reaching home without the help of parents.

DEMOCRATS PUSH FOR TAX INCREASE

(Mr. WELLER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, remember when? Remember when the Democrats controlled the White House and were in the majority in the House and Senate? Remember those days of spend and spend and spend? And what did they give us? The biggest tax hike in the history of our country. Why? Because they wanted to spend the money.

And remember when they were in control, how they raided the Social Security trust fund? Well, they are back at it again. Today in Congress Daily, what is on the front page? ''Democrats push for a tax increase.''

President Clinton's budget calls for a $180 billion tax increase. Now House and Senate Democrats want even more in tax increases, and they also support President Clinton's budget, which calls for raiding Social Security, 40 percent of Social Security going for other programs.

Republicans say no. Let us put a stop to spending beyond our means. Let us stop the raid on Social Security. One hundred percent of Social Security for Social Security-Medicare. Let us stop the raid on Social Security. It is all about spending.

PASS MEANINGFUL MANAGED CARE REFORM

(Mr. GREEN of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Republican leadership has unveiled yet another proposal they hope will derail the efforts for meaningful HMO reform. Just when a bipartisan majority has reached a consensus on real HMO reform with the Norwood-Dingell bill, the Republican leadership is once again proposing harmful provisions for Americans' health.

The American people want HMO reform. Instead of figuring out how to solve this, they just add poison pills to their proposed legislation.

For months, we have been hearing from the Republicans that a Patients' Bill of Rights will increase costs and open employers to lawsuits. Well, in my home State of Texas, we passed many of these patient protections; and we have not had any lawsuits against employers. In fact, the only increase that we have seen is the increase in prescription medication that other States have had to do. In fact, there has been no exodus of employers from providing healthcare in Texas under Texas law. What Texas residents have is health care protection and provisions that should be included in a national law. They eliminate gag clauses, open access to specialists for women and children, a timely appeals process, coverage for emergency care, and accountability for those decision makers in healthcare.

It is time to stop stonewalling and support a real Patients' Bill of rights.

□ 1015

FISCAL DISCIPLINE IS FORGOTTEN WHENEVER DEMOCRATS HAVE AN OPPORTUNITY TO INCREASE SPENDING

(Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, why is it the Democrats want to bust the budget caps that they themselves agreed to while at the same time they are opposed to giving tax relief to the taxpayers? On the one hand, they argue that we must relax our fiscal discipline and expand government. On the other hand, they argue that we must maintain fiscal discipline and therefore cannot have tax relief.

Leaving aside the many good arguments for tax fairness that the Republican tax relief proposal contains, let us consider what the Democrats are saying. New Washington spending, fine. Tax relief for the taxpayers, no way. Fiscal discipline is forgotten whenever Democrats have an opportunity to increase spending, but they are fiscal discipline's best friend whenever tax relief is on the table.

What is wrong with this picture? It is very simple. It is known as liberalism; never known, it must be said, for the rigor of its logic. Is there a liberal in the House that will step forward and defend their position?

HMO REFORM AND GUARANTEEING A PATIENTS' BILL OF RIGHTS

(Mr. WYNN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to talk today about changing the subject. We are having a discussion here in Congress about the patients' bill of rights. It is a bipartisan discussion in which both Democrats and Republicans agree that we need to protect patients' rights: access to specialists, emergency room coverage, coverage for all kinds of illnesses when it is needed. We need to have the right to sue if the HMO causes harm to someone's health. That is what we are talking about, but now the Republican leadership wants to change the subject.

All of a sudden, they want to talk about medical savings accounts and access to health care. They have several ideas. Some are good; some are bad. The point is, do not change the subject. The subject is HMO reform. The subject is guaranteeing a patients' bill of rights with real teeth in it.

We have a bipartisan agreement. We have the Dingell-Norwood bill that makes sense. We are having a good discussion. Do not change the subject. Let us stick with the patients' bill of rights. Let us pass a clean bill. Their ideas are not paid for. They should not be brought up in the context of this issue. Let us protect patients first, and then we will deal with some of these other issues.

WE MUST PROTECT THE SOCIAL SECURITY SURPLUS

(Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, let us be honest. President Clinton and his fellow Democrats believe in big government, the bigger the better. For years, President Clinton and the Democrats have increased taxes, squandered precious Social Security money on wasteful government spending. Now, thanks to fiscally responsible Republican policies, we have a budget surplus.

We tried to return some of it to the American people, the true owners, but President Clinton vetoed any tax relief for hard-working Americans. Instead, the President and the Democrats cannot resist the urge to take the surplus, go on a big spending spree and charge it to America's Social Security account. The President wants this funded with new taxes, of course. Americans do not want, need, or deserve new taxes.

Mr. Speaker, we must protect the Social Security surplus from the President.

REPUBLICANS SHOULD KEEP THEIR WORD AND HONOR FUNDING FOR THE WYE RIVER ACCORDS

(Mr. FROST asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, later today the House will vote on the Conference Report on Foreign Operations Appropriations for Fiscal Year 2000. I will vote against the conference report, marking the first time in 21 years that I have opposed a foreign aid appropriations bill.

I am taking this action for one very good reason. The Republican leadership of Congress has refused to include money requested by the administration to fund the Wye River Accords between Israel and the Palestinians. This is one of the most irresponsible acts taken by the Congress in a very long time.

In August, two delegations of Members of the House traveled to Israel and met with Prime Minister Barak and Palestinian Leader Arafat. I headed the

Democratic delegation and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAVIS) headed the Republican delegation. Both delegations told Prime Minister Barak and Yassir Arafat that we would support funding for the Wye River Accords. The Democrats intend to honor our word. Apparently the Republican leadership does not intend to allow those Republican Members to keep theirs.

This is indeed a sad day. The Wye River Accords and the subsequent agreement entered into by Israel and the Palestinians earlier this month to implement Wye mark a dramatic turning point in the history of the Middle East. President Clinton has said he will veto this bill if it is passed by the Congress. I urge a no vote today and a vote to sustain the President's veto when the bill is returned to the House.

STATE FLEXIBILITY, A MEANS TO PROTECT WELFARE REFORM

(Mr. DEMINT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DEMINT. Mr. Speaker, as we begin to debate raising the minimum wage, we must take into consideration the most significant change in our social, economic, and workplace laws in American history. We must remember welfare reform. Federal law currently places immense responsibilities on State governments to move people off of welfare and into productive jobs; but if we are not careful, another one-size-fits-all Federal minimum wage could harm our efforts to create good jobs for every American.

Mr. Speaker, we have trusted our governors with the responsibility to move welfare recipients into jobs. Now they need all the tools to do that job, including more control over the minimum wage. It is time we trust our State leaders to determine increases that best complement their successful welfare policies. I urge my colleagues to secure the employment future for American workers by sending these decisions back home.

REPUBLICAN MANAGED-CARE BILL

(Mr. RODRIGUEZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Speaker, making sure that everyone has an opportunity to see the doctor of their choice, that is one of the main principles that we are here for. One of the main things each and every one out there, each American, wants to be able to see the doctor of their choice, especially if they are paying for their own medication and their own health care.

For the last 2 years, we fought over the issue of managed-care reform, and we need to make sure that every American has that opportunity to see the doctor of their choice.

It is interesting that now as we come to battle on this issue that the other side is beginning to talk about coming together, and we do need to come together, but the reality is that we are skeptical about their proposals. We have the managed-care bill, the patients' bill of rights, that is there to make sure that we can come back and make the managed-care companies, the HMOs, accountable to our constituents. I want to make sure that as we move forward that we do the right thing. Let us stop wasting time. It is time that we come together and we make sure that we are responsive. Instead of reinventing the wheel and derailing things, we have to make sure that the majority is held accountable for health care in this country.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS BILL VETOED BECAUSE IT DOES NOT LEGALIZE MARIJUANA

(Mr. PITTS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, with the stroke of a pen yesterday President Clinton has thrown away a good Washington, D.C. appropriations bill. What has he thrown away? Good and needed things like helping D.C. kids go to college, placing foster kids into permanent homes, cleaning up the foul Anacostia River, cracking down on drug offenders, and reducing the size of D.C.'s bloated government. And for what? For legalizing marijuana. The President drew a line in the sand that said he would not sign a bill that did not legalize marijuana.

Nobody should be fooled by the pretense that this is a medical issue. That is a smoke screen. A war on drugs will never happen when the President's priority is to veto a bill over legalizing drugs in our Nation's capital.

The President is sending the worst possible message to our children. Every police officer, every teacher, every parent who has ever fought against drugs should be outraged by this veto.

IT IS TIME TO PROTECT AMERICANS FROM THE THREAT OF A BALLISTIC MISSILE ATTACK

(Mrs. CHENOWETH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, we are very busy here trying to make sure that we have enough money to continue to shore up our military defense system. Some are tempted in thinking that free trade, diplomatic goodwill, and more international communication will remove the threat of war. All of human history really suggests that such thinking is a fantasy. It is not only a fantasy, Mr. Speaker, but it is a very dangerous illusion. It was a dangerous illusion in 1914, and it was a dangerous illusion in 1939 and it is a dangerous illusion today.

In fact, it is because of the existence of nuclear weapons that this illusion, this fantasy, is even more dangerous today than ever. It is, therefore, imperative that we reconsider our foolish policy of remaining vulnerable to a foreign ballistic missile attack. Many Americans will be surprised to learn that this is so, but America does not have a national missile defense system. It is time to protect Americans from the threat of a ballistic missile attack because the world is still a dangerous place out there.

ONCE AGAIN, BIGGER GOVERNMENT WINS AND THE TAXPAYER LOSES

(Mr. KNOLLENBERG asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, President Clinton has vetoed the tax relief package passed by Congress. Once again, by vetoeing this legislation, he has denied the average middle-class family relief from the marriage tax penalty. He is robbing millions of workers the opportunity to obtain health-care coverage, who do not have health-care coverage now. He is making it more difficult for parents to save for their children's education. He is making it more difficult for people to pass on the family farm or the family business after a lifetime of toil, sacrifice, and devotion. He is making it more difficult for people to save for their future and provide for their retirement. This tax legislation would have been a step towards more fairness in the Tax Code and it would have reduced the burden on the people who are carrying the load paying the taxes and living the American dream, or trying to live the American dream. Once again, bigger government wins and the taxpayer loses.

A COMMITMENT NOT TO SPEND THE SOCIAL SECURITY TRUST FUND

(Mr. BLUNT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Speaker, yesterday we debated a very important resolution on this floor to reaffirm our commitment not to spend the Social Security surplus. We heard repeatedly from the other side of the aisle that we had already spent the Social Security surplus when not one penny of that surplus has been spent, and when this House needs to be firmly committed not to spend one penny of the Social Security surplus.

I wondered all afternoon and all evening why we would constantly hear that, and then I began to realize that for four decades the House has spent the Social Security surplus. This is