EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

PATIENT PROTECTION ACT OF 1998

SPEECH OF

HON. GLENN POSHARD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 24, 1998

Mr. POSHARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to oppose H.R. 4250, the Republican Patient Protection Act. We have the opportunity to institute real change today, and to give the citizens of this country the peace of mind that comes with knowing that their health plan is working with them, not against them. In particular, we should act to protect and promote the interests of women's health. The Dingell/Ganske bill provides guarantees, the Republican bill offers HMO-controlled possibilities. I urge my colleagues to support the Democratic alternative, H.R. 3605, the Patient's Bill of Rights.

Only the Democratic Patients' Bill of Rights would require health plans to cover a hospital stay of at least 48 hours for women undergoing a mastectomy, and at least 24 hours for women having a lumpectomy with lymph node dissection. Furthermore, only the Democratic Patients' Bill of Rights would require health plans that provide coverage for mastectomies to also cover prostheses or reconstructive breast surgery. The Republican bill would not allow patients to continue seeing their physician if that physician leaves the plan or their employer changes plans. The Democratic legislation would allow patients to continue treatment with their current physician for 90 days, and longer for pregnant women. How can we tell a woman in the fourth month of her pregnancy that she has to find a new doctor if her current physician leaves her health plan? I ask you to consider the health of your wives, mothers, daughters, and sisters. I ask you to consider the health of your female constituents. Do you want health to be jeopardized or do you want to give them access to the health care they deserve?

Mr. Speaker, perhaps the most fundamental aspect of the patients' rights debate is that of the gag clause. Simply put, patients should have access to all necessary information concerning their health and medical options. The Republican bill makes this promise, but offers no protection for providers from retribution from their health plan when dispensing this critical knowledge. Without this safeguard, the gag clause is truly an empty promise. Only the Democratic Patients' Bill of Rights makes this guarantee, the Republican bill does not. For my colleagues who are concerned with women's health and the basic premises of HMO reform, I again urge you to vote for the Dingell/Ganske bill.

RECOGNIZING THE CHRISTIAN CHILDRENS FUND

HON. TOM BLILEY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 27, 1998

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like take an opportunity to identify an organization headquarted in Richmond, Virginia that has been extremely successful in bringing hope to the world's poor.

Christian Children's Fund (CCF) serves the needs of 2.5 million children in 31 countries throughout the world, including the United States. CCF began assisting children through the Moda Kane Project in Senegal in 1988. Since that time, they have provided over $199,000 of assistance to this project. Christian Children's Fund currently assists 654 families through the Moda Kane Project.

In 1988, the Moda Kane school had only 6 classrooms and very little educational activity to support the book work. Christian Children's Fund has added 7 classrooms, constructed a medical hut and employed a community health worker, provided teaching materials for the whole school, and provided school supplies for all Christian Children's Fund children.

This Christian Children's Fund project has had great impact on the school and community including:

The number of children who pass the primary school exam and earn their certificate for successful primary school completion has improved from 39% to 83%;

The number of children passing the secondary school entrance exam also increased;

The school headmaster has been recognized for his excellence; and

Families in the region are very interested in enrolling their children in the Moda Kane school.

The Moda Kane School has now become a focus of community development activity. In addition to classes for children, Christian Children's Fund has initiated a literacy program in the national language and a small loan program for women.

I salute CCF for the efforts they are making abroad and wish to identify them as being successful in their efforts to bring hope to a troubled world.

PATIENT PROTECTION ACT OF 1998

SPEECH OF

HON. ANNE M. NORTHUP

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 24, 1998

Mrs. NORTHUP. Mr. Speaker, our discussion on health care is extremely important, especially to residents in Kentucky. For the last few weeks, I have received calls and letters from patients stating that they want me to protect their rights to have health care—affordable health care. You see, Kentucky residents know what it is like to have very few choices in health care, to only have two insurers left in the state to offer health plans, and they know what it is like to have their health care premiums go through the roof. Well-meaning, but very poorly thought-out mandate-laden legislation on the state level created a monster they must face every day. We cannot have that happen nationwide.

Kentucky residents have told me they must have affordable health care. The Republican bill which passed the House last Friday, H.R. 4250, improves a patient's access to affordable health care and protects patients against abuses in the delivery of care. The bill allows employees to direct their health care benefits toward the coverage they deem most appropriate for themselves—if they want to have chiropractic care, they can choose a plan that offers these benefits. In addition, the bill makes Medical Savings Accounts a more attractive option, and permits individuals to participate in a Flexible Spending Account similar to the option currently provided to Kentucky state employees. The bill also would enable more small businesses to provide affordable health care coverage to their employees, an option which is not available right now.

Patients also deserve to know that they can get quality health care when they need it. That is why H.R. 4250 guarantees women direct access to OB/GYN care and allows parents to have direct access to pediatricians so that they can get the care they need as soon as necessary. The bill prohibits health plans from restricting physicians from giving advice to a patient about the best medical treatment for that patient and requires health plans to provide information about their plans to patients, and allows patients to inspect their medical records.

No one should argue with the fact that medical dollars should go strictly to medicine—not to administration of the plans and not to lawyers. Talking to my constituents, they have told me they want health care not court action. If their child is ill, they want them to see a doctor for care, not a lawyer. H.R. 4250 requires plans to provide written and understandable notice to patients of any negative coverage decision within 30 days (for emergencies or specialty care—72 hours); it allows patients to appeal a decision internally with a doctor who did not make the initial decision; and permits patients to request an external review within 30 days with one or more independent medical experts.

This bill is about protecting the rights of patients to have affordable quality health care. It is the right bill for the 42 million Americans who currently have no insurance, and it is the right bill for those who currently have health insurance. It will provide more opportunities, more choices, and more patient control over health care decisions. It is a bill for children, women and families in Kentucky and throughout our nation.

TRIBUTE TO LOUIS STOKES

SPEECH OF

HON. TONY P. HALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 23, 1998

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to the dean of the Ohio delegation, my good friend Representative LOUIS STOKES. LOU has served his constituents in Cuyahoga County with enormous distinction for the past 30 years. When he retires after the November election, he will be sorely missed. It has been an honor for me to serve with him for the past two decades.

LOU has been a member of the Appropriations Committee for 28 years and was the Chairman and then Ranking Member of its Subcommittee on VA, HUD and Independent Agencies. He is a former Chairman of the House Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, the House Intelligence Committee, and the Special Committee which investigated the assassinations of President John F. Kennedy and the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. In all of these posts, he served with dedication, dignity and fairness.

LOU STOKES was the first African American elected to Congress from the State of Ohio. He was also the first African American to serve on the Appropriations Committee. He was one of the founders of the Congressional Black Caucus.

LOU has never forgotten his roots. Because he grew up in public housing, he knows that public housing need not breed despair and hopelessness. He served in the Army during World War II, and as a result has been a steadfast proponent in behalf of the interests of our Nation's veterans. He used the GI Bill to obtain a legal education and became a distinguished lawyer who argued and won a case before the United States Supreme Court.

In Congress, he has fought untiringly to provide legal protection for the poor through the Legal Services Corporation. He has sponsored landmark legislation in education such as the Federal TRIO programs for disadvantaged students, and in health to improve the delivery of health care services to minorities.

Just earlier this week, President Clinton signed into law a bill that LOU sponsored to establish the National Underground Railroad Network to Freedom within the National Park Service.

LOU comes from an illustrious family. His brother Carl was the first African-American mayor of Cleveland and he was Ambassador to the Seychelles. His daughter Angela is continuing the family tradition by being elected as a judge.

I shall miss LOU. I wish him, his wife Jay, his four children and his seven grandchildren the best of luck in the future.

CONGRESSIONAL RECOGNITION OF DON D. SYKORA

HON. SHEILA JACKSON-LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 27, 1998

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Mr. Don A. Sykora, whose contributions to the city of Houston and its citizens will not be forgotten. Mr. Sykor's personal dedication to Harris County spanned over 40 years, during which epoch he served as benefactor in both the business and civic sectors of society. Mr. Sykora's exemplary dedication and selflessness provide a beacon to which all should fervently strive.

Don Sykora was most notably known for his extensive tenure with the Houston Lighting and Power Company, which began in 1956. His service to the HL and P, and later Houston Industries, displayed his prowess as an executive, displaying incredible vision throughout his stay. An example of his ground breaking leadership came amidst the energy/oil crisis of the 1970's. As Vice President of Marketing for Houston Lighting and Power, Mr. Sykora passionately advocated the need for energy conservation long before environmentally conscious behavior became fashionable. It was this visionary guidance that garnered him the highest positions of authority within both organizations for which he worked. He ascended to the position of President both with the Houston Lighting and Power Company and at Houston Industries, in 1982 and 1983 respectively.

Mr. Don Sykora's contributions to Houston cannot be restricted to those in the business arena, for any time not spent at his executive positions, was dedicated to his family and community. Mr. Sykora's civic dedication to his environment ranged from his position on the Chamber of Commerce to his work with the Houston International Festival.

Don Sykora's tireless resolve and contributions to the improvement of his community for posterity, deserve the utmost praise and recognition. On behalf of the citizens of Harris county and the United States of America, I thank Don Sykora.

INTRODUCTION OF THE MEDICARE HOME HEALTH BENEFICIARY PROTECTION ACT OF 1998

HON. NICK RAHALL

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 27, 1998

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the Medicare Home Health Beneficiary Protection Act of 1998, on behalf of myself, and Mr. MERRILL COOK of Utah, Mr. BOB WISE of West Virginia, and Mr. J.C. WATTS of Oklahoma.

Last November I introduced another bill linked to changes made in the way home health agencies would be reimbursed for services they provide to homebound seniors and other frail and disabled persons, in their homes, by the Medicare program.

The bill I introduced late last year is called the Medicare Venipuncture Fairness Act, H.R. 2912, and it seeks to restore a home health benefit known as venipuncuture—the drawing of blood samples—to Medicare enrollees who were receiving this care provided by home health providers, in consultation with the patient's own physicians. This home benefit, so important to the stability of homebound patients, was terminated by the Balanced Budget Act of 1997. As a result, many former venipuncture patients have entered nursing homes, and hospitals, and some have died from having their health and well-being compromised because of the loss of this vital service.

Today, I find myself again trying to assist the home health agencies and their needy patients, by introducing a three year moratorium on the Interim Payment System—or IPS—also imposed on the industry under the BBA of 1997.

Under the BBA, the Health Care Financing Administration, or HCFA, was directed by Congress to replace cost-based reimbursement for home health services with Prospective Payment System (PPS), to become effective in October, 1999. This Interim Payment System (IPS) was imposed while HCFA prepares to implement the PPS late next year, imposing new per beneficiary caps on home health agencies. HCFA Administrator Nancy-Ann Min DeParle has recently stated that her agency cannot meet the PPS deadline of October 1999.

While there is no question of the importance of providing a transitioning procedure for home health benefits into a PPS, to ensure that all such agencies are cost-effective as they deliver services to the homebound, usually elderly, frail patients, it is our solemn duty to also protect eligible, elderly Medicare beneficiaries.

It is quite evident to me that the current IPS, coupled with HCFAs interpretation of the surety bond status, is gravely threatening access to these invaluable services throughout our nation. Quite simply, the IPS is fatally flawed.

While we all seek to drive out those who would deceive and defraud the elderly and the Medicare Program, by devious, fly-by-night home health providers, I am deeply concerned about a punitive IPS, which is now in effect, which is driving good, caring, quality providers out of business. Nationwide, over 1000 home health providers have closed or stopped accepting Medicare patients. There are few resources available to former patients except nursing facilities, which are much more expensive but which Medicare does not have to pay for, or emergency rooms at local hospitals if a beneficiary's health destabilizes—another expense that must be borne by Medicare.

Since last November I have sought intervention from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, the President, and among my colleagues, urging them to take action to stop the demonizing of home health providers by allowing HCFA to continue to misinterpret the intent of Congress, and to continue to impose more and more punitive measures upon the home health care industry.

Since last November I have sought to impress upon my colleagues, HHS and the White House, that HCFA is over-regulating these industries a majority of which are caring providers. Yet HCFA continues its arrogant disregard for Congressional intent, and our constituents—the elderly, the frail, the disabled—leaving them to find other sources of care as agency after agency is forced out of business.

Today, let me say again that fraud and abuse in the Medicare system must be ended—but it is also noteworthy that in its zeal to find criminals, HCFA appears to have written and enforced regulations that treat all providers as criminals or potential criminals.

It is time for Congress to now impose a moratorium on the IPS. My bill not only accomplishes this equitable goal, but it also puts

pressure on HCFA to move expeditiously toward the establishment of PPS for home care.

A study conducted by the George Washington University Medical Center, Center for Health Policy Research, entitled ''Medicare Home Health Services; An Analysis of the Implications of the BBA of 1997 for Access and Quality,'' confirms why Congress must take expedited action in removing the IPS.

Just briefly, the Study concluded that (1) the BBA's reductions in Medicare's Home Health coverage and financing can be expected to impact the sickest and highest cost patients, and punish the very agencies that specialize in the provision of care to this population; (2) the most severe effects of the IPS falls on the sickest patients living in states with the lowest utilization patterns (as is true in my State of West Virginia); and (3) the BBA's interim payment system will shift costs to other payers (notably Medicaid) while rewarding inefficient agencies who care for relatively healthier patients.

So it is not only beneficiaries and providers who are alerting a sleeping Congress to the devastation of this IPS system, but outside experts are also telling us that we must revisit this issue.

While the IPS approach is a short-term solution, it has serious consequences for many vulnerable patients and honest providers.

For that reason, last Friday, June 24, 1998, Senator CHRISTOPHER BOND introduced an identical bill to the one I and my colleagues introduce today. I salute him for quickly recognizing that the IPS is a serious—very serious—problem and for acting at once.

Mr. Speaker, ensuring that home health care agencies, both profit and not-for-profit, can continue operating as the high quality health care providers they are, will require the cooperation of Congress, the agencies themselves, HCFA, HHS and the White House.

But Congress has the power to fix the IPS problem, and it must take expedited action to do so. We truly must not stand by while thousands of home health agencies shut down. It seems to me to be in our best interest to maintain and support those who are not only specialist in caring for the aged, the infirm, the severely disabled, but to heap upon them the high praise they deserve and have earned for the work they do, both in the name of compassion and out of a sense of responsibility toward the home health care needs of senior citizens.

CELEBRATING THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF TURKEY RUN FARM PARK

HON. JAMES P. MORAN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 27, 1998

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, this year is the 25th anniversary of what has become one of the most unusual and successful experiments in the U.S. National Park System. It is a National Park that owes its existence to public-spirited entrepreneurism in a cooperative effort which demonstrates what can be accomplished by the determination, resourcefulness, and ingenuity of private citizens committed to a cause about which they care deeply. The Claude Moore Colonial Farm at Turkey Run flourishes today as an example of a public-private partnership between citizens and government that utilizes the best both have to offer.

The park was created in 1973 and was called Turkey Run Farm Park, and its purpose was to portray the home of a family of ordinary means in 1771—a counter-balance to the 18th century historic plantations of the more well-to-do. A citizen's group formed the non-profit Friends of Turkey Run Farm in 1981. The Friends negotiated a long-term lease with the Park Service, matched a $250,000 endowment gift from Dr. Claude Moore, and changed the name to the Claude Moore Colonial Farm at Turkey Run. The group has successfully managed the Farm since 1981 as the first privately funded and operated Park in the National Park system.

The Farm has achieved national recognition for its innovative educational programming which reaches over 50,000 people a year, including thousands of students in the Washington area. The Farm provides a visual benchmark, against which the many changes that have occurred since the 1770s can be put into perspective, leading to a better understanding of where we were then, who we are now, and what we may become. ''The farther back you look,'' Winston Churchill is reported to have said, ''the further ahead you can see.'' The Farm's motto is similar: ''AMERICA—To see where we are going, see where we've been!''

Well over half the Farm's total current income is generated from self-supporting programs. More than one-fourth of their revenue comes from fundraising events. Together these accounts for about 85 percent of their annual income, with endowment funds and grants making up the rest. In September 1995 the Farm suffered a devastating loss when their replica 18th century farmhouse was destroyed by fire. A massive fundraising effort was launched to rebuild it. That effort has now been successfully completed. The new farmhouse was finished and ready for visitors in April, a testimony to the level of interest and commitment elicited by the farm from its supporters.

Mr. Speaker, the Farm has remained open, against all the odds, because of the support of those who appreciate what it has given and continues to provide to the local community, the National Capitol region, and the Nation. It is a true public/private partnership which has grown stronger with the years, and as we celebrate the 25th birthday of the Claude Moore Colonial Farm at Turkey Run, we wish them many happy returns.

PATIENT PROTECTION ACT OF 1998

SPEECH OF

HON. PETER DEUTSCH

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 24, 1998

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4250 is an ineffective attempt to solve the real problems and concerns of the American people. The legislation fails to achieve real managed care reform by allowing insurers to selectively choose specific geographic areas to limit enrollment. This approach will inevitably segment the market, removing the healthy from the general insurance pool and leaving the remainder with increasingly unaffordable premiums.

H.R. 4250 also fails to provide patients with information on benefits, cost-sharing, access to services, and grievance and appeals. It fails to provide an internal quality assurance program and fails to allow for an effective mechanism for accountability. In short, H.R. 4250 fails the American people.

The Republican leadership bill is simply a cosmetic approach toward enacting real patient protections. We must enact strong, common sense measures which include critical protections for all privately insured Americans. We must strengthen federal enforcement to ensure compliance, and increase access to affordable, high quality care. Again, H.R. 4250 fails the American people on each of these counts.

Mr. Speaker, only through bi-partisan consensus can we achieve meaningful reform. As Congress continues to work toward this goal, I look forward to supporting truly bi-partisan proposals that addresses patient concerns honestly and expands health care options for all Americans.

TRIBUTE TO J. CAMERON WADE

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 27, 1998

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I stand today to pay tribute to a constituent, Mr. J. Cameron Wade, better known as J.C. Wade of Irving, Texas who was awarded a long-awaited Bronze Star medal and restoration of rank for his valiant service to our country during World War II.

Mr. Wade and four other African-American veterans of WWII were finally recognized for their heroic participation in the U.S. Army fighting both the scourge of segregation and Adolf Hitler. On Thursday, July 23rd, 1998, Mr. Wade was officially recognized for his efforts to halt fascism and tyranny and protect freedom for the United States and the entire world.

Unfortunately, Mr. Wade's contribution to our country was overlooked for many years. While history recorded the service of thousands of soldiers, Mr. Wade and other black servicemen were literally erased from those annals of history. Indeed, they fought, and some died alongside white soldiers until the war in Europe came to a close in May 1945.

However, Mr. Speaker, their work was neither acknowledged or rewarded. After their WWII service, they did not find a warm welcome or gracious thanks. Instead, African-American soldiers found an Army that returned to the practices of segregation. Because of the Army's return to segregation, those African-American soldiers were refused restoration of their rank status. These were soldiers like Mr. Wade, a sergeant who volunteered to be demoted to the status of private in order to fight on the battlefield for his country.

Mr. Speaker, even worse was the fact that soldiers like Mr. Wade found that their discharge petitions omitted their combat service. These warriors were truly forgotten. In addition, upon their leaving the service, no one bothered to inform them that the Bronze Stars were available to them for service in the combat infantry.

Mr. Speaker, we all agree that Mr. Wade and his colleagues were directly slighted and

insulted. Their contributions were ignored, the Army refused to restore their rank and withheld information about the medals they deserve.

As Mr. Wade said about the Army, "When they enticed us to volunteer, they said that the units we were going into would be our permanent units when the war was over." However, this did not happen. Simply put, they were misled.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Wade endured years of misinformation and dishonesty by his Army, by his Government. While it is late, it is fitting that last Thursday, the 50th anniversary of President Truman's order to integrate the military, Mr. Wade was finally awarded his Bronze Star and had his rank restored.

I would like to join our military in congratulating and honoring Mr. Wade. I join with a military that has changed for the better because individuals like Mr. Wade proved their worth and ability on the battlefield. Our servicemen and women of color can stand tall and move through their ranks because of people like Mr. Wade. We all offer him our thanks and gratitude. Most importantly, we all join our military in recognizing his being awarded the Bronze Star and being restored to the rank of sergeant.

REGARDING THE UNITED STATES-JAPAN INSURANCE AGREEMENT

HON. SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 27, 1998

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask to insert into the RECORD the following Memorandum which the American Family Life Assurance Company ("AFLAC"), a Georgia company, has submitted to Ambassador Barshevsky, the United States Trade Representative.

The United States Trade Representative will be leading an interagency review process to consider her decision regarding a violation of the United States-Japan Insurance Agreement.

She has asked that submission be made to her office, and I think it appropriate to share with the House the AFLAC submission, which I know will be of interest to many both inside and outside the insurance industry.

MEMORANDUM

To: Interagency Task Force on Yasuda Fire & Marine's Activities in the Third Sector
From: Alan Wm. Wolff, Charles D. Lake II
Date: July 27, 1998
Re: Scope of Review and Copies of AFLAC's Submissions

Yasuda Fire & Marine Co., Ltd. has entered the third sector and has caused and is causing ''radical change'' in the business environment of the third sector. Therefore, in response to a request from the Office of the U.S. Trade Representative, we are pleased to submit on behalf of American Family Life Assurance Company of Columbus (''AFLAC'') additional copies of our submissions regarding Yasuda Fire & Marine's activities in violation of the U.S.-Japan Insurance Agreement.

The interagency review of Yasuda Fire & Marine's activities should be conducted on the basis of the primary object and purpose of the U.S.-Japan Insurance Agreement, which is enhancing U.S. market access in Japan. The U.S.-Japan Insurance Agreement is designed to promote liberalization of the Japanese insurance market by preserving the third sector until the primary first and second sectors have been liberalized by the Government of Japan. To achieve this objective, the Japanese Government agreed to provide a ''stand-still'' in the third sector, until the primary first and second sectors have been liberalized.

''Stand-still'' means that giant Japanese insurance companies such as Yasuda Fire & Marine are currently not permitted to enter the third sector (i.e., stand-alone cancer or medical market) or cause ''radical change in the business environment'' of the third sector. This commitment is premised on the fact that these giant Japanese companies have been the principal beneficiaries of the highly protected primary sector in Japan. The basic bargain struck under the agreement is that until companies like Yasuda are forced to face international competition in the primary sector, giant Japanese companies would not be allowed to penetrate the third sector. The U.S.-Japan Insurance Agreement is about one thing and one thing only, that is, access to the Japanese market for the sale of insurance.

It is essential that the interagency task force conduct its review of Yasuda Fire & Marine's activities in the third sector of the Japanese market by examining the evidence based on the object, purpose, and specific requirements of the agreement. A single, narrow focus on the question of whether CIGNA ''controls'' INA Himawari does not provide an appropriate basis for review of the available evidence and relevant issues. Yasuda Fire & Marine's activities in the third sector pose an unprecedented trade policy challenge to the United States with respect to its ability to enforce its trade agreements. It involves a clever scheme by a giant Japanese company to use its previously unsuccessful joint-venture partner both as a sword and shield to circumvent a trade agreement. Accordingly, we urge the interagency task force to consider the following facts:

Yasuda announced its agreement to buy majority ownership of INA Life, CIGNA's unsuccessful subsidiary, in August 1996.

Yasuda renamed the subsidiary INA Himawari (''Sunflower'') to add the Yasuda corporate symbol to the name of the subsidiary to provide public identification of the entity as part of Yasuda.

Yasuda covered INA Himawari promotional materials in sunflowers to further establish in the public's mind that INA Himawari products were Yasuda policies.

Yasuda transferred 10,000 of its agents to INA Himawari to sell third sector products, and there is a potential for approximately 60,000 additional Yasuda agents to be transferred.

Yasuda has linked its proprietary computer sales systems, integrating its new ''subsidiary'' into its database, thus enabling the two companies to provide a seamless line of insurance products.

Yasuda represented to its agents that INA Himawari was in fact its subsidiary.

Yasuda's agents acting through INA Himawari targeted AFLAC's policy holders for replacement sales.

Yasuda used its keiretsu links to further extend policies into the third sector.

Yasuda cross-subsidized the sale of INA Himawari products by offering its agents special incentives rewarding aggressive sales of INA Himawari products.

Yasuda violated Japanese law in several regards in selling these policies in the third sector. Yasuda agents:

Offered rebates to new policy holders;

Misrepresented INA Himawari as a Yasuda subsidiary;

Conducted inappropriate product comparisons; and

Provided inappropriate information on AFLAC's cash surrender refund amounts.

Without agreeing to sell off their companies, change their corporate names and identities, take on platoons of outside managers, and disclose proprietary information, it is impossible for AFLAC or other foreign companies to enter into similar arrangements with other giant Japanese insurance companies. The transfer of Yasuda's agents to INA Himawari is the direct result of CIGNA's withdrawal from the life sector. It is impossible for other foreign companies dedicated to staying in the Japanese market to commit to such arrangements.

As Yasuda Fire & Marine's penetration of the third sector continues, foreign firms have been and are currently denied opportunities accorded to Yasuda and other giant Japanese insurance companies in the primary life and non-life sectors.

We further urge the interagency task force to consider among other things the following issues:

Are Yasuda Fire & Marine's activities in the third sector consistent with the object and purpose of the U.S.-Japan Insurance Agreement?

Has Yasuda Fire & Marine entered the third sector or has it caused or is it causing ''radical change'' in the business environment of the third sector?

Does participation in ownership by a U.S. entity in a joint-venture provide a blanket exemption for the Japanese partner from the agreement's provisions?

Has Yasuda Fire & Marine or INA Himawari engaged in activities designed to mislead agents and consumers into thinking that INA Himawari is Yasuda's subsidiary or a functional member of Yasuda keiretsu?

CIGNA is disinvesting from the Japanese market and seeking to increase its exit price by taking advantage of the U.S.-Japan Insurance Agreement. Are CIGNA's actions consistent with the U.S. objective to improve market access?

Does permitting Yasuda Fire & Marine to continue its activities in the third sector through INA Himawari promote U.S. market access to the Japanese insurance market?

When a prima facie case of a trade violation is presented, and a responding company has exclusive possession of certain relevant information, the burden of production should shift to that responding party. Further, if that responding party refuses to cooperate and provide the necessary information to conduct an impartial review, an adverse inference should be used against that party.

The interagency task force's decision should promote market access in Japan and discourage other Japanese companies from using their U.S. joint-venture partner to circumvent U.S.-Japan trade agreements.

CONGRESSIONAL RECOGNITION OF DON HORN

HON. SHEILA JACKSON-LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 27, 1998

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Don A. Horn, whose dedication to the labor movement and community of Houston deserve the utmost praise and admiration. From his extended tenure with the AFL–CIO in Harris County to the innumerable charity's and non-profit organizations he faithfully served, Mr. Horn's selfless

resolve to improve his environment serves as an example to us all.

Mr. Horn is most notably recognized for his extended service on the Executive Board of the Harris County AFL–CIO, where he occupied the position of Secretary-Treasurer for over thirty years. During this epoch, Mr. Horn concurrently served on the Texas AFL–CIO Executive Board as a trustee for over a decade.

Mr. Horn's merit, however, cannot be constrained to his mere occupational accomplishments. In the community, Don selflessly served a myriad of underprivileged and needy individuals in a multitude of capacities. Mr. Horn's altruistic efforts ranged from his extended service on the Harris County Hospital Board to his efforts to increase electoral participation among under-represented minority groups. Mr. Horn also volunteered countless hours to the United Way, serving on its Houston Area Board for several years, as well as the local chapter of the Boy Scouts of America. Today, Mr. Horn remains an active member of the community, serving on the City of Houston's Ethics Committee.

I sincerely commend, and thank, Mr. Don Horn on behalf of the city of Houston and its people for his accomplishments, his dedication, and for his efforts to improve his community for posterity.

HONORING BOB VOGEL

HON. JON D. FOX

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 27, 1998

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to salute an outstanding citizen of Pennsylvania's 13th Congressional District, Bob Vogel, on his selection as a member of the Abington Senior High School Hall of Fame.

Following his graduation in 1962, Bob went on to Princeton and then Yale Law School, following which he has had a distinguished career in business and law. He is currently Vice President and General Counsel of Rohm and Haas Company, whose world headquarters for research is in Spring House, Montgomery County.

Bob was nominated for this honor by his long-time friend, and mine, Ken Davis of Gladwyne, Montgomery County. Ken and Bob went through the Abington Township school system together, following which Ken served with distinction as Administrative Assistant to the late U.S. Senator from Pennsylvania, Hugh Scott. Ken then served as Director of Government Relations for Rohm and Haas Company. He now heads his own government relations consulting firm in Ardmore, Montgomery County, and is President of the Lower Merion Township Board of Commissioners.

I extend my heartiest congratulations to Bob Vogel on this memorable achievement.

PATIENT PROTECTION ACT OF 1998

HON. LANE EVANS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 27, 1998

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to defeat this rule.

Yesterday, I appeared before the Rules Committee. I urged the Committee to make in order an amendment I proposed to offer to H.R. 4250. My amendment would authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to reimburse veterans enrolled in the veterans health care system for the cost of emergency care or services received in non-Department of Veterans Affairs facilities. My amendment is similar to H.R. 3702, the Veterans' Access to Emergency Health Care Act, which I introduced earlier this year.

Under the Evans amendment, veterans enrolled in the VA health care system would be reimbursed for the cost of emergency care they receive from a non-VA facility when there is a ''serious threat to life or the health of a veteran.''

The legislation we are considering today attempts to write into law certain basic health care protections, including emergency care protections, for millions of Americans not enrolled in the VA health care system. My amendment, which was blocked by the Rules Committee, would have afforded similar protections for the millions of American veterans who receive their health care from the VA.

Yesterday's action by the Rules Committee is a disservice to American veterans, and comes on the heels of another successful—but misguided—Republican effort to strip away compensation benefits from veterans who became addicted to tobacco while in the military. In the apparent view of the Republican leadership, veterans should have known better than to become addicted to nicotine while in the service, despite the obvious role played by our government and the tobacco companies to facilitate smoking by service members.

As yesterday's Rules Committee action suggests, veterans apparently should also have known better than to get sick and require emergency medical care outside a VA hospital.

This Congress has no conscience when it comes to issues of significance to our American veterans. Without my amendment, low-income, or service-connected disabled veterans who rely on VA for their health care needs would be provided no basic protections for emergency medical care. It's just not right, and it's a slap in the face to the men and women who have risked their lives in defense of our nation and the values we hold so dear.

I urge my colleagues to stand up for our veterans and vote against this rule.

FOREIGN AID

HON. BERNARD SANDERS

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 27, 1998

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have printed in the RECORD statements by high school students from my home state of Vermont, who were speaking at my recent town meeting on issues facing young people today. I am asking that you please insert these statements in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as I believe that the views of these young people will benefit my colleagues.

STATEMENT BY ANGELA DEBLASIO AND LYNNE CLOUGH REGARDING FOREIGN AID

ANGELA DEBLASIO. Foreign aid is an essential part of the United States' annual budget. This aid to less fortunate nations helps to alleviate famine and the effects of disasters. It promotes agricultural and industrial production. It also provides U.S. know-how for basic health, education and housing needs, while rewarding governments for embracing American ideals and interests.

Foreign aid is not just money. The United States aid program consists of development, economic, military and food assistance. Development assistance provides training and advice in all areas. Economic support contributes to the political stability and economic strength. Military aid provides grants and credits for the purchase of weapons, along with training and advice for the forces. Food aid is free or reduced-price agricultural products.

One of the great historical successes of American foreign aid was the Marshal Plan.

LYNNE CLOUGH. World War II left many scars in Western Europe and the United States. Secretary of State George Marshal proposed a plan that would not only help Western Europe overcome poverty and resist temptations of communism, but help Americans keep their jobs and offer more opportunities.

This plan became known as the Marshal Plan. We sent over tons of goods and money to Western Europe. Then, in turn, Western Europe bought our products, which gave Americans jobs. Giving U.S. aid prevented Western Europe from falling under the influence of communism and it gave us protection from the Soviet Union.

Aid to foreign countries has expanded over the past few years.

ANGELA DEBLASIO. For the past 37 years, Peace Corps volunteers have worked together with the people of Africa and other nations around the world. Today, Peace Corps volunteers contribute to grassroots development projects in education, business, the environment and health. They establish forest conservation plans and find alternatives to wood as a source of food.

Volunteers work to involve people in protecting endangered wildlife species and recycling projects. Peace Corps volunteers help individuals in developing nations to learn the skills necessary to help themselves.

The best example of how the United States gains from foreign aid is the country of Russia. The U.S. is currently giving aid to the Russians. The American taxpayers are definitely getting their money's worth. They are helping to bring banking experts, legal experts, business experts, and political scientists to the nation of Russia and create a free democratic society based on free enterprise. Also, American tax dollars are paying to help the nations of the former Soviet Union safely dismantle nuclear weapons once pointed at the United States. American aid is also helping to ensure that the nuclear materials do not fall into the hands of terrorists during these potentially dangerous times.

LYNNE CLOUGH. ''Why spend our money on foreign aid?'' That is a question many of us ask. As you just heard, foreign aid helps America prosper. Foreign aid is only one percent of our annual budget and is a very good investment. It provides security by aiding our allies and sets up good trading partners. Giving aid is also a way to deal with problems when they are small, and perhaps prevent future conflict.

STATEMENT BY NATALIE ROSS REGARDING STUDENT DRINKING AND DRIVING

NATALIE ROSS. Good afternoon. I will have to be quite honest with you: Many of the issues that I was going to speak about today have already been brought up with the student drinking and driving.

CONGRESSMAN SANDERS. That doesn't make them less important for you to bring them up.

NATALIE ROSS. Recently, as you can tell by today, we had many people who brought up many concerns about how advertisers influence us, and many different things—we were reminded of the tragedy up in Newport, which, unfortunately, claimed two of my very close friends.

I feel there is a message that we're sending to our youth that is not totally appropriate. It has been engraved in our brains for the longest time not to drink and drive, but I think that message is totally appropriate for adults who are of age, because they have the right to drink. But I think we are only fighting the battle halfway when we tell students not to drink and drive; I feel the message should be not to drink at all.

Many times students say, it is okay, you know, somebody will bail me out. For example, we had a community forum in St. Albans, and we have many parents who said, Sure, on prom night, I will sit at City Hall and wait for all the teenagers who are drinking, that are too, in their minds, drunk to drive home, and I will go and get them. But I feel they are sending the wrong message, because that is just saying: We will come and get you if you mess up. And I feel that there are too many times that people get off the hook too easily. And I'm not exactly sure what the answer is, but I just wanted to come today and express my concern about this.

STATEMENT BY NORA CONLON, MEGAN REARDON, BLAIR MARVIN, SHAWN BEIGEN, KATE HENRY AND PHILLIP MOORE REGARDING THE U.N. AND THE U.S.

NORA CONLON. A great deal of how successful the United Nations is depends on the attitudes of its member states. Americans have usually supported full U.S. cooperation with the U.N., but the level of support declined markedly beginning in the early 1970s, and remained relatively low during the 1980s. The U.S.'s stance during that period toward the United Nations was that of a reluctant participant.

The 1990s have witnessed a strong revival of American support for full U.S. cooperation with the United Nations Nations. This is because President Clinton's administration has expressed a great interest in the U.N., more so than its predecessors. The U.N. support that exists now from Americans is roughly equal to the strong support that existed in the 1960s. While American public support for the U.N. may be high, nevertheless the United States Government's opinion of the U.N.'s effectiveness is low.

This chart illustrates U.S. cooperation with the United Nations. The question asked was whether or not poll respondents agreed with the statement: Should the United States cooperate fully with the United Nations? The red line represents the percentage of those who are in support of full cooperation, while the black line represents those who oppose full cooperation with the United Nations. You can see that American support for the United Nations has increased considerably, and yet the U.S. Government has taken a far different stance towards the U.N.

KATE HENEY. The tension is between the U.S. and the U.N. is financial. By a contradiction of terms, the U.S. is both the greatest contributor and debtor of the 185 member countries of the U.N. The United States is responsible for 25 percent of U.N. expenditures, but despite a $60 billion surplus in our own budget, we are $1.3 billion behind in our payments to the peacekeeping budget of the U.N.

Legislative efforts have been made to pay up—and, actually, I have a question for you, Congressman, concerning this. On March 26th, the State Department authorization bill approved by voice vote an $819 million U.N. debt payment. This has been stalled since 1997, because the House of Representatives tried to include a provision holding that none of the money was to fund any family planning organization that performed abortions. President Clinton vows to veto any bill containing the abortion provision.

I believe that they have lost sight of the humanitarian issues and that the payment of international peacekeeping dues should not be prevented by conflicts within our own government. I was wondering what your position was on this.

CONGRESSMAN SANDERS. I will answer that question in a minute, Okay? I am happy to answer that, but let's let everybody make their statement.

BLAIR MARVIN. One of the reasons why the U.S. is withholding a payment of its debt is that our government has developed its own agenda for U.N. reform. The United States emphasis on reform is intended to stabilize the U.N. financially, making the organization more efficient. We wanted it to be more focused on key priorities and more accountable for its members.

Progress has begun in areas of greater budget discipline. The two key requirements in this is the lowering of the U.S.'s assessed share of the U.N. budget from 25 percent to 20 percent over a three-year period, along with the creation of a contested arrears account for debts disputed by the U.S.

One other area of reform is the U.S. commitment to the expansion the U.N. Security Council, which will strengthen its effectiveness and this will enhance representation throughout the world without detracting from its working efficiency. The U.S. wishes to grant permanent seats to Japan and accept three other seats from the developing nations from the regions of Africa, Asia and Latin America.

PHILLIP MOORE. The U.N. is a valuable asset for the U.S. foreign policy. On numerous occasions, the U.N. has given the United States a chance to gain international backing for issues important to American national interests—for instance, the Persian Gulf War. The U.N. Security Council provided for several measures which gave support for a multinational coalition force, which helped regain control of Kuwait from Iraq and also provided President Clinton with the authorization to form a multinational force to help reinstall the democratic government on Haiti.

The peacekeeping missions of the U.N. are also vital to American interests. Often, peacekeeping missions keep regional conflicts from growing into a wider crisis which may involve U.S. military intervention. For instance, on the island of Cyprus. The two NATO nations of Greece and Turkey have a conflict over the island of Cyprus. However, U.N. forces have kept the issue from growing into open conflict. And since the two nations are members of NATO, that could be a serious problem for the alliance. Humanitarian aid of the U.N. also benefits America as well, because it is in no one's interest to allow members of other countries to go on suffering.

By not paying our dues to the U.N., we are weakening our ability to play a larger role in the international community and ultimately hurt our own national interest and well-being.

MEGAN REARDON. We would like to leave you with a few suggestions on the U.N., because it is a tough topic. We propose you support the U.N. agencies on human rights and economic and social development; and pay our dues, which is an important one; support expansion of the Security Council with Germany and Japan; and support and gain support for collective peacekeeping.

CONGRESSMAN SANDERS. Thank you. Excellent.

DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1999

SPEECH OF

HON. DAVID McINTOSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 23, 1998

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4194) making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes:

Mr. McINTOSH. Mr. Chairman, today, the House needs to retain the legislative restriction on new regulations in the VA–HUD bill to ensure that the Clinton-Gore Administration does not implement the Kyoto Protocol through the backdoor prior to Senate ratification of the treaty.

Retaining this language will ensure that the Administration will not circumvent through regulation the Senate's constitutional responsibility of advice and consent with respect to treaties.

In Kyoto, Vice President Al Gore already ignored the U.S. Senate's bi-partisan, unanimous resolution (the 95–0 Byrd-Hagel resolution) not to negotiate a treaty which either exempts developing countries or hurts the American economy.

In a series of hearings entitled ''The Kyoto Protocol: Is the Clinton-Gore Administration Selling Out Americans?,'' my Subcommittee has heard from democratic and Republican State and local elected officials, businesses, labor, and consumers, that the Kyoto Protocol is a bad deal for America and will have dire consequences on Americans, including:

Huge job losses, up to 1.5 million according to the AFL–CIO and more according to other studies; Cecil Roberts, the President of the United Mine Workers, testified that the Administration should not proceed prior to Senate ratification; Ande Abbot representing the Boilermakers union, part of the AFL–CIO, agreed—no implementation prior to ratification.

Huge increase in the cost of living for American families ($2700 more per household for energy and other products);

Greatly diminished U.S. trade competitiveness;

Recently, a union machinist from my district testified before my Subcommittee that the Kyoto Protocol ''is bad news for the American worker'' and ''we want jobs, not assistance.''

Al Gore's Kyoto Protocol is a fundamentally flawed treaty, with unrealistic targets and timetables.

It commits the U.S. to reduce greenhouse gas emission by 7% below 1990 levels within the 2008–2012 period.

In real terms, this treaty mandates an unprecedented 41% reduction of fossil fuels use from business-as-usual.

Al Gore's Kyoto Protocol is unfair and unworkable.

It does not allow developing countries (like China, India, and Brazil), which will be emitting a majority of the world's greenhouse gas

emissions by 2015, to opt in to the targets and timetables.

It allows the developing countries, which constitute a majority and which have no obligations to reduce emissions, to define the rules, procedures, and enforcement mechanisms of the treaty.

CEA Chair Janet Yellen testified that the economic impact would be ''modest'' if the U.S. was able to satisfy 85% of its Kyoto obligations by purchasing emission reduction credits from other countries. Other countries have refused to agree to such a trading system.

Amazingly, the White House has been unwilling to disclose to Congress information and analyses to justify the president's request for a huge increase in funding (+$6.3 billion) for its climate change agenda and to support fully its policy positions about this major initiative; as a consequence, Chairman Burton has so far issued three subpoenas to obtain key documents and may be forced to issue more subpoenas and/or to go the next step by pursuing one or more contempt resolutions.

While Al Gore, in a recent press conference, claimed that Congress is imposing a gag order on global warming, it is the Administration that is imposing a gag order by withholding documents that would supposedly help to explain and justify its budget request. What is the Administration hiding and why are they hiding it?

Let's send a message to Al Gore that Congress is entitled to the information and documents we have requested since March and that the Clinton-Gore Administration cannot undermine Congress' Constitutional role through back-door implementation of the Kyoto Protocol prior to Senate ratification.

VOTE ''NO'' ON THE GREENWOOD AMENDMENT

A ''NO'' VOTE ON THE GREENWOOD AMENDMENT IS A NO VOTE ON THE KYOTO TREATY UNTIL IT IS RATIFIED BY THE SENATE

Let's make sure that the Clinton-Gore administration does not make an end-run around our constitutional process to implement the Kyoto Protocol.

Myth	Reality
Good Deal: The Administration says that the Kyoto Protocol will be good for America.	Bad Deal: The Kyoto Protocol is a bad deal for America. It violates the Byrd-Hagel Resolution (which passed the Senate pre-Kyoto by a 95–0 vote) because it only places restrictions on developed nations (exempting all developing countries entirely) and because it could result in serious harm to the U.S. economy. And, it would result in no net environmental gains.
Achievable Target and Timetable: The Administration says that it negotiated realistic and achievable U.S. targets and timeframes in the Kyoto Treaty.	Unachievable Target and Timetable: This agreement requires the U.S. to reduce its emissions of greenhouse gases by 7% below 1990 levels between the years 2008–2012. Even if America stopped operating every car, truck, boat, train, and airplane in this country, the energy savings would not be enough to meet the requirements of the Kyoto Protocol. In fact, Under Secretary of State Stuart Eizenstat testified that Congress should fund the President's requested $6.3 billion climate change budget increase in order to ''place us further down the road so that we won't have to face the kind of drastic reductions that we would otherwise have to face.''
Fair: The Administration says that it will obtain the ''meaningful participation'' of developing countries.	Grossly Unfair: The Kyoto Treaty exempts the vast majority of the international community from making reductions in their emissions of greenhouse gases. There are not even voluntary opt-in provisions for developing countries. At Kyoto, the China delegate announced his 3-no policy: No, we will not restrict our emissions; No, we will not promise to restrict our emissions in the future; No, we will not agree to a voluntarily opt-in clause in the treaty to reduce emissions. Recently, in Bonn, Germany, the G–77 nations and China adamantly opposed even including an agenda item on voluntary commitments by developing countries for Buenos Aires in November 1998.
International Emissions Trading a Panacea: The Administration says that the costs to American workers, consumers, and businesses will be ''modest'' because a significant portion of the U.S. emissions reductions requirements can be undertaken by other nations through international emissions trading. In fact, the Administration's estimates assume that the U.S. will satisfy 85% of its Kyoto obligation by purchasing credits from other countries which can reduce emissions more cheaply.	International Emissions Trading No Panacea: Developing countries and the European Union are firmly opposed to any unrestricted, global emissions trading system that allows any country to buy its way into compliance. Developing countries have stated that they will not commit to cap their emissions so that they can participate in emissions trading. In May 1998 President Clinton signed a G–8 National Communique committing the U.S. to ''undertake domestically the steps necessary to reduce significantly greenhouse gas emissions,'' and, as the Kyoto Protocol says, to use trading simply to ''supplement domestic actions.''
Treaty Advances Technological Development: Based on a study performed by 5 Department of Energy national laboratories, the Administration claims that technologies can be developed and deployed between now and 2010 that could reduce emissions and energy consumption sufficient to meet our Kyoto Protocol target.	Treaty Threatens Technological Development: Even that 5-lab study indicates that it will require ''luck'' to achieve the necessary technological breakthroughs by 2010. At hearings before the Subcommittee on Regulatory Affairs, Dr. John McTague, VP, Ford Motor Company, testified that, contrary to the Administration's rosy predictions, deployment of new technology through the joint government/industry Partnership for a New Generation of Vehicles will not meet the U.S. Kyoto targets and timetable. He stated that the treaty's ''rigid timetables threaten significant disruption to sound technological development.'' The treaty's short timeframe for compliance will divert limited resources into high-cost, less effective investments.
Full disclosure of information: The Administration claims that Council of Economic Advisers (CEA) Chair Janet Yellen's so-called ''economic analysis'' (without any backup tables) and its budget request provide sufficient information for Congress to act favorably. It has stated one conclusion after another about how the U.S. can meet its Kyoto Protocol commitment through technology development and international emissions trading.	Stonewalling on disclosure of information: The Administration has been unwilling to disclose to Congress information and analyses to justify its funding requests and its policy positions. As a result, the Government Reform and Oversight Committee was forced to issue 3 subpoenas in order to obtain documents and may even have to pursue contempt resolutions.

IMPACT OF THE KYOTO PROTOCOL BY STATE

[Source: 1998 WEFA data]

State	Number of jobs lost by 2010 under Kyoto Protocol	Unemployment rate in 2010		State tax revenue $ lost (in millions) by 2010 under Kyoto Protocol
		Without Kyoto Protocol	Under Kyoto Protocol	
Alabama	67,500	3.63	6.33	929
Alaska	4,300	7.20	8.51	239
Arizona	102,300	3.03	5.73	1,700
Arkansas	20,600	4.72	6.13	513
California	278,800	6.10	7.73	11,500
Colorado	47,400	3.75	5.32	2,000
Connecticut	28,100	5.48	6.97	1,800
Delaware	4,500	4.71	5.64	264
Florida	142,000	4.97	6.56	5,800
Georgia	80,000	3.92	5.48	2,700
Hawaii	9,700	6.55	8.15	329
Idaho	11,600	3.92	5.28	393
Illinois	190,700	3.38	6.06	5,200
Indiana	99,700	3.65	6.15	1,800
Iowa	21,600	5.07	6.29	785
Kansas	18,400	4.21	5.39	780
Kentucky	56,500	4.60	7.10	997
Louisiana	64,500	6.35	8.85	945
Maine	7,000	5.31	6.37	322
Maryland	33,300	4.71	5.92	2,000
Massachusetts	45,600	4.32	5.50	2,900
Michigan	96,500	3.80	5.54	3,400
Minnesota	46,900	3.45	4.93	1,800
Mississippi	28,600	5.86	7.94	423
Missouri	48,700	4.04	5.55	1,600
Montana	41,500	6.04	9.94	288
Nebraska	19,000	3.09	4.82	502
Nevada	27,300	4.64	6.48	1,000
New Hampshire	12,400	4.39	6.12	447
New Jersey	120,500	5.15	7.84	3,600
New Mexico	13,500	7.26	8.68	377
New York	140,000	6.24	7.76	7,100
North Carolina	107,200	3.95	6.14	2,500
North Dakota	3,600	2.78	3.66	173
Ohio	119,800	3.92	5.74	3,500
Oklahoma	26,600	3.83	5.41	753

IMPACT OF THE KYOTO PROTOCOL BY STATE—Continued

[Source: 1998 WEFA data]

State	Number of jobs lost by 2010 under Kyoto Protocol	Unemployment rate in 2010		State tax revenue $ lost (in millions) by 2010 under Kyoto Protocol
		Without Kyoto Protocol	Under Kyoto Protocol	
Oregon	22,900	5.47	6.63	1,200
Pennsylvania	108,000	4.65	6.37	3,800
Rhode Island	3,400	4.57	5.27	260
South Carolina	32,500	5.48	6.99	815
South Dakota	7,200	3.23	4.81	191
Tennessee	39,500	5.41	6.61	1,500
Texas	124,600	5.21	6.32	6,000
Utah	12,700	3.09	3.89	713
Vermont	2,300	4.12	4.79	167
Virginia	34,600	4.23	5.06	2,300
Washington	47,700	5.35	6.76	2,400
West Virginia	19,400	4.87	7.09	319
Wisconsin	69,800	2.59	4.71	1,800
Wyoming	7,600	5.45	8.29	116
Total [1]	[2] 2.4	5.43	6.95	[3] 93.1

[1] The details do not add to totals because the totals, which are underestimated, are based on a national model.
[2] Million.
[3] Billion.

PARTIES WITH BINDING COMMITMENTS UNDER THE KYOTO PROTOCOL

Country	Percentage commitment
Australia	108
Austria	92
Belgium	92
Bulgaria	92
Canada	94
Croatia	95
Czech Republic	92
Denmark	92
Estonia	92
European Community	92
Finland	92
France	92
Germany	92
Greece	92
Hungary	94
Iceland	110
Ireland	92
Italy	92
Japan	94
Latvia	92
Liechtenstein	92
Lithuania	92
Luxembourg	92
Monaco	92
Netherlands	92
New Zealand	100
Norway	101
Poland	94
Portugal	92
Romania	92
Russian Federation	100
Slovakia	92
Slovenia	92
Spain	92
Sweden	92
Switzerland	92
Ukraine	100
United States of America	93
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	92

PARTIES EXEMPT FROM BINDING COMMITMENTS UNDER THE KYOTO PROTOCOL

Albania, Algeria, Antigua & Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Azerbaijan.

Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Buikina Faso, Burundi.

Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Rep., Chad, Chile, China, Columbia, Comoros, Congo, Cook Island, Costa Rica, Cote d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus.

Democratic Republic of the Congo, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominica.

Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia.

Fuji.

Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea Bissau, Guyana.

Haiti, Honduras.

India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Israel.

Jamaica, Jordan.

Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait.

Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho.

Macedonia, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Moldova (Republic of), Mongolia, Morocco, Mazambique, Myanmar.

Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Niger, Nive.

Oman.

Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines.

Qatar.

Republic of Korea.

Saint Kitts & Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic.

Tajikistan, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad & Tabago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu.

Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan.

Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam.

Yemen.

Zambia, Zimbabwe.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate on February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place, and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled, and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Tuesday, July 28, 1998, may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

JULY 29

9:00 a.m.
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
To hold oversight hearings on the Department of Agriculture's progress in consolidating and downsizing its opearations.
SR–332

9:30 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.
SR–253

Energy and Natural Resources
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.
SD–366

Environment and Public Works
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.
SD–406

Judiciary
To hold hearings on S. 1554, to provide for relief from excessive punitive damage awards in cases involving primarily financial loss by establishing rules for proportionality between the amount of punitive damages and the amount of economic loss.
SD–226

Labor and Human Resources
Business meeting, to mark up S. 1380, Charter Schools Expansion Act, and S. 2213, Education Flexibility Amendments of 1998.
SD–430

Rules and Administration
To hold hearings on S. 2288, to provide for the reform and continuing legislative oversight of the production, procurement, dissemination, and permanent public access of the Government's publications.
SR–301

10:00 a.m.
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
Business meeting, to mark up S. 1405, to provide for improved monetary policy and regulatory reform in financial institution management and activities, to streamline financial regulatory agency actions, and to provide for improved consumer credit disclosure.
SD–538

Select on Intelligence
To hold closed hearings on intelligence matters
SH–219

2:00 p.m.
Finance
Social Security and Family Policy Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 1858, to provide individuals with disabilities with incentives to become economically self-sufficient.
SD–215

Governmental Affairs
International Security, Proliferation and Federal Services Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine the satellite export licensing process.
SD–342

Judiciary
Immigration Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings on enforcement activities of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice.
SD–226

Indian Affairs
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.
SR–485

2:30 p.m.
Select on Intelligence
To hold closed hearings on intelligence matters.
SH–219

JULY 30

9:00 a.m.
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
To hold hearings to review a recent concept release by the Commodity Futures Trading Commission on over-the-counter derivatives, and on related proposals by the Treasury Department, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, and the Securities and Exchange Commission.
SD–106

Environment and Public Works
Clean Air, Wetlands, Private Property, and Nuclear Safety Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings on activities of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.
SD–406

9:30 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Communications Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine international satellite reform.
SR–253

Judiciary
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.
SD–226

10:00 a.m.
Finance
To hold hearings to examine Medicare choice implementation.
SD–215

Governmental Affairs
To hold hearings to examine issues in preparation for the Year 2000 Census.
SD–342

Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe
To hold joint hearings with the House Committee on International Relations to examine issues relating to religious intolerance in Europe.
2172 Rayburn Building

1:00 p.m.
Judiciary
To hold hearings on pending nominations.
SD–226

2:00 p.m.
Environment and Public Works
To hold hearings on the nominations of Romulo L. Diaz, Jr., of the District of Columbia, to be Assistant Administrator for Administration and Resources Management, and J. Charles Fox, of Maryland, to be Assistant Administrator for Water, both of the Environmental Protection Agency.
SD–406

JULY 31

9:00 a.m.
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
To hold hearings on pending nominations.
SR–332

9:30 a.m.
Special on SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE YEAR 2000 TECHNOLOGY PROBLEM
To hold hearings to examine telecommunication issues with regard to the Year 2000 information problem.
SD–192

10:00 a.m.
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
To hold oversight hearings on mandatory arbitration agreements in employment contracts in the securities industry.
SD–538

Judiciary
To hold hearings to examine issues with regard to physician assisted suicide.
SD–226

SEPTEMBER 2

9:30 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
To hold hearings to examine the impact of United States satellite technology transfer to China.
SR–253

SEPTEMBER 10

9:30 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Communications Subcommittee
To resume hearings to examine international satellite reform.
SR–253

OCTOBER 6

9:30 a.m.
Veterans' Affairs
To hold joint hearings with the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs on the legislative recommendations of the American Legion.
345 Cannon Building

CANCELLATIONS

JULY 29

10:00 a.m.
Governmental Affairs
To hold hearings on S. 2161, to provide Government-wide accounting of regulatory costs and benefits, and S. 1675, to establish a Congressional Office of Regulatory Analysis.
SD–342