules (during the special order of Mr. PALLONE), submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106-346) on the resolution (H. Res. 308) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2559) to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act to strengthen the safety net for agricultural producers by providing greater access to more affordable risk management tools and improved protection from production and income loss, to improve the efficiency and integrity of the Federal crop insurance program, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

ANNOUNCEMENT FROM COMMITTEE ON RULES REGARDING SUBMISSION OF AMENDMENTS ON H.R. 2723 REGARDING MANAGED CARE PLANS AND OTHER HEALTH COVERAGE

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

Mr. SESSIONS (during the special order of Mr. PALLONE). Madam Speaker, this afternoon a "Dear Colleague" letter was sent to all Members informing them that the Committee on Rules is expected to meet the week of October 4, 1999, to grant a rule which may restrict amendments for consideration of H.R. 2723, a bill regarding managed care plans and other health care coverage. Any Member contemplating an amendment to H.R. 2723 should submit 55 copies of the amendment and a brief explanation to the Committee on Rules no later than 3 o'clock p.m. on Friday, October 1. The Committee on Rules of office is located in H-312 in the Capitol. Members should use the Office of Legislative Counsel to ensure that their amendments are properly drafted and should check with the Office of the Parliamentarian to be certain their amendments comply with the rules of the House.

MANAGED CARE REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, tonight I would like to talk about the Patients' Bill of Rights, the managed care reform legislation which will be considered on the floor of the House of Representatives next week.

My happiness, if you will, over the fact that the Republican leadership in the House of Representatives has said that they will allow a debate on HMO reform next week that will include the Patients' Bill of Rights is somewhat tempered by my concern that the way they may set up the procedure for the debate and the consideration of managed care reform, or HMO reform, may in fact be nothing more than a way to try to kill effective HMO reform and essentially end up with a bill that passes the House and that goes to the Senate that does not accomplish the goal of providing real patient protections.

I just wanted to mention very briefly, if I could, why we need the Patients' Bill of Rights and why my concern about what the Republican leadership may try to do is legitimate.

My colleagues know that I have been on the floor and in the well here many times over the last several years talking about the need for the Patients' Bill of Rights, and the reason for that is there are so many abuses with patients, with constituents that I have,

with Americans, who have their health care delivered with HMOs or with managed care, and those abuses have come to light with our constituents calling us up, coming to our office, testifying at various hearings that we have had, particularly those with our Democratic health care task force.

□ 1830

I would say, if I could, to summarize the problems in our attempt to address the problems, basically fall into two broad categories. One is the issue of medical necessity. Too many times HMOs simply do not allow the particular patient to have the operation that their doctor thinks they need or to stay in the hospital for the length of time that their doctor thinks they should stay or to sometimes even to be able to have the information provided by their doctor about what kind of care that they need, and the reason that is true is because the HMOs increasingly make those decisions. Rather than decisions about what kind of operation you have or how long you stay in the hospital being made by your physician, which was the traditional way and the logical and sensible way for health care to proceed, HMOs increasingly have those decisions made by the insurance company in an effort to try to save costs.

We need to correct that. The decision about what is medically necessary, what kind of care you need, should be made by the physician and the patient, by the health care professional and the patient, not by the insurance company, and that is what we seek to do with the Patients' Bill of Rights is to turn that around and give that decision about what is necessary for your health back to the physician and to you.

The second thing we do and the second most important area where there is abuse is that if a decision is made that you cannot have an operation, for example, that your physician and you think that you need, you should be able to appeal that, and right now that is almost impossible because most HMOs define on their own what is medically necessary, what kind of operation you are going to have. And then if you seek to appeal, the only appeal is to an internal review board which they control. And what we say in the Patients' Bill of Rights is that there should be an independent review, an external review, by people that you can appeal to who are outside the control of the HMO, independently will decide whether or not the HMO's decision was wrong and can be overturned.

And failing that, if that fails, that you should be able to sue and enforce your rights in a court of law which is not the case now because many people, most Americans actually, fall under a Federal preemption called ERISA that says that if their employer is essentially self-insured, which most employers are these days, that then you cannot sue the HMO for damages or to overturn a bad decision about what kind of care you should receive.