

pointed out, this is a real problem. We are getting real people coming up to us on a regular basis saying that they are suffering. How cruel it is really for the Republican leadership in this House to say, well, we are going to solve their problem by throwing a few bucks at the insurance industry when the insurance industry is telling us that they are not going to provide the benefits, anyway.

I just wondered if I could for a minute go back to this article in the New York Times that talked about what had happened in Nevada. Nevada as I said in March of this year passed a piece of legislation that was very similar to what the House Republicans had proposed in terms of providing subsidies to seniors if they could go out and buy an insurance policy that covered prescription drugs. It has been a total failure. This is a reference here in the article. This is from July 8, New York Times, of this year. It quotes Barbara Buckley, a State assemblywoman who is cochair of a task force that monitors this potential program. She says that the task force refused to authorize the release of any money until it could see the details of a drug program that met the eligibility criteria in terms of premiums, deductibles, copayment, and benefit limits. Most of those details would be decided by the successful bidder.

The problem was that no insurance company wanted to offer a program that met the standards that the legislature set in terms of specifying what the premium would be, what the copayment would be, what drugs would be proposed. It says in the article, asked why insurers did not show any interest, a retired Navy captain, a Mr. Fend, who serves on this task force, said, probably because they did not think they could make any money. If they thought they could make a reasonable amount of money, they would probably buy into the program and bid on it.

The bottom line is, it is just a hoax. The Republicans here have talked about a prescription drug program that will not work. It is really awful to think that they know it will not work, it has not worked in a State where it was proposed, yet they keep bringing it forth as if somehow they are trying to address the problem when they are not.

Mr. TURNER. The Medicare program probably never would have been passed in 1965 if the private insurance industry could have taken care of the health care needs of our seniors. That is why we passed Medicare, is because private insurance would not work. I had a letter from a lady who had been in an insurance business 19 years. In fact, I have it here with me. It was a letter that was actually handed to me at a town meeting I had in Shelby County in my district. The lady asked me if I would read this letter on the way to my next stop.

This lady writes very eloquently to say she had been in the insurance business 19 years and her letter calls for us

to provide a prescription drug benefit under Medicare for our seniors. She tells the story about her mother who died last November at the age of 87. As she was going through her mother's papers, she knew, of course, her mother had been on prescription medicines, I think, for about 20 years, the last 20 years of her life. She was going through all her bills, seeing what she had spent on medicine. She came across a credit card bill that had a balance owed of \$6,000, and she was just shocked. She could not believe her mother, as frugal as she was, would have run up a \$6,000 credit card bill and not taken care of it.

So she wrote letters to Visa. She found out what were all these charges. It turned out all of them were for prescription medicines. Her mother had been spending about \$300 a month on prescription medicines, and her Social Security check just was not enough for her to get by and take care of those medicines. The lady wrote me, she says, I think my mother understood that when she died, her home could be sold and I could pay off that \$6,000 Visa bill for her. But she said my mother was a very proud woman.

No senior in this country should have to struggle like that to pay for their prescription medicines. We have seniors who are breaking their pills in half trying to take their medicine and being able to afford it. I have seniors that told me at a meeting that they routinely just take one every other day. A pharmacist was standing there. He said, "For some medicines, that can be extremely dangerous for you to do that."

I had seniors come up to me and tell me that they actually have to make a choice every month of whether to buy groceries or to go fill those prescriptions. In a country as prosperous as we are today and as compassionate as we like to say we are, I believe we can do something about the problem of a prescription drug crisis for our senior citizens.

We talk about this big surplus that is going to arrive here over the next 10 years. I hope it does. I am not sure it will, but I hope it does. Some as we know on the other side of the aisle have proposed that we cut taxes to the tune, I believe Governor Bush says, of \$1.6 trillion when we only have an estimated, hoped-for \$2 trillion budget surplus. But I think if we are as compassionate as we like to say we are that surely we could set aside 10 percent over the next 10 years of that \$2 trillion surplus and provide our senior citizens with a meaningful prescription drug benefit.

I know everybody wants tax cuts. I know everybody enjoys getting their taxes lower. But the truth is there is a basic need here that should not be ignored. And I think the vast majority of the American people agree with that. That is why I think on close examination of the Democratic prescription drug plan as compared to the Repub-

lican proposal that the overwhelming majority of our seniors and of all Americans would be in favor of a prescription drug benefit under traditional Medicare as the Democrats propose in this country.

Mr. PALLONE. I want to thank the gentleman. I think we are running out of time. The last point the gentleman made is so important. I really believe that one of the reasons why Governor Bush has proposed this scaled-down prescription drug plan that really only addresses some of the problems for low-income people is because he has proposed using so much of the surplus for this grandiose tax cut plan, which primarily benefits the wealthy and corporate interests, and so he does not have enough money left to pay for a Medicare prescription drug program the way the Democrats have proposed. And so that has actually forced him in some ways to propose this more scaled-down version that will only help some low-income people. That is unfortunate, because if we have a surplus, and you and I both I know are worried about these estimates and whether the level of surplus that is being talked about will ever materialize, but there is certainly enough that we could provide the prescription drug program along the lines of what the Democrats have proposed. I would hate to see that not happen just because of Governor Bush's tax proposals and the tax proposals that the Republicans have put forward, which I think really do not help in any significant way the average American.

I just want to say we were here again tonight as Democrats because we believe strongly that this is a major issue that should be addressed in this Congress, that is, providing a prescription drug program under Medicare. We are going to continue to be here every week until this Congress adjourns demanding that this issue be addressed.

NIGHTSIDE CHAT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. MCINNIS. Until the end of Congress, I am going to be here to rebut the gentleman from New Jersey who employs the doctrine of fear. He likes to get up here in front of the microphone and speak to all of you and give these misstatements, misleading statements, inaccurate statements. Less than 5 minutes ago, I just heard the gentleman from New Jersey say, and I quote, The Republican leadership, speaking of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT), the Speaker of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY), the majority leader, they used the word "cruel," they throw a few bucks at the insurance companies. And then these Democrats talk about the dream team, about how everybody is

going to be caught in this wonderful net, and all of your needs, your prescription needs, your medical needs will all be met by this Democratic Congress and by this Democratic Gore plan. Have you ever heard of the proposition, You don't get nothing for free? Somewhere somebody has got to pay for it. You better figure out what the problem is. I think we can agree on the problem. The Democrats that were up here, they would like you to believe that they are the only ones that understand that there are prescription service problems out there in our society and that they are the ones with the solution and their solution is very simple.

It tracks the Canadian health care plan. It is nationalized health care. It is socialized health care. The Republicans and frankly some conservative Democrats are saying, Wait a minute. Wait a minute. Before we jump into this pool of nationalized medicine, what you tried to do with Hillary Clinton about 6 or 7 years ago, 7 or 8 years ago, let's take a look at what the ramifications are; let's study other nations that have jumped into the same pool that you want us to jump into, for example, Canada, and take a look at what the Canadian system has that is better than our system.

That is what I propose you do. Before you jump into the pool, take a look at what the unintended consequences are. Maybe there are some things in the Canadian health care system that are better than the American health care system. But I would tell you this, that in America you still get the best health care of anywhere in the world. When they like to come up here and talk about the uninsured Americans, remember that there are different categories. You may have somebody that is uninsured; but no matter where you are in America, you can never be denied emergency care at a hospital if that hospital receives government funds. And I do not know any hospital, I am sure there are a couple of them out there but not very many more that do not operate on government funds.

The fact is, the prescription drugs in this country, the prices that are being charged for them are in my opinion outrageous. There is no question that the angel here is not the pharmaceutical companies. But let me tell you, there is also something to be said about the research that these pharmaceutical companies ought to be doing so that we have better medicines.

You take a look at the kind of medicines we have today, just in the last few years. I can remember 3 years ago when you got diarrhea, you drank that junk, that pink junk, you drank it. You drank a whole thing of it to try to get rid of the diarrhea. Today you buy a little packet about this big with little pills, you pop one pill and that is it. Our country is the country that makes advancements. We have got to do something about these outrageous prices that have snuck in here. For example,

I do not know why the Democrat from New Jersey, instead of up here bashing and misleading all of you by saying that the Republicans, the leadership, have planned this cruel hoax on the Americans. Really, honestly, is there anybody you have ever met in elective office that wants to go out and play a cruel hoax on the constituents they represent? Is that an exaggeration? Of course it is an exaggeration.

But the fact that we come back to is this: What do we do to bring the pharmaceutical prices into line without bringing in nationalized health care? The Democrats are very easy to stand up here in front of you, ladies and gentlemen, and stand in front of my colleagues and promise you the Moon, the magic cure, greener fields on the other side of the fence. All I am saying is before you jump on the other side of the fence, take a look at the consequences of the plan that they are proposing.

Where do you think AL GORE, the Vice President, is going to get his money from this? It comes out of that surplus. Remember, this is the first time in 30 years we have had that surplus. As I say, clearly there is a problem out there. We need to address that problem. But the Gore approach and the Democratic Congress approach or at least the liberal side of it, I have got to say, I have got to restrain myself because we have several conservative Democrats who do not agree with the liberal approach as just espoused by the gentleman from New Jersey. But the liberal Democratic approach is the Hillary Clinton approach, nationalized health care, socialized health care. I can tell a lot of you right now, 64 percent of the people in America, as I understand, have some kind of prescription care service.

You better figure out what the gentleman from New Jersey is proposing to do with the service of those of you that have prescription care in moving that to the people that do not have prescription care service. There are lots of consequences to what the Democrats, the liberal Democrats, are proposing when they offer you something for nothing.

□ 2130

There is a price to be paid, and I think it is incumbent upon the gentleman from New Jersey and his colleagues when they stand up here and trash and cut down more conservative Democrats or the conservative Republicans. I think it is incumbent on them to kind of have an openness requirement. Tell the people what the consequences are of nationalized health care. Tell people what the consequences are of a Canadian-type of system. Talk about it. Tell the people what the consequences are of research for better medicines.

Know this is why this Congress just does not jump up and sign the blank check offered by the gentleman from New Jersey. We are not going to jump up and sign a blank check, at least

enough of us on both sides of the aisle are saying wait a minute, what are we doing, what are the consequences. Clearly, we all agree on the problem.

Despite what the gentleman from New Jersey says, nobody is patting the pharmaceutical companies on the back and saying be proud of yourself. They have not done a good job in some regards with medicine, but frankly it appears that there is some gouging going on out there.

But before my colleagues address that problem, take a very careful look at what the Democrat, the liberal Democrat approach is, because I can assure my colleagues in the long run, first of all, they promise it will only be 10 percent of the surplus and a much, much smaller percent of the budget and nothing will grow and grow and grow; and it is the open door for socialized medicine in this country, for a national health care, and there are a lot of people who, in my opinion, will suffer under a national health care plan.

Nobody should be forgotten and nobody should be left behind, but there are ways to address that without going into a Hillary Clinton-type of health care plan. So my discussion here tonight was not intended to be on health care, but there is nobody else that stands here to rebut these gentlemen, as they speak here unrebutted for 1 hour about the so-called quote cruel hoaxes by the Republican leadership.

Those words ought to be stricken from the RECORD. They are inaccurate. They are misleading. The gentleman from New Jersey and some of his colleagues, they know that the cruel hoax by the leadership. I did not say there is a cruel hoax by the Democratic leadership. Come on, we have more protocol on this floor. We can be more ladies and gentlemen in talking about the problem.

The people that suffer while this partisan bickering goes on back here are the senior citizens that do not have prescription care or, by the way, anybody that does not have the ability to care for themselves. But do not address it by waving the magic wand and saying look, citizens, we have got something for nothing. We are going to take care of all of your health care needs. We are going to take away your personal responsibility and the government is going to assume it.

Remember, every time, and I cannot say this strong enough, every time the government assumes one of your responsibilities, every time the government takes a burden of yours and makes it a burden of theirs, they take something with it. It comes with a price. Somewhere we are losing a freedom. Somewhere we are going to lose the ability to have choice in the future.

So in summary on this health care plan, let me say, I am discouraged by the comments that were made previous to my speaking here this evening. We do not get anywhere, and I direct my remarks at the liberal Democrats. Look, we are not going to get anywhere with a nationalized health care

plan. We are not going to get anywhere with socialized medicine.

Why do you not sit down instead of talking about how leadership has this cruel conspiracy going on by throwing a few bucks at insurance companies? Why do you not put the election-year rhetoric aside and sit down with us and help us try and figure out what a solution is.

Every day that we use that kind of rhetoric, there are people out there who are suffering because my colleagues are not willing to sit down and put their heads together to come up with a solution. And there is a solution.

I am optimistic that we can have a solution. We do have a great country, and we have made wonderful strides in health care. But clearly we have got some problems in that system, but we can fix it without having our health care provided by the United States of America, which means they are going to oversee what doctors you see. They are going to oversee what kind of prescriptions you get. They are going to oversee what kind of treatments you get. They are going to oversee how often you are going to get to see this doctor or that doctor. Socialized or national medicine is not the magic answer it appears to be.

Tonight it is very easy to buy into this, very easy to buy into this, because the Democrats, the liberal side over here, not all Democrats, I stand corrected, the liberal Democrats over here, they think you are going to get something for nothing. And they are saying, look, it is easy for us to afford it, no problem. Remember, you do not get something for nothing.

Let me switch subjects and talk about something much, much more pertinent, I think, really because of the Olympics. I hope some of you have are having the opportunity to watch it. In fact, I was over at the office before I came over this evening watching the Olympics, how exciting that is, even if it is taped NBC or whoever does that. The reality of it is look what we get to see clear across the ocean in Sydney and watch those Olympics, and I am very proud of those people.

I want to tell you I heard an advertisement, I will not tell you the name of the company the other day, but I heard an advertisement about the Olympics, and it said our young men and women that go over there to compete in the Olympics, they will come home heroes. And I thought to myself, you know, they will come over celebrities. I would like to have their autographs. I am proud of them.

But I think using the word heroes is somewhat of a delusion. I think the real word of heroes is used in a different type of setting. There are sports celebrities, and there are heroes.

I have a perfect example. I am not just up here talking without giving you an example. It is happening this week in Pueblo, Colorado. First of all, on my way over I real quickly grabbed a dic-

tionary, and I looked up the word hero. Hero, a mythological or a legendary figure often of divine descent endowed with great strength or ability, an illustrious warrior, a man admired for his noble qualities, one that shows great courage, an object of extreme admiration and devotion with courage.

With that said, let me read an editorial from one of the leading newspapers in the State of Colorado, the Pueblo Chieftain. It is called Patriots Week. What is Patriots Week about? This is a celebration of heroes.

This week, we anticipate more than 110 Americans, more than 110 Americans who have been decorated with the Medal of Honor, which is the highest honor our country can give out, 110 of them will be in Pueblo, Colorado, to be honored by a city which was recently designated as one of the four finest communities to live in this country. Pueblo, Colorado, picked out of hundreds of communities. It was picked in the top four.

This week Pueblo is hosting 110 medal of honor winners, and they are calling their week Patriots' Week. I am going to go through my poster here in a few minutes with you and show you some of the interesting things about what this week is going to consist of.

First of all, let me read the editorial out of the Sunday Chieftain Star and Journal, my good friend Bob Rawlings, who is the publisher and editor, this is Patriots Week, the home of heroes in Pueblo, Colorado. On Tuesday, the National Medal of Honor Society convenes here for its annual convention. Pueblo is home to four medal of honor recipients, the most of any city at least in modern times.

On Thursday, larger-than-life bronze sculptures of the four Puebloans who won this will be unveiled at the Pueblo Convention Center. They are Carl Sitter, William Crawford, Drew Dix, and Jerry Murphy. Mr. Sitter and Mr. Crawford died this year, but not before they got to see their sculptures taking form. Also included is a display of all medal of honor recipients dating back to the Civil War, when the Nation's highest honor was approved by the United States Congress.

A black tie patriot dinner on Friday will bring five greats from the world of sports to Pueblo. Golfer Arnold Palmer; gold glove baseball player Brooks Robinson; NBA center David, The Admiral, Robinson; one-time boxing champion Gene Fullmer; and the NHL hockey star Pat LaFontaine will receive the Society's Patriot Award for the joy and support they have given to our military forces. Also commentator Paul Harvey and World War II cartoonist Bill Maudlin will receive special awards from the Medal of Honor Society.

Two other veterans organizations are in Pueblo this in week in conjunction with the Society's convention. Two days ago, the 50th anniversary reunion of the 578th Combat Engineering Battalion began. Later this year, the crew

of the Peachy, a B-29 piloted by Puebloan Bill Haver that flew raids over Japan, will meet for its annual get-together. Mr. Haver named the plane, a replica of which is at the aircraft museum at the Memorial Airport in honor of his sister Peachy Wilcoxson, and I know Peachy. Today is Constitution Day. All of these patriots spot for the ideals embodied in the United States Constitution, and many of their comrades perished in that effort.

So let each and every one of us reflect on that remarkable document and re-dedicate ourselves to the cause of liberty and justice. Well, how exciting. In Pueblo alone, for example, I would like to just to kind of, for a moment, go over who are the four members who are from Pueblo, Colorado.

As I mentioned in my comments, unfortunately, two of our members, two of our citizens of Pueblo, passed away earlier this year. Mr. Crawford, who was in the Army, you can see right here, and Mr. Sitter, right here, but we still have surviving Drew Dix, the gentleman right here with the red dot, and Jerry Murphy, who was in the Marines in Korea.

This is the plaza that Pueblo, Colorado, has dedicated and put together through contributions from the local community. Here is a community that came together, did not come to the United States Congress and ask for money, did not expect the government to do it; they got together in their community of Pueblo, Colorado, to honor all medal of honor recipients, but specifically to put something that will be a long-lasting recognition of the four medal of honor winners from Pueblo, Colorado. That is what that little plaza is going to look like. The statues, here is one of Jerry Murphy, 8½ feet tall; that is the completed statue there honoring Jerry.

Here, so you have an idea, there is Bill Crawford before he passed away as he stands with the statue of him, which is also about 8½ feet high. This is going to be an exciting week in Pueblo.

What I thought I would do is share with my colleagues four of the stories of these medal of honor winners. I can tell you that I have had the occasion, and I consider it amongst the highest privileges of my congressional career, if I were to kind of recapture my memories of serving in the United States Congress, where I felt the most fortunate to meet somebody or the most privileged to be able to shake their hand, I would have to put it in the order of, I am Catholic, the Pope, and Mother Theresa, and right behind them, our medal of honor winners.

In fact, I was in a parade in Pueblo not very long ago, and I had the opportunity in that parade to shake the hands of two medal of honor winners who were watching the parade. You feel so much pride, because these people are such heroes. They really are what heros are, the word. They do not cause any delusion to the word hero.

They embody hero in its fullest envisions.

Let me talk about Drew Dix. I will point out Drew here. Drew right here. By the way, a special hello to his mother, a very sweet person in Pueblo, Colorado. Let me talk a little about Drew, Drew D. Dix, U.S. Army Special Forces Vietnam, citation for conspicuous gallantry in the action at the risk of his life above and beyond the call of duty.

Sergeant Dix distinguished himself by exceptional heroism by serving as a unit advisor to heavily armed Vietcong battalions attacked the providence capital of Chau Phu resulting in complete breakdown and fragmentation of defenses of the city.

Sergeant Dix with a patrol of Vietnamese soldiers was recalled to assist in the defense of the city. Learning that a nurse was trapped in a house near the center of the city, Sergeant Dix organized a relief force, successfully rescued the nurse and returned her safely to the tackle operations center; but that is not all.

Being informed that now there were other trapped civilians within the city, Sergeant Dix voluntarily led another force to rescue eight civilian employees located in a building which was under heavy mortar and small arms fire. Sergeant Dix then returned to the center of the city. Upon approaching a building, he was subjected to intense automatic rifle and machine gun fire from an unknown number of Vietcong. He personally assaulted the building, killing six of the Vietcong and rescuing two Philipinos. The following day, Sergeant Dix, still on his own volition, assembled a 20-man force, and though under intense enemy fire, cleared the Vietcong out of the hotel, the theater and other adjacent buildings within the city.

□ 2145

During this portion of the attack, Army Republic of Vietnam soldiers, inspired by the heroism and success of Sergeant Dix, rallied and commenced firing upon the Viet Cong. Sergeant Dix individually captured 20 prisoners, including a high ranking Viet Cong official. He then attacked enemy troops who had entered the residence of the deputy providence chief and was successful in rescuing the official's wife and children.

Sergeant Dix's personal heroic actions resulted in 14 confirmed Viet Cong killed in action and possibly 25 more. The capture of 20 prisoners, 15 weapons and the rescue of 14 United States and free world civilians. The heroism of Sergeant Dix was in the highest tradition and reflects great credit upon the United States Army.

Raymond Jerry Murphy, and if you ever go to Pueblo, Colorado, you will see Murphy Boulevard. I mean, these guys are real heroes. Their community loves them. Our country has deep respect for Medal of Honor winners. Excuse me. Not winners they did not win

it. Medal of Honor recipients, and I stand corrected on that.

Raymond Jerry Murphy, United States Marine Corps, Korea, citation for conspicuous gallantry at the risk of his own life, above and beyond the call of duty as a platoon commander of Company A, an action against enemy aggressor forces. Although painfully wounded by fragments from an enemy mortar shell while leading his evacuation platoon in support of assault units attacking a cleverly concealed and well-entrenched hostile force occupying commanding ground, Second Lieutenant Murphy steadfastly refused medical aid and continued to lead his men up a hill through a withering barrage of hostile mortar and small arms fire; skillfully maneuvering his force from one position to the next and shouting words of encouragement. Undeterred by the increasing intense enemy fire, he immediately located casualties as they fell and made several trips up and down the fire swept hill to direct evacuation teams to the wounded, personally carrying many of the stricken Marines to safety.

When reinforcements were needed by the assaulting elements, Second Lieutenant Murphy employed part of his unit as support and during the ensuing battle personally killed two of the enemy with his own pistol.

With all of the wounded evacuated and the assaulting units beginning to disengage, he remained behind with a carbine to cover the movement of friendly forces of the hill, and although suffering intense pain from his previous wounds he seized an automatic rifle to provide more firepower when the enemy reappeared from the trenches.

After reaching the base of the hill, he organized a search party and again ascended the slope for a final check on missing Marines, locating and carrying the bodies of machine gun crew back down the hill. Wounded a second time, while conducting the entire force to the line of departure through a continuing barrage of enemy small arms artillery and mortar fire, he again refused medical assistance until assured that every one of his men, including all of the casualties, had preceded him to the main lines.

His resolute and inspiring leadership and exceptional fortitude and great personal valor reflect the highest credit upon Second Lieutenant Murphy and enhance the finest traditions of the United States Marine Corps.

William Crawford, our third Pueblo citizen, United States Army, World War II, for conspicuous gallantry at the risk of life and above and beyond the call of duty in action, with the enemy in Italy, 13 September 1943, when Company I attacked an enemy-held position on hill 424, the third platoon in which Private Crawford was a squad scout attacked as a base platoon for the company. After reaching the crest of the hill, the platoon was pinned down by intense enemy machine

and small arms fire. Locating one of these guns, which was dug in on a terrace on his immediate front, Private Crawford, without orders, and on his own initiative, moved over the hill under enemy fire to a point within a few yards of the machine gun emplacement and single-handedly destroyed the machine gun and killed three of the crew with a hand grenade; thus enabling his platoon to continue its advance.

When the platoon, after reaching the crest, was once more delayed by enemy fire, Private Crawford again, in face of intense fire and on his own volition, advanced directly to the front midway between two hostile, two this time, hostile machine gun nests located on a higher terrace and placed in a small ravine. Moving first to the left, with a hand grenade he destroyed one gun emplacement and killed the crew. Then he worked his way to the right and under continuous fire from the other machine gun emplacement, he used one hand grenade and the use of his rifle and he killed one enemy and blew out the machine gun nest and forced the remainder of the enemy to flee.

Seizing the enemy machine gun that was left from the one emplacement, he fired on the withdrawing Germans and facilitating his company's advance.

These are remarkable individuals.

Carl Sitter, United States Marine Corps Korea, for conspicuous gallantry at the risk of his own life, above and beyond the call of duty as a commanding officer of Company G, in action against enemy aggressor forces, ordered to break through enemy infested territory to reinforce his battalion the morning of 29 November. Captain Sitter continuously exposed himself to enemy fire as he led his company forward, and despite 25 percent casualties suffered in the furious action, he succeeded in driving the group to its objective.

Assuming the responsibility of attempting to seize and occupy a strategic area, occupied by a hostile force of regiment strength, deeply entrenched on a snow covered hill, commanding the entire valley southeast of town, as well as the line of march of friendly troops withdrawing to the south, he reorganized his depleted units the following morning and boldly led them up that steep frozen hillside under blistering fire, encouraging and redeploying his troops as casualties occurred, and directing forward platoons as they continued the drive to the top of the ridge.

During the night when the vastly outnumbered enemy launched a sudden vicious counterattack, setting the hill ablaze with mortar, machinegun and automatic weapons fire and taking a heavy toll in troops, Captain Sitter visited each foxhole and gun position, coolly deploying and integrating reinforcing units consisting of service personnel unfamiliar with infantry tactics

into a coordinated combat team and instilling in every man the will and determination to hold his position at all costs.

With the enemy penetrating his lines, in repeated counterattacks which often required hand-to-hand combat, and on one occasion infiltrating to the command post with hand grenades, he fought gallantly with his men in repulsing and killing the fanatic attackers in each encounter. Painfully wounded in the face, wounded in the arms and wounded in the chest by bursting grenades, he staunchly refused to be evacuated, and he continued to fight on until a successful defense of the area was assured with a loss of the enemy by more than 50 percent of their troops dead or wounded or captured. His valiant leadership, superb tactics and great personal valor throughout 36 hours of bitter combat reflect the highest credit upon Captain Sitter and the U.S. Naval service.

These four gentlemen that I just described as heroes who got the Medal of Honor are from Pueblo, Colorado, but I want to remind all of my colleagues there is what we call the Medal of Honor Society, and 110 members of that society will be in Pueblo, Colorado, this week to be honored by our community and to be honored by our Nation for what they have done.

Those four stories I told are but a drop in the bucket of the stories of valor, the stories of courageous brave men and women, who stepped out above the call of duty because they believed in America. They believed in freedom and they were willing to lay their life down for it.

This weekend I had a wonderful opportunity to spend with my wife and my parents in Meeker, Colorado, and we were up at the cemetery, an old cemetery, we were in the old section of the cemetery, and I walked by a grave and it was a young man, not much on the gravestone, had the gentlemen's name, had his birth. He was 22 years old, and all it said on the gravestone was he died for his country.

As we know, we have thousands and thousands and thousands of men and women in this country who have died for their country, and we have hundreds of thousands of men and women who have fought bravely for what this country stands for, for the freedom of this country, for the benefit of all of us.

We cannot acknowledge everybody with a Medal of Honor, so we know that there are brave and courageous individuals out there who should have received the Medal of Honor, who earned the Medal of Honor but did not receive it, but we do know we still have a group of individuals who did receive the Medal of Honor, and they truly should own lock, stock and barrel the title of hero.

WHAT KIND OF VIOLENCE ARE WE EDUCATING OUR CHILDREN WITH?

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to move on. It is election year so

in the last week and a half we all of a sudden begin to hear about a problem that, frankly, I addressed over a year ago. Not that I knew that I could foresee this problem, we had a lot of people talking about it after the Columbine High School tragedy in Colorado, and that is, what kind of violence are we educating our young people with?

We know that at tender ages, at younger ages, that is an opportunity, probably the maximum opportunity, to mold a young person, to influence a young person, to set him upon a direction in the life that they are beginning. Unfortunately, for example, the tobacco companies took full advantage of that. They marketed their products to very, very young individuals because they knew, frankly, that they could get them addicted. They knew what the disease was that they would cause. They knew the evils of tobacco, but nonetheless they knew their customer base had to constantly be renewed and the best way to renew it was to go into this fragile age, say 14, or maybe 12 to about 17, and get them hooked on the product that you wanted them to buy.

Well, we see the same kind of thing happening today in the video game industry. There is actually a market out there not for what I would consider bad entertainment but what I would consider trash. Now, look, I am not up here bashing Hollywood. I go to the movies like all the rest of you. I enjoy them. In fact, I watch Titanic any time I get an opportunity to. I have lots of favorite movies. So do you. There are a lot of neat things about Hollywood. In fact, I think films in America really speak freedom throughout the world. It is amazing on my international travels what kind of influence America has because there is American music in these countries, in China, for example, or when the American movie industry starts to creep into China, freedoms, people see what freedoms are about. So I think Hollywood has a very strong place in our society, and I think that under our First Amendment they have constitutional privilege, and 99 percent of the product that comes out of there is good product, but unfortunately 1 percent of it is being ignored by the other 99 percent.

Now I am not talking about entertainment that I do not like. Look, there are movies out there that I would not watch. There is music out there that I am not entertained by. I can assure you that my three children, who are all now in college, are not exactly entertained by the kind of music I listen to and they are not necessarily entertained by the kind of movies I like to go to. So I am not talking about music that is not entertaining to my ears or to my sight. What I am talking about is violence that is being marketed in a retail sense clear across America.

Now some people have said, well, what should government do about it? I do not think we need what is called a recreation or an entertainment czar. I

do not think we need that any more than we need socialized medicine in this country. Our country prides itself on saying to the individuals, look, you have personal responsibility. The people in America still exercise a great deal of personal responsibility. So what can the government do about this? I think we in the government have an obligation for an awareness, to put out as much as we can about what we think is going on out there so that we can communicate a message to the maximum amount of our constituents.

For example, I had not been in a video arcade in a long time before last year. After Columbine, I was at the Denver International Airport and I decided to go into the video arcade, and I think out of the 27 games in that video arcade in Denver, Colorado, well over half of them were games of killing somebody; violence; games of shooting each other.

Now to the credit, Mayor Wellington Webb of Denver, Colorado, I called the city and I said, hey, I have just become aware of this. We do not have anything in the government that prohibits the City of Denver from leasing this video arcade to have this kind of merchandising of violence, but the mayor took it upon himself and within I would say half a day those games were out of that video arcade.

□ 2200

It did not take government action; it did not take a U.S. Congressman coming back here with his colleagues and passing laws to get it out of the arcade. It took the responsibility, the personal responsibility of the people of Denver, led by their mayor and the mayor's staff, and they stood up to it and they took it out in about a half a day.

Well, I think we as congress people, we have to take this message to our constituents and say hey, go visit your local video arcade, see what is going on in your neighborhood. For example, I had one of my constituents give me the magazine that his then 13-year-old boy bought off the counter. I am going to show my colleagues this magazine in a few minutes and what it markets. This magazine right here. It markets terror, it markets violence, it markets death, and it markets it in such a way that it knows that the typical 13-year-old or 14-year-old will grab this and begin to become influenced and molded by what they are reading, and what they are seeing, and pretty soon, what they are playing when they buy the video game.

For example, on this chart here, this is a video game that is advertised in this magazine. This magazine is called, Next Generation. This is the ad, a full, 2-page center-fold ad. The name of the game and the name of this ad is "You're Going to Die." This is what is being marketed out there: "You're Going to Die."

Now, in the last week, Hollywood has gotten defensive, and I have heard some artists say well, you cannot impede on the right of free speech and an

artist's opportunity to have free thought. Come on. We have to have some peer enforcement. We have to exercise responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, I happen to agree with Hollywood; I do not think the government ought to have an entertainment czar. But I do think, and I would say to my colleagues that if we have constituents in the entertainment industry, that we have to emphasize upon them that, look, we all have a duty, a responsibility to our young people. This incident that occurred at Columbine High School, it did not occur because of this magazine, but let me tell my colleagues, there are some violent things out there, in my opinion, that have occurred as a result of this kind of game.

Let me show my colleagues. I have blown up the ad. This ad is available to our children and our constituents. Any constituent out there that has children, they can go to the store and pick up this magazine, no problem.

Now, take a look at this ad. This is the video game that we can buy. "You're Going to Die." You will see right here to my left the individual, this is a person who has been shot, that red is obviously blood. Let me tell my colleagues what the game offers. It offers its player to zoom in, to zoom in on this game, right up here, one can zoom in on one's computer, and one can target specific body parts and actually see the damage done, including exit wounds. They do not have to show a lot. All you have to be is a kid with some money and you go in the video store and you buy this game. You can steal a bike or hop a train just to get around town. Even the odds by recruiting the gang members you want on your side. Talk to people the way you want, talk to them any way you want on the video game. Actual game play screens, built on top of the revolutionary Quake 2 engine, includes multi-player gang bang death match for up to 16 thugs. Life of crime. Unbelievable.

I pulled it up tonight. I web to the web site. Needless to say, a year ago, when my constituent came to me with this after we were discussing what had occurred at the Columbine High School in Colorado, I was amazed.

I contacted the executives of one of the magazines that advertises this type of advertising and then too, I contacted the producers of this game, and I asked those executives; in fact, I disclosed their names on the House Floor, I asked those executives about their own children. Believe it or not, on the web sites, on their web sites they disclosed their background, or maybe on financial documents under public corporation disclosure, they described their families.

So I wrote them and I said, Mr. Executive, Mr. Big Corporation Executive, do you allow your children to go buy the product that you are trying to market intensely to every other child in America? I will bet any amount of money, I say to my colleagues, that

not one of the executives of this company allows their own children to possess this game that they, in turn, are marketing to every other American family that has children the same age they have, young children. Not one of those executives puts that trash in their own children's hand. Do we know why? Because they know the impact of what this influence means. They know what the result will be if we continue to allow these kids to play game after game after game where one can focus in and see the damage of exit wounds, where they are encouraged to steal a bike, where they tell you to go in and gang bang death and talk smack.

When the tobacco companies first came forward and said oh, this is not addicting; when the tobacco companies first came forward and said, kids have the right to choice, this is not addictive to young kids, we are not targeting young kids, it was a lie, and it is the same thing here. Do not let this company tell us they are not trying to grab that young kid, that young boy or girl, the future leaders of our country, the future citizens, the members of our families, I say to my colleagues, we know darn well what this company is trying to do with this videotape. Stuff cash in their pockets at the expense of the right and wrong of our children.

I pulled up the web site tonight, I wanted to see if this company had changed anything since I had written to them. They have not changed much.

Let me tell my colleagues how they describe that. I pulled it off the web, it is called a story off their web site. "Somewhere in the past that never existed lies the world of kingpin", that is the name of this game, "a landscape of burned out buildings and urban decay where local gangs rule the street. Begin your rise to the top, assembling your own gang of thugs. If a new member turns out to be a punk, waste him. Waste him, and make room for new blood. Moving up in the world is sure to attract the attention of kingpin. Eventually, you are going to have to take him down, but you knew that anyway."

Mr. Speaker, that is awful. I pulled that off the web site tonight before I came over here to speak. This company has not slowed down one bit.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is unfortunate. I contacted Imagine Publishing, and Imagine Publishing, by the way, is the magazine that puts this stuff out. I asked Imagine, I talked to some of their executives about a year ago, why do you put this kind of stuff in? Well, they start to give me the freedom of speech and the First Amendment. I said, wait a second, wait a second. Why do you put this stuff in there? Would you let your own children play with it? Well, no, but that is not the point, they said. The point is that really we do not censor.

Essentially, anybody that wants to put something in one of the Imagine publications, why, this is just fine. Do they have any sense of responsibility

to the community that they maybe ought to say no? I did not get any idea at all, I did not get any feeling that the Imagine Publishing Corporation cared at all about any kind of community responsibility to the young people that picked up their magazine called Next Generation right here and saw this ad and went out to buy that kind of video game.

Now, of course I contacted Interplay, as I mentioned earlier in my remarks. I contacted Interplay, and as I mentioned earlier in my remarks, I said to them, do you let your own children do it? Why do you go out to America, why do you go out to our communities and market this kind of crap? Why do you do it? Look at this garbage. Do you think it is a distortion of reality? Do you think that you, in effect, are brainwashing our young people, that violence is the answer? And to think nothing of killing and to think nothing of being proud of the exit wounds the size of the exit wound that you create in a body, and that if you want to get around town you just steal a bike or a train, and then if you have a gang member you do not get along with, waste him, you are going to do it anyway? I did not get any sense of responsibility out of that corporation called Interplay.

So my conclusion is this, I say to my colleagues. We have to shoulder a responsibility to go into our communities. We should go and look in our local arcades. Most of the video arcade dealers that I have talked to, and prior to last year I had not gone into video arcades since my kids were that big playing pinball machines, and they have changed a lot. And my bet is most of my colleagues have not gone into their own districts and stopped just at a regular video arcade store to take a look at the games that are being played. But I have done that in the last year, and I can tell my colleagues that most of the video arcade owners that I have talked to responded much the same way that the city of Denver responded saying, wow, we really were not paying attention to it. We will get the game out of there.

Mr. Speaker, I can also tell my colleagues that I went to the advertisers. I figured I was not going to get this publisher to do anything, because he wanted the cash; and, by the way, there was a she too, a she executive, and they wanted the cash in their pocket. They could care less, in my opinion, about community responsibility towards our youth and violence.

So I went to the advertisers, and I tried to encourage the advertisers not to buy advertising in this magazine. I set up meetings; it did not require Federal law, it did not require U.S. congressional action. I set up meetings with Target, with City Market, King Supers Corporation, with Wal-Mart Corporation, with J.C. Penney Corporation. Every one of those retailers was responsive and every one of those retailers has taken not large steps, but

□ 2215

small steps and, in some regards, some aggressive steps towards doing something about making sure that this kind of stuff, this kind of true violence is taken off of those retail shelves, is not being offered for sale by some of these retailers.

Mr. Speaker, that is what I am speaking here tonight about. I think we have an obligation.

I know that in the last week Al Gore prided himself on taking on Hollywood. I think we have to go to the grassroots. I think each one of us, each one of my colleagues, we need to go into our communities, take it by the grassroots, just like we are doing in our political campaigns in the next 5 or 6 weeks and talk to our local video arcades, talk to our local parent-teacher organizations, talk to our local churches and say, hey, here is somebody over here, we ought to ask them to take this stuff off of their shelves. We ought to go to the local Wal-Mart or local Target or local K-Mart, or the bookstore, and if they have this kind of stuff, we ought to ask them to take it off. I think we would get a pretty positive response. Because most citizens out there, unlike the executives of Interplay, and unlike the executives of Imagine, most people out there that are proprietors that have their own businesses and who are operating these businesses and have more community responsibility. After all, they are a part of the community.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think we can be successful, and I do not think we need to take the kind of action that requires Federal oversight.

ELIMINATING THE DEATH TAX

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, let me move on to another subject very quickly. I am going to wrap up with a letter that I got after our last discussion. In our last night side chat, we talked about the death tax. We talked about the fact that the President at that time was going to veto, and has subsequently vetoed; not only supports death as a taxable event, but that the Clinton-Gore administration actually proposed this year in their budget a \$9.5 billion increase in the death tax.

Now, it was amazing how much I heard, the rhetoric, about how the death tax only hits 2 percent of the community. It hits the entire community. Because to summarize, what happens with the death tax is we take the money out of a community and we transfer that money, regardless of whose money it is, it is still money that circulates within that community, and we move it from that community to Washington, D.C. to the bureaucracy and the U.S. Federal Government for redistribution. I can assure my colleagues that not a fraction of what we send in goes back to our community.

I got a very interesting letter subsequent to that and I would like to read just parts of it.

Although my own personal experience seemingly pales in comparison to the families in Colorado and Idaho who lost ranches and farms in order to pay estate taxes, I can still easily relate to the frustrations that those families are experiencing. I am just one of the growing number of middle-class Americans who feel that they have literally been "screwed" by their own government, and I encourage you to continue in your efforts to repeal our country's death tax laws now to prevent more of us from having to experience what my own family recently experienced.

My mother fought a valiant battle against breast cancer for a few years, but passed away in 1996. Sadly, she had just turned 65 years old. She was a full-time mother and also worked hard as a nurse for many years to pay college tuition for my sister and I. Dad worked most of his life for a defense contractor as an aerospace engineer. You can see that both of my parents were not farmers or ranchers, but they worked at jobs that many ordinary Americans work at. Both of my parents were also raised in families that survived the Great Depression, and, as a result, they acquired a deep appreciation for the value of a dollar. They both worked hard and they were also great "savers."

They were wealthy in many ways, but they certainly were not rich. When mom and dad were in their early thirties they purchased a dream home in a typical middle-class track neighborhood on Long Island for about \$16,000. They resided there for 40 years, and last year my sister and I had to sell the house, which we sold for many many times what my folks bought it for, and every penny we got from that House went to the Federal Government to pay for the death tax.

Dad passed away unexpectedly. We knew that my folks had planned all their lives for retirement, but we didn't have any idea how they really had saved all those years. They did not have an extravagant lifestyle, but they lived comfortable, as many middle-class American families do. Upon retirement, dad and mom wanted to ensure that they could continue to live the comfortable standard of living they had come to enjoy as middle-class Americans during their prime earning years. Unfortunately, neither one of my parents got to reap a dime from their IRAs, their pension account, their savings or from the proceeds of the sale of their home. Rather, as I just mentioned, my sister and I were forced to sell the home soon after my dad's passing in order to pay the death taxes on the estate that was left to us.

There aren't as many farms anymore, for many reasons. Many baby-boomers, like my sister and I, who are now just beginning to inherit the wealth of a previous generation, were born and raised in suburban cities and subdivisions. Even here in Colorado Springs, my own kids are far removed from the rural farming communities that you had referred to in Colorado and Idaho. But, nonetheless, many city folks from previous generations also worked hard all of their lives. While they do not have farms or ranches to leave to their children, they do have other kinds of assets to bequeath.

While the estates of middle-income Americans often will not qualify them to be included among the rich and famous, these estates are, nonetheless, considered sizable to most of us. Many suburban and city dwellers save so they can retire comfortably, as my parents had planned, and many, like my parents, many intended their estates to be passed to their own children and to their grandchildren, estates that had already paid the taxes on the property, and they wanted to have enough money to send their

grandkids to college. But they did not intend upon their death for 55 percent of their estate to be handed over to the government because death is a taxable event. It is absolutely ludicrous and unconscionable to think that this could happen in America, but it is a reality.

I was amused by your comments in which you indicated that the current administration would most likely, once they left office, seek out the expertise of tax attorneys and accountants to advise them how to best shelter their assets on their estates to avoid paying the death taxes. How true that is. But the irony is that many of these folks probably are already sheltering their assets in various tax deferred plans so their heirs can avoid paying these taxes.

If my father would have lived for a couple more years and had gotten into the retirement routine, he probably would have tried to seek advice too. But he just never got around to it. My dad used to laugh, "don't worry, I won't spend your inheritance on fancy sports cars and other expensive toys. There will be something for you."

I am sure millions of Americans haven't gotten around to it either, and I know these folks would be equally distraught to know how much that they would have passed on to their children instead automatically goes to the Internal Revenue Service.

My sister nor I never felt we were owed or entitled to an inheritance. Our parents provided for us and we were raised to be independent. We also knew that both of our parents fully intended to have what they worked so hard for to be conveyed to their children, as was directed in their wills. My parents were known for their generosity to their family, their church and their community, but we never knew that they would have contributed 55 percent of their entire estate to the Federal Government.

So, you know, I know there has been a lot made about the death tax and the President says and the vice president, well, it is a tax for the rich. This is middle-class America. As I said earlier in my comments, few are a contractor, all you have to do is own a dump truck, a pickup, a bulldozer and a backhoe, and if you own it, you are subject to that death tax. It has a very punitive way of working against communities. And what bothers me the most is not, of course, the Kennedys and the Fords and the Carnagies and all those people. They have lawyers to plan to save their estate. But what bothers me the most is the small communities, where somebody who has been successful in that community and that money is working in that community, either through contributions to charity or jobs or otherwise, and that money is taken by the Internal Revenue Service and transferred to Washington, D.C. for redeployment through government programs.

It simply can be summed up in a couple or three words: It is not fair.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mrs. CHENOWETH-HAGE (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today on account of travel delays.

Mr. SAXTON (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today on account of personal reasons.

Mr. WAMP (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today on account of flight cancellation.