

August 3, 1995

the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BAESLER. Madam Speaker, recently, on Wednesday, July 19, a freshman Republican Member of Congress made the following quote in an interview regarding Koresh and the Waco hearings. "The only law they clearly established," talking about Koresh, "broke that I can see, so far, is he had sex with consenting minors." He said, "Do you send tanks and Government troops into large sections of Kentucky and Tennessee and other places where such things as this occur?"

This statement shows, I think, the extent to which some members of the majority party will go in order to justify the narrow world view about David Koresh. Instead of condemning him for what he was, this Member attacked the good people of Kentucky and Tennessee.

Something is clearly wrong with this picture, and this Member, as others, just does not get it. Defending religious freedom is not the same as defending religious fanaticism. Somebody ought to tell him the difference.

On behalf of the good people of Kentucky and Tennessee, I think this Member owes us an apology.

ABC GOT IT WRONG ON REPETITIVE MOTION STATISTICS

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

Mr. NORWOOD. Madam Speaker, I have come to the floor to correct a few things ABC's report on ergonomics last night would have led the American people to believe.

Madam Speaker, ABC says that 60 percent of workplace illness occurs from repetitive motion. Why would they give out that number? Why would they not say that the Bureau of Labor Statistics says that only 7 percent of the workplace illnesses occur because of repetitive strain?

Why would ABC not have said, The National Safety Council does not agree with either one? They say that only 4 percent of the workplace illnesses come from repetitive strain. It is a perfect example of what is wrong in this town.

Where did ABC get 60 percent? They got it from Joe Dear. Why did Joe Dear say 60 percent? So he could do what they have been doing for 40 years: Run down to this Congress and say, "Look at all these problems. I need more money. I need more people. I need to grow my agency."

MEDICARE PATIENTS NEED TRUE CHOICES

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Madam Speaker, the Congress is about to embark on

major changes in Medicare. These reforms we will be considering will offer patients less choice, not more, unless we take action to ensure that their choices are protected.

Many of the so-called reform plans include efforts to increase the use of managed care for Medicare patients. A study released last week found that three-fourths of Americans age 50 and over said they would not join a Medicare managed care plan without the freedom to choose their doctor; 82 percent believe that the freedom to choose out-of-network physicians or specialists would be "very important" or "critically important" to their decisions about whether to join a Medicare managed care plan.

The message is simple. Choice is essential to older Americans. A point-of-service option provides true choice by allowing Medicare patients to go outside of a network when they need services. This option should be built into every health plan involving Medicare patients.

Madam Speaker, \$270 billion in cuts in Medicare to pay for tax breaks for the rich is wrong. It is equally wrong to force America's elderly into managed care and take away their choice of physician.

HOLD THE LINE. COMPETITION JUST DOES NOT RING TRUE

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

Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma. Madam Speaker, hold the line. Competition just does not ring true.

Madam Speaker, does competition mean a monolithic, one-sided monopoly? The manager's amendment to H.R. 1555, the Communications Act of 1995, will do just that. The bill that came out of committee passed with bipartisan support and had some level of approval from all industry representatives. What happened?

The provisions in the manager's amendment are so vague, it will be difficult for State regulators, and everyone else, to determine what constitutes competition. As the U.S. Congress deregulates telecommunications, we must assure that some fair standard exists for gauging competition and create a blueprint for the future of a competitive communications industry.

As a former state utility commissioner, I have seen firsthand how true competition can benefit the consumer. This is why I have some reservations about the manager's amendment.

Madam Speaker, I urge a "no" vote on the manager's amendment. Let us go back to the original bill that the committee passed. We owe it to our constituents, the customers for all of these services, to make sure that rates are fair and wide open to competition.

IRS RIPPING OFF THE AMERICAN PUBLIC

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Madam Speaker, thousands of Americans receive faulty notices from the IRS. The IRS says, "Your taxes are delinquent, pay them up." When the IRS was asked if the 1993 tax law allowed deferrals, they said, "The law is being reviewed." When IRS was asked how many taxpayers got notices they said, "A small number."

Now documents reveal that 43,000 Americans got faulty notices in the first month. The IRS said, "Small problem. These things happen."

Shame, Congress. Shame, for allowing the IRS to rip off and trample the rights of the American taxpayers.

By the way, the old saying, "Easy for you, difficult for me," does not apply to the IRS.

REPUBLICANS ARE KEEPING THEIR PROMISES

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

Mr. WHITFIELD. Madam Speaker, yesterday we were treated to a tremendous display of partisan rhetoric on the floor of this House.

Madam Speaker, most of yesterday, liberals took to the floor and accused Republicans of being extremists, mean-spirited, and shameful. The experiment in big government that was started in the 1960's has failed. It is over. We will not keep pouring hard-earned tax dollars of the American people down a huge sinkhole of debt just to support a bloated, ineffective government.

Madam Speaker, the American people want a balanced budget, they want to eliminate duplicative and wasteful programs, and they want, in short, to transform government to be effective and provide the needs that the American people demand.

Madam Speaker, we are going to keep our promise on this side of the aisle to reduce the size and cost of government and to create effective programs that work.

PHILADELPHIA'S EXAMPLE

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

Mr. SANFORD. Madam Speaker, the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight held a field hearing in early July in Cleveland. Amongst those who gave testimony were the mayor of Philadelphia, Edward Rendell.

Madam Speaker, I was fascinated by his story because 3½ years ago Philadelphia stood at the brink of financial disaster. They were a quarter of a billion dollars in debt. Their bonds had

H. R. 1555 - AUGUST 3

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN ENGROSSMENT OF H.R. 2127, DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker I ask unanimous consent that in the engrossment of H.R. 2127 the clerk be authorized to correct section numbers, punctuation, cross references, and to make other conforming changes as may be necessary to reflect the actions of the House today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

ORDER OF MEETING, ORDER OF BUSINESS AND PROVIDING FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1555, COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1995

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I should advise the members that pending the following unanimous-consent request, this could be the last vote of the night.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House convene at 8:00 a.m. today and that there be no intervening motion from the time of convening until the Pledge of Allegiance; and that further consideration of the bill H.R. 1555 in the Committee of the Whole pursuant to House Resolution 207 shall also be governed by the following order:

First, immediately after the Pledge of Allegiance, the House shall resolve into the Committee of the Whole for the further consideration of H.R. 1555 pursuant to House Resolution 207 without intervening motion;

Second, consideration in the Committee of the Whole shall proceed without intervening motion except the amendments printed in the House Report 104-223, except one motion to rise, if offered by Representative BLILEY;

Third, that any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole shall be deemed as having been adopted in the House; and

Fourth that Representative CONYERS shall have permission to modify amendment number 2-2.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I do not think that I will object, but I want to make a couple of comments.

Like every other Member of this body, I have received a deluge of mail on the subject of this bill. Like the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FLANA-

GAN] yesterday, I took the trouble to check into the behavior of those who stimulated that mail. I found, as did the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FLANAGAN], that the stimulators of that mail had used the names of people who were unaware of the use of their names, that those who put that mail campaign together made false statements about the persons who had signed the letters, and led the people to sign the mail without any correct impression of what the content of the mail or the campaign was to be. Under the proposal tomorrow, I cannot discuss that matter at that time.

I want to make it very clear that I intend to follow up on this matter and to see to it that the miscreants who have engaged in this improper practice are exposed in proper fashion and that their behavior which demeans themselves, the legislative practices of this body and the democracy of which we are a part is properly exposed.

I will be sending them a letter on behalf of a number of my colleagues about this serious and gross misbehavior. Anyone who would like to join in signing the letter will be welcome at this desk tomorrow. I would also say that I intend to see to it that this kind of practice does not again infect the legislative process.

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. Further reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to applaud the gentleman for his statement. I intend to work closely with you, if you will have me, to see that jointly we pursue this matter to its proper conclusion. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. Further reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as the subcommittee chairman of oversight investigations, a post the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] held for so many years with such distinction, if his investigations uncover something that is worthy of investigation by that subcommittee, I will be happy to work with the gentleman and the full committee chairman to fully follow up on whatever he finds out.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I can think of no Member who would do a finer job in setting right this matter. I want to thank the gentleman from Texas and also my dear friend the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I will not object, but I would like to ask the majority leader if Members could be as-

sured that there would not be a vote in the morning until 8:45 a.m.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, we will convene at 8 a.m. and go immediately into consideration of the chairman's amendment. The debate on that amendment would be 30 minutes. So even a 15-minute vote could not, even under the greatest conditions of expediency, be completed until 8:45 a.m. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. GEPHARDT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

ADMINISTRATION'S NATIONAL URBAN POLICY REPORT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith my Administration's National Urban Policy Report, "Empowerment: A New Covenant With America's Communities," as required by 42 U.S.C. 4503(a). The Report provides a framework for empowering America's disadvantaged citizens and poor communities to build a brighter future for themselves, for their families and neighbors, and for America. The Report is organized around four principles:

First, it links families to work. It brings tax, education and training, housing, welfare, public safety, transportation, and capital access policies together to help families make the transition to self-sufficiency and independence. This linkage is critical to the transformation of our communities.

Second, it leverages private investment in our urban communities. It works with the market and the private sector to build upon the natural assets and competitive advantages of urban communities.

Third, it is locally driven. The days of made in Washington solutions, dictated by a distant Government, are gone. Instead, solutions must be locally crafted, and implemented by entrepreneurial public entities, private actors, and a growing network of community-based firms and organizations.

Fourth, it relies on traditional values—hard work, family, responsibility. The problems of so many inner-city neighborhoods—family break-up, teen pregnancy, abandonment, crime, drug use—will be solved only if individuals, families, and communities determine to help themselves.