



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 105th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 144

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JULY 23, 1998

No. 100

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
July 23, 1998.

I hereby designate the Honorable JO ANN EMERSON to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

In addition to all we must know to do our work, all the facts, background, consequences, and magnitude of our action or inaction, we pray, gracious God, that we will also be blessed by the gift of wisdom. We pray that we will know discernment in our thoughts and sound judgement in our decisions as we weigh the worthiness and merit of what we do. We realize that facts and events gain meaning and power when they are blended with prudence and insight. As the scripture tells us, so teach us to number our days that we may get a heart of wisdom. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House her approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms.

DUNN) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. DUNN led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will take 10 one-minutes from each side.

THE WORLD TRADE ORGANIZATION AND AMERICAN SOVEREIGNTY

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, we will soon be debating an amendment which will define what powers the World Trade Organization will have over the ability of the American people, through their elected representatives, to determine our own fate, to make our own laws, to decide our own policies.

Should we sacrifice our sovereignty, our domestic interest in order to satisfy an international tribunal? I think not and I hope that our colleagues will agree. The WTO is selectively challenging our local, State and Federal laws, saying that they are infringements on free trade. No U.S. laws or regulations are safe from the reaches of the World Trade Organization. Even at risk are sanctions laws such as the ones passed by New York City and the States of California and New Jersey which protect Nazi Holocaust victims who had their assets stolen by Swiss banks. The Swiss have already said they want a WTO ruling on such sanctions. Is nothing sacred from the clutches of the WTO? Apparently not.

So along with the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH), the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS), we will be offering an amendment to state that diplomacy does not mean surrender.

REPUBLICAN MANAGED CARE REFORM DOES NOT MEASURE UP

(Mr. STUPAK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. STUPAK. Madam Speaker, tomorrow we are scheduled to begin the debate on the Patients' Bill of Rights. I ask the American people to look at both plans, the Democratic plan and the Republican plan. As you do, you will see point by point the Democratic Patients' Bill of Rights bill is far superior in reform that will guarantee that doctors and patients and not insurance executives will decide your medical future. The right to have protection for women after mastectomies and reconstructive surgery is in the Democratic bill, not in the Republican bill. Democrats provide for a choice of doctor within a plan, access to specialty care, and direct access to OB-GYN for women. These are all parts lacking in the Republican plan.

To enforce your choice, and it is your choice and your access to your doctor, the Democrats allow enforcement in State courts if you are injured by your HMO plan. Why do you need that protection? Because in this country, two groups have immunity. They are HMOs and foreign diplomats. You pay for health insurance. You have the right to demand quality health insurance. Support the Democratic HMO Patients' Bill of Rights.

TRIBUTE TO MARGARET BARNETT

(Mr. SHIMKUS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H6189

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SHIMKUS. Madam Speaker, Mrs. Margaret Barnett has a distinction no other woman in Illinois has. She was the first female high school band director in Illinois. Mrs. Barnett studied piano and received her Bachelor's Degree from Shurtleff College in 1930. She played trombone with the St. Louis Symphony Orchestra and earned a Master of Arts Degree from Washington University in St. Louis, Missouri.

In addition, Mrs. Barnett studied clarinet at the Western Military Academy. Fortunately, Mrs. Barnett did not keep all her musical talent to herself. She taught every child the proper techniques on his or her instrument, leading her bands at Alhambra High School and Bethalto High School to win many contests and awards.

However, music was not the only subject Mrs. Barnett could teach. She taught English, mathematics and Latin at both Alhambra and Bethalto High Schools. She even served as librarian and assistant to the superintendent at Bethalto. Earlier in her career in 1932 she was Vice President of the Illinois State Teachers Association.

I applaud Mrs. Barnett for her dedication to teaching young people. She is definitely a pioneer and an inspiration for women in high school band positions. Most importantly, Mrs. Barnett is a role model for all teachers to follow.

RESULTS OF MANAGED CARE REFORM

(Ms. SANCHEZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. SANCHEZ. Madam Speaker, I rise today to share with my colleagues the success of a forum I hosted in my district on managed care reform. Since I came to Congress, I have listened closely to the managed care reform debate. I have also read the newspapers, I have seen the polls, and I have heard the horror stories.

This past weekend I did what every Member of this Congress should do, I heard from my communities. I learned that my communities do want reform and do want some type of Patients' Bill of Rights. They want Congress to initiate reform and to keep the interest of the patients in mind.

My constituents believe that HMOs are the future of health care, but they want to make sure that care is put above profits. Any bill that we pass is going to affect each one of these people, millions of Americans and thousands of Orange County residents.

Now, we may have to take some votes this week on the managed care bill offered by the Republicans. Let me tell you, they are not very happy about that bill. But before you decide to vote for any bill, I want to encourage my colleagues to host similar forums in their districts. By listening to your

constituents, you will learn what changes are really needed. It is time that we give our constituents a voice before their choice is taken away.

2000 CENSUS

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

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Madam Speaker, today on the House floor we plan to debate the Commerce, State and Justice appropriations bill. Funding for the constitutionally mandated census in the year 2000 is an issue that the American people will soon be hearing a lot more about.

First let me remind my Democratic colleagues of a provision in the U.S. Constitution that they routinely ignore in their discussions of the census. Because I know that Democrats are not in the habit of carrying around the Constitution with them, I will make their life easier by quoting Article I, Section 2 from the document to which you swore an oath:

The actual enumeration shall be made within 3 years after the first meeting of the Congress of the United States, and within every subsequent term of 10 years, in such manner as they shall by law direct.

Now, despite the liberal Democrat habit of finding things in the Constitution, there is no getting around the words that are there for all to see. "Actual enumeration" no matter how you slice it means exactly what it says. Congress shall by law direct an actual count, not an approximate guess, poll or sample. Period.

DEMOCRATIC PATIENTS' BILL OF RIGHTS VERSUS REPUBLICAN INSURERS' BILL OF RIGHTS

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

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, this week we will be voting on a Patients' Bill of Rights, something that all our constituents want. The Republican plan as put forth in the House does not do anything, does not protect people, and I think it is time to take a look at the difference between the Democratic plan and the Republican plan.

The Republican plan fails to protect every American in a private insurance plan. Their plan only applies to 50 million people and leaves everyone else out in the cold. The Democratic Patients' Bill of Rights protects at least 140 million people, every American who is covered by a private insurance plan.

The Republican plan does not return health care decisions to health care professionals and their patients. The Democratic Patients' Bill of Rights does. The Republican plan does not guarantee patients the right to see a specialist when they need to do so. The Democratic Patients' Bill of Rights does. The Republican plan does not

allow for access to OB-GYN for all women or emergency room coverage for all patients. The Democratic Patients' Bill of Rights does. The Republican plan does not hold insurance companies responsible for their actions denying patients the care they need. The Democratic Patients' Bill of Rights does.

When you stack the two up, Madam Speaker, there is no comparison. The Democratic Patients' Bill of Rights protects the American people, guarantees access to health care, and guarantees that this coverage will be there for all Americans. The Republican plan is just a public relations gimmick and a sham.

VOTE TO OVERRIDE VETO OF BAN ON PARTIAL-BIRTH ABORTION

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

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, today is the day that the House will vote to override the veto of the partial-birth abortion ban. I want to illustrate here why President Clinton's position is the extremist position. This is a baby that could be born. But let me show you what happens. The doctor reaches in and turns this baby around so that the baby is born breech first. The head is still within the birth canal. Then at this time, the doctor inserts scissors into the back of the neck of the baby and then puts a suction tube in to suck out the brains of a live baby. Do you think this baby does not have pain and feel pain? This is a baby that could be delivered as a live baby boy or girl.

We need to vote to override this veto of the partial-birth abortion ban which is a horrific procedure in America.

SUPPORT THE DEMOCRATIC PATIENTS' BILL OF RIGHTS

(Mr. FAZIO of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. FAZIO of California. Madam Speaker, I rise today to remind my colleagues about the real priorities of managed care reform. A woman from the Sacramento community I represent has waged a 4-year battle with her former employer and its self-insured ERISA plan. This woman is in court because her firm denied her care for her 7-year-old son born with a spinal cord injury facing many of the same challenges as actor Christopher Reeves. The law that shields employers who self-insure from accepting responsibility for denied medical services leaves this family with no health care for their son. When the plan started to refuse coverage, this woman had to choose between a job she was good at and enjoyed and the well-being of her child. So she quit her job to give her child nursing care 24 hours a day. But without this income, the family was forced into bankruptcy and lost its business.