

title 31, United States Code, or deemed accepted by the Senate or the House of Representatives pursuant to Rule XXXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate or clause 4 of Rule XLIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives shall be reported as required by such statute or rule and need not be reported under this section."

(b) **REPEAL OF OBSOLETE PROVISION.**—Section 901 of the Ethics Reform Act of 1989 (2 U.S.C. 31-2) is repealed.

(c) **SENATE PROVISIONS.**—

(1) **AUTHORITY OF THE COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION.**—The Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, on behalf of the Senate, may accept gifts provided they do not involve any duty, burden, or condition, or are not made dependent upon some future performance by the United States. The Committee on Rules and Administration is authorized to promulgate regulations to carry out this section.

(2) **FOOD, REFRESHMENTS, AND ENTERTAINMENT.**—The rules on acceptance of food, refreshments, and entertainment provided to a Member of the Senate or an employee of such a Member in the Member's home State before the adoption of reasonable limitations by the Committee on Rules and Administration shall be the rules in effect on the day before the effective date of this subtitle.

(d) **HOUSE PROVISION.**—The rules on acceptance of food, refreshments, and entertainment provided to a Member of the House of Representatives or an employee of such a Member in the Member's home State before the adoption of reasonable limitations by the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct shall be the rules in effect on the day before the effective date of this subtitle.

SEC. 05. EXERCISE OF CONGRESSIONAL RULEMAKING POWERS.

Sections 201, 202, 203(c), and 203(d) of this subtitle are enacted by Congress—

(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively, and pursuant to section 7353(b)(1) of title 5, United States Code, and accordingly, they shall be considered as part of the rules of each House, respectively, or of the House to which they specifically apply, and such rules shall supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent therewith; and

(2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change such rules (insofar as they relate to that House) at any time and in the same manner and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of that House.

SEC. 06. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This subtitle and the amendments made by this subtitle shall take effect on May 31, 1995.

**FORD (AND FEINGOLD)
AMENDMENT NO. 4**

Mr. FORD (for himself and Mrs. FEINGOLD) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. . USE OF FREQUENT FLYER MILES.

(A) **LIMITATION ON THE USE OF TRAVEL AWARDS.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, or any rule, regulation, or other authority, any travel award that accrues by reason of official travel of a Member, officer, or employee of the Senate or House of Representatives shall be considered the property of the Government and may not be converted to personal use.

(b) **REGULATION.**—The Committee on House Oversight of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Rules and Adminis-

tration of the Senate shall have authority to prescribe regulations to carry out this section.

(c) **DEFINITIONS.**—As used in this section—

(1) the term "travel award" means any frequent flyer, free, or discounted travel, or other travel benefit, whether awarded by coupon, membership, or otherwise; and

(2) the term "official travel" means travel engaged in the course of official business of the House of Representative and the Senate.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, January 5, 1995, to conduct a hearing to examine issues involving municipal, corporate, and individual investors in derivative products and the use of highly leveraged investment strategies.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent on behalf of the Governmental Affairs Committee (jointly with the Senate Budget Committee) for authority to meet on Thursday, January 5, for a hearing on S. 1, Unfunded Mandates.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, January 5, 1995, at 10 a.m. to hold a hearing on the balanced budget amendment to the Constitution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

AN INTERVIEW WITH QUENTIN D. YOUNG

• Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, one of the people who has been calling for justice in the field of health care in this Nation for many years is Dr. Quentin Young.

Recently, he was interviewed by the Christian Century, and that interview was published. It contains so much common sense that I hope some of my colleagues will read what he has to say.

I ask to insert his comments at the end of my remarks.

A person does not have to agree with everything that he mentions in his interview to recognize that we should be doing much better and that our friends in Canada are doing much better.

My conversations with Canadian Members of Parliament suggest that there are some improvements that we

could make on the Canadian system, if we were to adopt a similar system. To suggest, as have so many in our country, that the Canadian system is a failure, is an outright falsehood. It is of interest that not a single Canadian Member of Parliament has introduced legislation to repeal the Canadian system.

The article follows:

HEALTH REFORM AND CIVIC SURVIVAL: AN INTERVIEW WITH QUENTIN D. YOUNG

(Since his days as a medical student at Cook County Hospital in Chicago, Dr. Quentin D. Young has been engaged professionally and politically in issues of public health. Currently clinical professor of preventive medicine at the University of Illinois Medical Center in Chicago, Young is also national president of Physicians for a National Health Program. He has been a leading and tireless spokesman for health care reform. We spoke with him recently about the fate of the Clinton health care proposal and the alternative of a single-payer insurance system like Canada's.)

A year ago many people had high hopes for health care reform. It was at the top of President Clinton's agenda and it seemed to have widespread public support. Now the issue is dead, and perhaps a crucial political opportunity has been lost. What went wrong?

President Clinton produced an enormously complicated proposal, which left him vulnerable to attacks from across the spectrum. Those of us who support a single-payer plan thought that if the reform had been enacted the way he proposed, it would have been a dreadful disappointment and a step backward. By going the route he did, he was forced to rely on the whole insurance infrastructure and a real nightmare of managed competition. All these huge bureaus he proposed—they invited ridicule and defeat. From his public and private comments it is clear that he understands the redundancy and the parasitic role of the insurance industry: it adds nothing to the product and subtracts mightily. (Basically insurance agencies and conglomerates are in the business of finding reasons not to give care.) So in light of that, his proposal showed a lack of courage. Another form of cowardice was that he didn't come right out and call his mandated premium—which had all the force of law—a tax. So that's the President's contribution to the failure of reform.

The decisive factor was the appalling undermining of the democratic process that took place in Congress. At least \$150 million were spent on lobbying, on polls, on onslaughts from small business groups and others. In the face of this pressure, Congress became impotent. I think that viewing this activity intensified people's dislike of the political process. And I also think that there's a little bit of concern by those involved that perhaps the lobbyists engaged in overkill—that they created a sense of futility among the public. And power elites usually don't like to see a sense of futility among the public. Nor is it wholesome from the point of view of a reformer.

The conventional wisdom was—probably still is—that a single-payer plan is politically unfeasible.

Well, the route Clinton tried was politically unfeasible. His proposal couldn't have done any worse than it did. And winning isn't the whole thing. The big changes that have occurred in American politics—the abolition of slavery, the adoption of unemployment insurance and social security—did not happen in one swift action. There was a buildup of popular pressure and finally a breakthrough.