

picking up children who have lost employer-based coverage.

Passage of the Medicaid proposals, said physician Stephen Berman in an editorial, would "reduce the capacity of the public sector to absorb the increasing number of children losing private insurance [and] would swell the number of uninsured children." The impact of gaps in health insurance for children was sketched out in a third journal article, written by Michael D. Kogan of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and six others.

The article did not address the current legislative proposals but reported on a nationally representative sample of 8,129 children whose mothers were interviewed in 1991 when the children were about 3 years old.

Based on the survey, the article said, "About one-quarter of U.S. children (22.6 percent) were without health insurance for at least one month during their first three years of life. Over half of these children had a health insurance gap of more than six months."

About 40 percent of the children, estimated conservatively, did not receive care continuously at a single site—for example, the office of a family doctor—and breaks in insurance coverage are often the cause of sporadic medical care at this critical stage of physical development.

"Children are in particular need of primary care providers who can track developmental milestones, assure the maintenance of immunization and other health maintenance schedules, monitor abnormal conditions and serve as the first contact of care," wrote Kogan and his co-authors, especially in finding and treating "emerging disabilities, chronic illnesses or birth defects" and in providing preventive care.

"A schedule of routine primary care is much easier and usually more cost-effective when these activities are carried out in an organized manner over time with successive office visits at the same site," they said.

Berman said, "Having a regular source of care has been shown to reduce child expenditures by 21.7 percent compared with not having a regular source of care."

#### EXHIBIT 2

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 6, 1995]

#### MEDIPOK

When the current Congress set out on the path of turning the major programs for the poor into block grants, Sen. Daniel P. Moynihan (D-N.Y.) issued an interesting warning. Once Washington gives up on making policy and instead just ships off billions and billions to state governments, he said, politics will turn away from substance and instead become one big formula fight as states and regions battle over who will get the biggest pots of cash.

His prediction has become fact, as a report in *The Post* by Judith Havermann and Helen Dewar documented last week. In the scramble to pass their budget, Republican leaders in the Senate found they had to pass around billions of extra dollars in Medicaid payments to states to buy the votes of—pardon us, we mean secure the support of—Republican senators. It seems that many senators are worried about the impact of the Medicaid proposal on their state budgets.

They should be. The pressure this budget puts on the program that serves the poor and many among the elderly and the disabled is simply too much. Facing potential rebellion, the leadership kept rejiggering the formula to please wavering senators. And given that the leadership knew it would have to find votes for its budget from Republican senators, guess what? The increases largely went to states represented by Republicans. The cuts were mostly reallocated to states

with Democratic senators whose votes the leadership knew it couldn't win anyway.

Thus, an analysis by Sen. Bob Graham (D-Fla.) found that states with two Democratic senators lost a net of \$3.6 billion in the Medicaid reshuffling; states with two Republican senators gained \$11.2 billion. Texas alone (with two Republican senators) gained about \$5 billion; California (represented by two Democrats) lost \$4 billion.

Ginny Kooops, a Senate Finance Committee aide, had it about right when she said: "This formula will be redone again in conference and again and again. It is just incredibly difficult to come up with something that makes 5 states happy; somebody always complains."

Ms. Kooops' comment goes to the heart of what's wrong with his whole Medicaid approach: Of course many will keep complaining about the formulas of a so-called reform that dumps upon the states the responsibilities of running Medicaid and then asks them to do that job with huge cuts in the rate of expected growth in the program.

Medicaid costs do need to be contained; the Republicans are right about that part. But this budget's approach to Medicaid will not only keep producing comical mathematical games; it will also cause real harm to the states and to the medical care of many among the most vulnerable Americans.

#### GREAT FALLS CHURCH DESECRATION

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, last weekend, somebody in Great Falls, MT, spray painted satanic icons and racist slogans on the walls of the Mount Olive Christian Fellowship. The congregation of Mount Olive is mostly African-American, and they were the direct target of this perverted mind. But this attack really was on the whole community, and I am very proud to say that the whole community responded.

I congratulate and thank all of the 200 citizens of Great Falls, MT, who came to the church on Monday to show their support for the Reverend Phillip Caldwell. Members of the congregation, city manager Lawton, our State Representative Deb Kottel, and many others turned out. I am proud of them, and like the vast majority of Montanans, I am with them in our State's fight against hate groups. On my next visit to Montana, I hope to attend services at Mount Olive.

The desecration of Mount Olive is a sickening event and one which shows that as a State and a country, we still have a long way to go in our fight against hate. But its aftermath also shows us something else. Many Americans are concerned, and rightly so, about a decline of civic spirit, a growing indifference to our neighbors, and a general loss of moral values in our country.

However, the rally this Monday showed us that our courage, our willingness to meet our responsibilities as citizens, and our basic decency are stronger than the pessimists admit.

Thank you, Mr. President. I yield the floor.

#### MIKE WALLACE CAN DISH IT OUT BUT NOT TAKE IT

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, for 27 years, Mike Wallace has been a hard-hitting, pull-no-punches investigative journalist primarily on "60 Minutes." Relentless in pursuing a story, there are few tactics he will not employ—bullying, insults, confrontation, ambush journalism.

That is fine, because however you feel about Mr. Wallace, he works in America, and here in America the first amendment secures our right to free speech. We Americans can say or write just about anything we like, and, no matter how offensive it may be, how distasteful, repugnant, however uncomfortable it may be to others, we have the right to express our views. Mike Wallace has the inestimable privilege of expressing those views on network television to tens of millions of people.

I had been under the impression that, given his profession and his unorthodox modus operandi, Mr. Wallace was a first amendment advocate, but in today's *Washington Post* we find evidence that suggests the venerable Mr. Wallace has a peculiarly narrow devotion to free speech.

Yesterday, Marlin Fitzwater, a long-time spokesman for Presidents Reagan and Bush, was waiting to appear on the cable television show "Politically Incorrect." Mr. Fitzwater has just published his memoirs of his time in the White House, and in that book he offers some mild criticism of both "60 Minutes," calling it "liberal" and always framed in terms of "good versus evil," and of Mr. Wallace himself. I quote:

As a small boy . . . I would watch Mike Wallace . . . as he insulted his talk show guests, drove women to cry and performed his pioneering version of talk show extremism.

Mr. Fitzwater's book also mentions Mr. Wallace's son, ABC reporter Chris Wallace, criticizing the younger Wallace for his privileged background.

All this is prefatory to the main event. The studio in which the cable show "Politically Incorrect" is taped is located in the CBS building in New York. While Mr. Fitzwater was waiting to go on the air, Mr. Wallace called Mr. Fitzwater in the studio and began shouting at him and then swearing at him over his book. A few minutes later, the *Post* reports, Mr. Wallace stormed into the studio and continued with the shouting and swearing and obscenities. Mr. Fitzwater, wisely, I believe, and astounded, left the studio posthaste.

Now, as they say, Mr. President, what is the deal? What is going on? The Lexis-Nexis system would blow a fuse if you tried to reach all the times Mr. Wallace criticized others on the air. After all the years that he has been in this peculiarly tough field of journalism, you would think he would be accustomed to criticism. A few years ago, for example, "60 Minutes" ran a program on the pesticide Alar and helped