That leaves five more, all carefully chosen consensus bills which every Member can support, from the reauthorization of the Mammography Standards Act, assuring safe machinery to detect breast cancer, to a Sense of the House Resolution encouraging the Federal Government to raise its support for the burgeoning number of women-owned businesses. There is no gender preference here. All Members can support these bills.

PROTECT-THE-TRIAL-LAWYERS HEALTH CARE BILL

(Mr. KINGSTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, we have heard a lot of squawking today from the Democrat side about their big protect-the-trial-lawyers health care bill. I think if you look at the Republican versus the Democrat bill, it is very clear: One of the bills gets you quickly into the courtroom, and the other one gets you quickly into the emergency room. The Republican bill gives you a choice of doctors; the Democrat bill gives you a choice of lawyers.

Now, we know that the trial bar gives obscenely to the other side. We know that many on the other side want to socialize medicine, and we know that socialization leads to rationing of health care. But we believe that American consumers should have a choice of doctors and a choice of plans without interference from HMOs and government regulators. We do not believe in centralized health care planning.

Last year my seven-year-old cut his foot and had to go in because of a complication to the surgery room and was in surgery for about two hours. During that time, and, I might add, there are certainly no atheists in a waiting room, but let me say this, while I was there, at least I knew that he was getting quality, professional, safe health care, free of excessive government bureaucracy regulating it and bringing down the quality. I was comforted by that, and I believe American consumers should be.

Vote for health care reform, not lawyer reform.

□ 1030

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mr. WYNN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join the debate on health care reform in America.

On the one hand we have the Democrats' plan, which is patient protection. On the other hand we have the Republican plan, which is basically insurance industry protection. It really amounts to this: When HMOs make health care decisions instead of doctors, they ought to be liable.

When a young man in my district had a bicycle accident, the HMO wanted to make the decision that he not receive the treatment that his doctor recommended. If that young man is disfigured, the HMO ought to pay the cost, and that essentially is the difference in today's debate.

We guarantee patients' rights, because if we cannot enforce a right, it is not really a right, and the way we enforce it is the ability to go into one's State court and say look, the HMO made the decision, the HMO denied the doctor's recommendation, and the HMO ought to be held accountable. That is real HMO reform; that is not what the Republicans want to do.

The reason we need accountability is so that the HMOs have an incentive to do the right thing, listen to the doctors. If we take away the incentive, we take away our ability to enforce our rights. I urge us today to pass real health care reform, not insurance industry protection.

AMERICANS WANT CHOICE IN HEALTH CARE

(Mr. HASTERT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Speaker, we have heard a lot of diatribe over here about health care, but the fact is that what the Republican Party is doing and what we are going to deliver to the American people is for the American people to make the choices of where they want to go on health care.

Also, I think most American people want to be able, if they have a malady or an illness, to get to a doctor's office or get to a hospital. They do not want to take the bypass to the courtroom or, heaven forbid, have to go hire a lawyer before they go get their health care.

Our friends on the other side of the aisle say one has to go to a lawyer, one has to go to a courtroom before they are going to get health care. Most people do not want that. They want to be expedited into the health care provider that they choose to get the health care that they want and to get it as cheaply and affordably and as quickly as possible.

That is exactly what the Republican health care bill does. It expedites people into health care and into the hospital room, not into the courtroom. Our friends on the other side have the Patients' Bill of Rights, and really it is probably the lawyers' right to bill. We do not want to do that. We want to give people good, quick, accessible health care, and that is what this bill does.

SUPREME COURT DECISIONS AND DELIBERATIONS SHOULD BE BASED ON U.S. CONSTITUTION AND U.S. LAWS

(Mr. COBURN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Speaker, regrettably, Reuters this last week reported that several members of the U.S. Supreme Court, on a recent trip to Europe, announced that they would be willing to consider legal arguments based on decisions of the European Court of Justice. Justice Breyer said that American lawyers ''may cite an EU ruling in our court to further a point.'' Justice O'Connor said that she might cite decisions of that court in her future opinions.

Now, I certainly would not want to discourage these Justices from learning all they can about the laws and customs of our European neighbors. As a matter of fact, I would hope all of the members of the Supreme Court will continue to learn as much as they can. Like the rest of us, their knowledge is limited, and wisdom will come from greater and expanded learning.

But I would respectfully remind all of the Justices of the Supreme Court that it is their sworn duty to apply the U.S. Constitution, as written, and the laws of the United States, as written, to the cases that come before them. It is not to bring about some sort of global convergence between the American system of ordered liberty under law and some other system, whether from Europe or elsewhere.

I appreciate the interest of the Justices in comparative law, but I would urge them to keep the distinction in mind.

AMERICANS LOSE OPPORTUNITY TO SAVE FOR EDUCATION

(Mr. FOSSELLA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FOSSELLA. Mr. Speaker, yesterday we got a perfect example and a distinction between right and wrong. In days when so many things become gray, we saw the President with much fanfare sign the IRS reform bill into law; and quietly, in the still of night, he vetoed I think a wonderful piece of legislation that would have empowered parents when it comes to education.

The education bill that passed both the House and Senate would have allowed parents to save as much as $2,000 a year per child in accounts that would earn tax-free interest, to be used for educational expenses from kindergarten through college.

Mr. Speaker, what we have here are two very diametrically opposed philosophies, one that believes that parents and local communities are the ones to determine what is best for their children when it comes to education, and the big bureaucrats, big government, monolithic approach that we know what is best here in Washington.

Sadly, the President vetoed a great opportunity for American parents to save more for their children, to improve their education, and instead,