

1920, they have witnessed the changing of our Nation—a World War, the challenge of the Last Frontier, 15 Presidents, and the anticipation of a new century. However, through these many transformations, their union has been a brilliant fixture.

Mr. Speaker, the Shreves are a shining example to all Americans about the value of a loving family, and I am proud to represent them in Congress. It is my hope that they have many more years of happiness.

MEDICARE AND THE ILLUSIONS OF PROTECTION

HON. J. DENNIS HASTERT

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 14, 1995

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Robert Goldberg ran in the *Washington Times* on December 6, 1995. Mr. Goldberg does an excellent job of explaining why the current Medicare system is in dire need of an injection of quality-based competition and incentives. As the Medicare debate continues, I commend this article to my colleagues:

MEDICARE AND THE ILLUSIONS OF PROTECTION

(By Robert M. Goldberg)

For all the rhetoric about how the Republican plan will bring misery and financial hardship to millions of Medicare beneficiaries, the fact is you couldn't design a better system than the current one to achieve that goal.

Medicare's financial problems are largely the direct result of its subpar treatment of the chronically ill. In particular, seniors bear an unnecessary financial and medical burden in the form of higher out-of-pocket expenses and costly supplemental health insurance.

Worse, because Medicare pays for all care regardless of its quality and outcome, the elderly—thinking that Medicare offers them health security—are actually spending billions on health care services that add nothing to their well-being. Those who are fighting Medicare reforms are perpetuating a system that makes the elderly sicker than they have to be for longer periods of time than they should.

At the heart of the problem are Medicare's price controls which get people out of hospitals quicker (so providers can keep the difference between what they spend and what Medicare pays for), but leaves them sicker as a result. For example, a University of California at Los Angeles medical school study of seniors hospitalized for depression found that Medicare's price controls led to more care without any additional benefit to patients. The income doctors and hospitals lost because of price controls was made up by increasing the volume of services provided.

Similarly, sub-optimal care has contributed to the 20-percent-a-year growth in home health services under Medicare. For instance, studies show that Medicare regulations increase the number of elderly with hip fractures that were discharged before they were fully well. As a result, more people had to rely on home health care or be sent to nursing homes for longer periods of time after the fracture. And a Rand Corp. study found that Medicare's regulations increased by 50 percent the chances that patients will be sent home in an unstable condition. The number of patients remaining in nursing homes one year after the fracture suggests that their quality of care had deteriorated.

Overall, a study of a national sample of Medicare patients found that patients are more likely to be sick or die after discharge than they were before the current set of Medicare regulations were imposed.

In fact, because premiums and deductibles have not increased for more than a decade, Medicare only provided the illusion of protection. And, the elderly pay a hidden tax in the form of higher out-of-pocket expenses and supplemental insurance coverage called Medigap, due to Medicare's mismanagement of medicine.

There is a little evidence that the additional coverage increases well-being. Seniors with Medigap spend up to 70 percent more on health care than seniors with Medicare coverage alone, regardless of their health status. These are the dirty little secrets that defenders of the current Medicare system will never reveal to America's seniors.

Medicare can be and is being made less expensive with medical innovations that make it more humane and more responsive. One such effect is the Healthy Seniors Program, created by The Carondelet Health Plan, in Tucson, Ariz. Gerry Lamb, the director of the program notes it is designed for the "elderly with serious chronic illness, those who constitute the highest costs, fastest growing health service group." Healthy Seniors provides examinations, service and individual assistance to reduce the incidence of serious and expensive episodes of illness. The result is dramatic: Participation in the Healthy Seniors program use fewer medical services than those who do not, saving nearly \$6,000 per patient each year. Notes Mr. Lamb, who is a nurse practitioner: "There are huge dollars to be saved from dealing with chronic illness early, rather than in the hospital and emergency rooms".

In fact, the proposition that better care saves money is the foundation for transforming entire private sector health care system. The Business Health Care Action Group (BHCAG), a coalition of 21 of the largest employers in Minnesota, provides a dramatic example of such initiatives. Starting in 1997, BHCAG's 1.5 million employees and retirees will be given vouchers that will be used to purchase health care from different groups. Medical providers will have to furnish consumers with patient-level information on how they improve the health of people with chronic conditions which afflict the elderly most such as stroke, hip fractures, heart disease and arthritis. BHCAG projects that with a greater investment in quality, the voucher system will be able to reduce the rate of spending 5 percent to 15 percent each year compared to other managed care approaches.

Rhetoric and emotion aside, quality-based competition and incentives are at the heart of the GOP plan. Such quality-driven reductions in spending are possible if Medicare is dramatically changes. Providers need to be placed at risk for making such savings while at the same time they are required to compete for business in terms of the quality of care they can offer. The Republican Medicare plan isn't perfect, but it does take health care for seniors in this direction.

As for Democratic and federally funded senior group efforts to save Medicare as we know it, they condemn this generation of elderly and the next to substandard care. House speaker Newt Gingrich is right: The faster the government-run Medicare program withers on the vine, the sooner it will stop taking dollars out of the pockets of seniors in order to prop up an obsolete health plan that undermines their quality of life.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR DEBATE AND CONSIDERATION OF THREE MEASURES RELATING TO U.S. TROOP DEPLOYMENTS IN BOSNIA

SPEECH OF

HON. JERRY F. COSTELLO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 13, 1995

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to articulate my position on the President's policy of sending 20,000 American troops to Bosnia.

I oppose, and have voted consistently in Congress to oppose, the introduction of United States ground troops into Bosnia. I do not believe that American soldiers should be on the frontlines of a multiethnic, quasi-religious conflict that dates back several hundred years. My position has been that we should have lifted the arms embargo against the Bosnians long ago, so that they could have defended themselves against Serbian aggression and helped put an end to the slaughter. It was clear that one reason the three parties came to the table in Dayton was the increasing strength of the Bosnian resistance.

I believe that this war, which has raged for 3 years with massive losses of life, is in the heart of Europe and is primarily a European responsibility. That is why I have opposed sending our soldiers into the heart of Bosnia to police the peace agreement signed in Dayton.

Let me make it clear, however, that I do believe the United States has a responsibility to our NATO allies and the world to assist in this effort. This terrible slaughter can and should end, and our diplomatic efforts to bring about a peace agreement have been admirable. With a real, signed agreement at hand, our European allies would use our air support, intelligence capability, and humanitarian efforts to accomplish this mission.

Unfortunately, the President believes the United States has a responsibility to put our soldiers—along with the French and the British—on the Bosnian frontlines. It is a policy I do not agree with.

Today, we are voting on three different resolutions.

The Dornan resolution would cut off funding to the troops stationed in Bosnia, some of which are already in or on their way to that country.

The Skelton resolution would express opposition to this policy, in particular the introduction of ground troops into Bosnia, but would also express support for our troops there.

Finally, the Hamilton resolution would express approval for the President's policy of sending ground troops to Bosnia and unequivocal support for the men and women of the United States Armed Forces who have been stationed there by their Commander in Chief, President Clinton.

I oppose the Dornan resolution for two reasons: First, our troops are on their way to Bosnia with some already in the Balkans, and to cut off their funding while they are in Bosnia would put them in serious danger; and second, the President has said he would veto the legislation if approved by the Congress, and given that fact, passage of this particular resolution would tell our troops, our soldiers, that they do not have the full support of the American people or their representatives. That is

reminiscent of Vietnam and a wrong message to send to our troops.

However, given my opposition to ground troops in Bosnia, I will support the Skelton-Buyer resolution. The President has the authority to dispatch these troops just as President Bush dispatched troops to the Middle East in 1990. However, I have an obligation to let the President know that I disagree with this policy. I have voted consistently against this policy and believe it is not in the best interest of our Nation.

Finally, I cannot support the Hamilton resolution, which expresses support for the President's Bosnia policy.

Mr. Speaker, I do not agree with the President's policy. I believe the United States should lend air and other support to our European allies, to enforce this peace agreement. However, as our troops are now stationed or en route to Bosnia, I believe the Congress has a responsibility to let the President know that public opinion is extremely wary of his policy. He should also know that at the first opportunity, we should bring home our troops and let Bosnian soldiers take their place, a policy I believe we should have implemented all along.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR DEBATE AND CONSIDERATION OF THREE MEASURES RELATING TO U.S. TROOP DEPLOYMENTS IN BOSNIA

SPEECH OF

HON. RODNEY P. FRELINGHUYSEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 13, 1995

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, for me, the most important priority is to support our servicemen and women. The President has made the decision, and while I am angry that he made it without consultation with Congress and the American people, we need to back them 100 percent.

Our actions tonight should send this message loudly and clearly to them as they prepare to go. Because 25 years ago, I was one of them in Vietnam. I was sent on a mission that bitterly divided this country and this House.

But I learned then, as I know now, that our troops deserve nothing less than the undivided support of this House and all the resources necessary to support their mission.

Please support the Buyer resolution.

We have all seen vivid and shockingly graphic pictures from Bosnia, but my visit there made the issue intensely human. I spoke with our troops on their way to the region from Germany, met with the Balkan leaders, wore a flak jacket, and took a bumpy bus ride into war-torn Sarajevo. No doubt, watching CNN and seeing things live are completely different. No longer is this a civil war in a far-away land, it is 32,000 American troops going into a historically troubled region as peacemakers.

President Clinton made that decision. He made it without congressional approval, but as Commander in Chief he has the authority to do this. In fact, it became clear that he made this decision long ago, since we learned from our troops that their training for this mission

began more than 6 to 8 months prior to the Dayton peace talks. We are going to Bosnia, and in some areas our soldiers are already there.

On November 30, I was selected to join a bipartisan congressional delegation to survey the Bosnian situation. Our trip was organized in response to concerns in Congress that the White House had not kept us informed of this major policy decision in a proper and timely manner. Indeed, State Department and Pentagon officials were dispatched to Capitol Hill just 1 day before we boarded our plane to Serbia.

We went with objectives—ours was a true fact-finding mission. Before leaving, we were briefed by Ambassador Richard Holbrooke, the chief U.S. negotiator at the Dayton peace accords. We were to meet with Serbian, Bosnian, and Croatian leaders to solidify their support for the peace accord and to get their assurances that United States forces would be protected. Our foremost objective was to verify that our troops would have the training, equipment, and resources necessary to defend and protect themselves.

We met with Serbian President Milosevic, Croatian President Tudjman and Bosnian President Izetbegovic. They remain committed to the peace agreement, pledged their support of protection for U.S. troops, and shared the fact that their citizens were truly weary from war. They said Americans were considered to be even-handed and that our military presence was vital for peace. Despite their words, they remain suspect due to past broken promises, and because facts show that these were indeed the very warmakers that caused 250,000 deaths in over 3½ years of ethnic and religious strife. As President Reagan used to say, "trust but verify."

Our trip to Sarajevo is one I'll never forget. We landed at the airport which was little more than a small pitted concrete platform surrounded by sandbags and bunkers. After an escort of U.N. armored vehicles was assembled, we boarded a bus and headed toward the city. We went through four Bosnian Serb armed checkpoints and saw defused land mines along the roadside which had previously lined our path. Along our well-protected route, the pictures came to life—buildings blown apart, people milling around, and everywhere burned out buses, trolleys, and cars. The 8-mile trip took almost 45 minutes.

What was left of the architectural beauty of structures from the time of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, or the towering high-rise buildings built during Marshall Tito's 30-year-reign, was now a twisted combination of bombed-out building shells, collapsed factories, or acres of roofless and pockmarked houses. Sarajevo is undoubtedly a scarred survivor.

I remember, too, the stories of no food, heat, or fresh water, and the chilling testimonials of snipers killing pedestrians in the street and marketplace. There were constant reminders of the 2½ million refugees who were either burned and bombed out of their houses and communities, or simply fled the area with terror.

After this eye-opener, we flew to Naples, Italy, for a briefing by the U.S. Southern Commander of NATO forces, Adm. Leighton Smith. He told us that our troops would be able to defend themselves, would be fully equipped, and that the military mission was limited to a year. "American troops would be enforcing a

peace", he said, "not fighting a war." He was honest, however, and reminded us that this mission was not without risk.

Our final stop was the most moving—meeting with our young soldiers in Germany who will go to Bosnia in mid-December. I had lunch with two soldiers from New Jersey, one a very young woman, perhaps early 20's, from Burlington County and the other a slightly older man from Bergen County. Both were professional, well-trained, and motivated. Still, I sensed apprehension—the same apprehension I felt 25 years ago as a young private headed to Vietnam.

This encounter placed everything in perspective and literally put a human face on this situation. For me, the most important priority for us is to support our servicemen and women. They are Americans, with over 80,000 family members on the homefront.

No question, the President should better define our national interest in Bosnia and explain what our total commitment will be. I feel he has an obligation to the families of our troops and all Americans to outline the specific objectives of this mission.

But while we can argue about his policy, which I do remain skeptical about, the fact is that the decision has been made and American soldiers, our soldiers, are going. And since they are going, we need to support them 100 percent. They deserve nothing less.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE WILLIAM B. HARVARD, SR.

HON. MICHAEL BILIRAKIS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 14, 1995

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, it is with sadness that I rise today to pay tribute to a great architect and an even greater man. On December 11, the citizens of St. Petersburg, FL, lost William B. Harvard, Sr., a warm and devoted family man and an extremely talented architect who left his unique mark on the skyline of west central Florida.

William Harvard left his home building business in 1941 to serve his country and fight for freedom during World War II. Upon returning, he reopened his offices in St. Petersburg and quickly established himself as a valued member of the community, joining several church and service organizations.

In 1959, he became a founding partner of Harvard, Jolly, Clees and Toppe Architects. Mr. Harvard and his associates proceeded to design many of the major structures in the St. Petersburg area. Colleagues stated that he was a remarkable man, always considering Florida's environment in his designs.

His environmentally conscious architecture is embodied in his design of the pier in St. Pete, the incredibly unique inverted pyramid, that became the focal point for the view down Second Avenue north towards Tampa Bay. As in all of his structures, people marveled at the uniqueness of the design of the pier.

Though unique, the design was also quite functional. He was quoted as saying that his goal was to "preserve the open views from pier level and have an open, tropical feeling and yet be protected from the elements." Anyone who has seen the pier knows he was successful in this endeavor.