we heard from the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON), the chairman of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, unfortunately for the American people it is doubtful that we are suddenly going to come to some conclusion and close down everything.

What we see, not knowing at what levels it is going on in this government but what we have seen in agency after agency, investigation after investigation, are people stonewalling information, pleading the Fifth, running out of the country, giving us partial truths, fighting for every little bit of information we can, and it looks like there was an orchestrated effort throughout this entire administration in every agency, uncertain at what levels and by who orchestrated it, for cash, in order to maintain power.

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

Mr. SOUDER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, Martin Davis, one of the three people who pled guilty, barred from work with the Teamsters and fined $204,000; Jere Nash, barred from work with the Teamsters, fined $10,000; Michael Ensara barred from working with the Teamsters and fined $126,000. Now it gets to be kind of interesting.

We talked about the Democratic National Committee. Citizen Action, their national office, implicated in the swap scheme. Who is Citizen Action? Citizen Action is a lobbying political advocacy group here in Washington.

□ 1930

And what do they advocate? Clean and fair elections. Clearly implicated through this whole process. Barred from working on Teamsters elections. But they are part of this swap scheme. You can sit there and say, they are in Washington and they are campaigning. It is kind of interesting what happened. Like many of these organizations, they have a national headquarters and they have State chapters. They are all trying to advocate for the same thing, which is clean and fair elections, at least with Citizen Action. That was one of their key messages. Washington sold them out. Washington was clearly implicated. Washington Citizen Action was clearly implicated in this. So what you see again is the Washington organization is corrupt, illegal activities, and they basically sold all of their locals, the grassroots kind of people, they sold them down the river. It is the same thing that happened with the Teamsters, the rank and file members. They are our neighbors. Their kids go to school with our kids. We go to church with them. We play tennis with them. We see them on the streets. We see them in the grocery store. These are our neighbors. What happens? They got sold out by their Washington leadership. Their Washington leadership stole from their own treasury. It is just too frequent of a story. You and I have seen it way too often in the last three, four, five years of good organizations, healthy organizations at the local level, the Teamsters advocating for worker rights and better wages and better working conditions and trying to do the right thing at the local level, in most cases doing the right thing. Their leadership in Washington tarnishing each and every Teamster around the country. At the same time that they are robbing them out of their pocketbook. It is unbelievable what happens to some of these national organizations. What I hope is that as soon as possible they can have a fairly run election, they can have new leadership and they can move forward and hopefully they can get out from under this yoke of government supervision and they can have their union back. Just like I hope Citizen Action, their Washington office is kind of shut down but the people who have worked hard for campaign finance reform and clean politics and all these types of things at the local level, they can reclaim their national headquarters and get some good people in there who do not participate in these kinds of activities.

Mr. SOUDER. I think that as the gentleman from Michigan and I both would state unequivocally, one of the problems is that we have too much power in Washington because when you have that much power there is going to be a temptation to cheat. But even given that, what we have seen in his investigation, what we have seen in this investigation is not everybody does this. I hear all the time, ''Well, everybody in Washington is corrupt.'' They are not. There are too many decisions made that are influenced by money in this town. There are too many decisions made out of fear for the next political election. What we are seeing gradually unfold over the last few years is something that in scale we have never seen before. We have not seen the amount of illegal foreign dollars moving in, apparently tied to specific decisions. We have not seen the massive scale laundering going from multiple countries even in. We have not seen this many Cabinet members. I mean even under Harding we were talking three. Going with special prosecutors, and even leading up into higher and higher levels of this administration. We do not know where it ends. We are not likely to find out very soon. But we have an obligation in this Congress. While we are doing the other things as the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA) said in the Committee on Education and the Workforce, we have been moving many bills through, having conference committees, we have balanced the budget, we are working on tax relief, this is not the primary thing we do here but it is one important part. That is, to make sure that each American citizen when you cast a vote have that vote honored and that your leadership does not have a secondary agenda, especially, and this is what the Founding Fathers were very concerned about, that any of the leadership would get illegal foreign money, where foreign nationals or through agents in this country would attempt to influence decisions of the United States Government. That is the weighty matters that we have been pursuing. I hope it does not lead all the way to the top. But to find out, witnesses need to cooperate with the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA). They need to be cooperative with the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON). We cannot have 116 people, by the way we have three more since we have printed these things, that would stretch clear across the front of this, this size sheet if I had been allowed under House rules to put them across, would have covered the entire front of this podium, or clear to the ceiling. We have to have honesty. We have to have American citizens willing to come forth with the truth.

## REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4006, LETHAL DRUG ABUSE PREVENTION ACT OF 1998

Mr. SOLOMON (during special order of the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER), from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 105–712) on the resolution (H. Res. 535) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4006) to clarify Federal law to prohibit the dispensing or distribution of a controlled substance for the purpose of causing, or assisting in causing, the suicide, or euthanasia, of any individual, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

## ANNOUNCEMENT ON AMENDMENTS TO FOREIGN OPERATIONS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1999

(Mr. SOLOMON, during the special order of the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER), asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to inform the House of the Committee on Rules's plan in regard to the Foreign Operations Appropriations bill for fiscal year 1999.

The Committee on Rules is likely to meet on Wednesday, September 16, to grant a rule on the Foreign Operations Appropriations bill for 1999. The bill was ordered reported by the Committee on Appropriations on September 10 and will be filed on Tuesday, September 15, tomorrow.

The Committee on Rules may grant a rule which would require that amendments be preprinted in the Congressional RECORD. In this case, amendments to be preprinted would need to be signed by the Member and submitted to the Speaker's table. Amendments should be drafted to the text of the bill as reported by the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. Speaker, Members should use the Office of Legislative Counsel to ensure that their amendments are properly drafted and should check with the Office of the Parliamentarian to be certain that their amendments comply with the rules of the House. It is not

necessary to submit amendments to the Committee on Rules or to testify before our committee as long as the amendments comply with House rules.

## MANAGED CARE REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BRADY). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, let me say this evening that I will be talking about HMO reform and the need to address that issue before this House adjourns in about four weeks, or at least is tentatively scheduled to adjourn after the first week in October. I am concerned that over the next four weeks that time will not be spent on the issues that the American people want addressed in this Congress, health care reform, HMO reform, education concerns, Social Security, environmental issues. There are so many issues that need to be addressed, and I am only going to talk about one of them tonight but I wanted to mention that the Democrats as a party are united behind a strong and a bold agenda which addresses the real challenges that face working families. I am very concerned that the Republican leadership is not going to address these issues. We need to strike out and say that these issues need to be addressed before we adjourn.

The one that I would like to talk about tonight and that I think really is the most important because this is the one that I hear the most about from my constituents is HMO or managed care reform. Too many of my constituents at town hall meetings or at my district offices tell me about the horror stories, and there are many, where they have been denied necessary care because their HMO, their insurance company, has refused to pay for it. The President and the Democrats have put forward a bill, we call it the Patients' Bill of Rights, that is a real, not a fig leaf political bill designed to cover the health insurance industry. We need patient protection legislation that returns medical care to doctors and patients instead of leaving those decisions to health insurance company bureaucrats.

Let me just mention a few key elements of this Democrat real patient protection act, or HMO reform. It includes guaranteed access to needed health care specialists, access to emergency room services, continuity of care protections, access to timely internal and external appeals process if you have been denied care by your HMO or by your insurance company; limits on financial incentives to doctors. We know that too often now the HMOs give the doctors financial incentives, bonuses, if you will, if they do not spend a lot of money or require a lot of services for their patients. Also assuring doctors and patients that they can openly discuss treatment options. Many people do not know that many HMOs now put their physicians within their HMO network under a gag rule that they cannot talk about legitimate medical options, operations or other procedures if the HMO will not cover it because they do not want the patients to know that those procedures exist because they are not going to pay for them. We should not allow those kind of gag rules. They should be prohibited. The Democrats' Patients' Bill of Rights would prohibit those kinds of gag rules. Also, the Democratic bill, the Patients' Bill of Rights, assures that women have direct access to an OB-GYN; and there is also an enforcement mechanism that ensures recourse for patients who were maimed or die because of health plan actions. So not only do we allow you to go through a procedure, an appeal externally before a board, before you have to go to court where the insurance company cannot influence that appeal, but also we allow you to go to court and sue for damages if you have suffered severe damages as a result of the denial of care.

I just want to talk a little bit more if I can about the positive aspects of the Democrats' Patients' Bill of Rights and why we need to get this legislation, or something like it, passed before we adjourn this Congress in another four weeks. Greater choice of doctors. A lot of my constituents point out that they feel there should be some sort of option that you can go outside the HMO network if you want to, even if you have to pay a little extra. What the Democratic Patients' Bill of Rights says is it requires that individuals enrolled in HMOs be offered a greater choice of doctors under what is called point of service. Employers must provide employees with the option of choosing a doctor outside the company health plan. What that means is that when your employer offers you a health plan, he can give you the choice of an HMO but he also has to give you the option of having the HMO and letting you go outside the HMO network for a little extra if you decide to do so. You get that option when you first sign up for your health insurance. Most important, in the Patients' Bill of Rights, the Democratic bill, medical decisions are made by doctors and patients based on medical necessity, not by insurance company bureaucrats. The bill ensures that treatment decisions, in other words, what you need, what is medically necessary for your care, those treatment decisions such as how long a patient should stay in the hospital after surgery, what type of procedures are appropriate, that these decisions are made by the doctor in consultation with the patients. They are not made by the insurance company. Again, we have an example of that which we did last year, or in the previous Congress with regard to pregnant women, that the length of stay provision for pregnant women, when they go to have the child, that they are guaranteed that they can at least stay in the hospital 48 hours for a normal delivery or four days for a C-section. That is exactly the type of guarantee that we will be including in this Democratic bill when we say that the doctor and the patient decide what is medically necessary rather than the insurance company.

Access to specialists. I want to spend a little more time on that because it is so important to so many of my constituents. Our bill allows patients to see an outside specialist at no additional cost whenever the specialist in their plan cannot meet their needs. So if there is a specialist in the HMO network who can take care of you, fine, but if there is not because they do not have that particular specialization, then they have to allow you to go outside the network to see another doctor. The bill also lets women select obstetricians and gynecologists, as I have said, as their primary care provider.

Enforcing patient protections. I think everybody knows, most Americans realize that if you have a right or you have a protection, it does not do you much good unless you can enforce it. What our bill does is it holds managed care plans accountable when their decisions to withhold or limit care injure patients. Unfortunately in court cases around the country, HMOs have not been held accountable. Currently patients may not have the right to sue their HMO in court if they are in certain circumstances. The Democrats' Patients' Bill of Rights removes the exemption under current Federal law that prevents HMOs from being sued in certain circumstances. It also establishes an independent system for processing complaints and appealing adverse decisions with expedited procedures for life-threatening situations. What this means is that if you have been denied a particular operation, not only do you get an external review board which is not influenced by the insurance company that you can go to to appeal the insurance company's decision and it would be enforceable, but also if it is life-threatening, that has to be done very quickly. Otherwise it is not very useful to you. What this guarantees is that decisions on care are based on medical appropriateness or necessity, if you will, not cost, because obviously what the HMOs do in many cases is make their decisions based on cost.

What I wanted to talk about a little more tonight, I have given you some idea I think about what the Democrats are trying to do with our Patients' Bill of Rights but I also have to point out tonight that the Republican alternative which passed the House in August before the August recess not only does not provide the types of guarantees that I am talking about but actually takes us back. It creates an even worse situation, even less guarantees in my opinion for the American people. The House hastily, and I say hastily because this Republican bill was just