

Director of Creativity, Culture and Arts Programs at the Rockefeller Foundation in New York.

On behalf of the 31st Congressional District, I thank Dr. Paredes for your leadership, your service and most importantly for your commitment to improving the quality of life for students in the state of California.

**IF MEDICARE CAN BUY A PROSTATE BIOPSY FOR \$178, WHY SPEND \$506?**

**HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 2001

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, Medicare pays different amounts for various medical procedures, depending on where the service is performed. In general (but not always), we pay more for a procedure in a hospital outpatient department, less for the same procedure in an ambulatory surgical center, and often even less when that procedure is performed in a doctor's personal office.

Some people—the very frail or those who are quite sick—often need to be cared for in a setting where intensive support services can be quickly provided. But for most, these various procedures can be performed safely in a variety of settings.

For those who do not need back-up support, it would seem that Medicare ought to pay no more than the lowest cost site of service. I've introduced legislation to ensure that type of savings—savings that would run into the hundreds of millions per year.

The following letter from a group of doctors describes why we should enact this change—ASAP.

FEBRUARY 14, 2001.

Representative PETE STARK,  
Cannon House Office Building,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE STARK: We are a group of six urologists. We are writing this letter to voice our concerns about, and ask for your help in clarifying/rectifying HCFA reimbursement policy as it relates to site of service payments.

To briefly summarize, three routine and frequently performed urology procedures are reimbursed at very different rates when performed in a physician's office versus an ambulatory surgical center. The procedures, corresponding CPT codes and associated payments are:

CPT code and description	Office pmt.	ASC pmt.
52000 Cystourethroscopy .....	\$179	\$418
52281 Cystourethroscopy w/urethral calibration/dilation	232	569
55700 Prostate biopsy .....	178	506

As you can see, if the bill for these procedures is sent to Part A Medicare instead of Part B Medicare the reimbursement is tremendously higher. This is true even though they are exactly the same service provided with identical equipment.

The Medicare Payment Advisory Commission (MedPAC) has stated "All else being equal, Medicare should pay for ambulatory care based on the service, not the setting in which it is provided." AUA Health Policy Brief, Page 5, December 1998). The major cost drivers of providing these services are basically identical regardless of site of service (cost of cystoscopes, ultrasound imaging

equipment, power tables, sterilization equipment, light sources, irrigation fluid, ancillary personnel, and cost per square foot of space). We believe this present policy adversely and unfairly affects all providers who aren't owners of an ASC as well as Medicare beneficiaries.

Medicare beneficiaries are concerned about access and quality of care. Presently we provide these services at four locations. Without a level reimbursement policy concerning site of service, we will have to consider closing some offices and congregating all or most of these procedures at one centrally located ASC.

**INTRODUCTION OF NO GUNS FOR VIOLENT PERPETRATORS ACT**

**HON. DENNIS MOORE**

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 2001

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, today I join with twelve of my colleagues in introducing legislation that will help protect our communities by keeping guns out of the hands of our most violent criminals.

As an elected District Attorney for twelve years, I know that tough enforcement of our current laws is vital to keeping our communities safe. One of these federal laws in existence makes it illegal for convicted felons to possess a firearm. But would it surprise you to know that there is no similar prohibition on possession of a firearm by a person who has a juvenile adjudication of a violent crime? That is a fact. And it is a narrow loophole in the law that should be closed.

A constituent who owns a gun store in my district, Bob Lockett, brought this loophole to my attention. An individual with a conviction for a shooting death as a juvenile in California tried to purchase gun parts at his store. The State of Kansas has a law making it illegal for persons with a juvenile adjudication of a violent crime to possess a firearm. Therefore, when a search discovered the prior conviction, Mr. Lockett was able to prevent the purchase and notify the authorities. I commend Mr. Lockett for his actions and for bringing this matter to my attention.

Mr. Speaker, although I am grateful that Kansas has such a law, I believe that this should be a federal law to prevent violent perpetrators from possessing firearms nationwide. These individuals with a violent past should be prohibited from possessing firearms.

During my years as a District Attorney, I found that, to the victim of a violent crime, it makes little difference whether the perpetrator was an adult or a juvenile. I believe we all can agree that violent persons should not be able to legally possess a firearm.

Mr. Speaker, persons who have a juvenile adjudication for a violent felony should never possess a firearm. I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

**THE ALTERNATIVE MINIMUM TAX REPEAL ACT OF 2001**

**HON. MAC COLLINS**

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 2001

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the The Alternative Minimum Tax

Repeal Act of 2001 which will repeal the individual Alternative Minimum Tax (AMT). The domestic tax system has dramatically changed since the creation of the AMT regime. Consequently, this tax regime has long outlived its purpose. Today, the AMT is punitive in nature, overly cumbersome and affects taxpayers who were never intended to fall into this tax trap. To immediately reduce the number of wage earners who are affected, my legislation will extend the current-law provision which allows personal tax credits to be applied against the AMT calculation. The proposal will also immediately increase the AMT income exemption level, originally added to the AMT structure in 1993, so that it is adjusted to reflect inflation since that time. Subsequently, it will increase the exemption amount annually by 10 percent. In addition, the bill will repeal the income limitation that currently applies to that exemption. Finally, at the end of a ten year period, the individual AMT will fully be repealed.

Included in the tax plan outline presented by President George W. Bush, was a statement in support of additional tax code changes that would provide relief from the Alternative Minimum Tax. Please join me by cosponsoring this important legislation. Eliminating the AMT will reduce the complexity of the tax code and remove another heavy burden shouldered by wage earners.

**INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO REDUCE THE CORPORATE TAX RATE TO 33 PERCENT**

**HON. PHILIP M. CRANE**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 2001

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing three pieces of legislation to refine the tax proposal put forward by President Bush. Let me state at the outset that I fully support President Bush's tax proposal as he laid it out. I think it is appropriate for the times and well-designed. Even so, there is no legislation or proposal that cannot be improved upon. And so I offer these three bills in this spirit and in the belief that the President in all likelihood would and should support them.

The bill I am introducing takes as its starting point the income tax rate reductions proposed by President Bush, phased-in over ten years. I have included these rate reductions to provide the context for my proposed refinement, which is to reduce the top corporate income tax rate to 33 percent to be consistent with the top individual income tax rate in the Bush proposal of 33 percent.

The driving force of the Bush tax program is the importance of reducing tax rates. This is manifested in the reduction in the statutory tax rates, but also in such provisions as the doubling of the per child credit, the effect of which is to soften the high effective tax rates many lower-income taxpayers face due to the phase-out of the Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC). When we reduce these "marginal" tax rates, we reduce the most important disincentives our tax system imposes on work effort, saving, and investment. Think of it! Just as an individual or a family starts to climb the economic ladder they face a marginal tax rate of almost 50 percent thanks to the combination of the federal individual income tax, the

phase-out of the EITC, the payroll tax, and any state income taxes imposed.

When it comes to tax policy, reducing marginal tax rates is the best insurance policy we can buy for ensuring a strong economy in the future. By reducing tax rates as he has proposed, the President would reduce disincentives for individuals, partnerships, sole proprietorships, and even for a special brand of economic organization called an S Corporation. However, his program does not provide similar relief to the more common corporate form, known as the C corporation. The bill I am introducing today extends the principle of reducing tax rates to the top corporate income tax rate faced by C corporations, which currently stands at 35 percent. My bill would reduce this tax rate to 33 percent, and in so doing would provide tax relief to almost all corporate taxpayers.

Reducing the corporate income tax rate to 33 percent would reduce the disincentive facing corporations to invest in new plants and equipment. Thus, the level of investment would increase, helping America out of its current economic slowdown and putting us on a path of stronger growth in the future. The extraordinary growth we experienced prior to the current slowdown was driven largely by productivity growth that is largely attributable to increased capital formation. Reducing the corporate income tax rate would encourage a resumption of this capital formation and, in the process, would increase the competitiveness of America's corporations and America's workers.

As the corporate community searches for tax relief that is broad in application, defensible in principle, and conducive to prosperity at home and greater competitiveness abroad, they can hardly do better than to reduce the corporate income tax rate as I have proposed in this bill. That is not to say that other changes would not also be beneficial. For example, repeal of the corporate Alternative Minimum Tax, reform of our international tax laws, and a thorough modernization of our system of capital cost recovery system would each be highly beneficial and worthy of consideration. However, in the context and an era of individual tax rate reduction, I believe a simple reduction in the corporate income tax rate has the greatest chance for success at this time. And so I urge my colleagues to support this legislation, modest though it is, to permit America's corporations and America's shareholders to share in tax relief while ensuring our companies remain strong and competitive.

---

#### RECOGNIZING LOUISE DAVIS

### HON. HILDA SOLIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 6, 2001*

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the notable accomplishments and the extraordinary life of a woman from the 31st Congressional District of California.

Louise Davis is retiring from serving over 20 years of public office in the San Gabriel Valley. Louise served as the mayor of Monterey Park for three terms, from 1980 to 1981 and again in 1983. Prior to her mayoral terms, she was elected as "The Grass Roots Candidate," for Monterey Park City Council in 1976 where

she served for eight years. She was a unique council member who spent her time directly addressing her constituents' problems and working to make Monterey Park a better place for all its residents. After a brief break from public life to enjoy her children and grandchildren, Louise accepted the encouragement from residents and ran for Monterey Park City treasurer in 1988. She served in this capacity for 12 years and was known for her sharp wisdom and good judgment.

Louise was born and raised in Joliet, Illinois, graduated from St. Angelea's Academy where she was class president and received a scholarship to pursue her college education in Milwaukee, Wisconsin. At the conclusion of World War II, she met Bill Davis and when he returned from the Navy, they were soon married. Louise and Bill Davis moved to Monterey Park in 1955 and raised seven children—all attended public schools. Louise became heavily involved with the PTA and the Mothers March of Dimes. She was appointed to the Community Relations Commission, where she worked to foster better ethnic relations in Monterey Park, a city known for its multicultural and diverse population. She served as the hostess of the City's Welcome Wagon in the 1960s, represented her community in the March of Dimes, served on the Monterey Park Boys and Girls Club Board, the President's Community Advisory Board of East Los Angeles College and the American Red Cross Board, San Gabriel Valley. She has also worked diligently to preserve the history of the City she served so well as President of the Monterey Park Historical Society.

Louise has served as a charter member and president of Hillhaven Health Care Center's Community Advisory Board and a charter member and chairperson of the Friends of the Seniors, Langley Senior Center.

Among her many honors, Louise was named, Woman of the Year by Soroptomist International, Monterey Park. She has been the recipient of the Most Valuable Citizens Award from the Monterey Park Boys and Girls Club, an Award of Merit from the Monterey Park Chamber of Commerce, and the Community Service Award from the Monterey Park Lions Club.

Louise Davis enjoys respect and notoriety from numerous residents of Monterey Park because of her vast contributions to the community. It is both fitting and proper that we recognize this community leader for her exceptional record of civic leadership and invaluable public service.

Mr. Speaker, I ask this 107th Congress to join me in recognizing the tireless, grass roots work of Louise Davis upon her retirement on March 8, 2001 for her service to the constituents of California's 31st District and wish her good health and prosperity in her retirement.

---

#### TRIBUTE TO WILLIAM J. PITKO

### HON. JAMES A. TRAFICANT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 6, 2001*

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, today, I am deeply saddened to share the news of the passing of William J. Pitko.

William J. Pitko was born on July 4, 1939 to Joseph Sr. and Mary Krulik Pitko. One of four

brothers and a sister, he leaves David, George, Joseph Jr., and Gladys Stahara. He also leaves two daughters, Laurie Pitko and Cindy Rawden, two granddaughters, and his companion.

For 16 years, William J. Pitko was treatment plant operator for the Mahoning County Sanitary Engineering Department. I knew he was a tremendous athlete from when we played football, baseball, and basketball together at St. Matthias parochial school. He dedicated much time and effort to his church, and proudly served his country in the U.S. Army.

William J. Pitko will be sorely missed in the Poland community. He touched the lives of many people, and was adored by all who had the privilege to know him. I extend my deepest sympathy to his friends and family.

---

#### RESTORATION OF WOMEN'S CITIZENSHIP ACT

### HON. ANNA G. ESHOO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 6, 2001*

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise on the third day of National Women's History Month to reintroduce the Restoration of Women's Citizenship Act, legislation that corrects an antiquated law that mars our Nation's history.

In 1922, Rose Bouslacchi, an American citizen, married Conrad Sabatini, a tailor by profession and an immigrant from Northern Italy. When the couple married, a Federal law existed which stripped women of their U.S. citizenship if they married resident alien men, but the law did not apply to men. Ironically, a year later the U.S. granted Conrad Sabatini the privilege of citizenship while his wife, Rose Bouslacchi, lost hers.

During the course of her life, Rose Bouslacchi reared a family of five daughters, each a college graduate and each a contributor to the well-being of our Nation. Four became teachers and one became a nurse. Rose Bouslacchi was an active member of her church and worked with her husband in the running of their business. Her life embodied the values of family and faith, representing the best of America. But, Rose Bouslacchi could never be called an American again.

Rose Bouslacchi was not alone. There were many women affected by this law. After decades of women voicing the gender inequities of our laws, Congress modified the law. In 1952, Congress enacted a procedure for women wronged by the 1907 law to regain their citizenship. A legislative oversight, however, failed to provide a procedure to enable deceased women to have their citizenship restored posthumously. Thus, many families like Rose Bouslacchi's have been left without any recompense. The Restoration of Women's Citizenship Act would grant U.S. citizenship posthumously to the women who were wronged in 1907 and were unable to benefit from the 1952 law.

I urge all my colleagues to celebrate National Women's History Month and honor those deceased women and their families by cosponsoring the Restoration of Women's Citizenship Act.