situations necessitating the emergency intervention of Federal officials. By calling a number such as 1–800–BAD–CARE, patients and health care workers could disclose any information about life-threatening situations in a hospital. If the situation warrants, such as the case in Tampa, FL, when the Health Care Financing Agency sent our an emergency team to a hospital that amputated the wrong limb of a patent, then OCAH could call upon HHS to investigate.

Moreover, each health plan would be required to form a consumer-dominated Independent Consumer Advisory Committee [ICAC]. This committee would provide outreach to its members—patients—by holding hearings, and forums to facilitate discussion between a health plan and the community. ICAC would help establish safe staffing levels, and quality-care criteria to which the health plan must adhere. Members of ICAC would be selected by a classified lottery procedure. Health plan members interested in serving would be placed not four categories: senior citizens, parents of children under 18, individuals with disabilities, and all other health plan members.

Finally, the Patient and Health Care Provider Protection Act would outlaw the gag order on nurses and doctors who must be free to communicate effectively with their patients. This bill contains strong whistle blower protections that prohibit the discharge, demotion, or harassment of any nurse, doctor, or other health care professionals who assist in an investigation of his or her employer.

There are many bills floating around that accomplish some of the goals outlined here, but in piecemeal fashion. Patient safety cannot be achieved in this way. A comprehensive approach is necessary to make sure patients are aware of who is treating them, are knowledgeable about the effects of a hospital's restructuring plan, are armed with a potent voice to affect the policies of the health plan, and possess some recourse if their safety is endangered. At the same time, the value of nurses' work must not be undermined. As individuals on the front lines of the health care delivery system, nurses and aides must be well-trained and free to act in ways that foster, rather than compromise, the quality of patient care.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge all of my colleagues to support this bill as a bold form of advocacy for the health care consumer—the patient. It is budget-neutral and would be financed by requiring health plans to contribute only 1 percent of their revenues to fund the Office of Consumer Advocacy for Health and the Independent Consumer Advisory Committees in each State. This is a small price to pay to protect patients, and to protect the integrity of such data on which the medical community should base its decisions. Congress has unequivocal role in assuring that cutting costs and increasing one's profit are not priorities of health care delivery at the expense of patient care quality and safety.

GLENS FALLS MARINE CORPS LEAGUE CELEBRATES 50TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. GERALD B.H. SOLOMON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 28, 1996

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to speak about two of the organizations in this country that I hold nearest and dearest to my heart: The United States Marine Corps, and Memorial Detachment Number 2 of the Marine Corps League, in Glens Falls, NY.

Anyone here who knows me at all, knows me as a Marine, probably because I've always been ready for a dog-fight over something I believe in. That's because, as a young Marine, I learned two things: accomplish your mission, and always take care of your buddies.

Well, Mr. Speaker, those basic principles have been carried by Marines everywhere, and the Marine Corps League, and Memorial Detachment No. 2 in Glens Falls is no different. They are veterans of World War Two, the Korean War, Vietnam and the Gulf war who have taken up arms in defense of this country. They are Marines who wore the uniform in times of so-called peace and placed themselves in harms way to keep that truce during the cold war and beyond.

And on top of that, for 50 years now, the Glens Falls detachment has been looking out not only for their fellow Marines in Glens Falls and the greater Adirondack area of New York, but for their communities and neighbors as well. Programs like Toys for Tots, which provide disadvantaged children with toys and gifts they might not otherwise receive during the Christmas season are a trademark of the Marine Corps League. And, the countless Christmas baskets they deliver to needy families over all their years serve as a continued reminder of the importance of community service and looking out for your buddies.

Mr. Speaker, the Glens Falls detachment has been celebrating their 50 year anniversary in the community throughout the year. And what better time for the ceremonies to culminate than on November 9 of this year, 1 day before the 221st birthday of the Marine Corps in this country.

On that note, I wanted to take the time to recognize all those fellow Marines who chartered Memorial Dispatch Number 2 back in 1946. Ten people were on the charter application: Joseph Fiore, Dante Orsini, Frank Orsini, Len Johnson, Raymond Charlebois, Jim Butterfield, Henry Knickerbocker, Guy D'Angelico, Dominick Fallacaro and Donald Weeks. Also on board in 1946 were: Francis Benware, Candelores Catalgamo, Mrs. Jane Lewis Crannell, Murray Crannell, George Deeb, Robert DeLoria, Joseph DeSare, Tullio DelSignore, Guy Fiore, Robert W. Gilligan, Arlus Fontaine, Gardner Goodro Jr., Edward Guy, Walt Hammer, Abraham Hoffis, Pete LaBarge, Dan Lawler, James Lawler, Herman Marino, Joseph McGuirk, Norman Miles, Fred Moody, John Murray, William Noonan, Dennis O'Leary, John Omiencinski, Adelon Potvi, William Ringrow, Kenneth Scribner, Robert Wilber, Joseph Gavita, Francis Smith, George Smith, Eugene Henneman, Leonard Rollo, Paul Abrey, George Shomaker, Robert Barrett, Ray Bortholomew, Earl Balcolm, George Austin and Irving Sexton.

Mr. Speaker, these are the members who set the course for Glens Falls Detachment on the heels of World War Two. Several of them were called back for the Korean War as well. And these are the Marines who I joined in my hometown of Glens Falls after my service in the Marine Corps. I owe my personal gratitude to them for starting this invaluable organization.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I ask that you and all Members join me in paying tribute to them and all members, past and present, who have accomplished their mission and then some over the last 50 years.

REDUCE INCIDENCE OF HOUSEHOLD FIRES

HON. CURT WELDON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 28, 1996

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, we are continually bombarded by news of disasters in our country. But unfortunately, the disaster that befalls more than 400,000 families each year is fire. While the number of household fires has been reduced, these fires continue to cause more than $4 billion in damage. According to the National Fire Protection Association, the most frequent cause of household fires is something that seems so simple—careless cooking.

Recognizing this situation exists, the Association of Home Appliance Manufacturers, representing the producers of kitchen ranges and ovens, has stepped forward to create awareness of this issue and focus educational efforts toward reducing the incidence of these needless fires.

The home appliance manufacturers joined with the National Association of State Fire Marshals and conducted an intense survey of careless cooking fires in 10 major jurisdictions in the United States. The survey results tell us some interesting things about careless cooking fires.

First, in nearly ¾ of fires, the person responsible for the cooking was not in the area at the time the fire broke out. Unattended cooking has long been the single greatest cause of these fires.

Second, in nearly ⅔ of the fires, the person left the area rather than fight the fire. But in those cases where someone stayed to try and deal with it, nearly half used incorrect methods to do so, often increasing their risk of injury and damage to the home.

Third, half of the people responsible for careless cooking fires were between the ages of 30 and 49, not the very old or very young. This number is far larger than the population represented by this age group.

Fourth, consistent with other studies of inner city and disadvantaged populations, a disproportionately high number of careless cooking fires seem to have occurred in minority households. Minority populations appear to be at particular risk for fire and should receive special attention in any education effort.

Using this study, the Association of Home Appliance Manufacturers and several other public safety groups, fire departments, and the U.S. Fire Administration are working together to help change the basic behavior. Special projects made possible by the appliance manufacturers are underway. For example, nearly

10 million special teaching brochures are being distributed this year. This includes the manufacturers inserting one in every new range as well as several million being distributed by school teachers, fire educators, and public service groups. In addition, a teaching video is being developed for fire educators. Finally, public service announcements and video news releases have been prepared and special educational grants have been made to fire educators to try new avenues to reach and educate the public.

The most important messages are rather simple. Stay focused on your cooking. If you have to leave the kitchen, turn off the range. If you have a fire, get the family out of the house and call 911 or the emergency service number.

I commend the appliance manufacturers on this program urge public service groups and all fire departments across the country to join together to fight careless cooking fires. Together we can reduce the numbers of these fires and the effects of such a disaster on our citizens.

INTRODUCTION OF THE COMMODITY EXCHANGE ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1996

HON. THOMAS W. EWING

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 28, 1996

Mr. EWING. Mr. Speaker, as a point of departure as the 104th Congress passes into the historical record, today I am introducing legislation to reform the Commodity Exchange Act [CEAct], the law governing the regulation of futures and options on our Nation's commodity exchanges and other risk management financial instruments that are traded in over-the-counter markets.

Although this legislation is not massive in size, it is sizable in scope. This area of Federal regulation—the importance of our futures and options markets—demands new treatment. Although the Commodity Futures Trading Commission [CFTC] was just reauthorized through the year 2000 last April, the Congress took more than three years to agree on the Futures Trading Practices Act of 1992 [1992 FTPA]. Needless to say, that law was a contentious debate; this bill may be similarly contentious. For that reason, it should be viewed as a discussion document. We will have several months to think about it and discuss it prior to the introduction of a new bill in the 105th Congress.

The purpose of the bill is to establish the concept of self-regulation with CFTC oversight. The commodity exchanges are self-regulatory organizations; they regulate their members and the trade and financial practices of their members. The National Futures Association [NFA], at this time the sole registered futures association, regulates the professional futures community, setting industry-wide standards of sales and trade practice conduct.

The aim is to keep the U.S. futures industry competitive as it enters the next century. The price discovery and hedging functions of our futures markets still are paramount. The law, however, must recognize that technology is constantly changing and that our commodity exchanges serve a sophisticated, mostly institutional clientele these days, not small, retail traders.

With that in mind, let me briefly outline the contents of the bill I am introducing.

Section 2(a)(1)(A)(ii), is known commonly as the Treasury amendment and was enacted as a part of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission Act of 1974. Unfortunately, this language has created numerous legal problems the courts have dealt with inconsistently.

Title II of the bill offers a solution to these problems. It is one solution. Obviously, there are others. Attempting to deal with a controversy of this magnitude is not easy. The solution in the legislation will be disputed and argued. I welcome all interested groups, including members of the other body, to help to solve this matter in the next Congress.

Section 3 of the CEAct describes the reasons for federal regulation of futures and option markets and a great deal of this section is simply outdated and does not fit today's regulatory requirements or needs. The bill substantially restates the purposes of federal regulation.

Section 4 is amended to include specifically an exemption for certain professional markets whose participants are recognized under current law. These ''appropriate persons'' are described in Sec. 4(c)(3) of the CEAct and include futures commission merchants, floor brokers and floor traders. In light of the exemptions afforded other professional traders by the 1992 FTPA, I believe this language is consistent with congressional intent in this area.

Sections 103 and 104 of the bill enhance the self-regulation of exchange institutions by providing simplified and streamlined contract market designation and rule submission procedures. These are necessary in my view to maintain the competitiveness of our commodity exchanges in a world that has come to understand the importance of risk management on exchanges with sound, but limited, regulatory programs.

These amendments presume a commodity exchange develops sound contracts with economic purposes that are widely recognized and will be used by commercial and speculative interests for price discovery and risk-shifting that have long been viewed in this country and by the Congress as beneficial to our Nation's economy.

Section 105 of the bill seeks to improve commodity exchange audit trails without impairing the functions of the markets. Audit trail issues date from the establishment of the CFTC but have been actively debated in the CFTC's regulatory programs since 1986, when the CFTC proposed a one-minute, verifiable standard.

Understanding that each commodity exchange has different trade customs and systems unique to each institution means there are numerous ways to obtain adequate, verifiable audit trails. These trade recordation systems have changed dramatically over the years, and U.S. commodity exchanges constantly are improving and upgrading their audit trail systems. The amendment seeks to develop standards that are objective and reasonable.

Section 106 of the legislation provides benefit-cost analysis to the CFTC's regulatory program. Regulation under Republican administrations and new law under this Republican Congress has moved us further in that direction. There is no reason we cannot bring similar sound, reasonable, and fair regulation to our commodity exchanges and preserve the public interest.

Finally, section 107 is a house-keeping matter of interest to the Committee on Agriculture. An objective of the Committee during the reform of U.S. Agriculture embodied in the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 [FAIR Act] was to use fewer words. The FAIR Act is literally one-half the volume of the 1990 farm bill. With that in mind—and there may be further improvements later—section 107 repeals Sec. 8e dealing with CFTC oversight and deficiency orders. It is my understanding that after the nearly four years this section has been law it has never been used. that makes it unnecessary in my view.

I look forward to comments on the legislation and working with interested parties as we proceed with this necessary reform in the 105th Congress.

THE PRESIDENTIAL DEBATE REFORM INITIATIVE

HON. BILL McCOLLUM

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 28, 1996

Mr. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Presidential Debate Reform Act. The situation surrounding the current Presidential election has highlighted some of the flaws in our current method for selecting a President and Vice President of the United States of America. One critical flaw involves the way Presidential debates are scheduled.

My legislation would create the framework for deciding the participants and structure of presidential debates. This framework would include a commission of 10 people nominated by various leaders and guaranteed to include 4 politically independent members. These commissioners would then schedule several debates.

One such debate would be optional and include any candidate who is on the ballot in 50 States or polls at 5 percent in popular polls among likely voters. This could include major party candidates, although it would provide a forum for lesser known candidates to express their views.

The commission would also establish debates for the Vice Presidential and Presidential candidates. These would be for the candidates polling over 10 percent in polls, taken after the optional debate, and on the ballot in at least 40 States. Participation in these debates would be mandatory. The penalty for not participating in the debate, other than perhaps embarrassment, would be a reduction in the amount of Federal funds that candidate's party will receive to run the next convention. The reduction would be equal to the fraction of mandatory debates missed. I cannot imagine that a party would want to miss out on $3 million (approximately the amount that would be lost to pay for the 1996 conventions through missing one debate).

This has nothing to do with whether I think certain people should or should not participate in debates. I do think that we need to have an established framework with defined ground rules to ensure the fairness in the system.

Mr. Speaker, I think this is a good bill and I look forward to hearing feedback from my