The House met at 10 a.m.

Rabbi Milton Balkany, Dean, Bais Yaakov of Brooklyn, New York, offered the following prayer:

Our Father in Heaven, the majestic sequoia tower over the Alpine expanses, and yet they continue to stretch upward toward the Sun. The mighty Colorado River carved the awesome grandeur of the Grand Canyon eons ago, yet it continues to surge ever onward. The thrashing tide of the Atlantic has brought innumerable ships to port, and yet the waves ebb and flow without cease. I stand here today among the jewels of our Nation, among men and women who are precious, who radiate dedication, and they have been selected as the leaders of our land. And I pray to You, O Lord, that they too remain unsatisfied with yesterday. Let them grow with insight and turn the tide for our land, for we need them, their wisdom, devotion and energy, now more than ever. Amen.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journâl of the last day’s proceedings and announces to the House their wisdom, devotion and energy, now more than ever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journâl of the last day’s proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

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

Mr. MCNULTY. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker’s approval of the Journâl.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Speaker’s approval of the Journâl.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. MCNULTY. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, further proceedings on this question are postponed until later today.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COOPER) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. COOPER led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows: I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Monahan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 825. An act to redesignate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 7401 West 100th Place in Bridgeview, Illinois, as the "Michael J. Healy Post Office Building".

H.R. 917. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1830 South Lake Drive in Lexington, South Carolina, as the "Floyd Spence Post Office Building".

H.R. 925. An act to redesignate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1859 South Ashland Avenue in Chicago, Illinois, as the "Cesar Chavez Post Office".

H.R. 981. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 141 Erie Street in Linesville, Pennsylvania, as the "James R. Merry Post Office".

H.R. 993. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 111 West Washington Street in Bowling Green, Ohio, as the "Delbert L. Latta Post Office Building".

H.R. 1055. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1901 West Evans Street in Florence, South Carolina, as the "Dr. Roswell N. Beck Post Office Building".

H.R. 1368. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 7554 Pacific Avenue in Stockton, California, as the "Norman D. Shumway Post Office Building".

H.R. 1465. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4832 East Highway 77 in Iron Station, North Carolina, as the "General Charles Gabriel Post Office".

H.R. 1596. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2318 Woodson Road in St. Louis, Missouri, as the "Timothy Michael Gaffney Post Office Building".

H.R. 1609. An act to redesignate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 201 West Boston Street in Brookfield, Missouri, as the "Admiral Donald Davis Post Office Building".

H.R. 1740. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 120 East Kiest Boulevard in Dallas, Texas, as the "Dr. Caesar A.W. Clark, Sr. Post Office Building".

H.R. 2030. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 120 Baldwin Avenue in Paia, Maui, Hawaii, as the "Patsy Takemoto Mink Post Office Building".

The message also announced that the Senate has passed bills of the following titles in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 163. An act to reauthorize the United States Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution, and for other purposes.

S. 408. An act to authorize the President to posthumously award a gold medal on behalf of Congress to Joseph A. De Laine, in recognition of his contributions to the Nation.

S. 867. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 720 Wicks Lane in Billings, Montana, as the "Ronald Reagan Post Office Building".

S. 1207. An act to redesignate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 120 East Ritchie Avenue in Marceline, Missouri, as the "Walt Disney Post Office Building".

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York (Mrs. KELLY) will be recognized for 1 minute, followed by 5 one-minutes on each side.

WELCOMING RABBI MILTON BALKANY

(Mrs. KELLY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)
Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, Rabbi Milton Balkany, Dean of Bais Yaakov in Brooklyn, New York, is an acquaintance of mine. He has been an active participant and leader in the Jewish community in New York City for many years. Rabbi Balkany has worked hard to bring the community together in order to continue traditional religious and cultural values. Not only does he help younger generations understand the intrinsic and extraordinary Jewish culture to which they belong, but he also welcomes others of all religions to engage in prayer, meditation and community.

I applaud you, Rabbi, on this special occasion and welcome you as the guest chaplain of the House of Representatives.

REGARDING AMENDMENT TO INTELLIGENCE BILL

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

Mr. KUCINICH. Madam Speaker, yesterday in debate over H.R. 2417, the intelligence bill, the chairman of the committee refused to commit to an Intelligence Committee audit of all telephone and electronic communications between the Central Intelligence Agency and the Vice President to determine whether or not the Vice President influenced intelligence produced by the CIA on Iraq's alleged weapons of mass destruction, the cause of war. First, the chairman said the material may be classified and, second, working documents of the executive are respected and privileged. Some Members want the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence to have jurisdiction over the issue which top committee members clearly do not want to investigate. If an executive official pressured or manipulated CIA analysts to disseminate false, raw, unreliable information to justify a war, that matter should be neither classified nor shielded nor privileged. My amendment to the intelligence bill would direct the Inspector General of the CIA to audit all electronic communications between the Office of the Vice President and CIA to get to the bottom of numerous public reports which raise questions as to whether or not the Vice President played a role in making false information to become the public reason the President went to war in Iraq.

MEDICARE MODERNIZATION

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

Mr. FORBES. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of a comprehensive prescription drug benefit for all seniors. The Prescription Drug and Medicare Modernization Act of 2003 will guarantee prescription drug coverage to all our seniors and future generations. I firmly believe that no senior should be forced to choose between putting food on the table or buying the medicines they need. The Prescription Drug and Medicare Modernization Act would build on the strengths and successes of the current Medicare system while guaranteeing that all seniors will have access to a prescription drug benefit.

Just the other day the Secretary of Health and Human Services released a study which shows doctors will get an up-front drug discount of 25 percent. That is a significant savings for many of the seniors in my district. The reforms in this legislation will put patients before paperwork and ensure that doctors will continue to serve seniors through Medicare. The House has acted in the past and will work with the Senate to provide affordable voluntary coverage for every senior immediately. Let us pass this important legislation. Our seniors have waited too long for this much-needed relief.

MEDICARE MODERNIZATION

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Madam Speaker, the Republican Medicare prescription drug bill will provide unprecedented benefits and protection. Unfortunately, the benefits and protection under this perverse legislation will all flow to the pharmaceutical and insurance industries, not the seniors who need help paying their drugs prescription. That is right. The biggest beneficiaries are the wildly profitable pharmaceutical industry and the anticompetitive insurance industry. You cannot provide a meaningful benefit unless you deal with the obscene price of prescription drugs. And this bill does nothing, not reasonable pricing, not reimportation, not negotiated lowering of prices, nothing, because that would hurt the profits of the pharmaceutical industry. The insured also will be able to buy a subsidy under this bill to offer some sort of benefit without any requirement what those benefits might be, without any limit on the premiums they might charge, without any requirement who they might provide coverage to or exclude, all beginning in 2006.

We just heard about the great affordable plan we are going to offer today. This begins in the year 2006 and seniors who pay $4,500 a year for drugs will get $3,500 out of their pocket and a thousand from this bill. This is the pharmaceutical industry and insurance industry protection legislation.

HONORING THE 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE NATIONAL DRAFT GOLDFRATER RALLY

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

Mr. WILSON. Madam Speaker, yesterday was the 40th anniversary of another Arizona statesman, Senator Barry Goldwater. In fact, next week marks the 40th anniversary of his significant step in the historic presidential campaign of 1964. On July 4, 1963, the National Draft Goldwater Rally was held at the Washington National Guard Armory. I was honored as a young teenager to come on a bus from South Carolina with the founder of the Republican Party, Dr. Edens, Floyd Spence and Rusty DePass. This failed presidential campaign actually was spectacularly successful in launching a political revolution for limited government and expanded freedom. Especially in the South, the Republican conservatives has risen from virtual nonexistence to majority status on the local, State and Federal level.

I am grateful for the lasting influence of Barry Goldwater, who inspired victory over communism achieved by Ronald Reagan, and an emphasis on expanding freedom by reducing taxation, promoted by George W. Bush.

In conclusion, God bless our troops.

MEDICARE PRESCRIPTION DRUG BENEFIT

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

Mr. COOPER. Madam Speaker, today is the day that our seniors have been waiting for for many, many years, the day that we will pass a Medicare prescription drug benefit. Unfortunately, the real debate took place last night upstairs in an attic room in this building in the dark of night, literally starting after midnight, from 1 to 4 a.m., burglar hours, not lawmaker hours. In that debate, they foreclosed real debate on this floor today. They allowed only two bills to be turned on the Republican plan which is deeply flawed, which will end Medicare as we know it, and another plan which is too large to fit within the budget window. I supported the Dooley alternative, a much more sensible piece of legislation. Our seniors deserve better, much better than will be done for them on this House floor today.

PRESCRIPTION DRUG LEGISLATION

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

Mr. PENCE. Madam Speaker, as Congress considers the prescription drug legislation today, I think it is important for all Americans to remember a few simple facts. This would be the biggest new Federal entitlement since 1965 when Medicare was created.
Medicare currently costs seven and a half times what this Congress said it would cost when it invented it. Seventy-six percent of seniors in America today already have prescription drug coverage and according to the CBO under some versions of this legislation more than a third of those Americans who enjoy coverage from a private employer from whom they have retired could lose that coverage. If the proposals to be destroyed, what can the righteous do? Let us not in this Congress today sow the seeds to destroy the foundation of a free market system by creating a universal drug benefit in Medicare. The answer is the reforms the President called for giving Americans the same choices that the Members of Congress have. It is not to create a massive new Federal entitlement.

REPUBLICAN MEDICARE BILL
(Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. SANCHEZ of California. Madam Speaker, I heard a strange rumor last night that the Republican Party was going to change its mascot from the elephant to the night owl. This would be fitting since most legislation these days is being discussed by Republicans in the dark of night behind closed doors without giving Democrats a fair chance to debate it here on the House floor.

Today we are going to vote on legislation to increase the provision of the most significant reform in Medicare since its creation in 1965. This legislation will impact millions of seniors across the Nation, yet many of the Representatives in Congress will not have seen this legislation until today. Would someone sign their name on a long-term mortgage for their home if they had never stepped inside that house?

Moreover, many well thought-out amendments today will be debated. For example, my simple, cost effective proposal for a Medicare prescription drug benefit, they did not allow us to bring it to the floor to discuss it. The night owls have yet again ruined a perfect opportunity on what should really be bipartisan legislation. Ain’t that a hoot.

HONORING SERGEANT JACOB BUTLER
(Mr. RYUN of Kansas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RYUN of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of a true patriot. It will soon be July 4, a date etched in America’s heart. A day that serves as a time of reflection and celebration in the memory of sacrifices made; sacrifices made throughout history that granted us the freedoms that we enjoy today.

As our Nation celebrates our independence, it seems appropriate to pay tribute to an Army sergeant that meant a great deal to Kansas and our country. Sergeant Jacob Butler, from Wellsville, Kansas, joined the Army as a private at the young age of 19. He later rose to the rank of sergeant and accepted the demanding task of a squad leader. Unfortunately, Sergeant Butler was killed April 1 when a rocket propelled grenade hit his vehicle in Iraq. It was an honor to attend Jacob’s memorial service and funeral with his parents, Jim and Cindy, his friends, his family, and his fellow soldiers. The ceremony reminded me once again that great sacrifices for the causes of freedom did not end on July 4, 1776. Sacrifices continue today.

Jacob is no longer only a blessing to his friends and family, he is now a blessing to an entire Nation. On behalf of the people of Kansas and this grateful Nation, I ask that we remember Sergeant Jacob Butler as a son, a friend, a soldier, and a patriot.
A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 418, noes 0, not voting 16, as follows: [Roll No. 318]

AYES—418

A recorded vote has been demanded. A recorded vote was ordered. The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 76, noes 347, not voting 11, as follows: [Roll No. 319]

AYES—76

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. A recorded vote has been demanded. A recorded vote was ordered. The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 76, noes 347, not voting 11, as follows: [Roll No. 319]

AYES—76

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. A recorded vote has been demanded. A recorded vote was ordered. The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 76, noes 347, not voting 11, as follows: [Roll No. 319]

AYES—76

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. A recorded vote has been demanded. A recorded vote was ordered. The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 76, noes 347, not voting 11, as follows: [Roll No. 319]

AYES—76

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. A recorded vote has been demanded. A recorded vote was ordered. The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 76, noes 347, not voting 11, as follows: [Roll No. 319]

AYES—76

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. A recorded vote has been demanded. A recorded vote was ordered. The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 76, noes 347, not voting 11, as follows: [Roll No. 319]

AYES—76

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. A recorded vote has been demanded. A recorded vote was ordered. The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 76, noes 347, not voting 11, as follows: [Roll No. 319]

AYES—76

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. A recorded vote has been demanded. A recorded vote was ordered. The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.
Ms. DelAuro and Mr. Reynolds changed their vote from "aye" to "no." So the amendment was rejected.

The record of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MS. LEE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on amendment No. 6 offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. Lee) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote. The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 6 offered by Ms. Lee:

At the end of title III, add the following new section:

SEC. 345. REPORT ON INTELLIGENCE SHARING WITH UNITED NATIONS WEAPONS INSPECTORS SEARCHING FOR WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION IN IRAQ.

(a) In General.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study to determine the extent to which intelligence developed by the Department of Defense and by the intelligence community with respect to weapons of mass destruction obtained or developed by Iraq preceding Operation Iraqi Freedom was made available to the United Nations weapons inspectors and the quantity and quality of the information that was provided (if any).

(b) Study Matter Studied.—The study shall provide for an analysis of the sufficiency of the intelligence provided by the Director of Central Intelligence to those weapons inspectors, and whether the information was provided in a timely manner and in a sufficient quantity and quality to enable the inspectors to locate, visit, and conduct investigations on all high and medium value suspected sites of weapons of mass destruction.

(c) Access to Information.—(1) Subject to paragraph (2), the Comptroller General may secure access to any agency, office, or department of the United States Government and any instrumentality thereof, carrying out the study to the extent possible pursuant to existing procedures and requirements, except that no person shall be provided with access to classified information under this section without the appropriate security clearances.

(d) Report.—Not later than 12 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall submit to Congress a report on the study conducted under subsection (a). The report shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may contain a classified annex.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. A recorded vote has been demanded. A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—aye 185, noes 239, not voting 10, as follows:
The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. BIGGERT). The question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The amendment was agreed to.

The Speaker pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

By unanimous consent, Mrs. HARMAN was allowed to speak out of order.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, now that we have completed debate on our intelligence authorization bill for 2004, I just wanted to thank our chairman who is graceful, collaborative, and bipartisan and the members and staff on the majority side and to thank the strong team we have on the Democratic side and especially our staff. By name: Christine Healey, John Keefe, John Price from the minority whip, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER) is recognized for 1 hour.

The Speaker pro tempore. The amendment was agreed to.

The Speaker pro tempore. The question was taken; and the ayes appeared to have it.

The Speaker pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered to be considered.

The Speaker pro tempore. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute adopted by the Committee of the Whole? If not, the question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Speaker pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I too would like to congratulate my ranking member and the members of the staff on both sides of the aisle. Normally I would name all those staff. This year I am going to point to one individual who really was the architect of the bill for the majority, put it together, did the hard work as he always does. He does the budget number and he understands the programs. His name is Mike Meermans.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I too would like to congratulate my ranking member and the members of the staff on both sides of the aisle. Normally I would name all those staff. This year I am going to point to one individual who really was the architect of the bill for the majority, put it together, did the hard work as he always does. He does the budget number and he understands the programs. His name is Mike Meermans.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I too would like to congratulate my ranking member and the members of the staff on both sides of the aisle. Normally I would name all those staff. This year I am going to point to one individual who really was the architect of the bill for the majority, put it together, did the hard work as he always does. He does the budget number and he understands the programs. His name is Mike Meermans.
of Congress. That very same day, the House also approved a standing order that authorized the Speaker to entertain motions to suspend the rules on Wednesdays, through the second Wednesday in April. On April 30, 2003, the House had a unanimous suspension of the rules. Through yesterday, this authority was exercised 13 times.

Entertaining motions to suspend the rules on Wednesdays has been a valuable and helpful tool for the House leadership. In fact, just a few weeks ago, the minority showed how much clout they can have actually in defeat- ing these suspensions when they op- posed two Senate-passed public lands bills and both measures failed under suspension of the rules. Eventually, we brought both measures back to the floor where they were overwhelmingly approved. There is simply no evidence to support any claim that permitting the Speaker to entertain motions to suspend the rules on Wednesdays, through the second Wednesday in April. On April 30, 2003, the House had a unanimous suspension of the rules. Through yesterday, this authority was exercised 13 times.

This resolution is simple. It allows the Republican leadership to consider suspension bills on Wednesdays. Current rules allow this body to consider suspension bills on Mondays and Tues- days. A special provision in the rules allows the majority to place items under suspension of the rules on Wednesdays. As Members know, and the American people are noticing, the Committee on Rules is the right thing to do.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia for yielding me this time, and I yield myself 5 1/2 minutes.

This resolution is simple. It allows the Republican leadership to consider suspension bills on Wednesdays. Current rules allow this body to consider suspension bills on Mondays and Tuesdays. A special provision in the rules allows the majority to place items under suspension of the rules on Wednesdays. As Members know, and the American people are noticing, the Committee on Rules is the right thing to do.

Madam Speaker, I am rising today to strongly oppose this resolution, and I urge my colleagues to vote "no" and defeat the resolution. I have serious concerns about not only the suspension process but also the way this House is being managed. Suspensions should be reserved for noncontroversial items that do not require lengthy debate by the full House. Controversial issues or substantive issues should not be brought to the House floor under the suspension process—a process that allows little debate and no amendments.

But, Madam Speaker, this House is becoming a place where trivial issues get debated passionately and impor- tant ones not at all. The majority of this House has allowed a form of little debate on critical issues facing the American people. Later today, we will debate the most sweeping changes to Medicare since the program was cre- ated 38 years ago. Two days ago, I asked the chairman of the Committee on Rules when as a Member of the House I could examine this hugely im- portant bill, and I was told emphati- cally that it would be available online yesterday morning, and I logged on at home; but there was no bill. I checked again during the day, but again no bill. Finally at 11:50 p.m. last night, we were given a copy of the bill and told that the Committee was holding an emergency meeting an hour later to consider this bill, and we reported the rule at 5 a.m. this morning.

Why the rush to do this bill in the middle of the night? Is this bill so impor- tant, so time sensitive that the Re- publicans need to force it through the Committee on Rules in the dead of night? When I asked the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules why it was considered an emergency hearing, all he could tell me was that he called the emergency hearing because it is his prerogative as chairman of the committee and he wanted to do it this way. We had only an hour to look at this final bill, a bill that is close to 700 pages.

This process, Madam Speaker, is dis- graceful. It demeans this body, and it insults the American people who rely on us to read, to debate, and to vote knowledgably on legislation. It is clear that the Republican leadership wants to rush this bill through this body as quickly as possible. The other body has already spent 2 weeks debat- ing this bill. They will consider over 70 amendments before they are done. Re- publicans and Democrats alike have been able to bring their amendments to the floor in the other body and to be heard and to debate these issues. Fifty- eight amendments on the Medicare bill were brought to the Committee on Rules this morning. Only one sub- stantive amendment was heard. Everything else, including some very thoughtful amendments offered by Republicans, was denied. We will have a grand total of 4 hours to discuss a bill that will fundamentally change the way 40 mil- lion Americans pay for the medicines that they need.

This process is awful, Madam Speaker; and this resolution will make it worse. The question is quite simple. Rather than naming more post offices that they would like; and this resolution will make it worse. The question is quite simple. Rather than naming more post offices that they would like, the American people pay for the medicines that they need.

This process is awful, Madam Speaker; and this resolution will make it worse. The question is quite simple. Rather than naming more post offices that they would like, the American people pay for the medicines that they need.

This process is awful, Madam Speaker; and this resolution will make it worse. The question is quite simple. Rather than naming more post offices that they would like, the American people pay for the medicines that they need.

Mr. FROST asked and was given per- mission to revise and extend his re- marks.

Mr. FROST. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Let us be very clear about what is happening on the floor today. The United States Senate has a procedure called a filibuster where Members can get up and talk and fill up the time. Up until today the House does not have a fili- buster. What we are doing is to pass a
Mr. LINDER. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), another member of the Committee on Rules. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) for yielding me this time. And the gentleman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), the ranking member who is a most distinguished member of the Committee on Rules, is very generous to my colleagues on other side when he says they will bring up nonsubstantive matters on the suspension calendar under the rule that is proposed now, to add a day where suspension matters of the rules can be brought to our attention.

I am not that generous because among the things that I believe that right? It would happen is that we are going to see substantive legislation here on the floor of the House under the suspension calendar. And when that happens that means it did not come to the Committee on Rules. Members have this opportunity to amend it. When it is here on the House floor they each have 20 minutes per side and one can bring the most major matter; for example, we were up last night, as has been pointed out, from 12:50 until 5:15 this morning in the Committee on Rules. That is all right, but would the Members believe that under this particular rule that is coming in the middle of a session that what we could also do is bring this same Medicare measure up if we wanted under the majority provision?

I cannot say it too well, but I said to the chairman of the committee, why are we doing this in the middle of the night? I would happen is that we what we can do is work 9 to 5 Monday through Friday rather than having to have this lack of time. The American people send us up here to work. They do not send us up here to avoid time.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding. And let me begin by expressing my appreciation for the hard work that he put into the Committee on Rules meeting last night.

My friend just mentioned the fact that measures that are considered under suspension of the rules are nonsubstantive and his concern is the fact that we may bring up substantive measures under suspension of the rules. The fact of the matter is major substantive matters that should come up under suspension of the rules. They can only pass if there is a two-thirds vote. The only requirement is that in fact 61 Democrats joined with every Republican to pass the measure.

I just wanted to make that clear.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, reclaiming my time, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) will speak to that a little later and tell us how tricky that is when they put matters on and Members cannot, for example, make a distinction between whether they want to vote yes and what matters they will want to vote no and find themselves in a box. I believe the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) will be able to explain it better than I.

The gentleman's chairman and mine, the gentleman's majority leader and mine, Gerald Solomon, said the following: Every time we deny an open amendment process on an important piece of legislation, we are disenfranchising the people and their representatives from the legislative process. The people and their representatives are not being even treated as second class citizens. And what I said to the chairman is that roughly 48.9 percent of the people in this country are represented by Demo-

Let me end by saying what Gerald Solomon said: The people are sick and tired of this political gamesmanship. They want back into their House, and want it open and democratic, not closed and dictatorial.

Anybody that believes that this measure is going to help this House of Representatives is participating in what Gerald Solomon described as a closed and dictatorial body, and time will tell.

Mr. LINDER. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time and rise in strong opposition to this rule today. Imagine, a bill that will affect over 40 million people. But not until 2006 they tell us, which is very interesting, and we do not even get a chance to read the bill before we vote on it. Last night, I was one of the people that stayed in the Committee on Rules until 5 a.m. this morning trying to amend this bill. I thought: “What a punitive process.”

Yet this is how they are treating the American people, too. It will be harder on them than it was obviously on us staying up all night on this measure that is so vastly important to grandmothers, grandfathers, to older citizens across this country. They want to privatize Medicare. They want to take this prescription drug benefit and put our seniors into Medicare HMOs. Try to find one that still exists in your area. And they denied me the opportunity to offer my amendment to permit the Secretary of Health and Human Services to have negotiated prices for prescription drugs. Everybody knows bulk buying gets you a better price. They denied me that ability, and not only that but in the base of section 505 of the bill the Secretary of Health and Human Services to have negotiated prices to get people the best price for prescription drugs, moreover, in their bill, if a
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person's drugs cost over $2,000 a year, well, it's just too bad. Seniors will have to pay between $2,000 and $4,000 for what they cannot afford. How many seniors earning $8,000 a year on Social Security can afford that?

What is the matter with you people? What is the matter with you?

And then they try to limit the amount of time for debate on the floor here. Let's look at negotiated prices on this companying chart, which I am trying to get in this bill, take this medicine for high blood pressure, for example, in Canada that costs about $152. In our country it costs about $182 if one goes to the regular drugstore. And if one has a negotiated price like the Department of Veterans Affairs has, you can get it for $102. The consumer saves all that money.

My amendment tried to do is to use what the Department of Veterans Affairs does to have bulk buying, and apply it to this program so we use the power of the people, the consumer power of the people, to get them the best price for prescription drugs. They will not allow my amendment on this floor today.

I have the right to offer my amendment. You can vote no on it, but you have no right to do this to the senior citizens of our country. I urge my colleagues to vote no on this rule.

Mr. LINDER. Madam Speaker, on my time, I would like to ask the Clerk to reread the rule.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. Biggert). Without objection, the Clerk will reread the rule.

There was no objection.

The Clerk reread the resolution.

Mr. LINDER. Madam Speaker, I thought I was correct. This is a rule on suspensions, not on Medicare.

Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. McGovern) for yielding me this time.

What are the consequences of what we are talking about? I will give an example. When we were debating the tax bill a couple weeks ago, we found out after the fact because we only had an hour to debate this major tax bill that 12 million children of working parents, 6% of children, were left out of the editing room floor not getting a tax cut that they were promised, a $1,000 tax cut. It costs us $3.5 billion to make the Department of Veterans Affairs do to have bulk buying, to use what the Department of Veterans Affairs does to have bulk buying, to apply it to prescription drugs.

And if one has a negotiated price like the Department of Veterans Affairs does to have bulk buying, to apply it to the Department of Veterans Affairs to have bulk buying, to use what the Department of Veterans Affairs does to have bulk buying, to apply it to prescription drugs does not allow us to do that. The same thing happens with name brands to reduce prices. It would be cheaper for us to import drugs from American-made drugs that are sold in Canada, Germany, and England at cheaper prices, that would bring real competition, make drugs affordable, would save close to a half of $1 trillion. There was no room for this debate on prescription drugs for that amendment.

So whether we want noncontroversial, it is not controversial to me, but whether we have real issues debated here on this floor, so people can vote and be held accountable, that, to me, is significant. Let us have time to bring our common values and common principles, to debate them, and stand up in front of our public to let them know where we stand.

Mr. LINDER. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Green).

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. McGovern) for yielding me this time. I urge my colleagues to oppose the rule when it comes up and obviously to oppose the underlying bill. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Madam Speaker, the disrespect that the majority has for the democratic process is evident today.

The majority brings this to the floor, does not deign to discuss it. Perhaps they are going to wait until they have passed the last word, which they are entitled to under the rule; but I do not understand why they should think it is not worth their time and energy to discuss the issues we are trying to solve.

Mr. LINDER. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I will yield to the gentleman from Georgia on his time.

Mr. LINDER. Madam Speaker, I am happy to give the gentleman 2 minutes.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Madam Speaker, I am happy to yield.

Mr. LINDER. Madam Speaker, I have explained this rule, and the Clerk has one of the most important issues this Congress will consider this year, this prescription drug package for our senior citizens.

The Committee on Energy and Commerce marked up this legislation for 3 days last week. The Democratic side offered dozens of amendments that would significantly improve the legislation. Several of these amendments were very close or tie votes, including one amendment that I offered to close that gap in coverage that is part of the so-called prescription drug benefit plan. That would close that doughnut hole that our seniors are going to fall into under the majority Republican plan. But the Committee on Rules would not let us offer these same amendments, amendments which should have been offered and may have passed on this floor.

One amendment was discussed by my colleague, the gentlewoman from Ohio, regarding a provision in this bill that prevents the Health and Human Services Secretary from negotiating for cheaper prices for our seniors. That is just wrong. We do not prohibit the VA from doing it. We do not prohibit our States from doing it. In fact, the Committee on Energy and Commerce does not extend the Medicare benefit that passed allowed States to do that; yet we are saying that the Federal Government cannot get cheaper prices for our seniors. That amendment should be on this floor.

Mr. LINDER. Madam Speaker, it is far too important for us to rush a debate on a prescription drug benefit for seniors and only have 1 day. The Senate has been debating this bill for the past 2 weeks, but in the House we are going to do this and rush it through in one afternoon. That is not the way our forefathers designed this House to legislate.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the rule when it comes up and obviously to oppose the underlying bill. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.
Mr. FRANK. Madam Speaker, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman for confirming my point. He said the Clerk has read it twice. You have, Mr. Frank, read it twice. You have specifically the language read twice. You should be grateful for that.

There are philosophical implications here. We have been meeting only on an average of 2 1/2 days a week. You are going to produce a majority body for a great democracy. What we want to have is debate. What we want to have is to air for the Members their doubts, their concerns, their Members do not like. And the important questions are not simply your ability, which I envy, to get your Members to vote in a majority for things that they do not like. You were afraid, you in the majority, you in the House, do not have the ability to change or modify the 10 percent, we are not going to let you try and change or modify the 10 percent, because then we will say, oh, you are not patriotic, you are not a supporter of the State of Israel, you are not a supporter of the American economy.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, reclaiming my time, I would like to comment on the gentleman’s comments, because democracy does not simply mean the end result. It means an open process of debate. It means letting people try to change each other’s minds. It means letting the American people through the media understand what is going on. What we have is a systemic process here not to allow that.

Mr. LINDER. Madam Speaker, it is not a matter of time. We are told we do not have enough time. By the way, when I came here and was told by the majority, well, that is the way it used to be. No, it was not. By the way, to the extent that there were abuses in the past, I objected. When I was in the majority, I helped lead a change in the rules because too often, both sides in a conference report took the same position. And I fought for the rights of minorities to take 20 minutes on the conference report. Madam Speaker, if we were here, we had something called the 5-minute rule. We debated. We yielded to each other. We debated defense bills for 3, 4, and 5 days.

The majority, in the interests of making sure that it gets its Members to do whatever they are told to do without being embarrassed on subordinate issues, has beaten down democracy. They have collapsed democracy into meaning simply the end product. And debates on amendments and public discussion, as evidenced by this today, hey, I read the rule; what do you need? Well, democracy needs debate, discussion. It needs a joinder of the issues, and we do not get that. And we do not get that for the reasons that you have given. And we have Members who are not as conservative as the center of gravity on the Republican Party, and I apologize to some in the Republican Party of saying “center of gravity,” because I know to many of them “center” is a dirty word.

So there are moderate Republicans, so-called, who do not agree with their party’s positions. What they are now doing is voting with their party on a series of procedures that disallow democracy, disallow debate, disallow amendments, and that allows them then to appear to be for certain positions when they have voted to collapse them. That is why the rule is a great disservice to democracy.

Mr. LINDER. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

First of all, let me echo a point that was made by my colleague from Massachusetts about the importance of the amendment process and how it promotes congressional accountability. Let me read my colleagues a quote: “What does the ability to offer an amendment have to do with accountability? If a Member has the power to
offer an amendment, he can no longer claim to support one thing, but then say that he was blocked in his effort to make a change in the law. In addition, with more floor votes and more clear issues, Members will be forced to take clear positions with their votes. That is exactly what the American people want: fewer excuses and more elected officials who actually stand for something."

That quote, Madam Speaker, was made by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from California (Mr. Dreier). I agree with that quote.

The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. Linder), my friend, seems confused as to why we are having this debate. He has asked for the amendment resolution to be read over and over, so let me try to clear something up. The reason why we are having this debate today is because we believe that this House is becoming a place where trivial issues get exaggerated passably, and important ones, not at all. The fact that what they are asking for is an additional day to debate essentially non-consequential, trivial issues bothers us because we are constantly being told by the majority that we do not have enough time to make everybody's amendments in order. We do not have enough time to allow this House to deliberate. We do not have enough time to make sure that the democratic process works, and that all Members, Democrats and Republicans, have an opportunity to have their constituents' voices be heard on this House floor. So that is why we are having this debate.

We are having it in a particularly passionate way today because of what went on earlier this morning in the Committee on Rules. The prescription drug bill, perhaps one of the most important pieces of legislation that we will deal with, an issue that impacts 40 million of our senior citizens in this country and to instill widely-held moral values is quite important and relevant to the topic at hand. So I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote "no" on this. We are spending too much time naming post offices and not enough time debating the issues that real people care about. So I urge a "no" vote.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. Linder. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I do not agree with my Massachusetts colleague who said it is dumbing down democracy to do suspensions and not have amendments. To get to a conclusion at many times is good for the process, good for the country.

Ms. Jackson-Lee of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H. Res. 297 which provides for the Speaker the option to entertain motions to suspend the rules on Wednesdays during the remainder of the One Hundred Eighth Congress. Functionally, this proposal hinders the legislative business of the House. Furthermore, this proposal appears to be nothing more than another attempt by the majority to diminish the opportunity of the minority to debate more substantive issues on this floor.

The purpose for allocating time for these items is to expedite their adoption and entry into the records because they are not controversial. To slow down the legislative calendar with three days, instead of two, of non-controversial items is patently wasteful. Passing legislation to commemorate great citizens and to instill widely-held moral values is quite important but should yield to the simple principle of prioritization. An appropriations bill for projects queued by the Department of Homeland Security to protect our Nation's critical infrastructure and bioterrorism readiness clearly deserves its priority over non-substantive matters. We have a moral duty not to take lightly the lives of our children and grandchildren. Quite frankly, this bill appears to be somewhat of a mockery to our democratic process.

In the years leading up to the election of 1994, the Republican Party in the House of Representatives complained loudly and vociferously that the then-Democratic majority ruled the House with an autocratic iron fist. The Members of the Rules Committee heard this complaint on a daily basis. Democrats were accused of stifling debate and gagging the House.

After eight and a half years of a Republican-controlled House, the Democratic Members of the Rules Committee can report that the House of Representatives is less democratic and more autocratic than ever before. Instead of reforming the House, the Republican major-
houses the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair. Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 48 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE) at 12 o'clock and 53 minutes p.m.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1, MEDICARE PRESCRIPTION DRUG MODERNIZATION ACT OF 2003, AND H.R. 2596, HEALTH SAVINGS AND AFFORDABILITY ACT OF 2003

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 299 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 299
Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 1) to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for a voluntary program for prescription drug coverage under the Medicare Program, to modernize the Medicare Program, and for other purposes. The bill shall be considered as a read for amendment. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) three hours of debate on the bill equally divided among and controlled by the chairmen and ranking minority members of the Committee on Energy and Commerce and the Committee on Ways and Means; (2) the amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, if offered by Representative Rangel of New York or his designee, which shall be in order without intervention of any point of order, shall be considered as read, and shall be separately debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent; and (3) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Sec. 2. Upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order on the legislative day of June 26 or June 27, 2003, without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 2596) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a deduction for its immediate consideration.

(a) In the engrossment of H.R. 1, the Clerk shall—
(1) add the text of H.R. 2596 as new matter at the end of H.R. 1;
(2) conform the title of H.R. 1 to reflect the addition of the text of H.R. 2596 to the engrossment;
(3) assign appropriate designations to provisions within the engrossment; and
(4) conform provisions for short titles within the engrossment.

(b) Upon the adoption of the text of H.R. 2596 to the engrossment of H.R. 1, H.R. 2596 shall be laid on the table.

Sec. 4. During consideration of H.R. 1 and H.R. 2596 pursuant to this resolution, notwithstanding the operation of the previous question, the Chair may postpone further consideration of either bill to a time designated by the Speaker.

Sec. 5. Upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order, any rule of the House to the contrary notwithstanding, to consider concurrently resolutions providing for adjournment of the House and Senate during the month of July.

Sec. 6. The Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight on Thursday, July 3, 2003, to file a report to accompany a bill making appropriations for the Department of defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Ohio is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume in responding to the gentlewoman.

During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purposes of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 299 is a multi-part rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 1, the Medicare Prescription Drug Modernization Act of 2003, and H.R. 2596, the Health Savings and Affordability Act of 2003.

This rule provides for consideration of H.R. 1 under a modified closed rule, an appropriate rule for such a delicate, complex, and historic piece of legislation. The rule provides for 3 hours of general debate equally divided between the chairmen and ranking minority members of the Committee on Energy and Commerce on the provisions of H.R. 1, and the Committees on Ways and Means. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of H.R. 1.

After general debate it will be in order to consider an amendment printed in the report accompanying this resolution, if offered, by the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) or his designee and debatable for 1 hour. All points of order are waived against the amendment. Finally, the rule permits the minority and a motion to recommit to H.R. 1 without instructions.

Section 2 of this rule provides for the consideration of H.R. 2596, the Health Savings and Affordability Act of 2003, under a closed rule on the legislative day of June 26, or tomorrow, June 27, under a closed rule. The rule provides 1 hour of general debate in the House equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means. All points of order against the consideration of H.R. 2596 are waived. Finally, the rule provides for one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

I would like to take a moment to clarify for my colleagues that upon passage of both pieces of legislation, the text of H.R. 2596 shall be added as a new matter at the end of H.R. 1. In simple terms, these two bills will become one. However, this bill does not preclude either the bill from moving forward independently.

Finally, the remaining sections of this rule provide for some housekeeping provisions and provisions to allow the House to act forward in the appropriations process.

Mr. Speaker, today is a historic day. For years now, seniors across this country have consistently voiced to Congress the same major concerns: the skyrocketing costs of prescription drugs. Their concerns are not perceived; they are very, very real. Each year, a typical senior pays approximately $1,300 on prescription drugs, filling about 22 prescriptions on average.

Today, the House will consider a plan to give all seniors a prescription drug benefit through Medicare.

In passing this bill, as I believe we will do before this day is over, we will renew America's promise to our seniors. We will reduce the burden of prescription drugs, and revolutionize medicine in the 21st century.

I would like to thank the gentlewoman from California (Chairman THOMAS) and the gentleman from Louisiana (Chairman TAUZIN) for their exemplary cooperation, their remarkable leadership, and inspiring vision they have provided on this complex, yet very much-needed legislation. I would like to take a moment just to give special thanks to them for working so closely with me on a couple of provisions that will greatly benefit cancer patients and hospitals across the country. Included in this legislation is immediate Medicare coverage for oral anticancer drugs and hospice, which will allow this body to move forward in the appropriations process. The House will consider a plan to give all seniors a prescription drug benefit through Medicare.

I would like to thank the gentlewoman from California (Chairman THOMAS) and the gentleman from Louisiana (Chairman TAUZIN) for their exemplary cooperation, their remarkable leadership, and inspiring vision they have provided on this complex, yet very much-needed legislation. I would like to take a moment just to give special thanks to them for working so closely with me on a couple of provisions that will greatly benefit cancer patients and hospitals across the country. Included in this legislation is immediate Medicare coverage for oral anticancer drugs and hospice, which will allow this body to move forward in the appropriations process. The House will consider a plan to give all seniors a prescription drug benefit through Medicare.

In passing this bill, as I believe we will do before this day is over, we will renew America's promise to our seniors. We will reduce the burden of prescription drugs, filling about 22 prescriptions on average.

Today, the House will consider a plan to give all seniors a prescription drug benefit through Medicare.

In passing this bill, as I believe we will do before this day is over, we will renew America's promise to our seniors. We will reduce the burden of prescription drugs, filling about 22 prescriptions on average.

Today, the House will consider a plan to give all seniors a prescription drug benefit through Medicare.

I would like to thank the gentlewoman from California (Chairman THOMAS) and the gentleman from Louisiana (Chairman TAUZIN) for their exemplary cooperation, their remarkable leadership, and inspiring vision they have provided on this complex, yet very much-needed legislation. I would like to take a moment just to give special thanks to them for working so closely with me on a couple of provisions that will greatly benefit cancer patients and hospitals across the country. Included in this legislation is immediate Medicare coverage for oral anticancer drugs and hospice, which will allow this body to move forward in the appropriations process. The House will consider a plan to give all seniors a prescription drug benefit through Medicare.
Now, some of my colleagues will no doubt put forth $1 trillion, pie-in-the-sky plans. These packages would bust any budget, Republican, Democrat, or otherwise. As a matter of fact, the Democrat substitute actually is larger than the sum of two budgets. The Democratic Senate plan alone for Medicare and the Democrat Blue Dog budget had $400 billion dedicated to Medicare. That is a total of $920 billion. But the Democrat substitute that they are offering today is over $1 trillion, not to mention the combination of those two Democrat budgets. Mr. Speaker, that is unacceptable.

Mr. Speaker, the lack of prescription drug coverage under Medicare is exactly what age discrimination looks like in 2003. Seniors are the last group of people who are forced to pay retail costs for their medications and, Mr. Speaker, that should be enough of a violation of civil rights to get even the ACLU involved.

I said just a moment ago that today is a historic day, and it is. Today we apply a little common sense by recognizing that health care is simply not what it was 30 years ago, and that Medicare is not what it was 30 years ago. We will just have to keep up. Today, we will take the first steps in creating the next generation of quality health care, a new era where prescription drugs make regular doctor visits less frequent, where cutting-edge treatments make hospital stays nearly obsolete in the future, and where life-saving medications reduce formerly deadly diseases to mere manageable symptoms within longer and healthier lives.

Today I urge my colleagues to be bold, to be courageous, to show leadership, and to take America’s health care system into a new frontier, a place where it has needed to go for far too long now. Time is precious and so are our seniors. I urge this Congress to pass the underlying rule and approve H.R. 1, the Medicare Improvement and Prescription Drug Act of 2003.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Ms. SLAUGHTER asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, this is a very sad day for most of us. A program that has served America well and has given peace of mind and good health care to seniors for over 40 years is under threat today; and actually, what we know is going to be before us is the death of Medicare.

One of the saddest parts about this bill today is that the Democrats have no role in it. To all of my colleagues who showed up last night at the Committee on Rules, or this morning, actually, at the Committee on Rules with amendments that they thought that they could use to strengthen the bill, I apologize to you that there is no possibility in the world that you could do it. I hope that you did not hate yourself this morning for all the sleep that you lost for nothing.

Mr. Speaker, this rule is an affront to the democratic process. The underlying bill will harm every single one of the 40 million Americans served by Medicare. At 1 a.m. this morning, with absolutely no meaningful opportunity to review the most 700-page prescription drug legislation, the Committee on Rules met to consider the resolution now before us. By now I should be used to it, but we cannot tolerate these continual attacks on democracy. When you refuse to allow half this House to speak and to give their amendments, you are cutting out half of the population of the United States from any participation in the legislation that goes on here. It defies reason and it defies common sense that political expediency and newspaper headlines could force this monumental legislation, probably the most monumental that any of us will do in our tenure in the Congress of the United States, to force it through the Chamber with little more than cursory consideration.

The other body, on the other hand, has spent over 2 weeks debating similar legislation. In stark contrast, we meet when nobody is around, up in the attic, as someone said today, and are permitted only 3 hours to discuss the largest overhaul of Medicare in its history. The people we represent would be disgusted if they understood how this issue is being handled.

We are not naming a post office here. We are considering, as I said, the most important change to Medicare since its creation. This decision will affect so many people. It is no simple undertaking, and it certainly deserves more debate than allowed by this rule. And even more so, if we refer to the messy process to the messy process to the messy process to the messy process, the Committee on Ways and Means, the Committee on Rules incorporated the so-called Health Savings Account bill into the rule for the Medicare overhaul legislation, so what we are doing here are two rules. So-called health savings accounts would create a new tax advantage, personal savings accounts, used to pay the out-of-pocket medical expenses. At first glance, perhaps it sounds innocuous. But when you look at the fine print, that it has led to a $2 billion tax cut over the next 10 years while the Federal deficit continues to grow out of control. Even worse, it is a tax break with a destructive purpose: to threaten the traditional employer-based health care by actually encouraging companies to reduce their employees’ health coverage.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps the most egregious problem with the legislation before us is that it does nothing to address the skyrocketing prices of prescription drugs. Oh, sure, they will tell you that we can import drugs from Canada, but the fact of the matter is that an amendment inserted into the Senate
bill by one of our Senators says that it cannot be done unless it is certified by the Secretary of HHS, who has stated already that he will not do it. Therefore, any debate today about being able to import drugs is absolutely a farce.

The increase in the out-of-pocket Social Security cost-of-living adjustments are based rose 98 percent, and the prescription drug costs that are crippling older Americans rose even higher. Seniors on Medicare are expected to spend $18 trillion on prescription drugs over the next decade.

Today's Washington Post tells a story of Marie Urban of Cleveland. After her housing and Medicare payment, she has $459 a month for utilities, food, car insurance, taxes, and medication. She told The Post that some months she has 87 cents left over. This is wrong. She deserves better. A few years ago, as a temporary Band-Aid, I organized a bus load of seniors to travel to Canada to purchase medications. Some of the prices charged in the American market. We had dozens of more people interested than we could accommodate, but those who went saved anywhere from $100 to $650 on a 3-month supply of medication.

Today we live in an age when science provides the medications that cure illness and improve the quality of life and extend life. But the promise of the wonder drug is meaningless if you cannot afford to buy it. The skyrocketing price of prescription drugs is the number one concern of American seniors and, indeed, most Americans. H.R. 1 does nothing to freeze or reduce the exorbitant cost of prescription drugs. In fact, again, the idea of going to Canada and handing it out with one hand and taking it away with the other is something that the drug companies will be very happy about, because they have fought in every possible venue to keep the re-imbursement on prescription drugs.

At the same time, we hoped that what the Veterans Administration has done with great success. By negotiating for the people that they represent with the drug companies, they have been able to save many of their veterans a great deal of money. Seniors fear this bill is a rush to privatize Medicare. We saw the flop of Medicare+Choice when many, many private insurance companies pulled out completely on senior citizens, leaving many of them in parts of the United States completely uncovered. Indeed, they have told us again, they do not want to cover a prescription drug program. One hundred percent of the people they cover will buy medicine. This is not what they consider a good business proposition.

Forty years ago, Congress created the Medicare program because private industry would not offer health insurance to older people. Company saw the older people as a threat to their profits. We should have learned this lesson in the 1960s, because nothing has changed; and now we are today taking away what is probably the most important issue to senior citizens, will they be able to get health care.

Don Young, who is the President of the Health Insurance Association of Americans, quoted here often, has said, "We caution Congress against relying on drug only insurance as a mechanism to deliver a benefit.

Ira Loss, an analyst with Washington Analysis, said, "The private sector that is supposed to be excited about this isn't. It creates a new benefit program built around insurance products that do not exist and are likely to never exist.

Mr. Speaker, this proposal would replace Medicare's guaranteed coverage with what is essentially a voucher program to purchase private insurance, assuming that there is an insurer willing to sell it to you. But those who want the traditional fee-for-service Medicare will be forced to pay higher premiums.

We have no idea, for example, what Part B would cost because it is not in the bill, which is intended to force the beneficiaries out of traditional Medicare and into a plan. Mr. Speaker, senior citizens do not want this legislation. We have received call after call and letter after letter beseeching us to oppose this plan. They did not contact me because they want the traditional fee-for-service Medicare will be forced to pay higher premiums.

According to the Consumers Union, the average Medicare user spends $2,318 for prescription medicine. Under this plan, the out-of-pocket drugs would rise to $2,954 for the average senior on Medicare. So this program is a placebo, not a cure, legislation crafted to provide political cover for the majority, not provide prescription drug coverage for seniors. Some may argue that this is something better than nothing, but it is only a start and, frankly, what we have in Medicare has not been that bad. But as many of our constituents say, a bad bill is worse than no bill.

Mr. Speaker, this bill that will raise premiums and reduce their choices and dismantle Medicare is a very bad bill. I urge my colleagues to oppose the rule. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SOLIS).

(Ms. SOLIS asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, this sham Republican prescription bill provides elderly women with nothing more than a false sense of security.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SOLIS).

(Ms. SOLIS asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, this bill is a sham. It does not provide adequate prescription drug benefit.

This projecto de ley no ayudara a los ancianos. No ayudara ni a nuestras madres ni a nuestras abuelitas.

(English translation of the above statement is as follows:)

It will not help our mothers, nor our grandmothers.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to call attention to the fact that women who are disproportionately impacted by Medicare reform. The reality we must confront is that women simply live longer than men—about 19 years into retirement, while men can expect to live 15 years. So although this means we have longer to cherish our mothers and grandmothers, it also means women are more susceptible to multiple and chronic illness, and require more long-term care needs.

It is no surprise then that women comprise the majority of Medicare. In fact, we constitute 53 percent of the Medicare population at 65, and 71 percent at the age of 85. Yet even more crucial is the fact that four out of five America's elderly women are widowed and almost half live out their days alone. Compound
this misfortune with the reality that these widowed women are four times more likely, and a single or divorced woman are five times more likely, to live in poverty after retirement than a married man.

America’s elderly women, many of whom live alone or in poverty, have higher out-of-pocket health care costs and are now being denied access to a secure and responsible Medicare prescription drug plan under the Republican Plan. Almost 8 out of 10 women on Medicare use prescription drugs regularly, though continue paying for these medications out-of-pocket. Now we are telling these women, who already spend 20 percent more on prescription drugs than their male counterparts, that they must navigate the privatized ropes, and we can only hope, not guarantee, that they will have affordable coverage and monthly premiums. Even middle-class women who have made wise financial planning decisions will quickly find that high drug costs may undermine any retirement security they have worked hard to establish.

My district, which is predominately Latino, will be one of the hardest hit by this new legislation. Latina women make up the largest minority percentage (58 percent) on Medicare with incomes less than $10,000. These minority women historically rely on public, rather than private, health insurance. Now, we are stripping their only health coverage security and implementing a new, privatized and completely unmanageable plan!

Have we not learned our lessons from Medicare-Choice? That private plans do not participate in many regions, that their premiums and benefits vary greatly by geographic area, that participation by Medicare HMO’s has been unstable, and that private plans are not less costly than traditional Medicare?

By 2010, Latinas are expected to comprise 18 percent of the elderly population and they are continually encountering strategically placed barriers that hinder their equal right to quality health care.

Let us not forget all the mothers, grandmothers, and sisters now and in the future for whom Medicare represents a lifeline to a healthy retirement. Who wants to tell the millions of hard working women who take care of our mothers, grandmothers, sisters, and nieces deserve.

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HARMAN).

(Ms. HARMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the bill to end Medicare as we know it, which will hurt our sisters, mothers, and grandmothers.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN).

(Ms. BALDWIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this bill which fails to provide women with the affordable and reliable Medicare prescription drug coverage that they desperately need and deserve.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote against this sham of a bill. It seeks to privatize Medicare and does not provide a real, guaranteed, affordable drug benefit that our seniors desperately need.

When I am home in Wisconsin, one of the issues I hear people discuss on the street, at the airport baggage claim, or in meetings from Monroe to Baraboo, is that seniors cannot afford to pay their prescription drug coverage. Seniors send me receipts for their drug bills and ask me how they are supposed to afford their rising drug costs on a fixed budget.

The Republican drug bill on the floor today is not going to provide seniors with the relief they deserve. Instead of providing a real, affordable prescription drug benefit, this bill seeks to privatize the Medicare program. It is my belief that privatization of Medicare is unwarranted. Medicare has been a vital component of our Nation’s health care system since its creation in 1965. In fact, Medicare was originally created because private insurance plans were simply not providing health insurance to seniors and people with disabilities. For nearly 40 years, Medicare has done the job that private insurers would not—or could not—do.

Why then, would we rely on private insurers to provide a Medicare prescription drug benefit to our Nation’s seniors? Would we rely on private insurers to provide a prescription drug benefit? Seniors would have to join HMOs and private insurance plans to get the benefit. The prices and benefits under this private coverage would vary from region to region, so that a senior in Wisconsin would have to pay a different premium than a senior in Florida. These geographic disparities are simply unacceptable.

There are no assurances in this bill that prescription drugs would be affordable. In fact, this bill takes no steps to stop or slow the skyrocketing cost of prescription drugs. Instead, this bill provides partial coverage of drug spending until $2,000 and then leaves seniors high and dry. There is a huge gap in coverage where seniors may pay 100 percent out of pocket for their medications. It would guarantee fair drug prices by giving the Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services the authority to use the collective bargaining clout of all 40 million Medicare beneficiaries to negotiate drug prices. The savings would then be passed on to seniors. In addition, the Demo-cratic proposal makes drugs more affordable by allowing the safe reimportation of drugs from Canada and makes lower cost generic drugs available more quickly. Unlike the Republican bill, there are no gaps in coverage in the Democratic proposal. Coverage is provided for any drug a senior’s doctor provides. Seniors would be able to choose where to fill their prescriptions and would not have to join an HMO or private insurance plan to get drug coverage. This is the proposal senators have been asking for, not one full of complexities and gaps in coverage like the Republican plan we will vote on shortly.

Today we are voting on a bill that is a sham. It is a sad mockery of what seniors in our country deserve. Instead of providing a comprehensive Medicare prescription drug benefit for America’s seniors, the Republicans have decided to make sure this bill suits the big drug companies and leads down the road of privatizing Medicare. This is just plain wrong for the retirees of the greatest generation, who worked hard, lived through the depression, won a war, and raised their families.

Seniors need a comprehensive prescription drug benefit that is affordable and dependable for all—with no gaps or gimmicks in coverage. This Republican proposal fails on all these counts, and I urge my colleagues to vote against it.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. DAVIS).

(Mrs. DAVIS asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this sham Republican Medicare bill. That is why I wear my black arm band because it is the death of Medicare and it does not provide the adequate prescription drug coverage our mothers, grandmothers, sisters, and nieces deserve.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS).

(Mrs. DAVIS of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this sham Republican Medicare bill. That is why I wear my black arm band because it is the death of Medicare and it does not provide the adequate prescription drug coverage our mothers, grandmothers, sisters, and nieces deserve.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to talk about older women and their need for a real prescription drug benefit. The legislation we have before us represents a hollow substitute for a bonafide Medicare prescription drug benefit. Some will claim that the Republican Medicare reform
Mr. Speaker, my constituents want an affordable prescription drug benefit that will be there when they need it. They do not want to privatize Medicare. However, the bill we will discuss dismantles Medicare and does nothing to lower prescription drug prices. This proposal eliminates the security of traditional Medicare. It leaves us in competition with private plans in 2010. It would transform Medicare from a defined benefit to a defined contribution program and ultimately eliminate Medicare as we know it. Because, private Medicare plans can aggressively recruit younger and healthier seniors, open competition will mean rising out-of-pocket costs for the vast majority who would choose the stable benefits and premiums of traditional Medicare.

The result of open competition will be the transformation of today's universal, national risk pool into a multitude of regional pools segmented by age, income, residence and health status. To many, this transformation sounds more like a scheme than meaningful reform.

Our seniors need more stability and certainty than this—especially older women who are counting on Congress to provide a real solution to the rising cost of prescription drugs. Women, literally, are the face of Medicare. They constitute 58 percent of the Medicare population. They constitute 71 percent of the Medicare population at 85. Women have a greater rate of health problems since they live longer. They have lower incomes, which make access to affordable prescription drugs more difficult. More than 1 in 3 women on Medicare (nearly 7 million) lack prescription drug coverage.

The Republican Medicare reform plan will only perpetuate these health care disparities. Where is the benefit for our seniors who are living on a fixed income and cannot afford to pay out-of-pocket during the coverage gap? Where is the benefit for the women who, because they were stay-at-home mothers and did not earn a pension, cannot afford the prescription drugs they desperately need? For the Senate, the Republican proposal is not good enough. I cannot support this legislation when I know we can do better. We are doing more than providing prescription drugs, we are legislating the future of Medicare.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Georgia (Ms. MAJETTE).

(Ms. MAJETTE asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. MAJETTE. Mr. Speaker, I oppose this sham Republican Medicare bill because it does not provide the adequate prescription drug coverage that our mothers and grandmothers absolutely deserve.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY).

(Mrs. MALONEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, I oppose this Republican Medicare bill, and I urge every woman, man, every American to read the fine print. There are gaping holes. There are problems. I will put this into the RECORD and I am totally opposed to this bill.

Mr. Speaker, the health of America’s older women is at serious risk. Whatever Medicare Prescription Drug bill we pass will have an enormous impact on older women, both now and in the future, and women are concerned. More than half of Medicare recipients age 65 are women and 60 percent are women. And most older women live on fixed incomes. Older women tend to have more chronic health conditions than men, and eight of ten women on Medicare use prescription drugs regularly.

In the face of these facts, the “bait and switch” tactics of the Republican Medicare Prescription Drug bill are simply outrageous. Seniors think we’re giving them help with high cost drugs. They think we’re offering them supplemental insurance—guaranteed, cheaper and permanent—to ease their burden of skyrocketing drug costs on fixed incomes. But the Republican bill is a cruel trick. Seniors who are sickest and taking expensive medications—mostly women on fixed incomes—get a little bit of help with the first 2000 bucks of drug expenses. But then they get the “donut hole”—a big fat zero until they pay a $3000 ransom to get more help with their drug bills.

The fiscal irresponsibility of the Republican bill is stunning and illogical. Instead of putting the purchasing power of America’s seniors to work as a huge bargaining chip to lower prescription drug costs, the Republicans prohibit the Secretary of HHS from negotiating for lower drug prices on behalf of seniors. The Democrats believe prescription drugs should be affordable for seniors—but our amendments to have the Secretary negotiate on seniors’ behalf were defeated.

The height of hypocrisy in the Republican bill is the fact that it actually discourages employers from continuing to offer drug coverage for retired seniors who have already paid health insurance premiums throughout their working lives. The Congressional Budget Office estimates that a third of employers will drop retiree drug benefit coverage if the Republican bill becomes law.

Frankly, the Republican Medicare Prescription Drug bill is cruel. This is not compassionate conservatism. It is blatant bias against the elderly, against women, and against the poor. It is the first step in doing away with Medicare as an entitlement and it is the first step toward dividing our elderly into the needy and those who can afford to “buy out”. The purpose of Medicare was to help the elderly with needed care as they age, and to do it with dignity and not on the basis of ability to pay.

Prescription drug coverage would save money in the long term because drug therapies can be substituted for more costly treatments like hospitalization and surgery. But what seniors—men and women—need and want is help that they can understand and can rely on, not the “bait and switch” of the Republican plan.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DE LAURO).

(Ms. DE LAURO asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. DE LAURO. Mr. Speaker, the Republican Medicare bill fails to provide Americans with real prescription drug coverage, that which they need and the which they deserve with disabilities.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

(Ms. SCHAKOWSKY asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I rise against the Republican bill that kills Medicare and fails to provide affordable prescription coverage to the elderly and people with disabilities.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

(Ms. LEE asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, this bogus Republican prescription drug bill will effectively dismantle and kill Medicare and leave millions of seniors, especially our women, our mothers, our grandmothers behind.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

(Ms. McCOLLUM asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, this Medicare bill fails to provide women with real prescription drug coverage they need and deserve.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. FLETCHER) for some substantive remarks. Dr. Fletcher is a member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce and also a member of the medical profession, and we look forward to what he has to add to this debate.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. Speaker, let me thank the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. PRYCE) for her leadership in chairing our majority conference as well as her leadership in getting the Republican House to respond to this issue and this rule.

Mr. Speaker, I find it interesting to see and observe the number of people that have stood in line here to talk about this bill, even though CBO estimates that 93 percent of our seniors will take advantage of this bill. That means many of the sisters, mothers and family members that these Members have just spoken about will take
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legislation provides a prescription drug benefit and declare success. Well, Mr. Speaker, we aren’t fooling anyone. We aren’t fooling Donna Koski, from San Diego, who cannot afford her medication. She wrote to tell me, “HMOs are no longer helping us with mediation.” I worked and paid taxes all my life, raised five kids in California and now have five grandkids. I can’t afford rent or so many things that I once took for granted would be there when I retired. What is to become of senior citizens [like me]? We aren’t fooling Sidney and Edith Horwitz, from La Jolla, who told me, “Figure out a way to give us drug benefits without joining a HMO.” Deregulation and outsourcing to private companies has been a travesty to consumers.

Mr. Speaker, my constituents want an affordable prescription drug benefit that will be there when they need it. They do not want to privatize Medicare. However, the bill we will discuss dismantles Medicare and does nothing to lower prescription drug prices. This proposal eliminates the security of traditional Medicare. It leaves us in competition with private plans in 2010. It would transform Medicare from a defined benefit to a defined contribution program and ultimately eliminate Medicare as we know it. Because, private Medicare plans can aggressively recruit younger and healthier seniors, open competition will mean rising out-of-pocket costs for the vast majority who would choose the stable benefits and premiums of traditional Medicare.

The result of open competition will be the transformation of today's universal, national risk pool into a multitude of regional pools segmented by age, income, residence and health status. To many, this transformation sounds more like a scheme than meaningful reform.

Our seniors need more stability and certainty than this—especially older women who are counting on Congress to provide a real solution to the rising cost of prescription drugs. Women, literally, are the face of Medicare. They constitute 58 percent of the Medicare population. They constitute 71 percent of the Medicare population at 85. Women have a greater rate of health problems since they live longer. They have lower incomes, which make access to affordable prescription drugs more difficult. More than 1 in 3 women on Medicare (nearly 7 million) lack prescription drug coverage.

The Republican Medicare reform plan will only perpetuate these health care disparities. Where is the benefit for our seniors who are living on a fixed income and cannot afford to pay out-of-pocket during the coverage gap? Where is the benefit for the women who, because they were stay-at-home mothers and did not earn a pension, cannot afford the prescription drugs they desperately need?

For the Senate, the Republican proposal is not good enough. I cannot support this legislation when I know we can do better. We are doing more than providing prescription drugs, we are legislating the future of Medicare.
Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, we have so little time to try to make any points here.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), a member of Committee on Rules.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, this is a sad day for this House and, more importantly, it is a sad day for America’s senior citizens.

This bill is a complex and controversial $400 billion Medicare privatization plan that will affect the lives of 40 million senior citizens. For 38 years Medicare has been there for our parents and our grandparents, helping them live longer, more healthy lives. It is a sacred promise with the elderly of this country and this House is about to radically and fundamentally break that promise.

If that were not bad enough, the Republican leadership blocks out all amendments other than one substitute to this bill. For example, this bill mandates for the first time a co-payment for senior citizens who receive Medicare home health care. I have been fighting for years to protect home health care cuts, so I had an amendment before the Committee on Rules around 4:30 this morning to eliminate that co-pay because I think it is unfair and I think we should help seniors who use home health care, not charge them more money. But like every single other amendment, Democrat or Republican, my amendment was not made in order.

The other body has spent the last 2 weeks, Mr. Speaker, debating, discussing and amending their prescription drug bill. They seem to recognize that this is a big deal. So how much time do we give our seniors in this House? Not 2 weeks, not even 2 days. Three hours. What a terrible disservice to the people I represent, the people we all represent.

This bill ends Medicare as we know it and turns it into a convoluted, complicated voucher program of HMOs and PPOs and shifting coverage. It is a bill that leaves a huge gap in coverage, penalizing people for getting sick. It is a bill that moves us toward privatizing Medicare and leaves our seniors at the mercy of the insurance industry and the big drug companies. It is a bill that only a CEO could love. Senior citizens deserve better. Senior citizens deserve within Medicare. They should not be left at the mercy of the HMO accountants who are more concerned with the bottom line and profit margins than with adequate health care.

Our substitute works like the rest of Medicare. It tackles the high cost of drugs and it guarantees our seniors meaningful, consistent prescription drug coverage. That is what our seniors deserve. I urge my colleagues to vote no on the rule and yes on the Democratic substitute.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. BRADLEY).

Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1 and the rule that accompanies this important legislation, for today we will begin to finally provide for a prescription drug benefit under Medicare for America’s senior citizens.

H.R. 1 will ease the financial burden placed on America’s seniors, improve access to the medications they need, and introduce market measures that will curb future cost increases.

According to a recent study, the House plan, our plan, would reduce the average overall cost of prescription drugs by 25 percent through aggregating the purchasing power of seniors. In addition to these overall savings, the plan provides significant and immediate savings for seniors through provisions, including a prescription drug discount card which would provide a 10 to 15 percent savings; significant front-end coverage with a cost sharing agreement that has seniors paying only 25 percent of the first $2,000 of drug costs after they pay a deductible and a monthly membership fee. Beyond that it involves catastrophic protection providing 100 percent coverage for out of control drug costs beyond $3,500. And, lastly, and perhaps most important, assistance for low income seniors, enabling those Medicare beneficiaries that have income of 135 percent of the poverty line to receive full coverage on their prescription drugs.

Speaker, the advancement of medical research and technology has led to the development of new drugs that can dramatically reduce the need for surgery, for hospitalization and for nursing home care.

It is high time that we provide America’s senior citizens with improved access to these drugs at prices they can afford. I urge my colleagues to support this bill and to support the legislation.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN).

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from New York for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, we should reject this rule because H.R. 1 offers the wrong vision for Medicare. H.R. 1 asks every Member a fundamental question, what do you want Medicare to be? If you want Medicare coverage that is guaranteed, dependable, universal and fair, you will vote against H.R. 1. If you want Medicare to cover every senior everywhere, you will vote against H.R. 1. If you want Medicare to offer the same coverage to seniors on Park Avenue as seniors in Appalachian, Ohio, you will vote against H.R. 1.

But Mr. Speaker, if you want Medicare to offer reliable, selective, discriminatory coverage, you will support H.R. 1. If you want Medicare to offer coverage to seniors in Appalachian, Ohio, less coverage than seniors on Park Avenue or no coverage at all, you will vote for H.R. 1. If you want Medicare to offer
I also want to thank leadership for their work to ensure stable funding in the Medicaid disproportionate share hospital (DSH) program. H.R. 1 provides all states with a one time 20% increase in their DSH allotments. This 20% increase means an additional $184 million in funding for our state’s safety net hospitals. This additional funding will help ensure that services to the most vulnerable populations remain available.

I believe that we must bring Medicare into the 21st century and that no American should be denied needed prescription drugs because he or she cannot afford them. I recognize that the lack of a prescription drug benefit for our seniors signifies the fact that Medicare has fallen behind the times. H.R. 1 is the best prescription drug benefit plan for America and I urge my colleagues to support its passage.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), my distinguished colleague, the chairman of the Committee on Rules, who led us through this last night to the historic conclusion today on the floor. (Mr. DREIER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, the first revision I would like to make to my very good friend and the role that I play was leading us through this morning as we did, in fact, as has been pointed out, beginning late at night. We began late at night because we were all working together to fashion a bill which I am convinced that at the end of the day will enjoy bipartisan support in this House of Representatives. It has been the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT), the speaker, who, as the author of this legislation, has been in the lead on not only the issue of bringing about measures to strengthen and protect and improve Medicare but also to put into place a very important expansion of medical savings accounts, which I joined him in championing for many, many years. This is a historic day, as many have said; and my colleague, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. PRYCE), has been working diligently over the last several days and weeks and months to get us here.

I mentioned the gentleman from Illinois (Speaker HASTERT). There are lots of other people, the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) who will force seniors who now have prescription drug coverage, a bill that will force people who now have prescription drug coverage to drop that coverage, then you will vote for H.R. 1. The gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) will offer a substitute amendment with a different version of Medicare. The Rangel-Dingell substitute strengthens Medicare by adding a prescription drug benefit, no unaffordable cost sharing, no gaps in coverage. The Rangel-Dingell substitute would maintain Medicare’s guaranteed coverage, remaining faithful to the trust Medicare has earned from seniors.

The Rangel-Dingell substitute harnesses seniors’ purchasing power to demand better prices from the drug industry. My friend from Kentucky had it all wrong when he said the Republican plan does that. The Republican plan, because it was written by the drug companies, does nothing to bring prices down.

Vote “no” on the rule. Vote “yes” on H.R. 1. Vote “yes” on the Rangel-Dingell substitute.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA), my distinguished colleague. (Mr. ISSA asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I support this bipartisan, Republican-led, legendary, historic event that we are participating in late at night because we were all working together to fashion a bill which I am convinced that at the end of the day will enjoy bipartisan support in this House of Representatives. It has been the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT), the speaker, who, as the author of this legislation, has been in the lead on not only the issue of bringing about measures to strengthen and protect and improve Medicare but also to put into place a very important expansion of medical savings accounts, which I joined him in championing for many, many years. This is a historic day, as many have said; and my colleague, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. PRYCE), has been working diligently over the last several days and weeks and months to get us here.

I mentioned the gentleman from Illinois (Speaker HASTERT). There are lots of other people, the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL), the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means; the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. TAUZIN), the chairman of the Committee on Energy and Commerce; but I would like to talk about the Representatives who did at 12:50 this morning appear before the Committee on Rules.

The gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN) represented the Committee on Energy and Commerce and did a wonderful job; but no one has been more involved in dealing with health care issues than the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON), and I was very impressed with the fact that she was able, in her presentation before the Committee on Rules, over a 90-minute period, to deal with virtually every question that came forward; and, Mr. Speaker, it was so apparent that her grasp of this issue, coupled with her commitment to ensuring that seniors get their fair share. Finally, I believe that we must bring Medicare into the 21st century and that no American should be denied needed prescription drugs because he or she cannot afford them. I recognize that the lack of a prescription drug benefit for our seniors signifies the fact that Medicare has fallen behind the times. H.R. 1 is the best prescription drug benefit plan for America and I urge my colleagues to support its passage.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), my distinguished colleague, the chairman of the Committee on Rules, who led us through this long night to the historic conclusion today on the floor. (Mr. DREIER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, the first revision I would like to make to my very good friend and the role that I play was leading us through this morning as we did, in fact, as has been pointed out, beginning late at night. We began late at night because we were all working together to fashion a bill which I am convinced that at the end of the day will enjoy bipartisan support in this House of Representatives. It has been the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT), the speaker, who, as the author of this legislation, has been in the lead on not only the issue of bringing about measures to strengthen and protect and improve Medicare but also to put into place a very important expansion of medical savings accounts, which I joined him in championing for many, many years. This is a historic day, as many have said; and my colleague, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. PRYCE), has been working diligently over the last several days and weeks and months to get us here.

I mentioned the gentleman from Illinois (Speaker HASTERT). There are lots of other people, the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL), the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means; the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. TAUZIN), the chairman of the Committee on Energy and Commerce; but I would like to talk about the Representatives who did at 12:50 this morning appear before the Committee on Rules.

The gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN) represented the Committee on Energy and Commerce and did a wonderful job; but no one has been more involved in dealing with health care issues than the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON), and I was very impressed with the fact that she was able, in her presentation before the Committee on Rules, over a 90-minute period, to deal with virtually every question that came forward; and, Mr. Speaker, it was so apparent that her grasp of this issue, coupled with her commitment to ensuring that seniors get their fair share. Finally, I believe that we must bring Medicare into the 21st century and that no American should be denied needed prescription drugs because he or she cannot afford them. I recognize that the lack of a prescription drug benefit for our seniors signifies the fact that Medicare has fallen behind the times. H.R. 1 is the best prescription drug benefit plan for America and I urge my colleagues to support its passage.

I believe that as we look at what it is that we are trying to do here there are so many very important and positive developments that have taken place. I know my friend from Ohio has just mentioned the very important issue of the disproportionate share of hospitals that provide assistance under Medicaid. Increasing the level of funding for those hospitals that are shouldering that responsibility has been one of the challenges that the Los Angeles area, which I am honored to represent, has faced; and we, I believe, are going to be able to help deal with that.

At the same time, I think it’s fair to say that in looking at some of the things that have been said that were critical of this rule and of the measure, first on the rule, Mr. Speaker, we have put into place what I believe is a very fair rule. In the 107th Congress we all know that we dealt with this issue, and there was no substitute made in order. So in this Congress we have done that, but in bringing the health savings accounts, which are a very important item, designed to provide incentives for people to make choices and plan for their long-term health care needs by bringing this measure in with our very important Medicare package, what we have done is we have provided the minority with three opportunities, the substitute and two opportunities to offer motions to recommit, and there was no substitute offered on the other and I suspect we would have made that. We conservatively offered our opportunities for the minority, if they had submitted those to us, that would have been made in order; and we, as the majority, have basically one opportunity and that is our bill.

I acknowledge that members of the majority we have been able under Speaker HASTERT’s leadership to put this package together; but anyone who claims that we are not giving an opportunity to the minority to offer motions to recommit is clearly wrong, and we have provided the proposal which was submitted to us by the ranking minority member of the Committee...
Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. NAPOLITANO).

(Mrs. NAPOLITANO asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, I think this is an unfinished Republican Medicare bill because it does not provide the simple, adequate prescription drug coverage for all our mothers, our sisters, and our grandmothers.

Ms. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS).

(Mrs. CAPPS asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding me the time.

I want to speak about a provision in the bill that will cut even with yesterday's revisions, hundreds of millions of dollars for cancer care. A cut like this will be devastating to seniors with cancer.

If this bill is passed, cancer centers will close, especially satellite centers that are located close to where seniors live. Those that remain open will admit fewer patients and lay off oncology nurses.

Medicare beneficiaries do pay too much for their oncology medications. We all agree that we must fix this, but Medicare also pays way too little for essential oncology services. The overpayments for oncology drugs has been used to pay for treatments oncologists provide to cancer patients. So we must fix both parts of this problem.

The bill fixes overpayment of drugs, but still cuts some $300 million from cancer care to do it. The quality of cancer care will suffer.

The gentlewoman from Georgia (Mr. NORWOOD) and I submitted amendments originally in it some 12 percent; but it still leaves a huge vacuum for the services that are provided by oncology nurses, the whole panoply of outpatient and clinic setting services that patients who are receiving chemotherapy, which is such a devastating treatment to go through, need in order to maintain.

It is really a life-and-death situation for people who receive a diagnosis of cancer and then find out that they have to go to the doctor and get their medication, and then they have to find some way to have the services delivered because Medicare will not cover this wide comprehensive care in a cancer center, and that is what we need to have a full debate upon.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Reclaiming my time, I disagree with the gentlewoman's analysis of how it works. There is a provision that will allow physicians to stockpile, if they prefer.

But on to another issue, Mr. Speaker. There were statements made earlier that there were no cost savings in this bill, by a former speaker. There are cost savings. There is group purchasing and insurance benefits, a 25 to 30 percent savings. There is a discount card, 15 to 20 percent savings. There is a Medicare best price, $18 billion in savings. Average wholesale price reform, $15 billion in savings. There is Hatch-Waxman reforms and reimportation reforms, all generating savings. And that is how we are able to expand and generate better treatment for seniors through the upcoming years.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN).
Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the proposed rule providing for consideration of the Medicare Prescription Drug and Modernization Act.

This rule restricts the House to 3 hours on the largest ever overhaul of a program that has been critical to the health of our Nation's seniors for 38 years. Furthermore, the rule blocked dozens of amendments, including one of my own, which could have resulted in tremendous savings for seniors by opening the door for the Health and Human Services Department to use the bulk purchasing power of America's 40 million Medicare beneficiaries to negotiate lower medication prices for them.

As a result, Members are denied the opportunity to address many disturbing provisions in this bill. To mention just a few, the failure to address the rapidly rising cost of prescription drugs that will soon render this benefit meaningless; the tremendously gaping holes in coverage that will result in less help for those who need it most; and the provisions that fundamentally alter the structure and entitlement of Medicare by requiring the program to compete with private plans beginning in 2010.

Mr. Speaker, the list of Members' concerns with this bill goes on and on. The other Chamber has been debating this bill for 2 weeks, meanwhile, the United States House of Representatives will have a mere 3 hours of debate on this bill that we are presented with. This is an affront to democracy.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DeFazio).

Mr. DeFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time.

We have heard a lot about the new benefits and protections that will be afforded by this bill. Unfortunately, most of the benefits and protections will not go to seniors in need, they will go to the pharmaceutical and the insurance industry. This bill will do a good job of protecting the monopoly profits and price gouging by the pharmaceutical industry.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Kentucky has not read or at least he doesn't understand the bill. Section 1801 prohibits the Federal Government, Medicare, from negotiating lower prices from the pharmaceutical industry, a provision inserted at the behest of the pharmaceutical industry to protect their profits. The VA negotiates very successfully, and that would lower the cost of drugs much more than the puny benefits in this bill at a cost of $400 billion.

The bill does not allow the reimportation of U.S. manufactured drugs from Canada because that would provide a greater benefit than the puny benefits in this bill. Here are three drugs: Tamoxifen. If we could just reimport, if Americans could just buy the drug by mail from Canada, they would save 90 percent. But a couple with a $4,500 a year drug bill get a 22 percent benefit under this legislation. For Vioxx, for arthritis, 52 percent if you could just buy it in Canada and bring it back into this country. Under this bill, a 22 percent reduction for seniors who pay $4,500 a year for drugs. And then for Xalatan, for glaucoma, a little closer, 33 percent from Canada, 22 percent under this bill.

So without any cost, without spending $400 billion and without spending a penny, but impinging on the profits of the pharmaceutical industry, we could provide much better benefits by negotiating or allowing reimportation.

But it does not stop there. It also benefits the insurance industry. It is going to drive seniors from Medicare Part D into private insurance. In order to subsidize to private insurance to provide unspecified benefits at a cost to be determined in the future when those benefits might become available in the year 2006, and they can be withdrawn at any time.

This is not the security our seniors deserve and it is outrageous that this should be offered without any amendments being allowed to this party.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DeLAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, this House has sometimes risen to the occasion on matters of great national importance; the first Gulf War, September 11, when we came together to bind the Nation's wounds and provide for the national security of the Nation.

Unfortunately, this bill does not rise to the occasion. It does not deliver an adequate prescription drug benefit or hold down the cost of drugs. What it does do is open the door to the privatization of Medicare. It turns it over to the HMOs, to the private insurance market which has dropped over half of the Medicare enrollees in my State of Connecticut over the last 4 years.

And seniors have not forgotten. This bill does nothing to contain costs. It prohibits the Secretary of Health and Human Services from even engaging in negotiations with the drug companies to lower prices. As a result, many seniors will pay more than they do now and their premiums will rise as the cost of drugs rises.

Throughout my time in Congress, the single most common concern I have heard from seniors at the local stops and shops where I meet with them every weekend is how expensive their prescriptions are becoming. Seniors know that they are being taken advantage of. They know they can get drugs cheaper in Canada and overseas. And when seniors find out that we are doing nothing to hold down the excessive profiteering of the pharmaceutical companies, when they find out that their coverage essentially stops during midsummer while they still have to pay the premiums, they are going to feel betrayed. And they are being betrayed.

If we allow this bill to become law, we would be saying that guaranteed health care for our seniors is no longer the obligation or the responsibility of this government. I did not come to this Chamber to preside over the dismantling of Medicare. Our social contract with our seniors must be honored, and I urge my colleagues to support a plan that does that and not this Republican sham. Oppose the rule and oppose the bill.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COOPER).

Mr. COOPER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, this should be a great day for this country. We should be on the verge of passing a real Medicare prescription drug benefit for our seniors. But, unfortunately, we are not. The Republican majority is rushing through a sham bill in this House in barely 24 hours. They won't let anybody see a copy of this bill until 11:50 p.m. last night. The Committee on Rules' deliberations began at 12:50 a.m. last night and lasted, as has been mentioned, until 4 a.m.

What are they afraid of? What are they hiding? And why would they not allow amendments like the Dooley amendment to be offered on this floor? It is my understanding in the other body that Senators HAGEL, ENSIGN, and CLINTON will be offering the Dooley amendment as a substitute to that legislation. The other body has deliberated on this matter for some 2 weeks in the full light of day so that all senior citizens around this country, all families around this country, could pay attention to the details of this legislation and judge for themselves whether it is good medicine for the American people or not.

But not only is the Republican majority hiding the real substance of this bill, they have failed to learn the lessons of past efforts of this House to reform the health care system. Number one, health care legislation that works must not be partisan. This bill is almost an entirely Republican-only bill. That doomed it to failure from the start.

Second, real health care reform must not be overly complex. This is one of the most complex bills that seniors could ever imagine facing. The red tape is incredible. And, third, this bill should not be overly burdensome to seniors. But it is. Watch out when your seniors back home realize they have to pay $35 a month for a very questionable benefit.
There is a donut hole in coverage, and that is almost too complex to explain in the 2 minutes I am allowed here, but this bill is so inferior to the Dooley bill, which solves these problems in a simple, clear and fair fashion. Under the Dooley bill, there is a zero monthly premium.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a “no” vote on the previous question.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL).

(Mr. EMANUEL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, like the preceding speaker before me from Tennessee, my good friend, the Dooley-Tauscher bill, I think, addresses the right priorities, the right common values we have. It does not try to end Medicare as we know it. It keeps Medicare, that has done so well over 40 years, intact. And unlike the other bills, it lives within the $400 billion frame. It is true to the principles that have held Medicare true. It relies on part B of Medicare to deliver the benefit. It does not try to privatize that benefit. It is a low-income benefit for our seniors, and importantly, it is universal in its benefit. Everybody would get it. There would be a minimum of 25 to 30 percent discount on drugs.

One of the biggest debates here is not only a benefit under Medicare of prescription drugs, but it is making the drugs that our elderly need every day when they go to the drugstore or their local pharmacy, making those medications affordable. The benefit accounts for all drug spending. That is the core principle here. It is a universal benefit.

So this is the right type of approach. The other day the Washington Post endorsed it. And, today, in the other body, a bipartisan group of Senators will be introducing it. I think it expresses our common values and our common principles of what is true to our vision of what Medicare should be, not what it should not be.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. Davis).

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, one of the things that we can all agree upon here today is that there ought to be an open and honest debate in our country, regardless of our seniority and exactly how to accomplish writing a prescription drug benefit. There are Democrats here who recognize that we have to live within the budget constraints that have been forced upon us, and we are ready to take the first step, even though it would not be the final step we would take. We are ready to work with Republicans.

This bill that is being forced on the House of Representatives today with a minimum of debate is a sham. There are many ways to illustrate the point. Probably the best is the private insurance companies who are being asked to provide this drug benefit are saying, once again, we do not want to do it. We do not want your money. There are not many people here in Washington who tell the government we do not want your money. These private insurance companies do not want to write this drug benefit. This bill is a sham.

The bill sets no details on premium, no details on the scope of the coverage. What are seniors getting under this bill? They do not know because we honestly do not know. The Dooley bill deserves a day that it represents a compromise between what the Senate and the House is trying to do here and what the Democrats are proposing in the substitute. We deserve to have a debate on the Dooley bill.

Mr. Speaker, the rule should be defeated, the motion should be defeated, and we should debate the Dooley bill.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. TIERNEY).

(Mr. TIERNEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this bill, which is not modernization of Medicare. It ends it, it does not mend it. And there is no choice here for doctors, only for insurance companies. It is going to put a lot of seniors who have good retirement plans back into the Medicare system without the care and the prescription drugs they need.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). The Chair has an announcement. As indicated by previous occupants of the Chair on June 27, 2002, and on March 24, 1995, although a unanimous consent to insert remarks in debate may comprise a simple declarative statement of the Member’s attitude toward the pending measure, it is improper for a Member to embellish such a request with other words or sentences, and it can become an imposition on the time of the Member who has yielded for that purpose.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, we will pay attention to that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. CARSON).

(Ms. CARSON of Indiana asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. CARSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I will be brief, and I appreciate the opportunity to speak about how the Medicare bill fails to provide women with the real prescription drug coverage that they need, especially to senior women of this Nation.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND).

(Mr. KIND asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule, and encourage my colleagues to vote “no” on the previous question so we can have a real and honest debate today, and make in order the Dooley substitute. Members in the New Democratic Coalition, have worked long and hard to offer a viable alternative to the base bill. The bill before us, unfortunately, will jeopardize the very sanctity of the Medicare program. The Dooley bill, on the other hand, is simple, progressive, affordable. It helps those seniors who need the most assistance, the low-income and those with high drug costs. It offers zero premium payments; it is Medicare as seniors know it. The benefits are integrated into Medicare part B, and every beneficiary gets a guaranteed benefit for no additional premium.

Unlike the House and Senate Republican bills, this bill has no gap in coverage, and it is fiscally responsible. It fits within the budget resolution that was passed earlier this year.

Later today, it is my understanding that Senators HAGEL and CLINTON and ENSIGN will be offering the same exact Dooley substitute on the Senate floor. We should be allowed to debate the same measure today. I urge a “no” vote on the previous question.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON).

(Mr. THOMPSON of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today against this rule. Members should have an opportunity to vote on an enhanced version of the bipartisan Senate bill. That is the Blue Dog prescription drug benefit bill. Unfortunately for seniors across this country, our friends across the aisle have allowed it to be eliminated. It is better because it has a guaranteed fall-back, which means if seniors cannot get a PPO, they will have Medicare. It is better because there are no premium supports, which means seniors are not going to be penalized for staying in Medicare, and it is better because it does not privatize Medicare. Medicare is an important program that has saved the lives of many seniors, and an inclusion of a prescription drug benefit deserves an open debate.

Mr. Speaker, I urge opposition to this rule so the Blue Dog proposal can be debated and seniors can have the best coverage that we can afford at this time.

Mr. Speaker, today I rise in opposition to the rule of the Republican Medicare Prescription Drug Bill, H.R. 1. It serves only one purpose—ensuring that the voices of several in the Democratic Party are never heard on this critical issue.

I thank the gentlewoman from Indiana, my friends, for engaging in this debate by crafting a moderate, affordable prescription drug alternative that would have appealed to Members on both sides of the aisle. But this
body will never consider the Blue Dog substitute, because the Rules Committee denied us the opportunity to debate our proposal and have a vote on the House floor.

As you know, the Blue Dogs are a group of fiscally conservative Democrats, who are committed—to the coalition—to the passage of a prescription drug benefit that fits within our $400 billion budget window. On Tuesday evening, the Coalition formally endorsed legislation based upon the bipartisan Senate Medicare bill (S. 1).

The coalition has come together to develop a strong bipartisan benefit. It is not perfect. But, in recent years, the perfect has become the enemy of good and, unfortunately, the perfect is out of our price range. The Senate offers America’s seniors a good benefit. It carries a monthly premium of $35. A deductible of $275. A 50 percent cost-share through the first $4500 of drug spending. And, it offers a catastrophic benefit that kicks in after beneficiaries have spent $3700 out of pocket. Further, it corrects a variety of inadequacies in our Medicare reimbursement system for rural providers.

We have strengthened the rural provider package, accelerating the start dates to 2004. And, we have improved the adjustments made to the wage index labor share—dropping the labor share to 62 percent.

We have built upon the Senate’s critically important fall-back provisions. The fall-back means that seniors—such as those living in rural areas without two or more plans providing service—will always have access to a drug benefit. We have provided an additional layer of stability for those seniors, by requiring the fall-back plans to contract for two years as opposed to one.

We have included the Senate Generic drug amendment, which has been scored by CBO as a cost-saver because it streamlines and clarifies the process by which generic medications can be brought to market. This will increase the amount of affordable medications available to all of our seniors.

We have incorporated disclosure requirements, to ensure that our plans are fully demonstrative of savings are passed on to our beneficiaries.

We allow the Secretary to negotiate on behalf of all Medicare beneficiaries for the best prices possible.

We permit the re-importation of medications from Canada, provided that the Secretary certifies that such action would not jeopardize the health and safety of the American public.

We allow Medicare to operate as the primary payor for all dually eligible beneficiaries, lifting some of the financial burden off the shoulders of our states.

We allow a portion of employer contributions to be counted towards the beneficiary out of pocket limit, encouraging our employers to continue sponsoring retiree health plans.

And we are able to make these improvements within the confines of the $400 billion budget allocation.

Unfortunately, the Congressional Budget Office was not able to complete a score on our legislation prior to the convening of the Rules Committee. However, the majority of the changes we have made to the already-scored Senate bill were based upon Senate amendments that have either been introduced and passed or are pending introduction. As such, they have all been scored by CBO for their sponsoring offices. The availability of that information has allowed the Blue Dogs to say with confidence that this legislation fits within the $400 billion budget window.

But, Members with questions about the Blue Dog substitute will never have the opportunity to pose them because the rule has prevented all debate on this alternative. Medicare is a complex issue. And, while the addition of a new prescription drug benefit cannot be a simple one. Voices should be heard, debate should be had, and all options should be fully explored before one course of action is decided upon. Unfortunately—to the detriment of this body and America’s seniors—that is not happening.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this rule, and in doing so allow the House of Representatives to give this critical issue the open and deliberate debate that it fully deserves.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY), another physician in our conference.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. PRYCE) for giving me an opportunity to speak on this issue. I rise in favor of the rule and in favor of this bill.

I have delivered probably 5,000 or more babies over a 30-year medical career; but I will be prouder today of this delivery that we are giving to our seniors, that we have promised them for the last 2 years. Finally today that delivery will occur. This will be the best delivery that I have ever given because what we are talking about is not just a prescription drug benefit; we are also talking about modernizing Medicare so that it will not be going bankrupt by the year 2030.

With the prescription drug benefit, we will have an opportunity for our seniors to avoid prolonged hospital stays and prolonged nursing home stays, difficult expensive surgery. Let them take those medications early in the disease process so that high blood pressure does not result in a stroke or heart attack or so the diabetes they are suffering with does not end up in them being a dialysis patient.

This is a good bill. This is a bill that our leadership is finally going to give to our seniors; and I tell Members this is the day to do it, and this is the finest delivery we can offer to our seniors.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY) is pleased that the Democrats tried to make the gentleman’s amendment in order last night.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. TAUSCHER).

Mrs. TAUSCHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to strongly encourage my colleagues to vote against the rule and to defeat the previous question. This will allow us to debate a much more realistic and fiscally responsible Medicare bill.

It is clear that the status quo is not working to make prescription drugs affordable for seniors. It is also clear that our country’s economic situation does not give Congress a lot of options for solving this growing problem. Unquestionably, our seniors do not have to pay a premium, and the generous low-income benefit far exceeds the one offered by the majority.

For seniors whose income is 150 percent of the Federal poverty level, roughly 10 percent of their income will only have a 10 percent cost share.

Furthermore, any prescription drug plan needs to be part of Medicare, which seniors like and trust. Our plan is managed by Medicare. The benefit is the Federal Government will assume and every beneficiary gets a guaranteed benefit at no additional cost. By leveraging the buying power of all seniors, our plan allows every single person on Medicare to benefit from immediate drug savings. Let them take how many prescriptions they are filling a month.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, our seniors need to be protected from catastrophic drug costs. Seniors with little drug costs will be able to access the full benefit sooner because our plan focuses on the total cost of the drug, not discounted price paid out of pocket. Our plan has an extra safety net for those who really need it. People with total drug costs of $4,000 a year.

Under our bill, companies that currently provide prescription drug coverage to their retirees will have the incentive to continue doing so because the Federal Government will assume the risk of drug coverage once beneficiaries reach their deductible.

We need to be smart and realistic about how we can provide every American senior with prescription drug coverage. Given the current economic situation, our plan is the one that provides this coverage and is fiscally achievable. I urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question and support the Dooley-Tauscher substitute.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN).

(Ms. CHRISTENSEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the sham Republican Medicare bill which fails to provide senior citizens with the real prescription drug coverage that they need and deserve, and undermines the entire program.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLEY).

Mr. DOOLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise to ask that the previous question be defeated so we can offer a real prescription drug benefit to seniors. It is my duty to state that the bill being offered by our Republican colleagues is one that seniors are going to find so complex that it is going to result in taxpayers displacing a lot of...
private sector contributions which are already providing prescription drug benefits.

Why in the world would we design a drug benefit program where we are actually going to be trading taxpayer dollars for dollars that are already being spent by corporations for their retirees?

There is a better alternative, and that is the bill we would like to offer. That is, we take the $400 billion that President Bush has talked about, roll it into Medicare part B, and use a drug card much like President Bush has talked about which ensures that every senior will have access to negotiated prices which ensures that they have 10 to 20 percent savings. We do this without an increase in premiums. We also target seniors facing catastrophic health care costs by ensuring that after they have purchased drugs that cost $4,000, that the Federal Government will be there to pick up the vast majority of their drug costs from that point on.

We also recognize that there are a lot of seniors in this country that cannot afford the $4,000, so we provide a low-income benefit that provides significant assistance to all those seniors who have incomes less than 200 percent of poverty. This would ensure that 50 percent of the seniors on Medicare today would have a subsidized low-income benefit that would help provide them access to much-needed prescription drugs.

It is time for this Congress to come together and say, if seniors have a limited amount of resources, let us target those resources of those seniors that are in greatest need. Those are the seniors with very high drug costs and those seniors with the least ability to pay, and the system should be simple.

The Republican plan that we are going to be considering on the floor today changes the benefit, if they are low-income, but not if they have $5,000 in assets or a car that is too valuable. We need a plan that seniors can understand, that they do not need to be an accountant to figure out; and that is what our alternative would provide.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD), a member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, today represents the culmination of 4 to 5 years of Congress’ efforts to provide a prescription drug benefit for senior citizens on Medicare. Two years ago, the House of Representatives passed a prescription drug benefit for senior citizens. Last year we did the same. The Senate did not do it the year before, nor did they do it last year; but this year both the House and the Senate will pass a prescription drug benefit.

This is a meaningful plan. It is going to provide basically free medicines for any senior citizen on Medicare who is at 135 percent of the poverty level and below. The only thing they will be expected to pay is a small $2 copay for generic drugs and a small $5 copay for name-brand drugs.

I have heard a lot of comments today about insurance companies are going to be involved in administering this plan. I think it is important to recognize that today’s Medicare plan uses private insurance companies to handle all of the reimbursement charges for Medicare. So we are not doing anything dramatically different in this bill than what is being done today.

I would also say that the fact that this bill would provide catastrophic coverage for seniors is going to be a tremendous benefit. It will give them the peace of mind to know that no matter how high their drug costs may be, at some point the Federal Government will pay for all of it, the taxpayers will pay for all of it. I would also say that this is the most important rural health benefit package that is going to benefit all of rural America. It also provides additional monies, important monies that are needed for disproportionate share hospitals. It will benefit those hospitals in America today. All those hospitals that provide care for people on Medicaid will receive additional funds. I think this is an important bill, and I urge Members to vote for the previous question and to adopt this new prescription drug benefit for Medicare beneficiaries.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Today, the House votes on the biggest change in Medicare in its 40-year history, a change that will affect 40 million Americans; but the Republican leaders have rigged the rules to prevent the House from voting on serious alternatives offered by Republicans and Democrats alike.

Mr. Speaker, I will call for a “no” vote on the previous question in the hope that the House gets the chance to consider an additional alternative that the Republican leaders fear. If the previous question is defeated, I will offer an amendment to the rule that will make in order the Dooley prescription drug alternative substitute. It makes all senior citizens enrolled in Medicare part B eligible for prescription drug assistance without increasing their premiums. Like the Republican bill, it has no sickness periods or doughnut hole that seniors can fall through. Unlike the Republican bill, it does not encourage companies to drop seniors’ existing drug plans.

Let me make it clear that a “no” vote on the previous question will not stop the consideration of H.R. 1. It will simply allow the House to vote on the Dooley substitute. However, a “yes” vote on the previous question will prevent the House from voting. I urge a “no” vote.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the amendment be printed in the RECORD immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, passing this plan is the right thing to do. It makes the kind of commonsense changes to the health care system in this country that the American public needs. Adding this Medicare benefit will renew our promise to our seniors. It will reduce the cost of prescription drugs, and it will revolutionize medicine for the 21st century. Seniors deserve this assistance now. They deserved it yesterday. They deserved it last week; and actually, they deserved it last year. It is time for this body to act. I urge my colleagues to support this fair rule and pass the needed reform today.
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The material previously referred to by Ms. SLAUGHTER is as follows:

[Previous Question for H. Res. 299—Rule on H.R. 1 and H.R. 2596 Medicare Prescription Drug and Modernization Act and Health Savings and Affordability Act]

In the first section of the resolution strike “and (3)” and insert the following: “(3) the further amendment in the nature of a substitute specified in section 7 of this resolution if offered by Representative Doley of California or a designee, which shall be in order without intervention of any point of order, shall be considered as read, and shall be separately debatable for 60 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent; and (4)” At the end of the resolution add the following new section:

Sec. 7. The further amendment in the nature of a substitute referred to in the first sentence of this resolution is as follows: “Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the “Medicare Rx Now Act of 2003”.

(b) AMENDMENTS TO SOCIAL SECURITY ACT.— Except as otherwise specifically provided, whenever in this Act an amendment is expressed in terms of an amendment to or repeal of a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to that section or other provision of the Social Security Act.

(c) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents of this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

TITLE I—MEDICARE RX NOW

Sec. 100. Purpose.

Subtitle A.—Part B Drug Benefit with High Deductible and No Premium

Sec. 101. Inclusion of high-deductible outpatient prescription drug benefit under part B.

Sec. 102. Provision of benefits through Medicare-approved prescription drug plans.

Subtitle B.—Benefits for Low-income Beneficiaries

Sec. 111. Benefits for low-income beneficiaries.
TITLE II—RURAL HEALTH CARE IMPROVEMENTS

SEC. 201. Fairness in the medicare disproportionate share hospital (DSH) adjustment for rural hospitals.

SEC. 202. Immediate establishment of uniform standardized amount in small urban areas.

SEC. 203. Establishment of essential rural hospital classification.

SEC. 204. More frequent update in weights for hospital market basket.

SEC. 205. Improvements to critical access hospital program.

SEC. 206. Redetermination of unused resident positions.

SEC. 207. Two-year extension of hold harmless provisions for small rural hospitals and sole community hospitals under prospective payment system for hospital outpatient department services.

SEC. 208. Exclusion of certain rural health clinic and Federally qualified health center services from the prospective payment system for skilled nursing facilities.

SEC. 209. Recognition of attending nurse practitioners as attending physicians to serve hospice patients.

SEC. 210. Improvement in payments to retain emergency capacity for ambulance services in rural areas.

SEC. 211. Three-year increase for home health services furnished in a rural area.

SEC. 212. Providing safe harbor for certain collaborative efforts that benefit medically underserved populations.

SEC. 213. GAO study of geographic differences in payments for physicians’ services.

SEC. 214. Treatment of missing cost reporting periods for sole community hospitals.

SEC. 215. Extension of telemedicine demonstration project.

SEC. 216. Adjustment to the medicare inpatient hospital PPS wage index to revise the labor-related share of such index.

SEC. 217. Establishment of floor on geographic adjustments of payments for physicians’ services.

TITLE I—MEDICARE RX NOW

SEC. 100. PURPOSE.

The purpose of this title is to provide for outpatient prescription drug benefits to medicare beneficiaries in the following manner:

(1) Medicare beneficiaries enrolled under medicare part B qualify for outpatient prescription drug benefits under a medicare-approved prescription drug plan.

(2) There are fixed dollar copayments for this coverage, with the average of such copayments equal to 20 percent of the benefits and the amount of the copayments varying depending upon whether the drugs are generic, preferred brand-name, or non-preferred brand-name.

(3) The benefits are provided through medicare-approved prescription drug plans. These plans may be current plans, such as Medicare+Choice, employer-based retiree coverage, medigap plans, State assistance programs, medicaid, drug discount card plans, and other qualified plans (as determined by the Secretary). All of these plans must offer, in addition to the high-deductible coverage, discounts for prescription drugs both while the annual deductible is being satisfied and after it is satisfied.

(4) To assure access to medicare-approved prescription drug plans for all medicare beneficiaries, the Secretary will solicit bids for prescription drug discount plans that will be available in all geographic regions to all medicare beneficiaries.

(5) All plans that comply with electronic claims processing standards may provide drugs under the program.

(6) This title also provides for the availability of additional benefits in the form of a waiver of the annual deductible and reduced copayments, thereby providing immediate entitlement to prescription drug benefits, for medicare beneficiaries who have incomes under 200 percent of the poverty line and who are not eligible for medicare prescription drug benefits.

Subtitle A—Part B Drug Benefit with High Deductible and No Premium

SEC. 101. INCLUSION OF HIGH-DEDUCTIBLE OUT-PATIENT PRESCRIPTION DRUG BENEFIT UNDER PART B.

(a) COVERAGE.—Section 1855(a) (42 U.S.C. 1395k(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking “and” at the end of paragraph (3);

(2) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (2) and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(3) entitlement to have access to a prescription drug plan that provides discounts on purchases for outpatient prescription drugs and, effective beginning with 2006, for payment made on his behalf (subject to the provisions of this part) for high-deductible outpatient prescription drug coverage under section 1855.”;

(b) DESCRIPTION OF HIGH-DEDUCTIBLE PRESCRIPTION DRUG BENEFIT.—Title XVIII is amended by inserting after section 1844 the following new section:

“OUTPATIENT PRESCRIPTION DRUG COVERAGE

SEC. 1845. (a) HIGH-DEDUCTIBLE OUT-PATIENT PRESCRIPTION DRUG COVERAGE DEFINENED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this part, the term ‘high-deductible outpatient prescription drug coverage’ means payment of—

(A) expenses for covered outpatient prescription drugs in a year after the individual has incurred expenses for such drugs in the year of an amount equal to the annual deductible specified in paragraph (2); reduced by

(B) cost-sharing described in paragraph (3).

For periods before 2006, such coverage shall consist of access to discounts for prescription drugs under a medicare-approved prescription drug plan.

(2) ANNUAL DEDUCTIBLE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The annual deductible under this title shall be—

(i) for 2006 is equal to $4,000, and

(ii) for a subsequent year is equal to the amount specified in subparagraph (B) for that year, except that if the amount specified in such subparagraph is not a multiple of $10, it shall be rounded to the nearest multiple of $10.

(B) INFLATIONARY ADJUSTMENT.—The amount specified in this subparagraph—

(i) for 2006, is $4,000, or

(ii) the amount specified in this subparagraph for the previous year increased by the annual percentage increase in average per capita aggregate medical expenditures for covered outpatient prescription drugs under the medicare program for the United States for medicare beneficiaries, as determined by the Sec-

(3) COST-SHARING.—

(A) THREE-TIERED COPAYMENT STRUCTURE.—Subject to the succeeding provisions of this paragraph, in the case of a covered outpatient drug that is dispensed in a year to an eligible individual, the individual shall be responsible for a copayment in an amount equal to the following (or, if less, the price for the drug negotiated pursuant to subsection (c)(5)):

(i) GENERIC DRUGS.—In the case of a generic covered outpatient drug, the base copayment amount specified in accordance with paragraph (B) shall apply.

(ii) PREFERRED BRAND NAME DRUGS.—In the case of a preferred brand name covered outpatient drug, 4 times the copayment amount applied under clause (i) for each prescription (as so defined) of such drug.

(iii) NONPREFERRED BRAND NAME DRUG.—In the case of a nonpreferred brand name covered outpatient drug, 150 percent of the copayment amount applied under clause (ii) for each prescription (as so defined) of such drug.

(B) ESTABLISHMENT OF BASE COPAYMENT AMOUNT CONSISTENT WITH 80:20 BENEFIT RATIO.—For each year beginning with 2006 the Secretary shall establish a copayment amount in a manner consistent with the principle (subject to reasonable rounding rules) that the ratio of the amount of benefits provided under this section to the aggregate copayments under this paragraph for each year should be approximately equal to 80:20.

(C) DISCOUNTS ALLOWED FOR NETWORK PHARMACIES.—A medicare-approved prescription drug plan may reduce copayments for its designees below the amounts provided under this paragraph, but in no case shall such a reduction result in an increase in payments made by the medicare trust fund.

(D) TREATMENT OF MEDICALLY NECESSARY NONPREFERRED DRUGS.—A nonpreferred brand name drug shall be treated as a preferred brand name drug under this paragraph if such nonpreferred drug is determined (pursuant to procedures established under subsection (c)(8)) to be medically necessary.

(E) REQUIREMENT FOR DESIGNATION OF PREFERRED BRAND NAME DRUGS.—Within each category of therapeutic-equivalent covered outpatient prescription drugs, the medicare payment advisory commission, in consultation with the medicare payment advisory commission, shall provide for the designation of at least one preferred brand name covered outpatient drug.

(4) PAYMENT OF BENEFITS BEYOND DEDUCTIBLE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—There shall be paid from the medicare trust fund an amount equal to the greater of—

(i) the amount incurred (subject to procedures established under subsection (c)(8)) for each covered outpatient prescription drug, 80 percent of the amount applied under clause (i) for each prescription of such drug, and

(ii) the amount incurred (subject to procedures established under subsection (c)(8)) for each covered outpatient prescription drug, 20 percent of the amount applied under clause (i) for each prescription of such drug.

(5) LIMITATION ON SHARING RESPONSIBILITY.—The individual shall be responsible for a copayment in an amount equal to the following (or, if less, the price for the drug negotiated pursuant to subsection (c)(5)):

(i) GENERIC DRUGS.—In the case of a—

(ii) PREFERRED BRAND NAME DRUGS.—In the case of a preferred brand name covered outpatient drug, 4 times the copayment amount applied under clause (i) for each prescription (as so defined) of such drug.

(iii) NONPREFERRED BRAND NAME DRUG.—In the case of a nonpreferred brand name covered outpatient drug, 150 percent of the copayment amount applied under clause (ii) for each prescription (as so defined) of such drug.

(B)記者の読み取る自然な形式を返す。
transmitted by the pharmacy or other entity dispensing the covered outpatient prescription drugs to the medicare-approved prescription drug plan consistent with electronic claims standards established under subsection (c)(3).”.

SEC. 102. PROVISION OF BENEFITS THROUGH MEDICARE APPROVED PRESCRIPTION DRUG PLANS.

(a) In General.—Section 1945 of the Social Security Act, as inserted by section 101(a), is further amended by adding at the end the following:

(1) Provision of Benefits Through a Medicare Approved Prescription Drug Plan.

‘‘(1) In General.—In the case of an individual entitled to benefits for high-deductible outpatient prescription drug coverage under this section, the individual may obtain such benefits through a medicare-approved prescription drug plan that is designated under this subsection.

‘‘(2) Designation Process.—The Secretary shall provide for a process for designation of medicare-approved prescription drug plans consistent with the following:

‘‘(A) Frequency of Designations.—The Secretary shall permit individuals, on an annual basis and at such other times during a year as the Secretary may specify, to change the plan designated.

‘‘(B) Dissemination of Information.—The Secretary shall provide for the dissemination of information on medicare-approved prescription drug plans under this subsection. Such dissemination may be coordinated with the dissemination of information on Medicare+Choice plan selection under section 1905(b).

‘‘(C) Default Assignment.—In the case of an individual who is enrolled under this part, the term ‘designee’ means such an individual who makes such a designation and, with respect to a plan, an individual who has designated that plan under this subsection.

‘‘(D) Medicare-Approved Prescription Drug Plans.—Any plan applying to such designees that is determined to meet such requirements as the Secretary establishes.

‘‘(E) Acceptance of Claims Through All Medicare Prescription Drug Card.—Claims for benefits under this section may be coordinated with the dissemination of information on medicare-approved prescription drug plans and, in such cases, the Secretary shall permit the individual to designate such a plan instead. The Secretary shall assign the individual to an appropriate prescription drug discount card plan serving the area in which the individual resides.

‘‘(F) Medicare Prescription Drug Plan Standards.—Standards for the real-time transmittal among pharmacies, medicare-approved prescription drug plans, and the Secretary (including an appropriate data clearinghouse operated by or under contract with the Secretary) of information on expenses incurred for covered outpatient prescription drugs by designees.

‘‘(G) Medicare Prescription Drug Plan Confidentiality.—Standards that assure the confidentiality of individually identifiable information of designees and that are consistent with the regulations promulgated under section 264(c) of the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996.

(b) Standards for Electronic Prescription Card System.—The Secretary shall establish standards for the system, including

‘‘(1) Cards.—Standards for claims cards to be used by designees under the system.

‘‘(2) Electronic Transaction Information.—Standards for the real-time transmittal among pharmacies, medicare-approved prescription drug plans, and the Secretary of such data (including data generated by a clearinghouse operated by or under contract with the Secretary) of information on expenses incurred for covered outpatient prescription drugs by designees.

‘‘(3) Implementation Issues.—Implementation issues as they relate to the electronic prescription drug program described in clause (ii).

‘‘(i) The Secretary shall constitute the task force under clause (ii) by not later than April 1, 2004.

‘‘(ii) The Secretary shall establish standards under part C of title XI.

(c) Acceptance of Claims Through All Qualifying Pharmacists.—A medicare-approved prescription drug plan shall—

‘‘(A) permit the participation of any pharmacist, pharmacy, or other entity dispensing drugs to the Medicare+Choice plan.

‘‘(B) permit enrollees to receive benefits under such plans.

‘‘(C) permit enrollees to receive benefits under such plans.

‘‘(D) permit the use of mail order pharmacy, rather than through mail order, with the provision of a name drug to a designee, of information on the availability of generic equivalents at reduced cost to the designee; and

‘‘(E) permit enrollees to receive benefits under such plans.

(d) Requirement to Negotiate Discounts and Generic Equivalents.—A medicare-approved prescription drug plan shall provide discounts of the type of plan with the following:

‘‘(A) Negotiated Prices.—Access to negotiated prices (including applicable discounts) used for payment for covered outpatient prescription drugs, regardless of the fact that such discounts or only partial benefits may be payable with respect to such drugs because of the applicability of the deductible under subsection (a)(2) unless determined under such rules or because the drugs are procured prior to
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2006.

(e) Advisory Task Force.—In developing such standards the Secretary shall establish a task force that includes representatives of physicians, hospitals, pharmacies, and related organizations that have expertise in the field of prescription drug benefit design and implementation.

(f) Use of Medicare Prescription Drug Cards.—The Secretary shall establish standards for the secure electronic exchange of such information.

(g) Standards for Electronic Prescription Card System.—The Secretary shall establish standards for the system, including

‘‘(1) Cards.—Standards for claims cards to be used by designees under the system.

‘‘(2) Electronic Transaction Information.—Standards for the real-time transmittal among pharmacies, medicare-approved prescription drug plans, and the Secretary of such data (including data generated by a clearinghouse operated by or under contract with the Secretary) of information on expenses incurred for covered outpatient prescription drugs by designees.

‘‘(3) Implementation Issues.—Implementation issues as they relate to the electronic prescription drug program described in clause (ii).

‘‘(i) The Secretary shall constitute the task force under clause (ii) by not later than April 1, 2004.

‘‘(ii) The Secretary shall establish standards under part C of title XI.

‘‘(iii) Acceptance of Claims Through All Qualifying Pharmacists.—A medicare-approved prescription drug plan shall—

‘‘(A) permit the participation of any pharmacist, pharmacy, or other entity dispensing drugs to the Medicare+Choice plan.

‘‘(B) permit enrollees to receive benefits under such plans.

‘‘(C) permit enrollees to receive benefits under such plans.

‘‘(D) permit the use of mail order pharmacy, rather than through mail order, with the provision of a name drug to a designee, of information on the availability of generic equivalents at reduced cost to the designee; and

‘‘(E) permit enrollees to receive benefits under such plans.

(f) Requirement to Negotiate Discounts and Generic Equivalents.—A medicare-approved prescription drug plan shall provide discounts of the type of plan with the following:

‘‘(A) Negotiated Prices.—Access to negotiated prices (including applicable discounts) used for payment for covered outpatient prescription drugs, regardless of the fact that such discounts or only partial benefits may be payable with respect to such drugs because of the applicability of the deductible under subsection (a)(2) unless determined under such rules or because the drugs are procured prior to
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A drug prescribed for an individual that
is dispensed by a pharmacist or a person
who is authorized to dispense drugs,
and is used for a medically accepted
indication (as determined under section
1927(k)(2)); or
(b) a biological product described in
clause (i) through (iii) of subparagraph (B)
of such section or insulin described in sub-
paragraph (C) of such section,
and such term includes a vaccine licensed
under section 351 of the Public Health Serv-
ice Act and any use of a covered outpatient
drug for a medically accepted indication (as
defined in section 1927(k)(6)).

(7) EXCEPTION FOR OUTPATIENT PRESCRIPTION
DRUG BENEFIT.—The provisions of this subsection shall not apply to benefits provided under section 1915.

Subtitle B—Benefits for Low-income Beneficiaries

SEC. 111. BENEFITS FOR LOW-INCOME BENEFICIARIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—First Dollar Coverage.—Section 1845, as inserted by section 101(b), is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(1) In general.—In the case of a subsidy eligible individual (as defined in paragraph (2)), except as otherwise provided for under section 1915, there shall be a 10% copayment for prescription drugs provided for which no applicable deductible applies.

"(2) Exclusions.—
"(A) In general.—Such term does not include drugs or classes of drugs, or their medical uses, which may be excluded from coverage or otherwise restricted under section 1927(f)(2), other than subparagraph (E) thereof (relating to smoking cessation agents), or under section 1927(d)(3), as the Secretary may specify and does not include such other medicines, classes, and uses as the Secretary may specify consistent with the goals of providing quality care and containing costs under this section.

"(B) Avoidance of duplicate coverage.—A drug prescribed for an individual that would otherwise be a covered outpatient prescription drug under this section shall not be considered to be such a drug if such drug is available under part A or under this part (other than under this section)."

(b) No Effect on Part B Premium.—
the copayments amounts specified in subsection (a)(3) increased by 150 percent, which reflects an average benefit percentage of 50 percent, but in no case shall such copayment amount exceed the price negotiated for the drug involved.

"(2) Determination of eligibility.—

(A) Subsidy eligible individual determined to be a subsidy eligible individual means an individual who—

(i) is enrolled under this part;

(ii) resides in a State that has adopted a copayment greater than a nominal amount (as described in section 1916(a)(3)) and there is no monthly or similar dollar limit established for enrollees of such assistance over any period of time.

(B) Coverage of individuals with income up to the Federal poverty line at State option.—One of the 50 States or the District of Columbia may, at its option and subject to section 1935(c), specify a percent of income, that does not exceed 100 percent but does not exceed 200 percent, that will apply for purposes of this subsection to individuals residing in the State.

(C) Determinations.—The determination of whether an individual residing in a State is a subsidy eligible individual shall be determined under the State medical plan for the State under section 1902(g) or by the Social Security Administration. There are authorized to be appropriated to the Social Security Administration such sums as may be necessary for the determination of eligibility under this subparagraph.

D) Income determinations.—For purposes of applying this subsection—

(i) income shall be determined in the manner less restrictive than the manner described in section 1905(b)(1)(B); and

(ii) the official poverty line means the official poverty line (as defined by the Office of Management and Budget, and revised annually in accordance with section 673.2 of the budget resolution (as defined in Act of 1981)) applicable to a family of the size involved.

(E) Treatment of territorial residents.—In the case of an individual who is not a resident of the 50 States or the District of Columbia, the individual is not eligible to be a subsidy eligible individual but may be eligible for the copayment assistance with respect to prescription drugs under title XIX (including under a waiver under section 1115) only if, with respect to such assistance, the individual is charged a copayment greater than a nominal amount (as described in section 1916(a)(3)) and there is no monthly or similar dollar limit established for enrollees of such assistance over any period of time.

(F) Administration of subsidies.—The Secretary shall provide for a notifica-

(G) General provision for cost-sharing.—The Secretary shall determine the amount charged to an individual for each prescription drug under the medicare program under title XIX, with particular attention to insuring coordination of payments and prevention of fraud and abuse. In developing and implementing such plan, the Secretary shall involve the States, the data processing industry, pharmacists, and other experts and representatives of low-income medicare beneficiaries.

(2) Reduction in catastrophic copayments for low-income individuals.—Section 1845(a), as inserted by section 101(b), is amended—

(A) in paragraph (3)(A), by inserting "and" at the end of paragraph (9) after "Subject to the succeeding provisions of this paragraph"; and

(B) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(5) Reduction in copayments for low-income individuals to 10 percent.—In the case of a subsidy eligible individual with income that does not exceed 150 percent of the poverty line (as defined for purposes of subsection (a)(3) of section 1916) and no copayment greater than a nominal amount such assistance, the individual is charged a copayment under section 1115) only if, with respect to prescription drugs under title XIX, with particular attention to insuring coordination of payments and prevention of fraud and abuse. In developing and implementing such plan, the Secretary shall involve the States, the data processing industry, pharmacists, and other experts and representatives of low-income medicare beneficiaries.

"(6) Determinations of eligibility for low-income subsidies.—

(A) Requirement.—Section 1902(a)(42 U.S.C. 1396a(a)) is amended—

(i) by striking "and" at the end of paragraph (64);

(ii) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (65) and inserting ";"; and

(iii) by inserting after paragraph (66) the following new paragraph:

"(66) provide for making eligibility determinations under sections 1845(a)(5), 1845(g), and 1905(a)."

(B) New section.—Title XIX of such Act is further amended—

(A) by redesigning section 1995 as section 1996; and

(B) by inserting after section 1994 the following new section:

"Special provisions relating to Medicare receipt of such benefit.

Section 1935. (a) Requirement for making eligibility determinations for low-income subsidy.

(1) In general.—As a condition of its plan under this title section 1902(a)(66) and receipt of any Federal financial assistance under section 1903(a), a State shall—

"(A) make determinations of eligibility for subsidies under (and in accordance with) sections 1845(g) and 1845(a)(5); and

(B) provide for making eligibility determinations in cases in which such eligibility is established; and

(C) otherwise provide the Secretary with such information as may be required to carry out section 1945.

(2) State option for coverage of additional low-income individuals.—A State may, by public notice under paragraph (2)(B) of section 1845(g) to cover additional low-income medicare beneficiaries under the prescription drug subsidy program provided under such subsection, subject to contribution under subsection (c).

(D) Payments for additional administrative costs.—

(1) In general.—The amounts expended by a State in carrying out subsection (a) are, subject to paragraph (2), expenditures reim-

bursable under the appropriate paragraph of section 1903(a); except that, notwithstanding any other provision of such section, the applicable Federal matching rate shall be increased as follows (but in no case shall the rate as so increased exceed 100 percent):

(2) For expenditures attributable to costs incurred during 2006, the otherwise applicable Federal matching rate shall be increased by 10 percent of the percentage otherwise payable (but for this subsection) by the State.

(3) For expenditures attributable to costs incurred during 2007, the otherwise applicable Federal matching rate shall be increased by 100 percent of the percentage otherwise payable (but for this subsection) by the State.

(4) For purposes of clause (i), the 'applicable percent' for—

(i) 2006 is 20 percent; or

(ii) a subsequent year is the applicable percent under this clause for the previous year increased by 10 percentage points.

(C) For expenditures attributable to costs incurred after 2013, the otherwise applicable Federal matching rate shall be increased to 100 percent.

(2) Coordination.—The Secretary shall provide the State with such information as may be necessary to properly allocate administrative costs associated with this paragraph (1) that may otherwise be made for similar eligibility determinations.

(3) State contribution at SCHIP matching rate for optional subsidy eligible individuals covered under state option.—In the case of a State that specifies a percent of income under paragraph (2) for a quarter, the amount of payment made to the State under section 1903(a)(1) for the quarter shall be reduced by the product of—

(1) 100 percent less the enhanced FMAP described in section 2105(b) for that State and quarter; and

(2) the additional amount of payment made under section 1945 because of the application of such specification.

(4) Phase-in federal assumption of medicare responsibility for cost-sharing subsidies for dually eligible individuals.—

(A) General.—Section 1902(a)(1) (42 U.S.C. 1396a(a)(1)) is amended by inserting before the semicolon the following: ', reduced by the amount computed under section 1902(a)(1)(B)(v) for the State and the quarter'

(B) Amount described.—Section 1905, as inserted by subsection (a)(2), is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

(1) Federal assumption of medicare prescription drug costs for dually eligible beneficiaries.—

(2) In general.—For purposes of section 1903(a)(1), for a State that is one of the 50 States or the District of Columbia for a calendar quarter in a year beginning with 2006 the amount computed under this subsection is equal to the sum of the product described in paragraph (3) plus the product of the following:

(A) Medicare benefits for medicare eligible beneficiaries.

(B) General.—The total amount of payments made in the quarter because of the operation of section 1945 that are attributable to individuals who are residents of the State and are eligible for medical assistance with respect to prescription drugs under this title for purposes of this subparagraph, an individual shall not be eligible for medical assistance with respect to prescription drugs under title XIX (including under a
waiver under section 1115 only if, with respect to such assistance, the individual is charged a copayment greater than a nominal amount (as described in section 1916(a)(3)) and the amount is below a generally applicable dollar limit established for the amount of such assistance over any period of time.

(8) STATE MATCHING RATE.—A proportion computed from 100 percent the Federal medical assistance percentage (as defined in section 1902(a)(28)) applicable to the State and the quarter.

(9) PHASE-OUT PROPORTION.—The phase-out proportion (as defined in paragraph (2) for the quarter.

(10) PHASE-OUT PROPORTION.—For purposes of paragraph (1)(C), the `phase-out proportion' for a calendar quarter in—

(A) 2006 is 90 percent; and

(B) a subsequent year before 2014, is the phase-out proportion for calendar quarters in the previous year decreased by 10 percentage points; or

(C) a year after 2013 is 0 percent.

(3) PRODUCT.—The product described in this paragraph for a State for a calendar quarter is the State matching rate described in paragraph (1)(C) for that State and quarter multiplied by the additional expenditures made under section 1945 as a result of the following—

1. REDUCTIONS IN CATASTROPIC COPAYMENTS.—The application of subsection (a)(5) thereof.

2. FIRST DOLLAR COVERAGE.—The application under subsection (g) of reduced copayments amounts insofar as such amounts are less than 25 percent of the amount of the price otherwise negotiated for the drug involved.

3. MEDICAID PROVIDING WRAP-AROUND BENEFITS.—Section 1935, as so inserted and amended, is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(e) MEDICAID AS SECONDARY PAYOR.—In the case of an individual who is entitled to benefits under part B of title XVIII and is eligible for medical assistance with respect to prescribed drugs under this title, medical assistance shall continue to be provided under this title for prescribed drugs to the extent payment is not made under such part B, without regard to section 1902(n)(2)."

(4) CLARIFYING AMENDMENTS.—Section 1905(p)(3) (42 U.S.C. 1396d(p)(3)) is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (B), by inserting ", but not including any copayments under section 1845 after "section 1813"; and

(B) in subparagraph (B), by inserting ", but not including any deductible under section 1845 after "section 1813(b)."

(5) TREATMENT OF TERRITORIES.—

(I) IN GENERAL.—Section 1935 of such Act, as so inserted and amended, is further amended—

(A) in subsection (a) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by inserting "subject to subsection (f)" after "section 1903(a);"

(B) in subsection (c)(1), by inserting "subject to after paragraph (1)(B);" and

(C) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(f) TREATMENT OF TERRITORIES.—

(I) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a State, other than the 50 States and the District of Columbia—

(A) the previous provisions of this section shall not apply to residents of such State; and

(B) if the State establishes a plan described in paragraph (2) for providing medical assistance with respect to the provision of prescription drugs to medicare beneficiaries under section 1845(g), the amount otherwise determined under section 11018(f) (as inserted by section 11018(g)) for the State shall be increased by the amount specified in paragraph (3).

(2) PLAN.—The plan described in this paragraph is a plan that—

(A) provides medical assistance under section 1845(g) with respect to the provision of covered outpatient drugs to low-income medicare beneficiaries whose income does not exceed an income level specified under the plan; and

(B) ensures that additional amounts received by the State that are attributable to the operation of this subsection are used only for such assistance.

(3) INCREASE IN FEDERAL MEDICAL ASSISTANCE PERCENTAGE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The amount specified in this paragraph for a State for a year is equal to the product of—

(i) the aggregate amount specified in subparagraph (B); and

(ii) the amount specified in section 11018(f)(1)(A) for covered outpatient drugs divided by the sum of the amounts specified in such section for all such States.

(B) AGGREGATE AMOUNT.—The aggregate amount specified in this subparagraph for—

(i) 2006, is equal to $25,000,000; or

(ii) a subsequent year, is equal to the aggregate amount specified in this subparagraph for the previous year increased by an annual percentage increase specified in section 1845(a)(2)(B) for the year involved.

(4) REPORT.—The Secretary shall submit to Congress a report on the implementation of this subsection and may include in the report such recommendations as the Secretary deems appropriate.

(5) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 1108(f) (42 U.S.C. 1396l(f)) is amended by inserting "and section 1935(f)(1)(B)" after "subject to subsection (f) for a subsequent year before 2014, is the Federal medical assistance percentage (as defined in section 1905(b)) applicable to the Federal medical assistance percentage (as defined in section 1905(b)) applicable to".

(f) RENEGOTIATION OF PHARMACY PLUS WAIVERS.—In the case of States which as of the date of the enactment of this Act have entered into agreements (poplarly known as pharmacy plus waivers) under section 1115 of the Social Security Act with managed care organizations, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall renegotiate such agreements in order to account for the additional prescription drug benefits made available under the amendements made by this title.

(f) RENEGOTIATION OF PHARMACY PLUS WAIVERS.—In the case of States which as of the date of the enactment of this Act have entered into agreements (poplarly known as pharmacy plus waivers) under section 1115 of the Social Security Act with managed care organizations, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall renegotiate such agreements in order to account for the additional prescription drug benefits made available under the amendements made by this title.

(f) RENEGOTIATION OF PHARMACY PLUS WAIVERS.—In the case of States which as of the date of the enactment of this Act have entered into agreements (poplarly known as pharmacy plus waivers) under section 1115 of the Social Security Act with managed care organizations, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall renegotiate such agreements in order to account for the additional prescription drug benefits made available under the amendements made by this title.

(f) RENEGOTIATION OF PHARMACY PLUS WAIVERS.—In the case of States which as of the date of the enactment of this Act have entered into agreements (poplarly known as pharmacy plus waivers) under section 1115 of the Social Security Act with managed care organizations, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall renegotiate such agreements in order to account for the additional prescription drug benefits made available under the amendements made by this title.

(f) RENEGOTIATION OF PHARMACY PLUS WAIVERS.—In the case of States which as of the date of the enactment of this Act have entered into agreements (poplarly known as pharmacy plus waivers) under section 1115 of the Social Security Act with managed care organizations, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall renegotiate such agreements in order to account for the additional prescription drug benefits made available under the amendements made by this title.

(f) RENEGOTIATION OF PHARMACY PLUS WAIVERS.—In the case of States which as of the date of the enactment of this Act have entered into agreements (poplarly known as pharmacy plus waivers) under section 1115 of the Social Security Act with managed care organizations, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall renegotiate such agreements in order to account for the additional prescription drug benefits made available under the amendements made by this title.

(f) RENEGOTIATION OF PHARMACY PLUS WAIVERS.—In the case of States which as of the date of the enactment of this Act have entered into agreements (poplarly known as pharmacy plus waivers) under section 1115 of the Social Security Act with managed care organizations, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall renegotiate such agreements in order to account for the additional prescription drug benefits made available under the amendements made by this title.

(f) RENEGOTIATION OF PHARMACY PLUS WAIVERS.—In the case of States which as of the date of the enactment of this Act have entered into agreements (poplarly known as pharmacy plus waivers) under section 1115 of the Social Security Act with managed care organizations, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall renegotiate such agreements in order to account for the additional prescription drug benefits made available under the amendements made by this title.

(f) RENEGOTIATION OF PHARMACY PLUS WAIVERS.—In the case of States which as of the date of the enactment of this Act have entered into agreements (poplarly known as pharmacy plus waivers) under section 1115 of the Social Security Act with managed care organizations, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall renegotiate such agreements in order to account for the additional prescription drug benefits made available under the amendements made by this title.

(f) RENEGOTIATION OF PHARMACY PLUS WAIVERS.—In the case of States which as of the date of the enactment of this Act have entered into agreements (poplarly known as pharmacy plus waivers) under section 1115 of the Social Security Act with managed care organizations, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall renegotiate such agreements in order to account for the additional prescription drug benefits made available under the amendements made by this title.

(f) RENEGOTIATION OF PHARMACY PLUS WAVERS.—In the case of States which as of the date of the enactment of this Act have entered into agreements (poplarly known as pharmacy plus waivers) under section 1115 of the Social Security Act with managed care organizations, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall renegotiate such agreements in order to account for the additional prescription drug benefits made available under the amendements made by this title.
the applicable formula described in clause (vii)" after "clause (x) or (xi)"; and
(iv) in subclause (V)—
(i) by inserting "and before October 1, 2003," after "April 1, 2003," and
(ii) by inserting "or, for discharges occurring on or after October 1, 2003, is equal to the percent determined in accordance with the applicable formula described in clause (vii)" after "clause (x)"; and
(v) in subclause (VI)—
(i) by inserting "and before October 1, 2003," after "April 1, 2003," and
(ii) by inserting "or, for discharges occurring on or after October 1, 2003, is equal to the percent determined in accordance with the applicable formula described in clause (vii)" after "clause (x)"; and
(B) in clause (viii), by striking "The formula" and inserting "For discharges occurring before October 1, 2003, the formula"; and
(C) in each of clauses (x), (xi), (xii), and (xiii), by striking "For purposes" and inserting "With respect to discharges occurring before October 1, 2003, for purposes".
(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to discharges occurring on or after October 1, 2003.
SEC. 202. EMERGENT RURAL HOSPITAL CLASSIFICATION.
(a) A hospital classified as an essential rural hospital—
(1) in the heading, by adding "E SSENTIAL RURAL HOSPITAL" at the end; and
(2) by redesigning clauses (v) and (vi) as clauses (vii) and (viii), respectively, and inserting after clause (iv) the following new clauses—
"(vii)'' after ''clause (x)''; and
"(viii)'' after ''clause (xi)";
(b) the determination under subparagraph (A) shall be based on the following criteria:
"(1)'' HIGH PROPORTION OF MEDICARE BENEFICIARIES RECEIVING CARE FROM HOSPITAL.—(I) A high percentage of Medicare beneficiaries residing in the area of the hospital who are hospitalized (during the most recent year for which complete data are available) receive basic inpatient services in the hospital.
(II) For a hospital with more than 200 licensed beds, a high percentage of such beneficiaries residing in such area who are hospitalized (during such recent year) receive specialized surgical inpatient care at the hospital.
(III) Almost all physicians described in section 1801(r)(1) in such area have privileges at the hospital and provide their inpatient services primarily at the hospital.
(IV) SIGNIFICANT ADVERSE IMPACT IN ABSENCE OF HOSPITAL.—If the hospital were to close—
"(1)'' there would be a significant amount of time needed for residents to reach emergency treatment, resulting in a potential significant harm to beneficiaries with critical illnesses or injuries;
(II)'' there would be an inability in the community to stabilize emergency cases for transfers to another acute care setting, resulting in a potential for significant harm to medicare beneficiaries; and
(III)'' any hospital (including a hospital in a market area) in which the hospital lacks the physical and clinical capacity to take over the hospital's typical admissions.
(2)'' FREE-STANDING AMBULATORY SURGERY CENTER, OFFICE-BASED ONCOLOGY CARE, AND IMAGING CENTER.—If the hospital is a free-standing ambulatory surgery center, office-based oncology center, and imaging center in the hospital's area to handle the outpatient care of the hospital.
(3)'' Beneficiaries in nearby areas would be adversely affected if the hospital were to close as the hospital provides significant harm to beneficiaries with critical illnesses or injuries; and
(4)'' Beneficiaries in nearby areas would be adversely affected if the hospital were to close as the hospital provides significant harm to beneficiaries with critical illnesses or injuries.
For discharges occurring on or after October 1, 2003.
"(2)'' EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to cost reporting periods beginning on or after October 1, 2004.
SEC. 204. MORE FREQUENT UPDATE IN WEIGHTS USED IN HOSPITAL MARKET BASKET.
(a) MORE FREQUENT UPDATES IN WEIGHTS.—After revising the weights used in the hospital market basket under section 1801(b)(2)(B)(iii) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395ww(b)(2)(B)(iii)) to reflect the most current data available, the Secretary shall establish a frequency for revising such weights, including any labor share, in such market basket to reflect the most current data available more frequently than once every 5 years.
(b) REPORT.—Not later than October 1, 2004, the Secretary shall submit a report to Congress on the frequency established under subsection (a), including an explanation of the reasons for, and options considered, in determining such frequency.
SEC. 205. IMPROVEMENTS TO CRITICAL ACCESS HOSPITAL PROGRAM.
(a) INCREASE IN PAYMENT AMOUNTS.—
(1) IN GENERAL.—Subsections 1831(a)(1), 1834(g)(1), and 1853(a)(3) of title XI (42 U.S.C. 1395m(a)(1), 1395q(g)(1), and 1395x(a)(3)) (as amended by sections 1831(a)(1), 1834(g)(1), and 1395x(a)(3)) are each amended by inserting "equal to 102 percent of" before "the reasonable costs".
(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by paragraph (1) shall apply to payments for services furnished during cost reporting periods beginning on or after October 1, 2003.
(b) COVERAGE OF COSTS FOR CERTAIN EMERGENCY ROOM ON-CALL PROVIDERS.—
(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 1834(g)(5) (42 U.S.C. 1395q(g)(5)) is amended—
(i) by inserting "CERTAIN" before "EMERGENCY"; and
(ii) by striking "PHYSICIANS" and inserting "PROVIDERS"; 
(B) by striking "emergency room physicians who are on-call (as defined by the Secretary) and inserting "physicians, physician assistants, nurse practitioners, and clinical nurse specialists who are on-call (as defined by the Secretary) to provide emergency services not otherwise provided"; 
(C) by striking "physicians' services" and inserting "services covered under this title".

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by paragraph (1) shall apply with respect to costs incurred for services provided on or after January 1, 2004.

(3) MODIFICATION OF THE ISOLATION TEST FOR COST-BASED CAR CH TREATMENT SERVICES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 1395m(i)(8)(A) of title 42, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following: "The limitation described in the matter following subparagraph (B) in the previous sentence shall not apply if the ambulance services are furnished by such a provider or supplier of ambulance services who is a first responder to emergencies as determined by the Secretary.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by paragraph (1) shall apply to ambulance services furnished on or after the first cost reporting period that begins after the date of enactment of this Act.

(d) REIMSTATEMENT OF PERIODIC INTERIM PAYMENT PIP—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 1815(e)(2) of title 42, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in the matter before subparagraph (A), by inserting "subject to subparagraph (D)" after "December 1989"; and

(B) by striking "and" at the end of subparagraph (C);

(C) by adding "and" at the end of subparagraph (D); and

(D) by inserting after subparagraph (D) the following new subparagraph:

"(E) Inpatient critical access hospital services;"

(2) DEVELOPMENT OF ALTERNATIVE METHODS OF PERIODIC INTERIM PAYMENTS—With respect to periodic interim payments to critical access hospitals for inpatient critical access hospital services under section 1815(e) of title 42, United States Code, as added by paragraph (1), the Secretary shall develop alternative methods for such payments that are based on expenditures of the hospital.

(3) REIMSTATEMENT OF PIP.—The amendments made by paragraph (1) shall apply to payments made on or after January 1, 2004.

(e) CONDITION FOR APPLICATION OF SPECIAL PHYSICIAN PAYMENT ADJUSTMENT—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 1834(g)(2) of title 42, United States Code, is amended by adding after paragraph (2) the following:

"(c) CONDITION FOR APPLICATION OF SPECIAL PHYSICIAN PAYMENT ADJUSTMENT.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 1820(c) of title 42, United States Code, is amended by adding after paragraph (1)(B) the following new subparagraph:

"(II) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this subsection shall be effective for cost reporting periods beginning on or after January 1, 2004."
respect to subparagraph (F) of such subsection.

(c) Report on extension of applications under redistribution program.—Not later than 1 year 1, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report containing recommended changes to extend the deadline for applications for an increase in resident limits under section 1886(h)(4)(I)(ii) of the Social Security Act (as added by subsection (a)).

SEC. 207. TWO-YEAR EXTENSION OF HOLD HARMLESS PROVISIONS FOR SMALL RURAL HOSPITALS AND SOLE COMMUNITY HOSPITALS UNDER PROSPECTIVE PAYMENT SYSTEM FOR HOSPITAL OUTPATIENT DEPARTMENT SERVICES.

(a) Hold harmless provisions.

(1) in general.—Section 1833(t)(7)(B)(ii) (42 U.S.C. 1395t(b)(7)(D)(ii)) is amended—

(A) in the heading, by striking “SMALL” and inserting “CERTAIN”.

(B) by inserting “or for a sole community hospital (as defined in section 1886(d)(5)(D)(iii)) located in a rural area” after “100 beds”; and

(C) by striking “2003” and inserting “2005”.

(b) Effective date.—The amendment made by subsection (a)(2) shall apply with respect to payment for OPD services furnished on and after January 1, 2004.

(b) Study; adjustment.—

(1) Study.—The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine if, under the prospective payment system for hospital outpatient department services under section 1833(t) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395t), costs incurred by rural providers of services by ambulance and by other payment classification groups (APCs) exceed those costs incurred by urban providers of services.

(2) Adjustment.—Insofar as the Secretary determines under paragraph (1) that costs incurred by rural providers exceed those costs incurred by urban providers of services, the Secretary shall provide for an appropriate adjustment under such section 1833(t) to reflect those higher costs by January 1, 2005.

SEC. 208. EXCLUSION OF CERTAIN RURAL HEALTH CLINIC AND FEDERALLY QUALIFIED HEALTH CENTER SERVICES FROM THE PROSPECTIVE PAYMENT SYSTEM FOR SKILLED NURSING FACILITIES.

(a) In general.—Section 1888(e)(2)(A) (42 U.S.C. 1395y(e)(2)(A)) is amended—

(1) in clause (iii), by striking “clauses (ii) and (iii)” and inserting “clauses (ii), (iii), and (iv)”;

and

(2) by adding at the end the following new clause:

“(iv) exclusion of certain rural health clinic and federally qualified health center services.—Services described in this clause are—

“(I) rural health clinic services (as defined in paragraph (1) of section 1861(a)); and

“(II) Federally qualified health center services (as defined in paragraph (3) of such section); that would be described in clause (ii) if such services were not furnished by an individual affiliated with a rural health clinic or a Federally qualified health center.

(b) Certain services furnished by an entity jointly owned by hospitals and critical access hospitals.—For purposes of applying subparagraph (III) of clause (ii) of title 42 of the Code of Federal Regulations, the Secretary shall treat an entity that is 100 percent owned as a joint venture by 2 Medicare-participating hospitals or critical access hospitals as a Medicare-participating hospital or a critical access hospital.

(c) Technical Amendments.—Sections 1861(a)(20) (42 U.S.C. 1395a(a)(20)) and 1861(aa)(5) (42 U.S.C. 1395a(aa)(5)) are each amended by striking “(4)” after “1835u(b)(6)(E); 1835u(a)(3)(H)(ii)” and inserting “(4)” before “1835u(b)(6)(E); 1835u(a)(3)(H)(ii)”.

SEC. 209. RECOGNITION OF ATTENDING NURSE PRACTITIONERS AS ATTENDING PHYSICIANS TO SERVE HOSPICE PATIENTS.

(a) In general.—Section 1861(d)(3)(B) (42 U.S.C. 1395t(d)(3)(B)) is amended by inserting “or a nurse practitioner (as defined in section 1888(e)(2)(A))” after “the physician (as defined in subsection (r)(3))”.

(b) Prohibition on nurse practitioner certifying service.—Section 1814(a)(7)(A)(i)(I) (42 U.S.C. 1395a(7)(A)(i)(I)) is amended by inserting “(which purposes of this subparagraph does not include a nurse practitioner)” after “attending physician (as defined in section 1861(d)(3)(B))”.

SEC. 210. IMPROVEMENT IN PAYMENTS TO RETAIN EMERGENCY CAPACITY FOR AMBULANCE SERVICES IN RURAL AREAS.

Section 1831(b) (42 U.S.C. 1395mm(b)) is amended—

(1) by redesigning paragraph (8), as added by section 221(a) of BIPA (114 Stat. 2763–2764), as paragraph (3); and

(2) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(d) Assistance for rural providers furnishing services in low Medicare population density areas.—

“(A) In general.—In the case of ground ambulance services furnished for services furnished on or after January 1, 2004, for which the transportation originates in a qualified rural area (as defined in subparagraph (B)), the Secretary shall adjust the amount for an increase in the base rate of the fee schedule for mileage for a trip estimated to take an additional 30 minutes in the case of a rural ambulance service or an additional 20 minutes in the case of a non-rural ambulance service.

“(B) Qualified rural area defined.—For purposes of subparagraph (A), the term ‘qualified rural area’ is a rural area (as defined in section 1886(d)(2)(D)) with a population density of Medicare beneficiaries residing in the area in the lowest three quarters of all rural county populations.

SEC. 211. THREE-YEAR INCREASE FOR HOME HEALTH SERVICES FURNISHED IN A RURAL AREA.

(a) In general.—In the case of home health services furnished in a rural area (as defined in section 1861(a)(2)(D)(ii) (42 U.S.C. 1395t(a)(2)(D)(ii)) during 2004, 2005, and 2006, the Secretary shall increase the payment amount otherwise made under section 1855 of such act (42 U.S.C. 1395w–2) by 5 percent.

(b) Rulemaking for exception for rural patients.

(1) Establishment.—

(A) In general.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services (in this subsection referred to as the ‘Secretary’) shall establish, on an expedited basis, standards relating to the exception described in section 1128(b)(3)(H) of the Social Security Act, as added by subsection (a), for health center arrangements to the anti-kickback penalties.

(B) Factors to consider.—The Secretary shall provide for an appropriate adjustment under such section 1833(t) to reflect those higher costs by January 1, 2005.

(2) Report.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall publish a rule in the Federal Register consistent with the factors under subparagraph (A) that will be effective and final immediately on an interim basis, subject to such change and revision, after public notice and opportunity for public comment, as is consistent with this paragraph.

(3) Whether the arrangement between the health center entity and the other party provides for a health care professional’s independent medical judgment regarding medically appropriate treatments.

(4) Whether the Secretary may also include other standards and criteria that are consistent with the intent of Congress in enacting the exception established under this section.

(2) Interim final effect.—No later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall publish a rule in the Federal Register consistent with the factors under subparagraph (A) that will be effective and final immediately on an interim basis, subject to such change and revision, after public notice and opportunity for public comment, as is consistent with this paragraph.

SEC. 213. GAO STUDY OF GEOGRAPHIC DIFFERENCES IN PAYMENTS FOR PHYSICIANS’ SERVICES.

(a) Study.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study of differences in payment amounts under the physician fee schedule under section 1848 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w–4) for physicians’ services in different geographic areas. Such study shall—

(1) an assessment of the validity of the geographic adjustment factors used for each component of the fee schedule; and

(2) an evaluation of the measures used for such adjustment, including the frequency of revisions; and

(3) an evaluation of the methods used to determine professional liability insurance costs used in computing the malpractice component, including a review of increases in professional liability insurance premiums applicable to such areas.

(b) Report.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the
SEC. 214. TREATMENT OF MISSING COST REPORTING PERIODS FOR SOLE COMMUNITY HOSPITALS.

(a) In General.—Section 1896(b)(3)(I) (42 U.S.C. 1395ww(b)(3)(I)) is amended by adding at the end the following new clause:

"(iii) In no case shall a hospital be denied treatment as a sole community hospital for payment (on the basis of a target rate as such a hospital) because data are unavailable for any cost reporting period due to changes in ownership, changes in fiscal intermediaries, or other extraordinary circumstances, so long as data for at least one applicable base cost reporting period is available.

(b) Effective Date.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to cost reporting periods beginning on or after January 1, 2008.

SEC. 215. EXTENSION OF TELEMEDICINE DEMONSTRATION PROJECT.

Section 400A of Balanced Budget Act of 1997 (Public Law 105–33) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(4), by striking "4-year" and inserting "8-year"; and

(2) in subsection (d)(3), by striking "$35,000,000" and inserting "$110,000,000".

SEC. 216. ADJUSTMENT TO THE MEDICAID INPATIENT HOSPITAL PPS WAGE INDEX TO REVISE THE LABOR-RELATED SHARE OF SUCH INDEX.

(a) In General.—Section 1886(d)(3)(E) (42 U.S.C. 1395ww(d)(3)(E)) is amended—

(1) by striking "WAGE LEVELS—The Secretary and inserting "WAGE LEVELS—";

(ii) in general.—Except as provided in clause (ii), the Secretary shall:

(1) hold harmless for certain hospitals.—If the application of subclause (I) would result in lower payments to a hospital than would result if the previous sentence for any period as if the application of subclause (I) had not been enacted.

(b) In general.—Section 1886(d)(3)(E) (42 U.S.C. 1395ww(d)(3)(E)), as amended by subsection (a), is amended by adding at the end of clause (i) the following new sentence: "The Secretary shall apply the previous sentence for any period as if the amendments made by section 202(a) of the Medicare Rx New Act of 2003 had not been enacted.

SEC. 217. ESTABLISHMENT OF FLOOR ON GEOGRAPHIC ADJUSTMENTS OF PAYMENTS FOR PHYSICIANS' SERVICES.

Section 1848(e)(1) (42 U.S.C. 1395w–4(e)(1)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking "subparagraphs (B) and (C)" and inserting "subparagraphs (B), (C), (E), and (F)"; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subparagraphs:


SEC. 217. ESTABLISHMENT OF FLOOR ON GEOGRAPHIC ADJUSTMENTS OF PAYMENTS FOR PHYSICIANS' SERVICES.

Section 1848(e)(1) (42 U.S.C. 1395w–4(e)(1)) is amended—

(1) in general.—For purposes of payment for services furnished on or after January 1, 2004, and before January 1, 2005, after calculating the geographic cost of services in subparagraph (A)(iii), the Secretary shall increase the work geographic index to the applicable base cost reporting period is

applicable floor index is less than 1.00.

(iii) In no case shall a hospital be denied treatment as a sole community hospital for payment (on the basis of a target rate as such a hospital) because data are unavailable for any cost reporting period due to changes in ownership, changes in fiscal intermediaries, or other extraordinary circumstances, so long as data for at least one applicable base cost reporting period is available.

(b) Effective Date.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to cost reporting periods beginning on or after January 1, 2008.

SEC. 215. EXTENSION OF TELEMEDICINE DEMONSTRATION PROJECT.

Section 400A of Balanced Budget Act of 1997 (Public Law 105–33) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(4), by striking "4-year" and inserting "8-year"; and

(2) in subsection (d)(3), by striking "$35,000,000" and inserting "$110,000,000".

SEC. 216. ADJUSTMENT TO THE MEDICAID INPATIENT HOSPITAL PPS WAGE INDEX TO REVISE THE LABOR-RELATED SHARE OF SUCH INDEX.

(a) In General.—Section 1886(d)(3)(E) (42 U.S.C. 1395ww(d)(3)(E)) is amended—

(1) by striking "WAGE LEVELS—The Secretary and inserting "WAGE LEVELS—";

(ii) in general.—Except as provided in clause (ii), the Secretary shall:

(1) hold harmless for certain hospitals.—If the application of subclause (I) would result in lower payments to a hospital than would result if the previous sentence for any period as if the application of subclause (I) had not been enacted.

(b) In general.—Section 1886(d)(3)(E) (42 U.S.C. 1395ww(d)(3)(E)), as amended by subsection (a), is amended by adding at the end of clause (i) the following new sentence: "The Secretary shall apply the previous sentence for any period as if the amendments made by section 202(a) of the Medicare Rx New Act of 2003 had not been enacted.

SEC. 217. ESTABLISHMENT OF FLOOR ON GEOGRAPHIC ADJUSTMENTS OF PAYMENTS FOR PHYSICIANS' SERVICES.

Section 1848(e)(1) (42 U.S.C. 1395w–4(e)(1)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking "subparagraphs (B) and (C)" and inserting "subparagraphs (B), (C), (E), and (F)"; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subparagraphs:


SEC. 217. ESTABLISHMENT OF FLOOR ON GEOGRAPHIC ADJUSTMENTS OF PAYMENTS FOR PHYSICIANS' SERVICES.

Section 1848(e)(1) (42 U.S.C. 1395w–4(e)(1)) is amended—

(1) in general.—For purposes of payment for services furnished on or after January 1, 2004, and before January 1, 2005, after calculating the geographic cost of services in subparagraph (A)(iii), the Secretary shall increase the work geographic index to the applicable floor index by the proportion determined to be necessary to increase such index to 1.00 for any locality for which such index is less than 1.00.

(iii) In no case shall a hospital be denied treatment as a sole community hospital for payment (on the basis of a target rate as such a hospital) because data are unavailable for any cost reporting period due to changes in ownership, changes in fiscal intermediaries, or other extraordinary circumstances, so long as data for at least one applicable base cost reporting period is available.

(b) Effective Date.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to cost reporting periods beginning on or after January 1, 2008.
The question is on the adoption of House Resolution 297 designated earlier today.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 221, noes 203, not voting 11, as follows:

AYES—221

Brown-Waite, Gephardt (MO)
Coble, Chocola
Castle, Cannon
Calvert, Buyer (IN)
Burton (IN)
Burr, Brown-Waite, Brady (TX)
Boozman, Bonilla
Bono, Bonner
Boehner, Bosco
Boehm, Briggs, Burgess
Brown-Waite, Burgess
Burns, Burr, Burton (IN)
Buser, Buyer, Calvert
Camp, Cannon
Capito, Castle
Chabot, Chocola

NOES—203

Abercrombie, Ackerman, Alexander (NC)
Allen, Andrews
Baca, Baird
Baldwin, Balch
Becerra, Berkley
Berman, Berry
Bishop (GA), Bishop (NY)
Boswell, Bourner
Boyd, Brady (PA)
Brown (OH), Brown, Corrine
Capps, Capuano
Cardin, Cardozza, Carson (CA), Carson (NV)
Case, Casey
Coburn, Cole
Collin, Cole
Conyers, Cooper
Costello, Craner
Crews, Cummings
Davis (AL), Davis (CA), Davis (TN)
DeFazio, Degette
Delahunt, Delahunt
Delalu, Delalu
Deutsch, Dicks
Dingell, Doggett
Doyle, Doyle

The question was taken; and the vote was ordered recorded.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 6 of House Resolution 299 and clause 1 of rule XXI, all points of order are reserved provisions contained in the bill making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, and for other purposes.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of agreeing to the resolution, House Resolution 297.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution;

The resolution was agreed to. The SPEAKER pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.
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Mr. Speaker, we must honor the most basic commitments we have made to our men and women of our Armed Services. We must ensure a reasonable quality of life to recruit and retain the best and brightest for America's fighting forces. Most importantly, we must do it all, everything in our power to ensure a strong, able, dedicated American military so this Nation will be ever vigilant, ever prepared, so much more important now than it has been in the past.

This bill provides nearly $1.2 billion for barracks, and $176 million for hospitals and medical facilities for our troops and their families. It also provides $2.7 billion to operate and maintain existing housing units, and $1.2 billion for new housing units, much, much needed.

Military families also have a tremendous need for quality child care, especially single parents and families in which one or both parents may face lengthy deployment. To help meet this need, the bill provides $16 million for child development centers. H.R. 2559 is more than just a signal to our soldiers, which one or both parents may face, it also provides a quality of life for themselves and their families.

Mr. Speaker, we must honor the most basic commitments we have made to our men and women of our Armed Services. We must ensure a reasonable quality of life to recruit and retain the best and brightest for America's fighting forces. Most importantly, we must do it all, everything in our power to ensure a strong, able, dedicated American military so this Nation will be ever vigilant, ever prepared, so much more important now than it has been in the past.

This bill provides nearly $1.2 billion for barracks, and $176 million for hospitals and medical facilities for our troops and their families. It also provides $2.7 billion to operate and maintain existing housing units, and $1.2 billion for new housing units, much, much needed.

Military families also have a tremendous need for quality child care, especially single parents and families in which one or both parents may face lengthy deployment. To help meet this need, the bill provides $16 million for child development centers. H.R. 2559 is more than just a signal to our soldiers, which one or both parents may face, it also provides a quality of life for themselves and their families.
them a decent quality of life so as to sustain the commitment and professionalism of America's all voluntary armed services and the families that support them.

While our men and women in uniform have bravely dispatched our enemies abroad, they face increasingly complex personal and professional challenges here at home. We must do more to take care of those who are putting their lives on the line to defend our freedoms and for the families who support them in their efforts. And I am really glad we are getting this done before we head home for the July 4th work break.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the rule and to support the conference report.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McGovern. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 35 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. Myrick) for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the rule under consideration for H.R. 2599, the Fiscal Year 2004 Military Construction Appropriations Act, is an open rule. It provides for one hour of general debate, waives all points of order against consideration of the bill, allows for germane amendments and provides for one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my appreciation for the work of the gentleman from Michigan (Chairman Knollenberg) and the ranking member, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Edwards) of the Subcommittee on Military Construction along with the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Florida (Chairman Young) and the ranking member, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. Obey) for continuing the tradition of bipartisan action on this bill and for doing the best with a terrible allocation.

Mr. Speaker, I have a terrible feeling of deja vu. Almost exactly 1 year ago, on June 27 of 2002, I stood on this House floor as the minority manager of the rule on the fiscal year 2003 military construction bill. Along with the then-chairman, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Hobson) and the ranking member, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. Olver), we all bemoaned the inadequacy of that bill. We all pledged to do better next year, and called upon President Bush to increase the budget for desperately needed military construction, housing, base realignment and base closure.

Well, 1 year later none of that has happened. This year is even worse. If last year's appropriations bill was inadequate, this one is woefully inadequate, to quote the gentleman from Michigan (Chairman Knollenberg). In fact, the fiscal year 2004 bill is $3.5 billion less than last year's bill. Let me repeat that. This bill is $3.5 billion less than the fiscal year 2003 funding levels. It is even $41 million less than the chairman's request.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask my colleagues what in the world are we doing? How can we stand on this House floor day after day, week after week and declare how much we support our uniformed men and women when the funding provided for family housing in this bill is less than last year? How can we stand on the floor of this House day after day, week after week and say that we are engaged in a long-term struggle against a global enemy when funding for military construction in this bill is $1 billion less than last year?

Mr. Speaker, poor facility conditions are not only unsafe, they hamper readiness and decrease troop retention. According to the Pentagon, 180,000 of the 300,000 units of military housing are substandard. According to the Pentagon, 68 percent of the Department's facilities have deficiencies so serious that they might impede mission readiness or they are so deteriorated that they cannot meet mission requirements. The current reductions in funding for construction in these facility categories means that the rate at which buildings are renovated or replaced has just increased from 83 years to 150 years.

This is a national scandal. And let us be clear, this bill is not only about new housing, it is about the operation and maintenance of existing family housing. One of the few increases in family housing in this bill, the Army, it receives an $81 million increase. Unfortunately, funding for the operation and maintenance of existing Army family housing is cut by $63 million, allowing more and more current housing units to deteriorate and fall into substandard condition. Talk about robbing Peter to pay Paul.

Mr. Speaker, I keep hearing that since the events of September 11 we live in a changed world. I keep on hearing how much we owe our Armed Forces. How much we appreciate their sacrifice and service. Then why do we keep cutting and cutting and cutting away at the folks who keep cutting and cutting and cutting away at the folks who serve our country on active duty have decent housing and workplaces for themselves and their families. But the Republicans on the Committee on Appropriations rejected the gentleman from Wisconsin's (Mr. Obey) proposal, and last night the Republicans on the Committee on Rules refused to allow the gentleman from Wisconsin's (Mr. Obey) amendment to even be debated again voted on in this House.

So we are faced with the results of what happens when we rob our Nation of the most basic revenue needed to adequately fund our Nation's priorities. We rob our valiant military personnel of decent homes and facilities. We rob our veterans of their basic benefits. We cut back funding for schools and child care for military families. And we are faced with passing this woefully inadequate bill. I believe that for all the hard work of the gentleman from Michigan (Chairman Knollenberg) and the ranking member, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Edwards), can only be viewed as a shameful scandal on the part of this House.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. Myrick. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McGovern. Mr. Speaker, I yield 9 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. Obey), the ranking Democrat on the Committee on Appropriations.

(Mr. Obey asked and was given permission to extend his remarks, and include extraneous material.)

Mr. Obey. Mr. Speaker, it would be so nice if the force of our rhetoric is matched by the force of our deeds. That certainly is not the case with this bill.

Just a few months ago this House passed this resolution and it said,
among other things, "Resolved by the House of Representatives, the Senate concurring, that the Congress express the unequivocal support and appreciation of the Nation to the members of the United States Armed Forces serving in Operation Iraqi Freedom and carrying out their missions with excellence, patriotism and bravery and also to their families."

Well, the sad news, unfortunately, is that the check is not in the mail. We have given them a resolution but we are not shepherding them in terms of things that military families need in order to make their life better. I do not understand why we are doing that. This bill shows the House's "support and appreciation" by providing $1.5 billion less than we appropriated last year to provide the military with decent housing and work places.

The bill also thanks the military supposedly by cutting the President's own request for the Pentagon by $180 million. This, for hangers, offices, fitness centers and teaching facilities that even OMB and the administration said the military needed. But this bill cuts them out.

Many Members of this House have seen the problems for themselves. The Pentagon itself rates the readiness of most military facilities as marginal or worse. Over 225,000 service members and their families cannot get decent barracks or decent housing. This bill is not up to the job and we all know why. It is not the fault of the subcommittee chairman. It is the fault of every single Member of this House who voted for the budget resolution which said that the only priorities for this year was going to be tax cuts. And as you know, the lion's share of the tax cuts went into the pockets of the wealthiest 1 percent of people in this country.

So as a result of that decision by the Republican leadership to put tax cuts as the primary goal of this Congress, the Pentagon said we need $160 million in cuts from the President's budget. I would like to restore all of them. I think the White House is right. We need them. I would also add $480 million in additional housing. That would help at least 2,500 military families. That would be a useful first step in replacing the 134,000 inadequate units that service members and their families are forced to live in today.

Finally, the amendment would provide $480 million for housing that would help 5,300 single service members into decent housing. The Pentagon says we need over 83,000 units, so even this amendment goes just an inch. My amendment is an opportunity to re-store the projects the President said were needed, to help about 8,000 service members and their families, and it would help Congress to keep its promise to the troops.

Now, as the gentleman from Massachusetts has indicated, I would pay for it by changing the tax package that was just passed by this Congress. What I would say is that for persons with adjusted gross incomes of more than $1 million, instead of their getting the $88,000 tax cut they will get next year, we would cut that to $83,000. That is hardly starvation wages. Now, these are not just millionaires. These are people with adjusted gross incomes of more than $1 million each year, about 200,000 people in this society. And I bet if you and I PSU's, they would happily take that reduction in order to provide a real improvement in the quality of life for our troops.

□ 1515

We are saying let them keep 95 percent of their tax cut but use that $5,000 difference to give people who are putting their lives on the line for this country better living conditions.

In recent months, President Bush and the Republican-controlled Congress have missed no opportunity to heap richly deserved praise on the military. But talk is cheap—and getting cheaper by the day, judging from the nickel-and-dime treatment the troops are getting lately.

For example, the White House griped that various pay-and-benefits incentives added to the 2004 defense budget by Congress were winding up unmatched. In a modest proposal to double the $6,000 gratuity paid to families of troops who die on active duty. This comes at a time when Americans continue to die in Iraq at a rate of about one a day.

Similarly, the administration announced that on Oct. 1 it wants to roll back recent modest increases in monthly imminent-danger pay (from $225 to $150) and family-separation allowance (from $250 to $100) for troops getting shot at in combat zones.

Incredible, one of those tax-provisions— eased residency rules for service members to qualify for capital-gains exemptions when selling a home—has been home-to reservists who travel long distances for training and parents deployed to combat zones, among others.

Incredibly, one of those tax-provisions— eased residency rules for service members to qualify for capital-gains exemptions when selling a home—has been home-to reservists who travel long distances for training and parents deployed to combat zones, among others.

The piece ends with a mention of the "104 wealthiest taxpayers" and their supposed tax-exemption for additional housing costs. This is a common trope in conservative rhetoric, where the wealthy are depicted as the only ones deserving government assistance. However, the reality is much more complex, and the amendment proposed by the author seeks to address the needs of military families directly, rather than relying on symbolic gestures or vague promises of future action.

The amount of $160 million proposed for additional housing is significant, as it addresses a long-standing issue of inadequate housing for military personnel. The amendment also seeks to cut $5,000 from high-income tax cuts, which is a small fraction of the overall savings needed. The author argues that this is a reasonable trade-off, given the critical needs of military families.

In summary, the amendment represents a clear attempt to prioritize the needs of military families over those of the wealthy, and to ensure that the military is supported properly. It is a call to action for Congress to fulfill its promises to the troops, and to do so in a way that is both practical and just.
for E-1s, E-2s and O-1s at 2 percent, well below the average raise of 4.1 percent.

The Senate version of the defense bill rejects that idea, and would provide minimum 3.7 percent and higher targeted hikes for some. But the House version of the bill goes along with Bush, making this an issue still to be hashed out in upcoming negotiations.

All of which brings us to the latest indignity—Bush’s $92 billion military construction request for 2004, which was set at a full $1.5 billion below this year’s budget on the expectation that Congress, as has become tradition in recent years, would add funding as it drafted the construction appropriations bill. But the $40 billion in cuts that have left little elbow room in the 2004 federal budget that is taking shape, and the squeeze is on across the board.

The result: Not only has the House Appropriations military construction panel accepted Bush’s proposed $1.5 billion cut, it voted to reduce construction spending by an additional $41 million next year.

Rep. David Obey, D-Wis., senior Democrat on the House Appropriations Committee, took a stab at restoring $1 billion of the $1.5 billion in construction cuts he proposed to cover that by trimming recent tax cuts for the roughly 200,000 Americans who earn more than $1 million a year. Instead of a tax break of $88,300, they would receive $83,500.

The Republican majority on the construction appropriations panel quickly shot down. And the outlook for fixing the $41 billion backlog of work that needs to be done on crumbling military housing and other facilities is bleak at best.

Taken piecemeal, all these corner-cutting moves might be viewed as mere flesh wounds, but in the context of the $28 billion cut in important programs that would mean that $15,000 would fix your leaky roof or to repair the damage to the structure of the house. If $15,000 would fix it; even if you never get that money to fix that house, you are living in adequate housing.

Unfortunately, the vast majority of the 44,000 Army soldiers that I have the privilege to represent at Fort Hood in Texas get only $50,000 a year, living at all out of their tax cuts, while the millionaires will average, not the millionaires but the people making over $1 million a year will average more than $88,000 in tax cuts.

How serious is the housing problem for our servicemen and -women? Maybe they already have quality housing. Perhaps there is some Member of this House or some member of the public, Mr. Speaker, that has not visited our military installations recently. Maybe they think that the only lap of luxury. Let me present the facts.

The fact is that there are 83,000 servicemen and -women living in inadequate barracks that do not even meet the lowest Department of Defense standards. The truth is that there are 128,660 military families, people that on this floor just a few minutes ago were called professional, the best, clearly dedicated, 128,660 of those families are in this House, this bill does not meet very low DOD standards.

By the way, just for the record, let me point out what is defined as meeting the quality standard required by the Department of Defense. In the Fiscal Year 2003 Appropriations Bill, that means that $2,000 could fix up your house where it could meet those lowest minimum DOD standards and you are living in adequate housing. Forget the fact that you may never get that $15,000 to fix your leaky roof or to fix the washer and dryer that are not working or to repair the damage to the structure of the house. If $15,000 would fix it, even if you never get that money to fix that house, you are living in adequate housing.

Mr. Speaker, first I want to thank the gentleman from North Carolina said, we ask a lot from our servicemen and -women; and I stand in this House today to say that this bill, despite the tremendous, valiant efforts of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KNOZEMBERING) who did the best anybody could with the amount of money given to him, this bill is a slap in the face to our servicemen and -women; and just as the Army Times in its editorial recently said that our soldiers in effect getting tired of lip service from Congress, this bill salutes them by insulting them.

It defines our rhetoric of appreciation with the reality of a $1.5 billion cut in important programs that would have meant a better quality of life, better training so that many of our troops might come home safely to the hugs of their families rather than in body bags.

What this House is saying, despite all the intentions that one might have, good or bad, what this House is saying with our votes is that we value more an $88,000 tax cut for millionaires, those making more than $1 million, more than them getting an $83,000 tax cut, we value that more than treating with respect our servicemen and -women.

We should oppose this rule, support the Obey amendment, and back up our rhetoric with our actions.

Mr. Speaker, first I want to thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. Obey) for their eloquent and powerful words for reminding us all how we are not living up to our promise to our uniformed men and women, and it is something that every single Member in this House should listen to very carefully; and we now have an opportunity to be able to do something about that.

Mr. Speaker, I will ask for a recorded vote on the previous question, and I will urge Members to vote “no” on the
The amendment is not subject to amendment except for pro forma amendments or to a demand for a division of the question in the committee of the whole or in the House.

SEC. 3. The amendment referred to in section 2 is as follows:

On page 2, line 13, under the heading "Military Construction, Army", delete the dollar amount and insert $1,726,600,000.

On page 3, line 13, under the heading "Military Construction, Navy", delete the dollar amount and insert $3,197,900,000.

On page 4, line 5, under the heading "Military Construction Air Force", delete the dollar amount and insert $956,500,000.

On page 4, line 21, under the heading "Military Construction, Defense Wide", delete the dollar amount and insert $782,130,000.

On page 5, line 20, under the heading "Military Construction, Army National Guard", delete the dollar amount and insert $956,500,000.

On page 7, line 19, under the heading "Family Housing Construction, Navy and Marine Corps", delete the dollar amount and insert $601,193,000.

And on page 9, line 6, under the heading "Family Housing Construction, Air Force", delete the dollar amount and insert $841,065,000.

At the end of the bill, add the following:

Section 3. The amendment referred to in section 2 is as follows:
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The SPEAKER pro tempore. The resolution was agreed to. So the previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KNOLENNBERG) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS) each will control 30 minutes. The Chairman recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KNOLENNBERG). Mr. KNOLENNBERG. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. KNOLENNBERG asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. KNOLENNBERG. Mr. Chairman, it is my pleasure to present to the House H.R. 2559, the fiscal year 2004 military construction appropriations bill. This legislation provides funds for all types of construction projects on military installations here in the U.S. and abroad. Projects range from barracks and housing to training ranges and runways. I would also like to express my appreciation to all members of the subcommittee for their help in putting together this year's bill. I commend the good work done by the subcommittee staff, Tom Forhan, Brian Potts, Mary Arnold, Kim Reath, and Valerie Bald staff, Tom Forhan, Brian Potts, Mary Arnold, Kim Reath, and Valerie Bald staff, Tom Forhan, Brian Potts, Mary Arnold, Kim Reath, and Valerie Bald staff, Tom Forhan, Brian Potts, Mary Arnold, Kim Reath, and Valerie Bald staff, Tom Forhan, Brian Potts, Mary Arnold, Kim Reath, and Valerie Bald staff, Tom Forhan, Brian Potts, Mary Arnold, Kim Reath, and Valerie Bald staff, Tom Forhan, Brian Potts, Mary Arnold, Kim Reath, and Valerie Bald staff, Tom Forhan, Brian Potts, Mary Arnold, Kim Reath, and Valerie Bald staff, Tom Forhan, Brian Potts, Mary Arnold, Kim Reath, and Valerie Bald staff, Tom Forhan, Brian Potts, Mary Arnold, Kim Reath, and Valerie Bald staff, Tom Forhan, Brian Potts, Mary Arnold, Kim Reath, and Valerie Bald staff, Tom Forhan, Brian Potts, Mary Arnold, Kim Reath, and Valerie Bald staff, Tom Forhan, Brian Potts, Mary Arnold, Kim Reath, and Valerie Bald staff, Tom Forhan, Brian Potts, Mary Arnold, Kim Reath, and Valerie Bald staff, Tom Forhan, Brian Potts, Mary Arnold, Kim Reath, and Valerie Bald staff, Tom Forhan, Brian Potts, Mary Arnold, Kim Reath, and Valerie Bald staff, Tom Forhan, Brian Potts, Mary Arnold, Kim Reath, and Valerie Bald staff, Tom Forhan, Brian Potts, Mary Arnold, Kim Reath, and Valerie Bald staff, Tom Forhan, Brian Potts, Mary Arnold, Kim Reath, and Valerie Bald staff, Tom Forhan, Brian Potts, Mary Arnold, Kim Reath, and Valerie Bald staff, Tom Forhan, Brian Potts, Mary Arnold, Kim Reath, and Valerie Bald staff, Tom Forhan, Brian Potts, Mary Arnold, Kim Reath, and Valerie Bald staff, Tom Forhan, Brian Potts, Mary Arnold, Kim Reath, and Valerie Bald staff, Tom Forhan, Brian Potts, Mary Arnold, Kim Reath, and Valerie Bald staff, Tom Forhan, Brian Potts, Mary Arnold, Kim Reath, and Valerie Bald

The bill includes $194 million for hospitals and medical facilities, an increase of $5 million over last year's level. This is another positive quality-of-life message, one intended for all service members as well as their families. $274 million is provided for community facilities, an increase of $5 million above President's request. These facilities include child development centers, fire stations, schools, and physical fitness centers.
$465 million is provided for the Guard and Reserve components, an increase of $95 million above the President’s request.

The bill fully funds the President’s request of $1.2 billion for new family housing units and improvements to existing units, and $2.7 billion is provided for the operation and maintenance of existing family housing units.

I would like to highlight the overseas military construction program for just one moment. In support of a global repositioning effort, the President’s amended budget submission and the recommendation before Members today rescinds and/or reduces overseas construction requirements by $327 million. Of these reductions, $279 million has been applied to construction requirements in the United States. It is my opinion additional cuts will adversely impact the quality of life and mission readiness of our troops living overseas, including those who are fighting the war against terrorism and also in Operation Iraqi Freedom. Therefore, I cannot recommend additional cuts in this area to my colleagues.

We have worked closely with the authorization committee in producing this legislation. I would like to take this opportunity to thank the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. HEFLEY) and his staff for their assistance.

In conclusion, we have focused our efforts on programs that directly support the men and women in our Armed Forces. We would like to do more. We always have and always will. But in my opinion, the recommendations in this bill are solid and fully fund projects that are vital to the security of the United States. The bottom line is this: with this bill, we meet the military’s mission critical infrastructure needs and enable its efforts to improve the quality of life for our men and women in the Armed Forces. This is a fair bill. I encourage all my colleagues to support it.

Mr. Chairman, I include the following tabular material for the RECORD:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>FY 2003 Enacted</th>
<th>FY 2004 Request</th>
<th>Bill</th>
<th>Bill vs. Enacted</th>
<th>Bill vs. Request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Military construction, Army</td>
<td>1,472,022</td>
<td>1,602,060</td>
<td>1,533,660</td>
<td>+61,638</td>
<td>-68,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defense emergency response fund (DERF)</td>
<td>211,688</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-211,688</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>1,683,710</td>
<td>1,602,060</td>
<td>1,533,660</td>
<td>-150,050</td>
<td>-68,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rescission</td>
<td>-49,376</td>
<td>-66,050</td>
<td>-183,615</td>
<td>-134,239</td>
<td>-117,565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplemental appropriations (P.L. 108-11)</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-2,000</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,636,334</td>
<td>1,536,010</td>
<td>1,350,045</td>
<td>-286,289</td>
<td>-185,965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military construction, Navy</td>
<td>1,095,698</td>
<td>1,147,537</td>
<td>1,211,077</td>
<td>+15,579</td>
<td>+63,540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defense emergency response fund (DERF)</td>
<td>209,430</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-209,430</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>1,305,128</td>
<td>1,147,537</td>
<td>1,211,077</td>
<td>-94,051</td>
<td>+63,540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rescission</td>
<td>-1,340</td>
<td>-14,679</td>
<td>-39,322</td>
<td>-37,982</td>
<td>-24,643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplemental appropriations (P.L. 108-11)</td>
<td>46,100</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-46,100</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,351,888</td>
<td>1,132,858</td>
<td>1,171,755</td>
<td>-180,133</td>
<td>+38,897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military construction, Air Force</td>
<td>891,650</td>
<td>830,671</td>
<td>896,136</td>
<td>+44,656</td>
<td>+65,465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defense emergency response fund (DERF)</td>
<td>188,597</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-188,597</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>1,080,247</td>
<td>830,671</td>
<td>896,136</td>
<td>-184,111</td>
<td>+65,465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rescission</td>
<td>-13,281</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>+13,281</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rescission (P.L. 108-7)</td>
<td>-18,600</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>+18,600</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplemental appropriations (P.L. 108-11)</td>
<td>152,900</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>+152,900</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,201,266</td>
<td>830,671</td>
<td>896,136</td>
<td>-305,130</td>
<td>+65,465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military construction, Defense-wide</td>
<td>836,345</td>
<td>815,113</td>
<td>813,613</td>
<td>-22,732</td>
<td>-1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defense emergency response fund (DERF)</td>
<td>33,300</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-33,300</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>869,645</td>
<td>815,113</td>
<td>813,613</td>
<td>-56,032</td>
<td>-1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rescissions</td>
<td>-2,976</td>
<td>-997</td>
<td>-32,680</td>
<td>-29,704</td>
<td>-31,683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>866,669</td>
<td>814,116</td>
<td>780,933</td>
<td>-85,736</td>
<td>-33,183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, Active components</td>
<td>5,056,157</td>
<td>4,313,655</td>
<td>4,198,669</td>
<td>-857,288</td>
<td>-114,786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military construction, Army National Guard</td>
<td>241,377</td>
<td>168,298</td>
<td>208,033</td>
<td>-33,344</td>
<td>+39,735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military construction, Air National Guard</td>
<td>194,880</td>
<td>60,430</td>
<td>77,105</td>
<td>-117,775</td>
<td>+16,675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defense emergency response fund (DERF)</td>
<td>6,933</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>+6,933</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>203,813</td>
<td>60,430</td>
<td>77,105</td>
<td>-126,708</td>
<td>+16,675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military construction, Army Reserve</td>
<td>100,554</td>
<td>68,478</td>
<td>84,569</td>
<td>-15,985</td>
<td>+16,091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military construction, Naval Reserve</td>
<td>67,804</td>
<td>28,032</td>
<td>38,992</td>
<td>-28,812</td>
<td>+10,960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defense emergency response fund (DERF)</td>
<td>7,117</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-7,117</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>74,921</td>
<td>28,032</td>
<td>38,992</td>
<td>-35,929</td>
<td>+10,960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military construction, Air Force Reserve</td>
<td>63,650</td>
<td>44,312</td>
<td>56,212</td>
<td>-7,438</td>
<td>+11,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defense emergency response fund (DERF)</td>
<td>3,976</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-3,976</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>67,626</td>
<td>44,312</td>
<td>56,212</td>
<td>-11,014</td>
<td>+11,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous appropriations (P.L. 108-7)</td>
<td>18,600</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-18,600</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>86,226</td>
<td>44,312</td>
<td>56,212</td>
<td>-29,614</td>
<td>+11,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, Reserve components</strong></td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, Military construction</strong></td>
<td>5,762,648</td>
<td>4,683,205</td>
<td>4,663,780</td>
<td>-1,098,868</td>
<td>-19,425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriations</td>
<td>5,185,580</td>
<td>4,764,931</td>
<td>4,919,397</td>
<td>-266,183</td>
<td>+154,446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defense emergency response fund</td>
<td>(662,641)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-662,641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rescissions</td>
<td>(-85,573)</td>
<td>(-81,726)</td>
<td>(-255,617)</td>
<td>(170,044)</td>
<td>(-173,891)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>North Atlantic Treaty Organization Security Investment Program</em></td>
<td>167,200</td>
<td>169,300</td>
<td>169,300</td>
<td>+2,100</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family housing construction, Army</td>
<td>280,356</td>
<td>409,191</td>
<td>409,191</td>
<td>+128,835</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rescission</td>
<td>-4,920</td>
<td>-52,300</td>
<td>-52,300</td>
<td>-47,380</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>275,436</td>
<td>356,891</td>
<td>356,891</td>
<td>+81,455</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family housing operation and maintenance, Army</td>
<td>1,106,007</td>
<td>1,043,026</td>
<td>1,043,026</td>
<td>-62,981</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family housing construction, Navy and Marine Corps</td>
<td>376,468</td>
<td>184,193</td>
<td>184,193</td>
<td>-192,275</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rescission</td>
<td>-2,452</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-3,585</td>
<td>-933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>373,016</td>
<td>184,193</td>
<td>180,608</td>
<td>-195,208</td>
<td>-3,585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family housing operation and maintenance, Navy and Marine Corps</td>
<td>861,788</td>
<td>852,778</td>
<td>852,778</td>
<td>-9,010</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family housing construction, Air Force</td>
<td>684,824</td>
<td>657,065</td>
<td>657,065</td>
<td>-27,759</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rescission</td>
<td>-8,782</td>
<td>-19,347</td>
<td>-29,039</td>
<td>-20,257</td>
<td>-9,692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>676,042</td>
<td>637,718</td>
<td>628,026</td>
<td>-48,016</td>
<td>-9,692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family housing operation and maintenance, Air Force</td>
<td>833,419</td>
<td>834,468</td>
<td>826,074</td>
<td>-7,394</td>
<td>-8,394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defense emergency response fund (DBRP)</td>
<td>29,631</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-29,631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>863,050</td>
<td>834,468</td>
<td>826,074</td>
<td>-36,975</td>
<td>-8,394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplemental appropriations (P.L. 108-11)</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-1,800</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>864,850</td>
<td>834,468</td>
<td>826,074</td>
<td>-38,776</td>
<td>-8,394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family housing construction, Defense-wide</td>
<td>5,480</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>-5,130</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Defense Family Housing Improvement Fund</td>
<td>42,359</td>
<td>49,440</td>
<td>49,440</td>
<td>+7,085</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, Family housing</strong></td>
<td>4,207,814</td>
<td>3,959,164</td>
<td>3,937,493</td>
<td>-270,321</td>
<td>-21,671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base realignment and closure account</td>
<td>561,336</td>
<td>370,427</td>
<td>370,427</td>
<td>-190,711</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General provision (sec. 118)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>55,000</td>
<td>55,000</td>
<td>+55,000</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand total, New budget (obligational) authority</strong></td>
<td>10,696,800</td>
<td>9,237,096</td>
<td>9,196,000</td>
<td>-1,502,800</td>
<td>-42,096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriations</td>
<td>(10,108,455)</td>
<td>(9,390,469)</td>
<td>(9,536,541)</td>
<td>(147,074)</td>
<td>(146,072)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defense emergency response fund</td>
<td>(692,272)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>(692,272)</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rescissions</td>
<td>(-101,927)</td>
<td>(-153,373)</td>
<td>(-340,541)</td>
<td>(236,164)</td>
<td>(-187,168)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to vote for this military construction bill for one reason and for one reason alone. I believe the gentleman from Michigan, the chairman of our committee, has worked very hard and in a fair and bipartisan manner from day one on this bill. He and his capable staff have worked diligently and professionally to deal with a $1.5 billion military construction cut. This grossly inadequate funding level was not the decision of the gentleman from Michigan or myself. The gentleman from Michigan has a deep and genuine commitment to supporting a high quality of life for our servicemen and -women and their families. I know that firsthand. This decision was made above his pay grade and above mine. As the chairman and the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Military Construction, our responsibility is to take whatever funding level is given to us and invest those resources in a way that will fund the highest-priority military construction priorities. I believe that is what the gentleman from Michigan, our subcommittee, and I have done; and that is why I will vote for this bill.

However, Mr. Chairman, I would be remiss and I believe it would be the height of irresponsibility for me not to speak honestly to our colleagues about what I consider to be the serious implications of cutting military construction funding by $1.5 billion. By the way, that is before the consideration of inflation. In my opinion, cutting military quality of life and military training investments during a time of war breaks faith with America's servicemen and -women and their families. I am deeply disappointed that the administration of the House leadership said they would say in effect that it is okay to salute our troops with our words while cutting critical military quality-of-life programs with our deeds. I believe it is wrong to salute our servicemen and -women with words while insulating them with our deeds. It is wrong in a time of war in Afghanistan for the administration in a separate bill to want to cut military education funds for military children by $173 million and to cut funds for family housing, health care, day care and training in this bill by $1.5 billion.

Mr. Chairman, we are starting to see a pattern of respect to our servicemen and -women in time of war with our rhetoric and disrespect with our priorities and our actions. Frankly, in my opinion, we are reflecting the values of the majority leader of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), who said during the Iraqi war that in time of war nothing is more important than cutting. I would like to invite the majority leader to my district to explain that statement and that value to the 44,000 soldiers I represent at Fort Hood, 20,000 of whom are overseas in Iraq today.

I believe it adds insult to injury to make these cuts in military quality-of-life programs to help pay for an $88,000 tax cut for people in America living here, but nowhere near the war zone, not fighting in war, people making over $1 million a year. It is not just wrong; it is outrageous. As public officials, our spending priorities are a better reflection of our values than our speeches and what we say about our values in Congress when we ask Americans to go into combat in Iraq and then the administration is trying to cut those very servicemen's and -women's children's education funding by 14 percent. What does it say about our values when a person making $1 million in dividend income this year just received a $200,000 tax cut while a soldier in Iraq must read that the House has voted to cut military housing, quality-of-life and training facility funding by $1.5 billion. This year, by the way, the House has voted to cut their future veterans benefits by $28 billion, a vote cast on March 21 just 8 minutes after we had overwhelmingly voted for a resolution saluting the service of our servicemembers.

Mr. Chairman, in my opinion that type of priority makes a mockery of the American ideals of fairness and shared sacrifice during time of war. What do these cuts mean? It means that tens of thousands of servicemen and -women living in inadequate housing will have to continue to do so. We have 83,000 new barracks that are needed to meet minimum DOD standards for our single servicemen and -women. We have a need for 128,680 new military housing units for military families who sacrifice so much for our country. This bill does not meet those needs. Why? Not because of the values or priorities of the gentleman from Michigan, but because of the leadership of this House and the administration decided that we must cut military construction by $1.5 billion to help pay for that massive tax cut that we have already signed into law.

There is a lot of good in this bill, and the committee should be proud of its work. There are a lot of important priority programs funded. I salute the chairman and his very professional staff for, under very difficult circumstances, working together to adequately fund the highest-priority programs. I salute the gentleman from Michigan, his staff and the professional staff on both sides. This bill was put together without partisanship. It was put together under trying circumstances, with a last-minute decision by someone, I do not know and I do not know how, someone who said, we are going to have to cut our spending by $560 million below the amount authorized just a few weeks ago.

I support this bill for the many good things in it and the good work that was done to produce it; but I say to my colleagues, Mr. Chairman, we should be ashamed that we are asking our servicemen and -women to have their housing, their quality of life, their day care, their health clinics, their training facility programs cut by $1.5 billion in time of war. We should salute our servicemen and -women and their families with our deeds, not just with our words.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I rise for two purposes: one, to express strong support for the bill and to compliment Chairman KNOLLENBERG and Ranking Member Edwards for committing as good a bill as they could with what they had to work with. We have heard today as we heard during the Homeland Security appropriations bill earlier and the Interior appropriations bill, that the gentleman from Wisconsin and I have sat together many times trying to figure out that magic. The gentleman from Wisconsin and I have sat many times trying to figure out that magic. We have not found the right magic wand yet. But the committees and the subcommittees are doing the best they can with what they have to work with, and they are producing good bills.

The second part of my interest today is to talk to our colleagues that, although there was a substantial delay in getting past some budgetary issues that were above the jurisdiction of the Committee on Appropriations, that 2 weeks ago when those issues were finally settled, your Committee on Appropriations has responded well. The Homeland Security bill was marked up, sent to the House, and it has gone on to the Senate. The military construction bill has been marked up, sent to the House, and will go to the Senate today. The defense appropriations bill has been marked up. The labor, health and human services bill has been marked up. The Interior appropriations bill has been marked up. The agriculture appropriations bill has been marked up, and the legislative branch bill has been marked up. So in that 2-week period, your committee has produced seven of the 13 bills. That is in addition to having completed 11 of last year’s bills due this calendar and one major wartime supplemental.

I am very proud of the Committee on Appropriations on both sides. I am...
Mr. Chairman, that is a statement not from a Democrat or Republican in this House, but from the “Army Times” editorial. I think we should listen to the words and spirit of that editorial. I do not think our servicemen and women are going to accept lip service, including the risking of their lives. It is time for us to give them more than lip service when it comes to committing to making tough choices, committing to ensure that they can have a better quality of life when they are on their housing, have day care for their children and quality schools for their families.

Mr. Knollenberg. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. Edwards. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. Young), the ranking Democrat on the Full Committee on Appropriations who made an effort earlier this day to offer an amendment that was closed off by the Republican leadership to add nearly $1 billion of commitment to our service-men and women’s quality of life programs.

Mr. O’Reilly. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I want to express my agreement with the comments made by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. Young), the distinguished chairman of this committee. And then I want to say this: Budgets are not just presentations of numbers. Budgets really reflect and define and demonstrate the priorities and values of the people in this House. And that is why this bill is such a sad commentary on the nature of this House.

When President Bush came into office, thanks to the fiscal discipline demonstrated by the previous administration, we expected to see at least $6 trillion worth of surpluses over the next decade. We were in the best shape that we had been financially in more than a generation. So the President decided that we could afford to provide very large tax cuts, and he estimated we would still have billions left over for other purposes, and the House passed those tax cuts.

My point is that then something happened that was totally unexpected. We got hit by 9/11 and the economic downturn that followed that. Any person of prudence in my view, having seen such a shocking change, would have been careful about the next step that they took, but this Congress and this White House, alas, was not. So despite the fact that the bottom was falling out of the economy and the bottom was falling out of Government revenues, the White House and this Congress decided they were going to push on with even larger tax cuts. And I want to say that we needed to do it in order to create jobs. But, not a single job has been created during the tenure of the Bush administration. In fact, we have lost almost 3 million jobs since President Bush took office. Part of that is not his responsibility; part of it in my view, is, and the Congress’s as well. My point is that when conditions change one would think that their approach and their rhetoric would change, instead it did not. We have gotten only one answer out of the administration in terms of dealing with the economy: Tax cuts, tax cuts, tax cuts, no matter how badly they are skewed to the upper reaches of the income ladder and no matter how much it cost to the other people in this society. And this bill is one of the examples of what it costs.

When this House passes these tax cuts, it pretends that there is no cost to anyone else. Let me just spell out what some of the costs are. Those tax cuts mean that we will be paying $23 billion more in interest payments next year than we would otherwise be paying. Before these tax cuts play out we will be spending more on interest payments in the Federal budget than we will be spending on all domestic appropriation items reported by this committee, and it will be a gargantuan share of the Federal budget. We ought to be able to make better judgments than that.

But there are other costs as well. We passed the “No Child Left Behind Act” for education, sent mandates out to the States and said we would send cash out to help pay for those mandates. I’ve heard from you, the appropriations bill that is coming out will short sheet those education programs by $8 billion. Nobody knows that, but that is what is going to happen. And this is happening at a time when budget crunches all over the country are going to be squeezing States and squeezing schools. We are also having to squeeze down on what we provide in health care. There are thousands and thousands of families being pushed off health care in many States in the Union. And this bill represents what is going to happen to military families, because we are cutting $1.5 billion below the deliverable amount in the previous year’s budget for military families under military construction. And we wind up making only token progress in improving the housing for military families and for single enlisted people.

The cost of the estate tax elimination, which this House just passed: For the cost of that money it took to take millionaires off the tax roll when we passed that estate tax change that is going to cost $300 billion—or for that $800 billion, we could close one-third of the gap in financing that will be existing in the Social Security system. We should have done that first. But we did not. We passed another huge tax cut for the high rollers.

So there are consequences, and there are costs to those tax cuts. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. Young) is right. He cannot perform a miracle.
Neither can the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KOLLENBERG). Appropriations are the table scraps that are left over after this House has decided to plunge ahead, promising all of these out-sized tax cuts to the American people while a huge share of those tax cuts go to the wealthiest, and then we see what happens to the rest.

So that is why I am not pleased with this bill, not because of the work of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KOLLENBERG) or the staff but because this House made a basic bad judgment to begin with and it is being compounded and illustrated and demonstrated with every other bill we bring to the floor.

That is the problem. There are consequences. The budget process is being handled in this House to try to hide those consequences. It is our responsibility to try to lay out what those consequences are, and that is why we have gone through this operation this afternoon.

Mr. KOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, I do not think there are any other speakers on this side. I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I never thought I in my 12 years in this House would come to the floor and speak out in favor of a military construction bill that cuts quality of life programs by $1.5 billion. I never thought I would ask my colleagues to vote for a bill that decreases Navy and Marine Corps family housing construction investment by $93 million compared to last year. I never thought I would ask my colleagues to vote for a bill that decreases family Air Force construction housing by $48 million compared to last year.

But I do ask my colleagues to vote for this bill because we had to do the best we could with the allocation given to us. Because of the needs, the important needs, military family needs that this bill meets, I will vote for it. Because of the needs that will remain unmet, I will not be proud that this House will go on record as saying in time of war to our servicemen and women thanks for risking their lives, thanks for fighting in Iraq, thanks for taking care of their children at home while they are wondering if their loved one will ever come home alive, while at the same time cutting their quality of life programs by $1.5 billion. I guess it is a testament to my respect for the Armed Services. For many weeks now, we have all pledged our love to these warriors and their families of the sacrifices they have made on behalf of our Nation.

Besides their incredible efforts in fighting the War on Terrorism, these patriots and their families have had to learn to live without their fathers or mothers or spouses present on a daily basis because of numerous, long, and dangerous deployments, or even worse, if their loved one has paid the ultimate sacrifice. I, myself, have had more than my share of families in my district that have paid this price. I have traveled extensively to our military facilities and have observed the substandard housing we force our military personnel and families to live in. We must address this situation.

We are all grateful for these sacrifices, but how will we show this gratefulness? Will we support the Ranking Member in his effort to scale back the tax cuts by a mere 5 percent for those who make over a million dollars a year, so we can restore funding and adequately house our forces? Even though we are cutting military construction spending by $1.5 billion from last year’s funding, we can still do the right thing at this time by voting for the Previous Question. We must support the Ranking Member’s efforts and truly show our gratitude to our troops.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend Chairman KOLLENBERG and Ranking Member EDWARDS for their work on this bill. They have done their best with an unreasonable and unacceptable allocation. I know they share my deep disappointment over this level of funding, which is $1.5 billion less than was appropriated for Military Construction & Family Housing last year.

Unfortunately this cut makes a bad situation worse. When the Bush administration came into office, they found a Department of Defense backlog of critical projects which do receive funding here are all unmet, I will not be proud that this House meets, I will vote for it. Be-
Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2004. It is the second bill we are considering pursuant to the 302(b) allocations adopted by the Appropriations Committee on June 17th. I am pleased to report that it is consistent with the levels established in H. Con. Res. 95, the House concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2004, which Congress adopted on April 10. The budget resolution provided $400.1 billion in discretionary budget authority for national defense. This bill funds the military construction and family housing portion of that commitment to our men and women in uniform.

H.R. 2559 provides $9.196 billion in new budget authority and $10.282 billion in outlays for fiscal year 2004. It is therefore identical to its 302(b) allocation to the House Subcommittee on Military Construction Appropriations. It does not contain emergency-ignited new BA. It does include $340.5 million in rescissions of previously enacted BA. Although budget authority in the bill declines by 12.8 percent from the previous year, it is $81 million above the President’s request. This mainly reflects that H.R. 2559 contains a procurement appropriation of $120 million that, according to CBO, was part of the administration’s request for the Defense appropriation bill rather than this bill.

The bill complies with section 302(f) of the Budget Act of 1974. It exhibits consideration of bills in excess of an appropriations subcommittee’s 302(b) allocation of budget authority and outlays established in the budget resolution.

H.R. 2559 represents this House’s solemn commitment to our men and women in uniform to put their lives on the line for freedom. It not only addresses the long-term infrastructure problems at military bases, it sustains barracks, family housing, medical facilities, and child support centers across the country and overseas. It also provides infrastructure funding for National Guard and Reserve troops who now find themselves on the front lines of the war against terrorism. Finally, it incorporates the results of real-world national security policy changes: The redeployment south of the United States of America, away from the North Korean nuclear weapons, and the transition of the role of the military from a war-fighting role to a peace-keeping role.

In conclusion, I express my support for H.R. 2559.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2559, making appropriations for military construction for fiscal year 2004. This legislation is a strong product for tough times and I want to commend the Subcommittee Chairman, the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. KNOLORENBERG, and the Gentleman from Texas, Mr. Edwards. This legislation provides $9.2 billion in funding for military construction and family housing projects across the country.

While no one is satisfied with the bottom line on this bill and we all wish that it could not do more, this is a solid product. It satisfies our obligation to ensure that our men and women in uniform live in, train at, and deploy from adequate facilities. This bill shows our commitment to our service members by constructing and upgrading military installations, and modernizing family housing in the United States and overseas.

Improving the quality of life for our men and women in uniform throughout the world is critically important. If we are asking these brave men and women to protect our national security, then we must ensure that they have the tools and the facilities to protect themselves. America’s armed forces have been charged with developing the capabilities to fight jointly and with coalition partners to secure victory across the entire spectrum of conflict. To continue the transition to a more flexible, more agile, lighter and more lethal force.

In this context, I am pleased the Committee has included funding for a state-of-the-art explosives loading facility at the Army’s “Home of Lethality”—Picatinny Arsenal in New Jersey.

In Afghanistan and Iraq, the achievements of our young men and women in uniform are due in part to the incredible technological advances employed by our military, much of which has been researched and developed by Picatinny Arsenal—the only Army-owned, Army-operated facilities for the research and development of energetics materials (mines, armor, warheads, artillery, etc.) in the nation. The new facility will mark a substantial upgrade in safety, environmental protection and process controls that will benefit the other branches of the military that rely on Army research and development expertise.

Mr. Chairman, once again I commend Mr. KNOLORENBERG and Mr. YOUNG and I urge support for this bill.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, today I urge your consideration of the authorization of $14.3 million for land acquisition to preserve access to the Barry M. Goldwater Range. This land acquisition would serve to protect training and test ranges, and to further encroach, and to increase the margin of safety in the Live Ordnance Departure Area located southwest of Luke Air Force Base.

The Barry M. Goldwater Range, a 2.7 million acre land and airspace area in southwest Arizona, is the crown jewel of all flight ranges, providing the Air Force with the space necessary to conduct live-fire training and simulating realistically the dimensions of a modern battlefield.

Luke Air Force Base—with its year-round idyllic weather—is the training home to the F-16 Fighting Falcon. With an average of 170 sorties flown each day, access to the Barry M. Goldwater Range is an essential part of the advanced training and practice required of the Air Force fighter pilots. The southern departure corridor from Luke Air Force Base is the only air corridor where live ordnance can be carried out by F-16 Fighters. The threat of increased traffic and increased pressure of residential development from what has traditionally been isolated farmland places the mission and the future of Luke Air Force Base at risk.


Mr. EDWARDS. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KNOLORENBerg. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chair may accord priority in recognition to a Member offering an amendment that has been printed in the designated place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Those amendments will be considered read.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY (INCLUDING RECESSIONS)

For acquisition, construction, installation, and operation of permanent and temporary military facilities and public works, military installations, facilities, and real property for the Army as currently authorized by law, including personnel in the Army Corps of Engineers and other personal services necessary for the purposes of this appropriation, and for construction and operation of facilities in support of the functions of the Commander in Chief, $1,533,660,000, to remain available until September 30, 2008: Provided, That of this amount, not to exceed $122,710,000 shall be available for study, planning, design, architect and engineer services, and host nation support, as authorized by law, unless the Secretary of Defense determines that additional obligations are required for such purposes and notifies the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress of his determination and the reasons therefor: Provided further, That of the funds appropriated for “Military Construction, Army” under Public Law 107-249, $342,200,000 are rescinded: Provided further, That of the funds appropriated for “Military Construction, Army” under Public Law 107-64, $24,000,000 are rescinded: Provided further, That of the funds appropriated for “Military Construction, Army” under Public Law 106-246, $7,415,000 are rescinded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. OBEY: On page 4, line 5, under the heading “Military Construction, Army”, delete the dollar amount and insert $601,191,000;

On page 5, line 1, under the heading “Military Construction, Navy”, delete the dollar amount and insert $872,110,000;

On page 5, line 5, under the heading “Military Construction, Air Force”, delete the dollar amount and insert $968,509,000;

On page 4, line 21, under the heading “Military Construction, Army”, delete the dollar amount and insert $872,110,000;

On page 5, line 20, under the heading “Military Construction, Army National Guard”, delete the dollar amount and insert $231,860,000;

On page 6, line 3, under the heading “Military Construction, Air Force Reserve”, delete the dollar amount and insert $95,605,000;

On page 7, line 19, under the heading “Family Housing Construction, Army”, delete the dollar amount and insert $9,000,000;

On page 8, line 13, under the heading “Family Housing Construction, Navy and
Mr. OBEY (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, what has been happening in this House is that the Committee on Rules has routinely been waiving points of orders for the majority but denying those same waivers to the minority. That puts us in an uneven position on the House floor. We are in that kind of position on this amendment. I want to simply say in conceding the point of order that I will continue to make this motion on this bill. I will not have it in my motion to re-commit. I will try at every stage of the process to get this matter before the House so we can make these priority judgments, and it is up to the majority whether it wants to knock them off the floor or not.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's point of order is conceded and sustained.

Mr. KNOLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill, from page 3, line 5, though page 19, line 19 be considered as read, printed in the RECORD and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is reserved.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I have already explained to the House what the intention of this amendment is. This amendment would restate the $318 million in cuts from the President's budget for hangers, maintenance shops, office space, physical fitness facilities for the military that even the White House thought were crucial. It adds $480 million for family housing to help at least 2,500 military families. There are 134,000 inadequate units that service those families to date. It would add $318 million for new barracks. It would help get 5,300 single service personnel into decent housing. The Pentagon says there is a need for over 83,000 unit fix-ups. And it would pay for that by reducing the expected tax cut for those with adjusted gross incomes of more than $1 million dollars annually. We would adjust their tax cuts from $888,000 to $533,000, thus enabling them to keep 56 percent of the tax cut. That would free up enough money to meet these military needs, and I would urge the House, despite the action of the Committee on Rules, to allow this amendment to go forward.

POINT OF ORDER

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KNOLENBERG) insist on his point of order?

Mr. KNOLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I do. I make a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change the existing law and constitutes legislation in an appropriations bill and therefore violates clause 2 of rule XXI, which states in part "An amendment to a general appropriations bill shall not be in order if changing existing law."

At this time I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard on the point of order. The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, what has been happening in this House is that the Committee on Rules has routinely been waiving points of orders for the Department of Defense (other than the military departments), as currently authorized by law, $831,613,000, to remain available until September 30, 2008. Provided, That such amounts of this appropriation as may be determined by the Secretary of Defense may be transferred to such appropriations of the Department of Defense available for military construction or family housing as he may designate, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes, and for the same periods, as the amounts as to which transferred: Provided further, That of the amount appropriated, not to exceed $68,784,000 shall be available for study, planning, design, architect and engineer services, as authorized by law, unless the Secretary of Defense determines that additional obligations are necessary for such purposes and notifies the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress of his determination and the reasons therefor: Provided further, That of the funds appropriated for "Military Construction, Defense-wide" under Public Law 107-249, $32,680,000 are rescinded.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD

For construction, acquisition, expansion, rehabilitation, and conversion of facilities for the training and administration of the Army National Guard, and contributions therefor, as authorized by chapter 1803 of title 10, United States Code, and Military Construction Authorization Acts, $208,033,000, to remain available until September 30, 2008.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR NATIONAL GUARD

For construction, acquisition, expansion, rehabilitation, and conversion of facilities for the training and administration of the Air National Guard, and contributions therefor, as authorized by chapter 1803 of title 10, United States Code, and Military Construction Authorization Acts, $77,105,000, to remain available until September 30, 2008.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY RESERVE

For construction, acquisition, expansion, rehabilitation, and conversion of facilities for the training and administration of the Army Reserve as authorized by chapter 1803 of title 10, United States Code, and Military Construction Authorization Acts, $84,569,000, to remain available until September 30, 2008.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, NAVAL RESERVE

For construction, acquisition, expansion, rehabilitation, and conversion of facilities for the training and administration of the Navy and Marine Corps as authorized by chapter 1803 of title 10, United States Code, and Military Construction Authorization Acts, $38,992,000, to remain available until September 30, 2008.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE RESERVE

For construction, acquisition, expansion, rehabilitation, and conversion of facilities for the training and administration of the Air Force Reserve as authorized by chapter 1803 of title 10, United States Code, and Military Construction Authorization Acts, $76,859,000, to remain available until September 30, 2008.

NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION SECURITY INVESTMENT PROGRAM

For the United States share of the cost of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Security Investment Program for the acquisition and construction of military facilities and installations (including international military headquarters, facilities, and expenses for the collective defense of the North Atlantic Treaty Area as authorized in Military Construction Authorization Acts and sections 2806 of title 10, United States Code, $169,300,000, to remain available until expended.
For expenses of family housing for the Army for construction, including acquisition, replacement, addition, expansion, extension and alteration, as authorized by law, $409,191,000, to remain available until September 30, 2008: Provided, That of the funds appropriated for "Family Housing Construction, Air Force" under Public Law 107-249, $52,300,000 are rescinded.

**Family Housing Operation and Maintenance, Army**

For expenses of family housing for the Army for operation and maintenance, including debt payment, leasing, minor construction, principal and interest charges, and insurance premiums, as authorized by law, $1,043,026,000.

**Family Housing Construction, Navy and Marine Corps**

For expenses of family housing for the Navy and Marine Corps for construction, including acquisition, replacement, addition, expansion, extension and alteration, as authorized by law, $184,193,000, to remain available until September 30, 2008: Provided, That of the funds appropriated for "Family Housing Construction, Navy and Marine Corps" under Public Law 107-249, $3,585,000 are rescinded.

**Family Housing Operation and Maintenance, Navy and Marine Corps**

For expenses of family housing for the Navy and Marine Corps for operation and maintenance, including debt payment, leasing, minor construction, principal and interest charges, and insurance premiums, as authorized by law, $852,778,000.

**Family Housing Construction, Air Force**

For expenses of family housing for the Air Force for construction, including acquisition, replacement, addition, expansion, extension and alteration, as authorized by law, $657,065,000, to remain available until September 30, 2008: Provided, That of the funds appropriated for "Family Housing Construction, Air Force" under Public Law 107-249, $19,347,000 are rescinded: Provided further, That of the funds appropriated for "Family Housing Construction, Air Force" under Public Law 107-249, $52,300,000 are rescinded.

**Family Housing Operation and Maintenance, Air Force**

For expenses of family housing for the Air Force for operation and maintenance, including debt payment, leasing, minor construction, principal and interest charges, and insurance premiums, as authorized by law, $825,074,000.

**Family Housing Construction, Defense-Wide**

For expenses of family housing for the activities and agencies of the Department of Defense (other than the military departments, including the military acquisition, replacement, addition, expansion, extension and alteration, as authorized by law, $350,000, to remain available until September 30, 2008.

**Family Housing Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide**

For expenses of family housing for the activities and agencies of the Department of Defense (other than the military departments, including the military acquisition, replacement, addition, expansion, extension and alteration, as authorized by law, $49,440,000.

**Department of Defense Family Housing Improvement Fund**

For the Department of Defense Family Housing Improvement Fund, $300,000, to remain available until expended, for family housing initiatives undertaken pursuant to section 2883 of title 10, United States Code, providing alternative means of acquiring and improving existing family housing and supporting facilities.

**BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE ACCOUNT**

For deposit into the Department of Defense Base Closure and Realignment Fund, $103,510,000, to remain available until expended.

**General Provisions**

**Sec. 101.** None of the funds appropriated in Military Construction Appropriations Acts shall be expended for payments under a cost-reimbursement contract, where cost estimates exceed $25,000, to be performed within the United States, except Alaska, without the specific approval in writing of the Secretary of Defense setting forth the reasons therefor.

**Sec. 102.** Funds appropriated to the Department of Defense for construction shall be available for hire of passenger motor vehicles.

**Sec. 103.** Funds appropriated to the Department of Defense for construction may be used for advances to the Federal Highway Administration, Department of Transportation, for the construction of access roads as authorized by section 133 of title 23, United States Code, when projects authorized therein are certified as important to the national defense by the Secretary of Defense.

**Sec. 104.** None of the funds appropriated in this Act may be used to begin construction of new bases inside the continental United States for which specific appropriations have not been made.

**Sec. 105.** No part of the funds provided in Military Construction Appropriations Acts shall be used for site preparation; or (2) install utilities for any family housing, except housing for which funds have been obligated in an annual Military Construction Appropriations Acts.

**Sec. 107.** None of the funds appropriated in Military Construction Appropriations Acts for minor construction may be used to transfer or relocate any activity from one base or installation to another, without prior notification to the Committees on Appropriations.

**Sec. 108.** No part of the funds appropriated in Military Construction Appropriations Acts may be used for the procurement of steel for any construction project or activity for which American steel producers, fabricators, and manufacturers have been denied the opportunity to compete for such steel procurement.

**Sec. 109.** None of the funds available to the Department of Defense for the construction or family housing during the current fiscal year may be used to pay real property taxes in any foreign nation.

**Sec. 110.** None of the funds appropriated in Military Construction Appropriations Acts may be used to initiate a new installation overseas without prior notification to the Committees on Appropriations.

**Sec. 111.** None of the funds appropriated in Military Construction Appropriations Acts may be obligated for architect and engineer contracts estimated by the Government to exceed $500,000 for projects to be accomplished in Japan, in any NATO member country, or in countries bordering the Arabian Sea, unless such contracts are awarded to United States firms or United States firms in joint venture with host nation firms.

**Sec. 112.** None of the funds appropriated in Military Construction Appropriations Acts for military construction in the United States, territories and possessions, in the Pacific and on Kwajalein Atoll, or in countries bordering the Arabian Sea, may be used to award any contract estimated by the Government to exceed $500,000 to any contractor: Provided, That this section shall not apply to contract awards for which the lowest responsive and responsible bid of a United States contractor exceeds the lowest responsive and responsible bid of a foreign contractor by greater than 20 percent: Provided further, That this section shall not apply to contract awards for military construction on Kwajalein Atoll for which the lowest responsive and responsible bid is submitted by a Marshall Islands contractor.

**Sec. 113.** The Secretary of Defense is to inform the appropriate committees of Congress, including the Committees on Appropriations, of plans and scope of any proposed military exercise involving United States personnel 30 days prior to its occurrence, if amounts expended for construction, either temporary or permanent, are anticipated to exceed $100,000.

**Sec. 114.** Not more than 20 percent of the appropriations in Military Construction Appropriations Acts which are obligated during the current fiscal year shall be obligated during the last 2 months of the fiscal year.

**Transfer of Funds**

**Sec. 115.** Funds appropriated to the Department of Defense for construction in prior years shall be available for construction authorized for each such military department by the authorities enacted into law during the current session of Congress.

**Sec. 116.** No military construction or family housing projects that are being completed with funds otherwise expired or lapsed for obligation, expired or lapsed funds may be used to pay the cost of associated superintendence, inspection, engineering and design on those projects and on subsequent claims, if any.

**Sec. 117.** Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any funds appropriated to a military department or defense agency for the construction of military projects may be obligated for a military construction project or contract, or for any portion of such a project or contract, at any time before the end of the fourth fiscal year after the fiscal year for which such funds were appropriated for such project: (1) are obligated from funds available for military construction contracts; and (2) do not exceed the amount appropriated for such project, plus which the cost of such project is increased pursuant to law.

**Transfer of Funds**

**Sec. 118.** During the 5-year period after appropriations available to the Department of Defense for military construction and family housing operation and maintenance and construction have expired for obligation, upon a determination that such appropriations will not be necessary for the liquidation of obligations or for making authorized adjustments to such appropriations for obligations incurred during the period for which any of such appropriations, unobligated balances of such appropriations may be transferred into
the appropriation “Foreign Currency Fluctuations, Construction, Defense” to be merged with and to be available for the same time period and for the same purposes as the appropriation to which transferred.

SEC. 119. The Secretary of Defense is to provide the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives with an annual report by February 15, containing details of the specific actions proposed to be taken by the Department of Defense during the current fiscal year to encourage other nations of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, Japan, Korea, and United States allies bordering the Arabian Sea to assume a greater share of the common defense burden of such nations and the United States.

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 120. During the current fiscal year, in addition to any other transfer authority provided, amounts made available to the Department of Defense, proceeds deposited to the Department of Defense Base Closure Account established by section 207(a)(1) of the Department Authorization Act, Air and Baseline Cost, Department Act (Public Law 100-526) pursuant to section 207(a)(2)(C) of such Act, may be transferred to the account established by section 2906(a)(1) of the Department Authorization Act, 1991, to be merged with, and to be available for the same purposes and the same time period as that account.

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 121. Subject to 30 days prior notification to the Committees on Appropriations, such additional amounts as may be determined by the Secretary of Defense may be transferred to the Department of Defense Base Closure Account established by section 207(a)(1) of the Department Authorization Act, Air and Baseline Cost, Department Act (Public Law 100-526) pursuant to section 207(a)(2)(C) of such Act, by the Secretary of Defense pursuant to the provisions of subchapter IV of chapter 169, title 10, United States Code, pertaining to alternative means of accomplishing the closure of military family housing and supporting facilities.

SEC. 122. None of the funds appropriated or made available by this Act may be obligated for Partnership for Peace Programs in the New Independent States of the former Soviet Union.

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 123. During the current fiscal year, in addition to any other transfer authority provided, proceeds deposited to the Department of Defense, amounts may be transferred to the account established by section 2906(a)(1) of the Department Authorization Act, Air and Baseline Cost, Department Act (Public Law 100-526) pursuant to section 2906(a)(2)(C) of such Act, by the Secretary of Defense pursuant to the provisions of subchapter IV of chapter 169, title 10, United States Code, pertaining to alternative means of accomplishing the closure of military family housing and supporting facilities.

SEC. 124. Notwithstanding this or any other provision of law, funds appropriated in Military Construction Appropriations Acts for operations and maintenance of family housing shall be the exclusive source of funds for repair and maintenance of all family housing units, general or flag officer quarters.

The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. OBEY moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 2559, to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same with the following amendment:

On page 2, line 13, under the heading “Military Construction, Army”, delete the dollar amount and insert $(891,909,000).

On page 3, line 13, under the heading “Military Construction, Navy”, delete the dollar amount and insert $(891,909,000).

On page 4, line 5, under the heading “Military Construction, Air Force”, delete the dollar amount and insert $(891,909,000).

On page 5, line 20, under the heading “Military Construction, Army National Guard”, delete the dollar amount and insert $(231,860,000).

On page 6, line 3, under the heading “Military Construction, Air National Guard”, delete the dollar amount and insert $(95,605,000).

On page 7, line 19, under the heading “Military Construction, Army”, delete the dollar amount and insert $(601,191,000).

On page 8, line 13, under the heading “Family Housing Construction, Navy”, delete the dollar amount and insert $(318,009,000).

And on page 9, line 6, under the heading “Family Housing Construction, Air Force”, delete the dollar amount and insert $(914,065,000).

At the end of the bill, add the following:

SEC. 1630. In the case of taxpayers with adjusted gross income in excess of $1,000,000 for the tax year beginning in 2003, the amount of tax reduction resulting from enactment of the Jobs and Growth Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2003 shall be reduced by five percent.

Mr. OBEY (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) on his motion to recommit.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I will not take the 5 minutes. This is simply the same motion I offered before. If this House were operating on the basis of any degree of fairness today, it would be before the House, and I would simply ask that the majority refrain from offering the point of order against it. I know they have their marching orders. They have to do what they have to do, and I have to do what I have to do.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the motion to recommit because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation in an appropriations bill, and therefore, violates clause 2 of rule X, section 4, clause 2.

The rule states, in pertinent part, “An amendment to a general appropriation bill shall not be in order if changing existing law.” The amendment proposes to alter the application of existing law.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin wish to be heard on the point of order?
Mr. OBEY. Yes, I do, Mr. Speaker.

As I said earlier, this is the same motion I made before. What is happening here is that because of a technical difference in the way the rules are being applied to the majority and the minority, we are being prevented from offering a motion which would strike a much better balance between the needs of our military and the needs of the most well-off people in this society.

With that, I concede the point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin concedes the point of order. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer a motion to recommit.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a quorum call.

The Clerk. The quorum is present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The motion is not debatable.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit offered by Mr. OBEY.

Under rule XX, this 15-minute vote on passage of the bill is suspended under the terms of Mr. OBEY's motion, H. Res. 277.

The vote was taken by electronic devices, and there were--yeas 428, nays 0, not voting 6, as follows:

[H. Res. 277]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAYS</th>
<th>YEAS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>426</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Announcement by the Speaker pro tempore]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 277, on which the yeas and nays are agreed to.

This is a 5-minute vote. The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were--yeas 426, nays 0, not voting 7, as follows:

[H. Res. 277]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAYS</th>
<th>YEAS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>426</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Expressing support for Freedom in Hong Kong]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, H. Res. 277.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) during the vote. Members are reminded less than 2 minutes remain in this vote.

Mr. ACKERMAN changed his vote from "nay" to "yea". So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table by Mr. ACKERMAN.

[Correction]

Mr. ACKERMAN changed his vote from "nay" to "yea". So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table by Mr. ACKERMAN.

[Announcement by the Speaker pro tempore]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Speaker pro tempore (Mr. THORNBERRY) during the vote. Members are reminded less than 2 minutes remain in this vote.

Mr. ACKERMAN changed his vote from "nay" to "yea". So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table by Mr. ACKERMAN.

[Correction]

Mr. ACKERMAN changed his vote from "nay" to "yea". So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table by Mr. ACKERMAN.

[Announcement by the Speaker pro tempore]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Speaker pro tempore (Mr. THORNBERRY) during the vote. Members are reminded less than 2 minutes remain in this vote.

Mr. ACKERMAN changed his vote from "nay" to "yea". So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table by Mr. ACKERMAN.

[Correction]

Mr. ACKERMAN changed his vote from "nay" to "yea". So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table by Mr. ACKERMAN.

[Announcement by the Speaker pro tempore]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Speaker pro tempore (Mr. THORNBERRY) during the vote. Members are reminded less than 2 minutes remain in this vote.

Mr. ACKERMAN changed his vote from "nay" to "yea". So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table by Mr. ACKERMAN.

[Correction]

Mr. ACKERMAN changed his vote from "nay" to "yea". So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table by Mr. ACKERMAN.

[Announcement by the Speaker pro tempore]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Speaker pro tempore (Mr. THORNBERRY) during the vote. Members are reminded less than 2 minutes remain in this vote.

Mr. ACKERMAN changed his vote from "nay" to "yea". So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table by Mr. ACKERMAN.

[Correction]

Mr. ACKERMAN changed his vote from "nay" to "yea". So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table by Mr. ACKERMAN.

[Announcement by the Speaker pro tempore]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Speaker pro tempore (Mr. THORNBERRY) during the vote. Members are reminded less than 2 minutes remain in this vote.

Mr. ACKERMAN changed his vote from "nay" to "yea". So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table by Mr. ACKERMAN.
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Sancier, Linda
T.
Schakowsky
Shadegg
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Stark
Stenholm
Strickland
Stupak
Sweeney
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Toomey
Towns
Udall (NM)
Visclosky
Waters
Weiler
Wicker
Wu
"VOTING—9
Brown-Waite, 
Grimm
Edward
Gephardt
Announcement by the Speaker pro tempore:
The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EDUCATOR): The request of the gentleman from California (Mr. SHONROCK) to dispense with the reading of the vote is held.
So the journal was approved.
Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 299, I call up the bill (H.R. 2596) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a deduction for amounts contributed to health savings security accounts.
This Act may be cited as the "Health Savings and Affordability Act of 2003".
Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 299, I call up the bill (H.R. 2596) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a deduction for amounts contributed to health savings security accounts.
SEC. 2. HEALTH SAVINGS SECURITY ACCOUNTS AND HEALTH SAVINGS ACCOUNTS.
(a) IN GENERAL.—Part VII of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to additional itemized deductions for individuals) is amended by redesignating section 223 as section 225 and by inserting after that section the following new sections:
"SEC. 223. HEALTH SAVINGS SECURITY ACCOUNTS AND HEALTH SAVINGS ACCOUNTS.
"(a) DEDUCTION ALLOWED.—In the case of an individual who is an eligible individual for the taxable year, there shall be allowed as a deduction for the taxable year an amount equal to the aggregate amount paid in cash during such taxable year by such individual to a health savings security account or a health savings account.
"(b) LIMITATION.—
"(1) IN GENERAL.—The limitation upon the deduction under subparagraph (a) shall not exceed the amount of such individual's adjusted gross income for the taxable year.
"(2) MONTHLY LIMITATION.—The monthly limitation for any month during the taxable year shall be equal to the lesser of—
"(A) $2,000, in the case of an eligible individual who—
"(i) has family coverage under a minimum deductible plan as of the first day of such month, or
"(ii) is uninsured as of the first day of such month and, with respect to the taxable year which includes such month—
"(I) is entitled to a deduction for a dependent child under section 152(e) but for paragraph (2) of (4) of section 152(e), or
"(II) files a joint return, and
"(C) zero in any other case.
"(3) ADDITIONAL CONTRIBUTIONS FOR INDIVIDUALS 55 OR OLDER.—
"(A) IN GENERAL.—In the case of an individual who has attained the age of 55 before the close of the taxable year, paragraph (2) shall be applied by increasing the $2,000 amount in paragraph (2)(A) and the $4,000 amount in paragraph (2)(B) by the additional contribution amount.
"(B) ADDITIONAL CONTRIBUTION AMOUNT.—For purposes of this section, the additional contribution amount is the amount determined in accordance with the following table:
For taxable years The additional beginning in: contribution amount
2004 $500
2005 $600
2006 $700
2007 $800
2008 $900
2009 and thereafter $1,000.
"(4) LIMITATION BASED ON ADJUSTED GROSS INCOME.—
"(A) SELF-ONLY COVERAGE.—The dollar amount in paragraph (2)(A) is reduced (but not below zero) by an amount which bears the same ratio to such dollar amount as—
"(i) the amount (if any) by which the taxpayer's adjusted gross income for such taxable year exceeds $75,000 ($150,000 in the case of a joint return), bears to
"(ii) $10,000 ($20,000 in the case of a joint return).
"(B) FAMILY COVERAGE.—The dollar amount in paragraph (2)(B) is reduced (but not below zero) by an amount which bears the same ratio to such dollar amount as—
"(i) the amount (if any) by which the taxpayer's adjusted gross income for such taxable year exceeds $150,000, bears to
"(ii) $20,000.
"(C) NO REDUCTION BELOW $200 UNTIL COMPLETE PHASE-OUT.—No dollar amount shall be reduced below $200 under subparagraph (A) or (B) unless (without regard to this subparagraph) such limitation is reduced to zero.
"(D) ROUNDING.—Any amount determined under this paragraph which is not a multiple of $10 shall be rounded to the next lowest $10.
"(E) ADJUSTED GROSS INCOME.—For purposes of this paragraph, adjusted gross income shall be determined:
"(i) without regard to this section or section 911, and
"(ii) after application of sections 86, 135, 137, 221, 222, and 402.
"(S) COORDINATION WITH OTHER CONTRIBUTIONS.—The limitation which would (but for this paragraph) apply under this subsection to the taxpayer for any taxable year shall be reduced (but not below zero) by the sum of—
"(A) the aggregate amount paid during such taxable year to Archer MSAs of such individual,
"(B) the aggregate amount paid during such taxable year to health savings accounts of such individual, and
"(C) the aggregate amount paid during such taxable year to health savings security accounts of such individual by persons other than such individual.
"(D) SPECIAL RULES FOR MARRIED INDIVIDUALS, DEPENDENTS, AND MEDICARE ELIGIBLE INDIVIDUALS.—Rules similar to the rules of
paragraphs (3), (6), and (7) of section 220(b) shall apply for purposes of this section.

"(c) Definitions.—For purposes of this section—

(1) Eligible individual.—

(A) In general.—The term ‘eligible individual’ means, with respect to any month, any individual who is covered under a health savings account established, as of the first day of such month, under any health plan which is not a minimum deductible plan.

(B) Certain coverage disregarded.—Subparagraph (A) shall be applied without regard to—

(i) coverage for any benefit provided by a governmental health plan,

(ii) coverage (whether through insurance or otherwise) for accidents, disability, dental care, vision care, or long-term care.

(2) Minimum deductible plan.—

(A) In general.—The term ‘minimum deductible plan’ means a health plan—

(i) in the case of self-only coverage, which has an annual deductible which is not less than $500, and

(ii) in the case of family coverage, which has an annual deductible which is not less than twice the dollar amount in clause (i) (as increased under subparagraph (B)).

(B) Cost-of-living adjustment for annual deductible.—

(i) In general.—In the case of any taxable year beginning in a calendar year after 2004, the $500 amount in subparagraph (A)(i) shall be increased annually by an amount equal to—

(I) such dollar amount, multiplied by

(ii) the cost-of-living adjustment determined under section 1(f)(3) for the calendar year in which such taxable year begins by substituting ‘calendar year 2003’ for ‘calendar year 1992’ in subparagraph (B) thereof.

(ii) Rounding.—If any increase under clause (i) is not a multiple of $50, such increase shall be rounded to the nearest multiple of $50.

(3) Special rules.—

(A) Exclusion of certain plans.—Such term does not include a health plan if substantially all of its coverage is coverage described in paragraph (1)(B).

(B) Safe harbor for absence of preventive care deductible.—A plan shall not fail to be treated as a minimum deductible plan if the reason for failing to have a deductible for preventive care is—

(1) uninsured.—An individual shall be treated as uninsured if such individual is not covered by insurance which constitutes medical care benefits under clause (i) of section 106(d) unless such individual is covered under a health savings account established, as of the close of the calendar year in which such taxable year begins, by substituting ‘calendar year 2003’ for ‘calendar year 1992’ in subparagraph (B) thereof.

(2) Rounding.—If any increase under clause (i) is not a multiple of $50, such increase shall be rounded to the nearest multiple of $50.

(4) Insured.—

(A) In general.—The term ‘insured’ has the meaning given such term in section 220(c)(3).

(5) Family coverage.—The term ‘family coverage’ has the meaning given such term in section 220(d).

(6) Archer MSA.—The term ‘Archer MSA’ has the meaning given such term in section 220(d).

(7) Health Savings Account.—The term ‘health savings account’ has the meaning given such term in section 220(d).

(8) Health Savings Security Account.—For purposes of this section—

(A) Exempt from income tax.—Except in the case of a rollover contribution from an Archer MSA, or a health savings security account established, which is not includible in gross income, no contribution will be accepted—

(i) unless it is in cash and is contributed by—

(I) the account beneficiary,

(ii) a member of the family of the account beneficiary, or

(iii) an employer of the account beneficiary, and

(B) to the extent such contribution, when added to previous contributions to the trust for the calendar year, exceeds the highest annual limitation which could apply to an individual under subsection (b) for a taxable year beginning in the calendar year.

(B) The trustee is a bank (as defined in section 408(n)), an insurance company (as defined in section 408(p)), or any governmental health plan which demonstrates to the satisfaction of the Secretary that the manner in which such person will administer the trust will be consistent with the requirements of this section.

(C) No part of the trust assets will be invested in life insurance contracts.

(D) The assets of the trust will not be commingled with other property except in a common trust fund or common investment fund.

(E) The interest of an individual in the balance in his account is nonforfeitable.

(F) Member of the family.—The term ‘member of the family’ has the meaning given such term in section 2032A(e)(2).

(ii) Qualifying medical expenses.—The term ‘qualifying medical expenses’ has the meaning given such term in section 220(d)(2), except that—

(A) paragraph (B)(i) thereof shall not apply to—

(I) insurance which constitutes a minimum deductible plan if no portion of the cost of such insurance is paid by an employer or former employer of the account beneficiary or the spouse of such beneficiary, and

(ii) such insurance (other than health insurance substantially all of its coverage is described in subsection (c)(1)(B)) if the account beneficiary has attained age 65, and

(B) subparagraph (C) thereof shall not apply for purposes of this section.

(4) Account beneficiary.—The term ‘account beneficiary’ means the individual on whose behalf the health savings security account was established.

(5) Certain rules to apply.—Rules similar to the following rules shall apply for purposes of this section:

(A) Section 219(d)(2) (relating to no deduction for rollovers).

(B) Section 219(f)(3) (relating to time when contributions deemed made).

(C) Except as provided in section 106(d), section 219(f)(5) (relating to employer payments).

(D) Section 408(g) (relating to community property laws).

(E) Section 408(h) (relating to custodial accounts).

(6) Contributions from flexible spending accounts treated as made by the employer.—Any contribution from a flexible spending account to a health savings security account which is not includible in the gross income of the employee by reason of section 125(h) shall be treated as a contribution made by the employer for purposes of this section.

(7) Tax treatment of distributions.—

(A) In general.—A health savings security account is exempt from taxation under this subtitle unless such account has ceased to be a health savings security account. Notwithstanding the preceding sentence, any such account is subject to the taxes imposed by section 511 (relating to imposition of tax on unrelated business income of charitable, etc., organizations).

(B) Account terminations.—Rules similar to the rules of paragraphs (2) and (4) of section 408(e) shall apply to health savings security accounts, and any amount treated as distributed under such similar rules shall be treated as not used to pay qualified medical expenses.

(8) Amounts used for qualified medical expenses.—Any amount paid or distributed out of a health savings security account which is used exclusively to pay qualified medical expenses of any account beneficiary shall not be includible in gross income.

(9) Inclusion of amounts not used for qualified medical expenses.—

(A) In general.—Any amount paid or distributed out of a health savings security account which is not used exclusively to pay the qualified medical expenses of the account beneficiary shall be included in the gross income of such beneficiary in the manner provided under section 72.

(B) Special rules for applying section 72.—For purposes of applying section 72 to any amounts taken into account under section (A) of—

(i) all health savings security accounts shall be treated as 1 contract,

(ii) all distributions during any taxable year shall be treated as a distribution,

(iii) the value of the contract, income on the contract, and investment in the contract computed as of the close of the calendar year in which the taxable year begins, and

(iv) such distributions shall be treated as made from contributors of the family of the account beneficiary to the extent that such distribution, when added to all previous distributions from the health savings security account taken into account under this clause, do not exceed the aggregate contributions from members of such family.

(9) Excess contributions returned before due date of return.—

(A) In general.—If any excess contribution is contributed for a taxable year to any health savings security account of an individual, paragraph (2) shall not apply to distributions from the health savings security accounts of such individual to the extent that such contributions do not exceed the aggregate excess contributions to all such accounts of such individual for such year if—

(i) such distribution is before the last day prescribed by law (including extensions of time) for filing the account beneficiary’s return for such taxable year,

(ii) no deduction is allowed under this section with respect to such contribution,

(iii) such distribution is accompanied by the amount of net income attributable to such excess contributions,

(iv) such distribution satisfies the requirements of subparagraph (B).

(B) Rules related to ordering.—(1) Distributions limited to contributions.—Subparagraph (A) shall apply to distributions to a person only to the extent of the contributions of such person to such accounts during such taxable year.

(ii) Classes of contributors.—Subparagraph (A) shall apply only to distributions of such contributions which are made in the following order:—

(i) first, to members of the family of the account beneficiary,

(ii) second, to the account beneficiary,

(iii) third, to employers of the account beneficiary with respect to contributions under section 125(h), and

(iv) fourth, to employers of the account beneficiary with respect to contributions under section 106(d).

(iii) Last-In-First-Out.—If distributions could be made to more than one person in any subclause of clause (ii), subparagraph (A) shall not apply to any such distribution unless such distribution is of the
most recent excess contribution which has not been distributed to the contributor.

"(C) TREATMENT OF NET INCOME.—Any net income described in subparagraph (A)(iii) shall be includible in gross income of the person receiving the distribution for the taxable year in which received.

"(D) EXCESS CONTRIBUTION.—For purposes of subsection (b)(2) with respect to a plan which is a high deductible health plan, the term 'eligible contribution' means any contribution (other than a rollover contribution from another health savings security account, or from an Archer MSA) which is not includible in gross income) to the extent such contribution results in the aggregate contributions to health savings security accounts of the account beneficiary with respect to contributions, distributions, and such other matters as the Secretary may deem appropriate. The reports required by this subsection shall be filed at such time and in such manner and furnished to such individuals at such time and in such manner as may be required by the Secretary.

"(h) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary may issue regulations to carry out the purposes of this section, including regulations regarding the proper treatment of distributions described in subparagraphs (f)(3) and (n) and noncontributory contributions by members of the family of the account beneficiary.

"SEC. 224. HEALTH SAVINGS ACCOUNTS.

"(a) DEDUCTION ALLOWED.—In the case of an individual who is an eligible individual for any month during the taxable year, there shall be allowed as a deduction for the taxable year an amount equal to the aggregate amount paid in cash during such taxable year by such individual to a health savings account of such individual.

"(b) LIMITATIONS.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The amount allowable as a deduction under section (a) to an individual for the taxable year shall not exceed the sum of the monthly limitations for months during which such taxable year that the individual is an eligible individual.

"(2) MONTHLY LIMITATION.—The monthly limitation for any month is the amount equal to—

"(i) the first day of such month of the individual's coverage under the high deductible health plan,

"(C) Special rules.—

"(i) Exclusion of certain plans.—Such term does not include a health plan which is a high deductible health plan, such plan shall not fail to be a high deductible health plan because of the application of section (c)(2).

"(ii) Annual deductible.—The annual deductible described in clause (i) shall be increased by an amount equal to—

"(i) the cost-of-living adjustment determined under section (f)(3) for the calendar year in which such taxable year begins by substituting 'calendar year 1997' for 'calendar year 1992' in subparagraph (b) thereof.

"(ii) Special rules.—In the case of the $1,000 amount in subparagraph (A)(i) and the $2,000 amount in subparagraph (A)(iii), subclause (i)(II) shall be applied by substituting 'calendar year 2002' for 'calendar year 1997'.

"(iii) Rounding.—If any increase under clause (i) or (ii) is not a multiple of $50, such increase shall be rounded to the nearest multiple of $50.

"(D) Treatment of network services.—

"(i) In general.—In the case of a health plan which is a preferred provider organization plan and which would (without regard to services provided outside such organization's network of providers described in clause (iii)(I)) be a high deductible health plan, such plan shall not fail to be a high deductible health plan because of the application of this paragraph.

"(ii) Annual deductible.—The annual deductible described in clause (i) shall be increased by an amount equal to—

"(i) the cost-of-living adjustment determined under section (f)(3) for the calendar year in which such taxable year begins by substituting 'calendar year 1997' for 'calendar year 1992' in subparagraph (b) thereof.

"(ii) Special rules.—In the case of the $1,000 amount in subparagraph (A)(i) and the $2,000 amount in subparagraph (A)(iii), subclause (i)(II) shall be applied by substituting 'calendar year 2002' for 'calendar year 1997'.

"(III) Safe harbor for absence of preventive care deductible.—A plan shall not fail to be treated as a high deductible health plan by reason of failing to have a deductible for preventive care.

"(E) Treatment of network services.—

"(i) In general.—In the case of a health plan which is a preferred provider organization plan and which would (without regard to services provided outside such organization's network of providers described in clause (iii)(I)) be a high deductible health plan, such plan shall not fail to be a high deductible health plan because of the application of this paragraph.

"(ii) Annual deductible.—The annual deductible described in clause (i) shall be increased by an amount equal to—

"(i) the cost-of-living adjustment determined under section (f)(3) for the calendar year in which such taxable year begins by substituting 'calendar year 1997' for 'calendar year 1992' in subparagraph (b) thereof.

"(ii) Special rules.—In the case of the $1,000 amount in subparagraph (A)(i) and the $2,000 amount in subparagraph (A)(iii), subclause (i)(II) shall be applied by substituting 'calendar year 2002' for 'calendar year 1997'.

"(III) Safe harbor for absence of preventive care deductible.—A plan shall not fail to be treated as a high deductible health plan by reason of failing to have a deductible for preventive care.

"(F) Treatment of network services.—

"(i) In general.—In the case of a health plan which is a preferred provider organization plan and which would (without regard to services provided outside such organization's network of providers described in clause (iii)(I)) be a high deductible health plan, such plan shall not fail to be a high deductible health plan because of the application of this paragraph.

"(ii) Annual deductible.—The annual deductible described in clause (i) shall be increased by an amount equal to—

"(i) the cost-of-living adjustment determined under section (f)(3) for the calendar year in which such taxable year begins by substituting 'calendar year 1997' for 'calendar year 1992' in subparagraph (b) thereof.

"(ii) Special rules.—In the case of the $1,000 amount in subparagraph (A)(i) and the $2,000 amount in subparagraph (A)(iii), subclause (i)(II) shall be applied by substituting 'calendar year 2002' for 'calendar year 1997'.

"(III) Safe harbor for absence of preventive care deductible.—A plan shall not fail to be treated as a high deductible health plan by reason of failing to have a deductible for preventive care.

"(G) Treatment of network services.—

"(i) In general.—In the case of a health plan which is a preferred provider organization plan and which would (without regard to services provided outside such organization's network of providers described in clause (iii)(I)) be a high deductible health plan, such plan shall not fail to be a high deductible health plan because of the application of this paragraph.

"(ii) Annual deductible.—The annual deductible described in clause (i) shall be increased by an amount equal to—

"(i) the cost-of-living adjustment determined under section (f)(3) for the calendar year in which such taxable year begins by substituting 'calendar year 1997' for 'calendar year 1992' in subparagraph (b) thereof.

"(ii) Special rules.—In the case of the $1,000 amount in subparagraph (A)(i) and the $2,000 amount in subparagraph (A)(iii), subclause (i)(II) shall be applied by substituting 'calendar year 2002' for 'calendar year 1997'.

"(III) Safe harbor for absence of preventive care deductible.—A plan shall not fail to be treated as a high deductible health plan by reason of failing to have a deductible for preventive care.
(A) Except in the case of a rollover contribution from an Archer MSA, a health savings security account, or a health savings account, which is not includible in gross income, any amount which will be accepted as a qualified medical expense of such beneficiary shall be included in the gross income of such beneficiary.

(2) Excess contributions returned before 2014.—If any excess contribution is returned for a taxable year to any health savings account of an individual, paragraph (2) shall apply to excess contributions returned from the health savings accounts of such individual (to the extent such distributions do not exceed the aggregate excess contributions to all health savings accounts of such individual for such year) if—

(i) such distribution is made on or before the last day prescribed by law (including extensions of time) for filing the account beneficiary’s return for such taxable year;

(ii) no deduction is allowed under this section with respect to such contribution;

(iii) such distribution is accompanied by the amount of net income attributable to such excess contribution; and

(iv) such distribution satisfies the requirements of subparagraph (B).

(B) RULES RELATED TO ORDERING.—

(i) Distributions limited to contributions under section 125(h).—Subparagraph (A) shall apply to distributions to a person only to the extent of the contributions of such person to such accounts during such taxable year.

(ii) Classes of contributors.—Subparagraph (A) shall apply only to distributions of such contributions which are made in the following order:

(A) first, to the account beneficiary;

(B) second, to employers of the account beneficiary with respect to contributions under section 125(d); and

(C) third, to employers of the account beneficiary with respect to contributions under section 125(e).

(C) Treatment of net income.—Any net income described in subparagraph (A)(ii) shall be included in the gross income of the person receiving the distribution for the taxable year in which received.

(D) Exclusion for healthcare.—For purposes of subparagraph (A), the term ‘excess contribution’ means any contribution (other than a rollover contribution from the health savings account of a health savings security account, or from an Archer MSA, which is not includible in gross income under paragraph (2)) that results in the aggregate contributions to health savings accounts of the account beneficiary for the taxable year to be in excess of the lesser of—

(A) the aggregate amount paid during such taxable year to health savings security accounts of such individual, and

(B) the aggregate amount paid during such taxable year to health savings accounts of such individual.

(2) Reduction in Archer MSA limitation.—Subparagraph (A) of section 220(f)(5) of such Code (relating to rollover contributions from Archer MSAs) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

‘‘(C) Coordination with health savings security accounts and health savings accounts.—The limitation which would (but for this paragraph) apply under this subsection to the taxpayer for any taxable year shall be reduced (but not below zero) by the sum of—

(A) the aggregate amount paid during such taxable year to health savings security accounts of such individual, and

(B) the aggregate amount paid during such taxable year to health savings accounts of such individual.’’

(3) Coordination with health savings security accounts and health savings accounts.—The limitation which would (but for this paragraph) apply under this subsection to the taxpayer for any taxable year shall be reduced (but not below zero) by the sum of—

(A) the aggregate amount paid during such taxable year to health savings security accounts of such individual, and

(B) the aggregate amount paid during such taxable year to health savings accounts of such individual.’’

(3) Exclusion from income tax.—Section 106 of such Code (relating to contributions by employer to accidents and health plans) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsections:

‘‘(d) Contributions to health savings security accounts.—

(1) In general.—In the case of an employee who is an eligible individual, amounts contributed by such employee’s employer to
any health savings security account of such employee shall be treated as employer-provided coverage for medical expenses under an accident or health plan to the extent such amount does not exceed the limitation under section 223(b) (determined without regard to this subsection) which is applicable to such employee for such taxable year.

"(2) Rules similar to the rules of paragraphs (2), (3), (4), and (5) of subsection (b) shall apply for purposes of this subsection.

"(3) Definitions.—For purposes of this subsection, the terms 'eligible individual' and 'health savings security account' have the respective meanings given to such terms by section 223.

"(4) Cross Reference.—

"For penalty on failure by employer to make comparable contributions to the health savings security accounts of comparable employees, see section 4980C.

"(e) Contributions to Health Savings Accounts.—

"(1) In General.—In the case of an employer who is an eligible individual, amounts contributed by such employee's employer to any health savings account of such employee shall be treated as employer-provided coverage for medical expenses under an accident or health plan to the extent such amount does not exceed the limitation under section 224(b) (determined without regard to this subsection) which is applicable to such employee for such taxable year.

"(2) Special Rules.—Rules similar to the rules of paragraphs (2), (3), (4), and (5) of subsection (b) shall apply for purposes of this subsection.

"(3) Definitions.—For purposes of this subsection, the terms 'eligible individual' and 'health savings account' have the respective meanings given to such terms by section 224.

"(4) Cross Reference.—

"For penalty on failure by employer to make comparable contributions to the health savings accounts of comparable employees, see section 4980C.

"(2) Exclusion from Employment Taxes.—Subsection (e) of section 3231 of such Code is amended by adding after section 4980F the following new section:

"SEC. 4980G. FAILURE OF EMPLOYER TO MAKE COMPARABLE HEALTH SAVINGS ACCOUNT CONTRIBUTIONS.—

"(a) General Rule.—In the case of an employer who makes a contribution to the health savings security account or the health savings account of any employee during a taxable year, that employer shall be treated as having imposed a tax on the failure of such employer to meet the requirements of this section (for the preceding taxable year, reduced by the sum of—

"(A) the aggregate amount contributed for the taxable year to the accounts (other than a rollover contribution from another health savings account, a health savings security account, or from an Archer MSA, which is not includible in gross income) which is in excess of the limitation under section 224(b) (determined without regard to paragraph (3)(C) thereof), and

"(B) the amount determined under this section for the preceding taxable year, reduced by the sum of—

"(1) the aggregate amount contributed for the taxable year to the accounts (other than a rollover contribution from another health savings account, a health savings security account, or from an Archer MSA, which is not includible in gross income) which is in excess of the limitation under section 224(b) (determined without regard to paragraph (3)(C) thereof), and

"(2) the amount determined under this section for the preceding taxable year, reduced by the sum of—

"(A) the distributions out of the accounts which were included in gross income under section 224(f)(2), and

"(B) the excess (if any) of—

"(i) the sum of limitations described in paragraph (1), over

"(ii) the amount contributed to the accounts for the taxable year.

"For purposes of this subsection, any contribution which is distributed out of the health savings security account in a distribution to which section 224(f)(3) applies shall be treated as an amount not contributed.

"(b) Rules and Requirements.—Rules and requirements similar to the rules and requirements of section 4980E shall apply for purposes of this section.

"(c) Regulations.—The Secretary shall issue regulations to carry out the purposes of this section, including regulations providing special rules for employers who make contributions to more than one of the following types of accounts during the calendar year:

"(1) An Archer MSA.

"(2) A health savings security account.

"(3) A health savings account.

"(d) Clerical Amendment.—The table of sections for chapter 43 of such Code is amended by adding after section 4980F the following new item:

"Sec. 4980G. Failure of employer to make comparable health savings account contributions.

"(e) Tax on Excess Contributions.—Section 4973 of such Code (relating to tax on excess contributions to certain tax-favored accounts and annuities) is amended—

"(1) by striking "or" at the end of paragraph (3)(C) thereof, and

"(2) by inserting after paragraph (4) of subsection (a) the following new paragraphs:

"(F) a health savings account described in section 223(d), or

"(G) a health savings account (within the meaning of section 223(d)), of which is not includible in gross income) which is in excess of the limitation under section 224(b) (determined without regard to paragraph (3)(C) thereof), and

"the term 'excess contributions' means the sum of—

"(1) the aggregate amount contributed for the taxable year to the accounts (other than a rollover contribution from another health savings security account, or from an Archer MSA, which is not includible in gross income) which is in excess of the limitation under section 223(b) (determined without regard to paragraph (3)(C) thereof), and

"(2) the amount determined under this subsection for the preceding taxable year, reduced by the sum of—

"(A) the distributions out of the accounts which were included in gross income under section 223(f)(2), and

"(B) the excess (if any) of—

"(i) the sum of limitations described in paragraph (1), over

"(ii) the amount contributed to the accounts for the taxable year.

"For purposes of this subsection, any contribution which is distributed out of the health savings security account in a distribution to which section 223(f)(3) applies shall be treated as an amount not contributed.

"(f) Excess Contributions to Health Savings Accounts.—For purposes of this section, in the case of health savings accounts within the meaning of section 224(d), the term 'excess contributions' means the sum of—

"(1) the aggregate amount contributed for the taxable year to the accounts (other than a rollover contribution from another health savings account, a health savings security account, or from an Archer MSA, which is not includible in gross income) which is in excess of the limitation under section 224(b) (determined without regard to paragraph (3)(C) thereof), and

"(2) the amount determined under this subsection for the preceding taxable year, reduced by the sum of—

"(A) the distributions out of the accounts which were included in gross income under section 224(f)(2), and

"(B) the excess (if any) of—

"(i) the sum of limitations described in paragraph (1), over

"(ii) the amount contributed to the accounts for the taxable year.

"For purposes of this subsection, any contribution which is distributed out of the health savings security account in a distribution to which section 224(f)(3) applies shall be treated as an amount not contributed.

"(g) Failure to Provide Reports on Health Savings Accounts.—Par"
of section 6693(a) of such Code (relating to reports) is amended by redesignating subparagaphs (C) and (D) as subparagraphs (E) and (F), respectively, and by inserting after subparagraph (B) the following new subparagraph:

"(C) section 223(g) (relating to health savings security accounts)."

"(D) section 224(g) (relating to health savings accounts)"

(h) Exception From Capitalization of Policy Account Expenses.—Subparagraph (B) of section 841(e)(1) of such Code (defining specified insurance contract) is amended by striking "and (iii)" at the end of clause (iv) by striking the period at the end of clause (iv) and inserting a comma, and by adding at the end the following new clauses:

"(v) any contract which is a health savings security account (as defined in section 223(d)), and"

"(vi) any contract which is a health savings account (as defined in section 224(d))."

"(j) Information Reporting by Providers of Health Insurance.—Subpart B of part III of subchapter A of chapter 63 of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"SEC. 300001. RETURNS RELATING TO PROVIDERS OF HEALTH INSURANCE.

"(a) Requirement of Reporting.—Under regulations prescribed by the Secretary, every provider who provides any individual with coverage under a plan which constitutes medical care shall, at such time as the Secretary may prescribe, make the return described in subsection (b) with respect to such individual.

"(b) Form and Manner of Returns.—A return described in this subsection if such return—"

"(1) is in such form as the Secretary may prescribe, and"

"(2) contains such information as the Secretary prescribes.

"(c) Statements to Be Furnished to Individuals With Respect to Which Information Is Required.—Every person required to make a return under subsection (a) shall furnish to each individual whose name is required to be set forth in such return a written statement showing—"

"(1) the name and address of the person required to make such return and the phone number of the information contact for such person, and"

"(2) the information required to be shown on the return with respect to such individual.

"The written statement required under the preceding sentence shall be furnished on or before January 31 of the year following the calendar year for which the return under subsection (a) is required to be made.""

(k) Conforming Amendments.—

"(1) The table of sections for part VII of subchapter B of chapter 21 of such Code is amended by inserting the following:

"Sec. 223. Health savings accounts.

"Sec. 224. Health savings accounts.


"(2)(A) Sections 86(b)(2)(A), 135(c)(4)(A), 137(b)(3)(A), 219(g)(3)(A)(ii), and 221(b)(2)(C)(i)

are each amended by inserting "223" after "222."

"(B) Section 222(b)(2)(C)(i) is amended by inserting "223," before "911.

"(C) Section 223(b)(3)(A)(ii) is amended by striking "and 222" and inserting "222, and 223.

"(I) Effective Date.—The amendments made by this section shall become effective during the taxable years beginning after December 31, 2003.

"SEC. 3. DISPOSITION OF UNUSED HEALTH BENEFITS IN CAFETERIA PLANS AND FLEXIBLE SPENDING ARRANGEMENTS.

"(a) In General.—Section 125 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to cafeteria plans) is amended by redesignating the subsections (h) and (i) as subsections (i) and (j), respectively, and by inserting after subsection (g) the following:

"(h) Contributions of Certain Unused Health Benefits.—"

"(1) In General.—For purposes of this title, a plan or other arrangement shall not fail to be treated as a cafeteria plan solely because qualified benefits under such plan include a health flexible spending arrangement under which no more than $500 of unused health benefits may be contributed during the calendar year for which the return under subsection (a) is required to be made.

"(2) Carry Forward.—The succeeding plan year of such health flexible spending arrangement—"

"(B) to the extent permitted by sections 222 and 224, contributed on behalf of the employee to a health savings security account (as defined in section 223(d)), or a health savings account (as defined in section 222(d)), maintained for the benefit of such employee, or"

"(C) contributed to a qualified retirement plan (as defined in section 401(k)), or an eligible deferred compensation plan (as defined in section 457(b)) of an eligible employer described in section 401(a) which in—"

"(I) section 223 if made directly by the employer to a health savings security account of the employee (determined without regard to any other contributions made by the employee), and"

"(II) section 224 if made directly by the employer to a health savings account of the employee (determined without regard to any other contributions made by the employee).

"(2) Special Rules for Treatment of Contributions to Retirement Plans.—For purposes of this title, contributions to which the employee has a non-forfeitable right in the case of a plan (other than a qualified defined contribution plan (as defined in section 401(a)) which is described in section 401(a)) which includes a trust exempt from tax under section 501(a)—"

"(I) shall be treated as elective deferrals (as defined in section 410(g)(3)) in the case of contributions to a qualified cash or deferred arrangement (as defined in section 401(k)) or to an annuity contract described in section 403(b), and"

"(II) shall be treated as employer contributions to such arrangement (as defined in section 401(k)) in the case of contributions to a qualified deferred compensation plan (as defined in section 457(b)), and"

"(D) shall be treated in the manner designated for purposes of section 408 or 408A in the case of contributions to an individual retirement plan.

"(3) Health Flexible Spending Arrangement.—For purposes of this subsection, the term ‘health flexible spending arrangement’ means a flexible spending arrangement (as defined in section 125(c)(2)(B) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986) that is a qualified benefit and only permits reimbursement for expenses for medical care (as defined in section 213(d)(1) without regard to subparagraphs (C) and (D) thereof).

"(4) Unused Health Benefits.—For purposes of this subsection, with respect to an individual, the term ‘unused health benefits’ means the excess of—"

"(A) the maximum amount of reimbursement allowable to the employee during a plan year under the applicable flexible spending arrangement, taking into account any election by the employee, over"

"(B) the actual amount of reimbursement during such year under such arrangement.

"(5) Effective Date.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2003.

"SEC. 4. EXCEPTION TO INFORMATION REPORTING REQUIREMENTS REGARDING CERTAIN HEALTH ARRANGEMENTS.

"(a) In General.—Section 6041 (relating to information at source) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(f) Section Does Not Apply to Certain Health Arrangements.—This section shall not apply to any payment for medical care (as defined in section 223(d)) made under—"

"(1) a flexible spending arrangement (as defined in section 106(c)(2)), or"

"(2) a health reimbursement arrangement which is treated as employer-provided coverage under an accident or health plan for purposes of section 106.

"(b) Effective Date.—The amendments made by this subsection shall apply to payments made after December 31, 2002."
which you have to make all of the contributions paid out of the health savings account. It is literally lifetime assistance. Why is that important? Because today, as we pass the new Medicare modernization with prescription drug, we are going to add tremendous new benefits, but there are other costs associated with the bill, both in acquiring prescription drugs and in making sure that seniors can pay for those additional costs.

It is correct to say that every additional benefit provided to seniors should be paid for by taxpayers. We are already in the midst of the greatest intergenerational transfer of wealth in the history of the world. But it is not fair to shift the costs for saving Americans that when they retire they should pay out of their own pockets if we have not provided an easily affordable method to accumulate those dollars.

That is exactly what we have in front of us today: A health savings account that has a multiple number of ways in which money can be placed in to be paid for health needs not only while you are working but when you retire. There is no tax shelter. There is no tax break. If there is money in it when the senior passes, then it becomes part of an estate and that money, in its transfer, is taxable. There is no possibility of gifting the system.

The concern is that we have told Americans oftentimes that they have to pay for particular costs, and yet we do not provide an easy and affordable way for them to do so. One of the big concerns we have today is chronic or catastrophic health care costs for seniors. Half the value of money is the best way to address a problem that is going to face most Americans. That is exactly what health savings accounts allow you to do. It is a nearly an affordable health care cost if you have planned for it.

Unfortunately, too often today’s seniors did not plan. There was not a program convenient and easy for them to plan. This allows them, in a prudent way, to put money away. Often times we may want to help our parents, senior children. This is a way, through a health savings account, that they can place money available for seniors to be readily used for health savings accounts that provide a positive, tax-free environment for accumulating those dollars.

In so many ways, Mr. Speaker, this particular program will blend not only with the Medicare changes that we are going to make but in terms of meeting the needs of today’s workers as well. It is completely portable, it is a fund that accumulates tax free, and it belongs to the individual. They can take it with them wherever they may want to work.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the control of the balance of my time be by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. Ryan). The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. Ryan) will control the balance of the time.

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, with senior citizens’ inability to plan for their future. Well, I am glad he is sending them a signal, after what they intend to do with seniors with the Medicare bill, somebody might have planned for their futures.

I remember in the good old days when Republicans used to say that they were going to travel around the country and pull the tax code up by the roots. That meant they were going to close loopholes, get rid of shelters, and to have a system that people did not have to hire accountants and lawyers in order to know what their tax liability would be. I even volunteered to drive around with them on these buses to see just how they intended to put back a Code that was more equitable and fair and one could understand.

But while the gentleman from California (Mr. Stark) still thinks that some of them are on the level as relates to Medicare, I asked for the opportunity to at least open up this debate just so that people who are not on the floor would understand that this has nothing to do with health. It has a heck of a lot to do with wealth and how to do it. They have to find ways to make certain that the deficit gets larger and that there is no money in the Treasury to take care of the problems that we used to say was a Federal responsibility. How do you do it? Just being creative.

Why, they do not even need a chairman of a Committee on the Budget because there are no budget restrictions.

Last night, this bill was supposed to be going over to the Committee on Rules at a cost of $71 billion over 10 years. When they looked at it, they realized when just overnight they found out that the bill really costs $171 billion. How can Republicans be so smart that they are going to travel around the country and pull the tax code up by the roots, and yet they want to know how much of the people’s money did you leave with them. Or to put it another way, how much did you take away from the Federal Government so that we cannot provide basic services.

So the gentleman from California (Mr. Stark) need not worry. This savings account has nothing to do with health. It has everything to do with shelter.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the balance of my time be turned over to the gentleman from California (Mr. Stark) and that he be given the authority to allocate time.

Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I just heard the ranking member say this is not a health bill, that this is a tax shelter. I beg to differ. Number one, what we are talking about here is really novel and revolutionary. We are saying that employers and employees can together contribute to their own savings account with pre-tax dollars, with tax-deductible dollars to purchase health care spending and to have a catastrophic plan.

The gentleman from New York (Mr. Stark) asked what about the people who do not have $4,000 to put in their health security accounts? Well, their employer can put $4,000 into their account. The purpose of this reform, Mr. Speaker, is to get at some of the big issues that are really hurting this country, and that is the cost of health insurance, the affordability, and the accessibility of health insurance.

So what this reform does is it equips the individual in the family with the ability to go out into the health care marketplace with tax-deductible dollars to act like good consumers and buy their health insurance. It gives incentives. It actually requires, on health savings accounts, that employers provide catastrophic health insurance, or individuals who have their own health savings accounts have catastrophic health insurance. So it makes sure that people do have health insurance if they really run into problems. But it also allows people to have their health care expenditures themselves.

You know, it is often said that we spend more time shopping for cars or...
computers than we do for our own health insurance. Well, the reforms in this bipartisan Thomas-Lipinski bill give us those incentives to act like good consumers so we can watch our health care dollars. Health care inflation is out of control. Health care spending is out of control. Premium increases facing small businesses and individuals are out of control. We need to give consumers the ability to get it under control. That is what this legislation does.

I am also interested in the argument that this is somehow fiscally irresponsible. I find that kind of a unique argument, given the fact that the gentleman from New York is about to bring a prescription drug substitute amendment to the floor that spends $500 billion more than the Republican plan does; a trillion dollar bill that spends a trillion dollars on prescription drug bill versus the $400 billion that was paid for in the House budget resolution, as is this health savings account legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time so that the other side can yield time.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. STARK asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I will start with an apology to all my Republican colleagues. For, oh, at least the 30 years or so I have been here, I have been accusing the Republicans of being inclusive, just dealing with the rich and forgetting about the minorities and the working people in this country. With this bill they have become broadly inclusive. Later on tonight, they are going to take the first step in destroying health care for seniors, and then, because they are being so inclusive with this bill, they are going to destroy the employer-based system. They are going to destory health care for the employees who get their health insurance from employers.

As the distinguished ranking member of our committee pointed out, $200 billion is added to this in the middle of the night, and the bill will be funded by borrowing, by increasing the national debt and worsening deficits. And all it really does, if you cut through all the Mickey Mouse that they have talked about, high-deductible insurance, is that it creates some new tax-exempt savings accounts. Tax shelters for the wealthy and the healthy. And it advances the objective of undercutting employer-provided health coverage.

It is no secret that the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means has expressed his desire to dismantle the employment-linked health care system, and I have noted that he believes it encourages overutilization of health care because individuals are shielded from knowing the true cost.

Now, the argument that the bill will assist the uninsured is not true. Most of the uninsured have incomes too low to be eligible for any tax benefits contained in H.R. 2596. And as was stated earlier, few, if any, have the $4,000 a year in additional savings required to utilize the benefits contained. There is nothing in this bill that requires the employers to pay any money to make up for that gap that will be created by the higher deductibles. It merely gives them the opportunity, if they have any money, to add to savings accounts.

Not surprisingly, the 6 million families who were deliberately excluded by the Republicans from the recent tax bill for child tax credit are the same families that they are excluding from benefiting in this bill. So for families with insurance, it provides tax benefits only if the insurance requires them to pay the first thousand dollars; and employers will be encouraged by this nonsense to increase health insurance deductibles, which lowers their costs and leaves them for most of their employees' health insurance.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. DUNN), a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Ms. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy that we have this bill on the floor finally. I think it serves a real need, and it provides total flexibility to people who want to provide for the coverage of their health care expenses.

One particular provision that appeals to me is that we used to refer to as a catch-up health savings account contribution. We now call it a health savings security account, and these are accounts that are designed particularly for people who are age 55 or older. It gives them the right to contribute additional dollars every year into their health savings accounts because of particular situations they might have faced in the past.

The flexibility of HSAs is widely known. These dollars can be used for any health-related expense as long as it is not reimbursed. For example, they can be used to pay for long-term care or for health coverage policy or doctors' bills or for prescription drugs; but what is special about the health savings security accounts is in the way it applies to people like me. Many people, particularly women, during their child-rearing years find working outside the workplace and often did not add money into accounts like IRAs, or actually Social Security accounts, and ended up with big goose eggs when the time came to calculate their benefits.

In this case, the health savings accounts provide for folks who took time off during their child-raising years, or to look after an ill parent; and it allows them to add up to 25 percent in additional dollars each year to their health savings accounts. This will begin in operation as soon as this bill is enacted. An individual age 55 or older could contribute $500 a year in addition to the total health savings account. That amount will grow to $1,000 in 2009, and I think it is a very sensibly written provision to help folks who have been away from the workforce or need this additional provision.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), a member of the Committee on Ways and Means who understands that with this $174 billion that we are wasting in this bill, we could help States maintain Medicaid coverage as they weather their fiscal crisis.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, this came out of the wee hours of this morning, but I want Members to realize how radical a move this is. We are going to have later today a radical effort to dismantle Medicare. What this is is a radical effort to dismantle our employer-based system in this country. So now we are going to take a step toward a kind of voucher for health insurance in the form of a tax credit. That is what we are trying to do.

Those who can afford to use the tax credit will have that voucher, and they will go out into the marketplace. The consumer, each individual one, is going to try to swim as best as they can. But for those who do not have money to put in this account, who have no benefit from the tax credit, they are going to continue not to swim as an individual consumer, but to sink. That is what is going to happen. That is why this is so radical.

Now, the other side of the aisle said we want to add money into Medicare in the prescription drug proposal. They are right. We did not create this deep deficit. Their answer to a deficit that is deep is to dig it deeper. In the middle of the night or early morning, you add $100 billion to the deficit; and I want to quickly read what this looks like.

The people were supposed to have with the March baseline a deficit of $377 billion. We added $484 billion through what was called a technical reestimate. Then through legislation, we added what was it, $700 to $800 billion. Now the projected deficit, $1.5 trillion, four times what was projected a few months ago, and this does not include the bill that is going to be brought up later or additional military expenditures. It does not include this $100 billion. I tell the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN), this is fiscally irresponsible. You Republicans have zero fiscal responsibility in your political veins. Zero. This is radical because it is going to dismantle the employer-based system.
try to dismantle the employer-based health care system in this country; but what you are doing is digging a deeper, deeper hole of debt in this country. This is a radical proposal on all accounts, and it should be rejected.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, is it appropriate for a Member to address his colleague directly to another Member, or should those comments be directed through the Chair addressing the Member?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All remarks should be directed through the Chair.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Was it true that the preceding gentleman addressed a Member directly?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All remarks in debate should be directed to the Chair.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, to respond to a couple of comments from the last speaker, I would suggest that we keep hearing this rhetoric, that this undermines or destroys employer-sponsored health care. Actually, it is far from that. It is the opposite of that. This makes it easier for employers to offer health care to their employees. What this does is it makes it easier because employers can offer less-costly catastrophic coverage and give their employees money, pretax money in their accounts, to purchase health care. This will lower the cost of health insurance and make it cheaper for employers to offer health care.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH), an esteemed member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, again, as we come to the well this evening, we see a very vast difference in our visions of health care and visions of America.

Our friends on the left who later tonight will offer a $1 trillion government command-and-control approach to prescription drugs now take strong objection, to put it diplomatically, about a plan that, yes, initially is expensive. I would grant Members that billions are real dollars here, but it substantially supplements and expands the ability of people to have health insurance.

As the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) mentioned, it gives employers more options to provide that type of insurance by embracing catastrophic plans and freeing up dollars to go to employees, and as we see in the case of health savings security accounts, and this is the key, and I would urge my colleagues to understand this, as so many do not see the well of this House on both sides of the aisle and lamented the numbers of uninsured Americans, not the medically indigent with whom we try to deal through Medicaid, but those who are working people who do not have insurance, this provides an option to those people to embrace insurance. To realize savings, yes, does require a modicum of personal responsibility, undoubtedly.

But, Mr. Speaker, only when we have not degenerated to the point where we absolutely forsake a notion of personal responsibility in savings. What we do is offer options that will supplement health care; and despite the cat calls and poisonous partisan rhetoric, it is worth noting that this is bipartisan legislation.

So again a cautionary note to my friends on the left. If you believe you are indicting one party, stop and think; many of your colleagues who share both the party label and broad-based philosophy, as my friends on the left share in many different areas, join with us in this legislation because they understand it opens opportunity for health insurance, it opens opportunity for individuals to keep their money, pretax money in their accounts, to purchase health care. This will lower the cost of health insurance, and make it cheaper for employers to offer health care to their employees. It is also going to help employers to offer health care to their employees. It is also going to help employees provide an option to those people to accumulate $2,000 annually for health care expenses. In this Committee on Ways and Means, we have $3,500 to put into a savings account. We have $3,500 to put into a savings account.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. This measure will make it easier for employers to offer health care to their employees. It is also going to help Americans save for their medical expenses, to gain greater access to quality health care. I particularly support the provision in this bill that would put back a portion of the unused balances and flexible spending arrangements from being forfeited at the end of the year. Right now there is a use-it-or-lose-it provision that applies to workers. I have been working for several years to allow individuals to accumulate unused balances from their flexible spending arrangements to save for health care expenses. In this Congress I introduced H.R. 176 to allow individuals to accumulate $2,000 annually from these FSAs, as we call them.

Right now we have over 30 million workers in the United States that have these FSAs available to them. Employees and employers can set aside pretax

I love to hear people who make $150,000 talk about what it is like to be in this country making $30,000, which is the average pay. Or the people making $18,000. They work every day. They have no insurance. Do you think they have $3,500 to put into a savings account?

This is for rich people. That is why it went up $100 billion miraculously between a $65,000 income limit and $150,000. It only cost $47 for all the people at the bottom, but it cost $100 for us. This is a bad bill.

What it does, also, it says people are going to get out of the pool. People who are rich and healthy are going to get out of the pool, and they are going to leave the sick and the poor in the pool. And what happens to the premiums for the premiums for the average person? They go up. The idea of insurance is to spread the risk, and you are letting the wealthy and healthy get out of the pool.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds to respond just briefly only to say that health care is voluntary by businesses. Mr. Speaker, Boeing could drop their health care right now, today, to their employees. And, Mr. Speaker, that is what is happening today. Millions of businesses are making those kinds of decisions to drop health care. We are trying to make it more affordable. We are trying to keep it so that businesses can still offer health insurance at an affordable price to all workers.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE).

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. This measure will make it easier for employers to offer health care to their employees. It is also going to help Americans save for their medical expenses, to gain greater access to quality health care. I particularly support the provision in this bill that would put back a portion of the unused balances and flexible spending arrangements from being forfeited at the end of the year. Right now there is a use-it-or-lose-it provision that applies to workers. I have been working for several years to allow individuals to accumulate unused balances from their flexible spending arrangements to save for health care expenses. In this Congress I introduced H.R. 176 to allow individuals to accumulate $2,000 annually from these FSAs, as we call them.
money which can be used to pay for out-of-pocket health care expenses and copayments and deductibles. Under the current system, unfortunately, employees forfeit money not used at the end of the year. Currently, this encourages employees to spend less on health care because employees, knowing that they will forfeit unused account balances, engage in end-of-the-year spending sprees on services they may not need like extra eyeglasses, shades or unnecessary lab work. Eliminating the use-it-or-lose-it provision solves this problem because then the employee will be able to roll over the balance from year to year. That is the attempt in this bill on that provision.

Preventing some forfeiture also increases the savings rate by increasing the disposable income of those employees in the program, and it also empowers them to make their own health care decisions. I urge my colleagues to pass this legislation.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds. I have a couple of letters, one from the AFL-CIO which suggests that this legislation would establish an enormous tax shelter for wealthy individuals and at the same time undermine employer-based health coverage and shift costs onto workers. I have a letter from Families USA which, among other things, says that this bill also threatens the employer-provided health insurance system particularly among smaller employers who will be able to take deductions in the top brackets and who will then no longer be interested in providing coverage for their employees.

Mr. Speaker, I include both letters for the RECORD.


DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: The AFL-CIO opposes H.R. 2531, the Health Savings Accounts Act. A major flaw in this legislation is that it would establish an enormous tax shelter for wealthy individuals and at the same time undermine employer-based health coverage and shift more costs onto workers. Despite employers' claims, this bill would fail to expand coverage to the uninsured and would be especially harmful to those low-income, older and sicker workers who now have comprehensive coverage.

Under H.R. 2531, employers could offer Health Savings Accounts as long as they are provided in conjunction with high-deductible health insurance policies, defined as at least $500 for an individual policy and $1,000 for a family. This policy encourages employers to abandon more generous coverage and offer instead less comprehensive policies that shift significant costs onto workers. The Joint Committee on Taxation has estimated that 30 million such accounts would be established by 2013 and the majority of employees would modify their health plans to meet the high-deductible guidelines of the legislation.

In addition, this shift in coverage would harm most those workers who need health care. Low-income workers who are the intended beneficiaries of these plans' preferred tax treatment are not likely to get back enough to cover the greater out-of-pocket costs they are likely to incur with these high-deductible plans.

Furthermore, those workers and other insured individuals who have traditional, more comprehensive coverage will see their premiums rise. Younger, healthier workers will move early in the year to take advantage of the low premiums, leaving older and sicker workers and those who earn too little to pay taxes in traditional coverage. As a result, costs for this coverage will rise dramatically, workers with no choice but to enroll in the high-deductible coverage this bill seeks to promote.

This legislation was slipped through the Ways and Means committee last week, and made mostly late at night in the Rules Committee. Among the changes made in Rules, the income threshold has been raised to $175,000 for joint filers. The cost of the reduced bill is estimated at $174 billion over ten years — more than twice the estimated cost of the bill that passed Ways and Means last week — and makes clear that this legislation is first and foremost another tax shelter, not a bill to cover the uninsured.

H.R. 2531 was raised just last week with little notice and certainly without any hearings, despite the bill's far-reaching implications and significant cost. And now the House leadership has called for it to be joined with the Medicare prescription drug legislation before the House. I urge you to vote against H.R. 2531.

Sincerely, WILLIAM SAMUEL, Director, Department of Legislation, FAMILIES USA Washington, D.C., June 26, 2003.

Hon. CHARLES RANGEL, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR REPREsentATIVE Rangel, On behalf of Families USA, the national advocacy group for health care consumers, I am writing to oppose the Health Savings and Affordability act of 2003 (H.R. 2531). Implementation of the Health Savings Accounts (HSAs) and Health Savings Security Accounts (HSSAs) will do little to expand health insurance coverage to the 41 million Americans who are uninsured.

This bill creates two programs loosely modeled after existing Archer Medical Savings Accounts Act of 2001. One would create tax-free accounts, the HSSA's, which can be accessed by enrollees with tax sheltered funds, endowments or other savings for the lowest-income uninsured, this bill will do little to expand health insurance coverage to the 41 million Americans who are uninsured.

This bill creates two programs loosely modeled after existing Archer Medical Savings Accounts Act of 2001. One would create tax-free accounts, the HSSA's, which can be accessed by enrollees with tax sheltered funds, endowments or other savings. The other, the HSA, would be open to all workers. Unfortunately, the latter program will do little to expand health insurance coverage to the 41 million Americans who are uninsured.

This bill creates two programs loosely modeled after existing Archer Medical Savings Accounts Act of 2001. One would create tax-free accounts, the HSSA's, which can be accessed by enrollees with tax sheltered funds, endowments or other savings. The other, the HSA, would be open to all workers. Unfortunately, the latter program will do little to expand health insurance coverage to the 41 million Americans who are uninsured.

How does it do it? It gives the employer an option. It says, Mr. and Mrs. Employee, we are changing your health policy. I am going to give you one starting next month that will provide for a $2,000 deduction on your health care costs. Start saving, because the Congress passed a bill where you can save and then you pay the first $2,000.

It sounds fine in principle, but here is the problem, my friends. Working families in this country have to first of all pay all the mortgage, pay the kids' education. Then this Congress said, colleague, let's give you a $2,000 deduction. Then the day the bill came up, the cost rose to $72 billion. And then last night the cost went to $173 billion. Mr. Speaker, let us pass this bill quickly, because I am afraid it is going to continue to grow. But that does not make it a good bill.

What is going on here, my friends, is this the demise of the employer-sponsored health care system in this country. The employers do not like it. What is going on? To get our members of the committee, including the chairman, have indicated that their desire is to dismantle the employer-based health care system. This bill does it.

How does it do it? It gives the employer an option. It says, Mr. and Mrs. Employee, we are changing your health policy. I am going to give you one starting next month that will provide for a $2,000 deduction on your health care costs. Start saving, because the Congress passed a bill where you can save and then you pay the first $2,000.

It sounds fine in principle, but here is the problem, my friends. Working families in this country have to first of all pay all the mortgage, pay the kids' education. Then this Congress said, colleague, let's give you a $2,000 deduction. Then the day the bill came up, the cost rose to $72 billion. And then last night the cost went to $173 billion. Mr. Speaker, let us pass this bill quickly, because I am afraid it is going to continue to grow. But that does not make it a good bill.

What is going on here, my friends, is this the demise of the employer-sponsored health care system in this country. The employers do not like it. What is going on? To get our members of the committee, including the chairman, have indicated that their desire is to dismantle the employer-based health care system. This bill does it.
member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, once again Republicans insist on a fiscally irresponsible bill that will benefit the wealthiest and in this case the healthiest at the cost of at least $74 billion added to our already soaring national debt.

Mr. Speaker, despite the bright sunshine outside, it really is a dark day for some of America’s who are working hard just to make ends meet. This bill is the natural companion to a measure written by the same folks that are presenting this bill, which previously denied a child tax credit to poor children. Tax cuts, no matter what the economic conditions, no matter how pressing are the other priorities we have in our country, such as protecting our families from terrorism, tax cuts, we are always told, can cure any and as far as for many other working people you are poor and working, in which case your kids are not worthy of a child tax credit.

Thanks to the intransigence of the House Republican leadership, there are now among American lies, they are folks like cafeteria workers and teachers’ aides, nursing home employees, those working at our hospitals doing the tough work, they will receive no check for their children this year, because the Republicans. Their bill to gain a little economic independence, to share in the economic benefits of the American Dream, it will come and go on July 4 unfulfilled because of the refusal of this House Republican leadership and their desire to go on recess not only for July 4 but to continue their recess from reality.

For these same families that were deliberately excluded from the recent tax cut and as many other working families, House Republicans add more insult to injury by encouraging employers to terminate or to weaken any group health insurance coverage through which some of these employees may be covered services, increase copayments. Tax cuts, no matter what the economic conditions, no matter how pressing are the other priorities we have in our country, such as protecting our families from terrorism, tax cuts, we are always told, can cure any and as far as for many other working people you are poor and working, in which case your kids are not worthy of a child tax credit.

Only yesterday we heard the same language from the sponsor of this legislation and the companion bill, that is, to weaken, at great cost to our Treasury, our employer-based health care system. By totally excluding employees unless they are in plans that deny any assistance on at least the first $1,000 in medical bill coverage, this bill will encourage even higher deductibles. And it will be a struggle for a cafeteria worker to pay their first $1,000 or their first $2,000 or more thousand under these new high-deductible plans.

The same plans will encourage more small employers to stop providing coverage at all and to protect themselves individually through these MSAs and to terminate costly health insurance for their other employees. It will encourage employers with plans to reduced covered services, increase copayments.

In short, through these three bills, we see Republican indifference from cradle to grave for children, for workers, for seniors.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ENGLISH) to talk about this legislation that we are debating, health savings accounts.

Mr. ENGLISH. Mr. Speaker, I really wish more of the American public were watching this debate because they would be able to fully appreciate how marginal the left has become to any serious debate about the problems facing this country. What we are going to be doing tonight is voting to repeal Medicare, but instead voting to pass this bill, which is a bill that would provide more medical security for uninsured Americans as well as many low- and middle-income workers.

This legislation actually creates two new instruments to meet health care needs by rewarding Americans who open either type of account with tax advantages and maximum flexibility, so as the other side has noted, even the healthy can have a greater role in managing their own health care. Encouraging individuals to enroll in these new savings vehicles has multiple benefits. First, this is a big step to make health insurance and health care more affordable and help reduce the growing number of Americans without health insurance. The tax-preferred nature of the health savings security accounts offers a powerful incentive for uninsured workers to take advantage of these accounts. The contributions to the accounts are deductible; the investment earnings within the accounts tax-free; and the distributions are also tax-free when used for health insurance. Many, including the self-employed, would find this enormously attractive. It results in significant savings on health insurance, an economic benefit that is certain to encourage many uninsured Americans to utilize these accounts.

Second, insured workers with high-deductible plans will also see similar incentives. Both savings vehicles give individuals a potenent incentive to save for health care costs that do not fit within their deductible, giving them another option and perhaps some peace of mind about unanticipated medical expenses. The medical expenses that qualify for tax-free distributions are very far reaching and include expenses from preventive care to long-term care.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE), who understands that we are presenting this bill, which I guess we did not really understand until today, that basically, it is going to be an effort to kill Medicare and destroy Medicare. And then they say they are going to bring up a prescription drug benefit tonight that really is not any meaningful benefit that forces one into HSA’s, that denies them choices of doctors and hospitals. And now this one, the ultimate trick, which I guess we did not really even know about until today, that basically tries to undercut employer-based health insurance. So what does it end? When are the Republicans going to end what they are trying to do to destroy the health care system?
Mr. Speaker, although we would like to provide health coverage for those who are uninsured, this bill does little or nothing to help the low-income uninsured. Individuals eligible for the tax credit under the Thomas bill would have about $500 billion. Where is it responsible tax cuts passed by the House. will cost the government over $173 billion. on our side have said, this legislation care for low income, older and sick individuals, the other large segment of the uninsured, may already deduct 100 percent of the health insurance costs. The only consequence of this bill is to undercut the provision of employer-sponsored health coverage or encouraging employers to raise deductibles or potentially drop their coverage and raise the cost of health care for low income, older and sick workers with higher co-payments and premiums. And, lastly, as many of the speakers on our side have said, this legislation will cost the government over $173 billion, another in a series of fiscally irresponsible tax cuts passed by the House. The entire cost of the bill will be funded by borrowing, increasing the national debt. Where does this end? We have a national debt $7 trillion. Where is it going to end? Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. TERRY). Mr. TERRY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.) Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, when will it end? I am saddened by the arguments from the left that fail to recognize the far more profound problems that face more people in America want to have choices. They do not want just the offering of a government program one size fits all. Not everyone thinks that the government is the answer to everything. So I am proud to support bills that allow the market to provide opportunities and choices, and that is what tonight is about. I am wondering sitting here listening to the debate what some of our Founding Fathers would think of today's debate about the health care that started this country that left their countries to set sail on a venture unknown to come to a new land for what? Freedom. Trying to escape the government powers that were controlling their lives. And not 200 or 250 years later from those first people that landed on our shores, our debate is how far government is going to control their health and their lives. Not everybody wants bureaucrats running their health care. So I am proud to stand in favor of the HSAs. Mr. Speaker, in today's world us baby boomers, and, yes, I am on the tail-end, there are a few others that are nearing their entry into Medicare, but we are facing a crisis too. Our parents need help in today's world. At the same time that we worry about our parents' health and their futures and what our role as their children will be in helping them, these golden years, we are also raising our children, trying to save for their college and their future. This is one pro-family tax item. It allows me, and they, to help a child with a stroke last October, to help my parents care for their care and their care. So this is one great pro-family tax measure, and I urge my colleagues to support it. Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 1/2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL). Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from California for yielding me this time. Earlier the speaker before me talked about choice. In the prescription drug debate we are having, I have talked about choice and I have an amendment, a bipartisan amendment, to offer people choice between generic versus name brand drugs that would reduce prices so people could pick cheaper drugs. Also part of the provision allows individuals, government, private sector, to buy medications anywhere in the G-8 countries and have competition so they can get drugs cheaper in Germany or France or Canada or Italy. That would drive prices down. I too agree with competition. The free market would drive prices down. So those of us who embrace the free market wonder why sometimes our colleagues on the other side are so scared of the free market. I have seen that the benefits of the free market work. I would like to see it come to the discussion we have on a prescription drug bill because if we bring that competition of the free market to the debate about prescription drugs, we will make medications more affordable for all Americans of all ages. The interesting thing is there are two issues that are driving health care inflation at 25, 30 percent for the public. One is the cost of prescription drugs. Two is the 42 million uninsured who show up in our emergency rooms, driving up hospital costs which insurance companies pass on to employers and employers pass on to employees. And if we want to insure the uninsured, we can do it for a lot less, not a lot less, but cheaper than this. Expand Kid Care. In Illinois we have a program known as Kid Care, insurance for the children of working parents, that expands the kid care to family. These are not three years. What is most interesting about this debate is that we have a prescription drug bill coverage for Members of Congress that is far more generous than the one that we are about to provide for our elderly. Those are the wrong values. Those are the wrong values that we came here to represent. Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. McCrery), from the committee. Mr. McCrery. Mr. Speaker, the immediate preceding speaker, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL), spoke about the free market and letting the market forces work for prescription drugs, and his solution is either import drugs from other countries and sell them here at the same time or lower prices on prescription drugs from other countries here in our country, and he called it the free market. What he failed to point out is those drugs and those prices that he would be importing or adopting the prices out here are set by government price controls, not the free market. Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield? Mr. McCrery. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois. Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, the fact is that would have come about is a Gutknecht-Emmanuel bill with a number of the gentleman's colleagues on his side and a number of colleagues on my side. The three provisions to this bill, A, allow generics to come to market quicker so name brand pharmaceutical companies cannot be involved in frivolous lawsuits. Mr. McCrery. Mr. Speaker, re- claiming my time, the issue of generics is addressed in the underlying bill that we will be debating later tonight, but the gentleman speaks of bringing drugs in from other countries and selling them at prices that have been imposed by governments, not by the free market. Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time. Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Burgess). Mr. Burgess. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for yielding me this time. H.R. 2596 will increase access to consumer-based health coverage to all Americans regardless of income. Under H.R. 2596 the availability of health savings accounts will assist those that live without health coverage and give Americans more options when it comes to their health. Health savings accounts will promote savings and more direct health purchasing. The character of these accounts will also simplify the patient-patient relationship. As a physician, I know first-hand the difficulty some patients have working through their insurance companies and trying to figure out what services are covered by their policies. With a health savings account, patients can focus their attention on their medical care. They can discuss their needs with their doctors frankly and honestly, and they can proceed with appropriate medical treatments that they need. Many colleagues on the other side of the aisle are more prepared to force people into a one-size-fits-all solution instead of giving individuals the choice...
or the purchasing power to make decisions for themselves.

I myself have had a medical saving account since 1997, that is, until I came to Congress, and it was coverage that I made available to everyone in my practice as a choice. It was not a requirement. If someone wanted the chance to be in charge of their medical decisions and a chance to build wealth in one of these accounts for future medical expenses, I thought it was only prudent as an employer to provide that opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, we talk about the evils of HMOs, and the Members on the other side of the aisle are frequently mentioning the evils of HMOs, but this is the anti-HMO. Put the purchasing power back in the hand of the patient. These plans are centered on the concept of personal choice. These accounts make more money available to purchase health coverage. We need to be serious about the solutions when addressing the problems of the uninsured in this country. An individual will make rational decisions when they have the ability to spend their own money on health services.

I ask my colleagues, I implore my colleagues, not to stand in the way. Give Americans the freedom to make their own choices. It was not a requirement, and we may be going to figure out this is worse than a Trojan horse because they see it coming. We should reject this and adopt the Democratic substitute.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Ms. HARRIS).

(Ms. HARRIS asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, today the House of Representative stands at the threshold of passing landmark legislation that protects and improves Medicare while providing our seniors with a real prescription drug benefit. While the debate remains properly focused on the intent of our seniors, I wish to highlight another exciting component of health care reform that we will address today.

H.R. 2596, the Health Savings and Affordability Act of 2003, authorizes the creation of health savings accounts which will enable every American to pay their basic medical expenses from tax-free money. In almost every purchase of goods and services except health care, individuals bargain directly with vendors and providers.

Assuming an adequately competitive market, suppliers will not charge more than buyers are willing and able to pay for very long.

The structure of our current health care system pushes consumers to the sidelines. Big insurance companies negotiate prices with big health care companies. The retail market and more expensive health care, prescription drugs, and health insurance premiums for the uninsured and self-employed.

H.R. 2596 allows Americans, particularly Medicare-eligible seniors, to use health care savings accounts to pay for medical expenses, prescription drug costs, retiree health insurance expenses, long-term care service, and COBRA coverage. It permits family members and employers to make tax-free contributions to these accounts.

The nature and uncertainty of health care expenses will always require critical programs that are compassionate and efficiently-operating insurance industries. That is why the reforms that we will adopt in H.R. 1 are so vital.

Nevertheless, through the magic of the free market, H.R. 2596 will reduce costs that many Americans pay for the most basic health care needs, while forcing our entire health care system to become more efficient.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to yield the balance of our time to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER), the ranking member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce reports.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, in the next few hours, the Republican in the Congress will engage in the greatest raid and diminishment of middle-class health care benefits in the history of this country. Benefits that have been built up over the last 50 or 60 years in this country that have enabled middle-class individuals to have some health security, to have some access to prescription drugs, to have access to the health care that they and their families need, will come under assault. It begins with this legislation of medical savings accounts, where millions of Americans who now have good health care plans, where they share the payment of those plans with their employers, between employers and employees, will find out that those plans are going to be substituted by high thresholds, fifteen-thousand-dollar deductible plans, and the theory is that they can pay for that out of their medical savings accounts.

Millions of Americans are going to wake up and find out that the health care plans that they have available to them today will not be available to them tomorrow.

Just as with the passage of the Medicare bill, the prescription drug bill that we will do later tonight, some 30 percent of the people who have prescription drug benefits will wake up and find out that they will get a lesser benefit under the Medicare prescription drug benefit than they are currently getting today. Millions of senior citizens will discover that they have lost their prescription drug benefit as they know it, and they will have to accept something much less than that.

When we come back from the Fourth of July break, we will have this trifecta assault on middle-class health care plans when the Committee on Education and the Workforce reports out the Association Health Care Plan proposal. Because the CBO, the Congressional Budget Office tells us that over 8 million Americans will lose the health care they have today, and what will be substituted will be a health care plan that is much less comprehensive than they have today. Mr. Speaker, 8 million Americans, 8 million middle-class Americans. And let us ask ourselves, Will the Republicans suggest to us is we can all just save and pay for that ourselves.

Well, if we look who is paying into 401(k)s, we know that most Americans do not have that disposable income. That is why they have employer-based health care systems.

But starting tonight, that employer-based health care system, that system that has done so much to keep people healthy, to keep people out of poverty, to keep them from losing their homes, is about to be shredded; and the assault is complete and its comprehensive, and it runs from the seniors to new and young families trying to raise children.

All of these people will find out. If my colleagues do not think it is going to happen, just look at the employers who are announcing that these cutbacks are going to come who are supporting the association health plans, who are supporting medical savings accounts, who are supporting health savings accounts tonight, and who are supporting prescription drugs. Because they are lining up to get rid of their obligations for prescription drugs, for health care for young
families, health care for older families, all in the name of their cost savings. But that will dramatically change the middle class in this country and what they have come to know as health care security.

But for the elderly it is going to be even more dramatic. When we look at the prescription drug benefit, it is interesting that the largest elderly group in the country, AARP, everything that they say is essential to protect senior citizens, and a prescription drug benefit is not in this bill. Read their letter. It is not in this bill. They wish it was, they hope it will be, but it is not here tonight.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the remaining time. I would like to begin my closing by saying that the gentleman from California is a person who has worked in health care for many, many years; and I know that he is sincere in trying to do what he thinks is best to give access to people to health care. I believe everyone who came to the floor and into the well who spoke on this bill today cares about health care.

Mr. Speaker, I am relatively new to this body; but one thing I have learned is that when you are running out of arguments, the oldest trick in the book is to impugn the other person's motives. Tell them that all we want to do is help the rich and hurt the poor, that what we are trying to do is destroy employer-sponsored health care.

Well, Mr. Speaker, two of the Nation's leading organizations who represent small employers, the people who are really facing these high premium hikes, the National Association of Manufacturers, the National Federation of Independent Businesses, this is one of their key priorities. They endorse this bill.

What this does, Mr. Speaker, is it makes it easier for employers to offer health care. It helps us continue employer-sponsored health care.

Another thing that I have been hearing, that this is fiscally irresponsible and adds to the deficit.

Mr. Speaker, what is fiscally irresponsible is the substitute prescription drug bill that the minority is bringing to the floor which costs $600 billion and into the well who spoke on this bill today cares about health care.

Mr. Speaker, at the end of the day, after we have heard all of these arguments, it kind of comes down to two things, two different philosophies: socialism versus consumerism. They want socialized medicine. They want power to go to Washington where Washington can ration the health care. We want power to go to the people. We want power to go to the consumers. We want people to have more choices. They want to restrict those choices.

Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of this bill.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it used to be that the most challenging part of my job here was finding meaningful ways of improving quality of life for the people in my district. Now it seems the most challenging part is trying to figure out how the Republican leadership will next try to deny those same people and their families dollars.

Today's bill is one of the more creative approaches I have seen by the Republicans to advance their goals of giving their rich political donors big tax cuts, and denying the poor and advancing their goals of giving their rich political donors big tax cuts, and denying the poor and Herrera-income employees and those who are uninsured pay all kinds of taxes: payroll taxes, income taxes, property taxes. However, they tend to not pay enough income taxes to take advantage of this new Republican-give-the- rich scheme. So the exact people who are not being left out of our healthcare system, and who need relief, are being left out of this bill.

The underlying goal of this bill is to dismantle the employer-based health insurance system that the Chairman of the Ways and Means Committee hates. He has stated that he does not like employer-based health insurance because it shields people from the cost of health care and thus enables people to use healthcare too much. I don't see that Americans have made themselves too healthy. I want to increase access to care not decrease it, so I will vote against this bill.

Not only is this a bad bill, it is an expensive one. It will cost $71 billion over the next ten years—all money borrowed from our children and grandchildren. In the later years of the budget window, this bill will cost in excess of $10 billion per year, and will accelerate just at the time when the baby boom generation retires, denying resources to meet our commitments to the Social Security and Medicare systems.

Again, it seems this bill was crafted to specifically target and destroy the elements of our healthcare system that people know and trust: Medicare and Employer-sponsored coverage—and use the savings to give to CEOs, the healthy, and the wealthy. It is not surprising to find that due to the structure of this bill, the exact people who are denied the benefits of a child tax credit, will also be denied the benefits of a child tax credit.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.
The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 237, nays 191, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 328]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAES—237</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aderholt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frelighsburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frelinghuysen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gohmert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gallegly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garrett (NJ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNunes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerlach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nussle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilchrest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bartlet (MD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gillmor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bartlett (CT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gingrich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goode</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodlatte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beasplaz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beremeier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Granger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petersen (MN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayley, A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania (PA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biggerger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green (WI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilirakis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenwood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pickering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bishop (GA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gutknacht</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pritts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bishop (UT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Platts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackburn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pombo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blunt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boebler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hastert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonilla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayworth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bono</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radvanovich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boyd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradley (NY)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hobson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hurbey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renzel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brady (TX)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ho ekstra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reinhberg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown (SC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hooley (OR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reynolds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burgess</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hostetter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rogers (AL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burson (IN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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**NOT VOTING—7**

Brown-Waltte, Mccinnes
Ginny
Gephardt
Smith (WA)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE.
The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SWEENEY) (during the vote). Members are advised that there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

Mr. STRICKLAND and Mr. GUTIERREZ changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**EXTENDING AVAILABILITY OF SCHIP ALLOTMENTS FOR FISCAL YEARS 1998 THROUGH 2001**

Mr. TAUNZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Energy and Commerce be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H.R. 531) to amend title XXI of the Social Security Act to extend the availability of allotments for fiscal years 1998 through 2001 under the State Children’s Health Insurance Program (SCHIP), and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:
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---

Paragraph (2) of such section 2104(g) is amended—

(a) RETAINED AND REDISTRIBUTED ALLOTMENTS FOR FISCAL YEARS 1998 AND 1999.—Paragraphs (2)(A)(i) and (2)(A)(ii) of section 2104(g) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1397dd(g)) are each amended by striking “fiscal year 2004” and inserting “fiscal year 2003”;

(b) EXTENSION AND REVISION OF RETAINED AND REDISTRIBUTED ALLOTMENTS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2000.—

(1) PERMITTING AND EXTENDING RETENTION OF PORTION OF FISCAL YEAR 2000 ALLOTMENT.—Paragraph (2) of such section 2104(g) is amended—

(A) in the heading, by striking “AND 1999” and inserting “AND 1999”;

(B) by adding at the end of subparagraph (A) the following new paragraph:

“(ii) FISCAL YEAR 2000 ALLOTMENT.—Of the amounts allotted to a State pursuant to this section for fiscal year 2000 that were not expended by the State by the end of fiscal year 2002, 50 percent of that amount shall remain available for expenditure by the State through the end of fiscal year 2004.”;

(2) RETAINED ALLOTMENTS.—Paragraph (1) of such section 2104(g) is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by inserting “or for fiscal year 2000 by the end of fiscal year 2002” after “fiscal year 2001”;

(B) in subparagraph (A), by striking “1998 and 1999” and inserting “1998, 1999, or 2000”; and

(C) in subparagraph (A)(i)—

(i) by striking “or” at the end of clause (i),

(ii) by striking the period at the end of clause (ii) and inserting “; or”; and

(iii) by adding at the end of such new clause:

“(iii) the fiscal year 2000 allotment, the amount specified in subparagraph (C)(i) (less the total of the amounts under clause (ii) for such fiscal year), multiplied by the ratio of the amount specified in subparagraph (C)(ii) for the State to the amount specified in subparagraph (C)(i) for the State;”;

(D) in subparagraph (A)(ii), by striking “or” and inserting “and”; and

(E) in subparagraph (B), by striking “with respect to fiscal year 1998 or 1999”.

(3) In the table of amounts, the amount specified in column (B) of such section for fiscal years 1998, 1999, and 2000 under the heading “SCHIP” are each amended—

(A) by adding at the end of the table the following new column:

| (C) AMOUNTS USED IN COMPUTING DISTRIBUTIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2000.—For purposes of subparagraphs (A)(iii) of paragraphs (2)(A) and (2)(B) of section 2104(g) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1397dd(g)), the amount specified in column (B) of such section for fiscal year 2000 shall be the total amount remaining available pursuant to paragraph 2(B)(ii)(II) of such section.

(B) in column (B), by striking “or” and inserting “and”;

(C) by striking “or” and inserting “and”;

(D) by striking “and”; and

(E) by striking “and”.

(4) In the table of amounts, the amount specified in column (B) of such section for fiscal years 1998, 1999, and 2000 under the heading “SCHIP” are each amended—

(A) by striking “or” and inserting “and”; and

(B) by striking “or”.

(5) The table of amounts in column (B) of such section is amended—

(A) in the table of amounts in column (B) of such section for fiscal years 1998, 1999, and 2000 under the heading “SCHIP” are each amended—

(B) in column (B), by striking “or” and inserting “and”;

(C) by striking “or” and inserting “and”;

(D) by striking “or” and inserting “and”;

(E) by striking “or” and inserting “and”.

---
expenditures under this title in fiscal years 2000, 2001, and 2002 exceed the State’s allotment for fiscal year 2000 under subsection (b); and

(iii) the amount specified in this clause is the sum, for all States entitled to a redistribution under subparagraph (A) from the allotments for fiscal year 2001, of the amounts specified in clause (ii)."

3. CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Such section 2104(g) is further amended—

(A) in its heading, by striking “AND 1999” and inserting “, AND 1999’’; and

(B) in paragraph (3)—

(i) by striking “or fiscal year 1999” and inserting “or fiscal year 2000’’; and

(ii) by striking “or November 30, 2001’’ and inserting “November 30, 2001, or November 30, 2002’’; and

(c) EXTENSION AND REVISION OF RETAINED AND REDISTRIBUTED ALLOTMENTS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2001.—

1. PERMITTING AND EXTENDING RETENTION OF PORTION OF FISCAL YEAR 2001 ALLOTMENT.—

Paragraph (2) of such section 2104(g), as amended in subsection (b)(2), is further amended—

(A) in the heading, by striking “2000” and inserting “2000, or 2001’’; and

(B) by adding at the end of subparagraph (A) the following:

“(iv) FISCAL YEAR 2001 ALLOTMENT.—Of the amounts allotted to a State pursuant to this section for fiscal year 2000 that were not expended by the State by the end of fiscal year 2003, 50 percent of that amount shall remain available for expenditure by the State through the end of fiscal year 2005’’.

2. REDISTRIBUTED ALLOTMENTS.—Paragraph (1) of such section 2104(g), as amended in subsection (b)(2), is further amended—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by inserting “or for fiscal year 2001 by the end of fiscal year 2003,” after “fiscal year 2002’’;

(B) in subparagraph (A), by striking “1999, or 2000’’ and inserting “1999, 2000, or 2001’’;

(C) in subparagraph (A)(i)—

(i) by striking “or” at the end of clause (ii); and

(ii) by striking the period at the end of clause (iii) and inserting “; or’’; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following new clause:

“(iv) the fiscal year 2001 allotment, the amount specified in subparagraph (D)(i) (less the total of the amounts under clause (ii) for such fiscal year), multiplied by the ratio of the amount specified in subparagraph (D)(i) for the State to the amount specified in subparagraph (D)(iii);”

(D) in subparagraph (A)(ii), by striking “or 2000” and inserting “2000, or 2001’’;

(E) in subparagraph (B)—

(i) by striking “and” at the end of clause (iii); and

(ii) by designating clause (iii) as clause (iv); and

(iii) by inserting after clause (ii) the following new clause:

“(iii) notwithstanding subsection (e), with respect to fiscal year 2003, shall remain available for expenditure by the State through the end of fiscal year 2005; and

(F) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(D) AMOUNTS USED IN COMPUTING REDISTRIBUTIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2001.—For purposes of subparagraph (A)(i)(IV)—

(i) the amount specified in this clause is the amount specified in paragraph (2)(B)(i)(i) for fiscal year 2001, less the total amount remaining available pursuant to paragraph (2)(A)(iv); and

(ii) the amount specified in this clause for a State is the amount, by which the State’s expenditures under this title in fiscal years 2001, 2002, and 2003 exceed the State’s allotment for fiscal year 2001 under subsection (b); and

(iii) the amount specified in this clause is the sum, for all States entitled to a redistribution under subparagraph (A) from the allotments for fiscal year 2001, of the amounts specified in clause (ii).’’

3. CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Such section 2104(g), as amended in subsection (b)(1)(B), is further amended—

(A) in the heading, by striking “2000’’ and inserting “1999, 2000, or 2001’’;

(B) in subparagraph (A), by striking “or” at the end of subclause (II), and inserting “or’’; and

(C) by adding at the end the following new clause:

“(III) the fiscal year 2001 allotment, the amount specified in this clause is—

(A) the following:

“(i) the amount specified in this clause is

(B) the amount specified in subparagraph (B) of this title;

(C) the amount specified in subparagraph (C) of this title; and

(D) the amount specified in subparagraph (D) of this title.”;

(D) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section, and the amendments made by this section, shall be effective as if this section had been enacted on September 30, 2002, and amounts under title XXI of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1397aa et seq.) from allotments for fiscal years 1998 through 2000 are available for expenditure on and after October 1, 2002, under the amendments made by this section as if this section had been enacted on September 30, 2002.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 531, the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

MEDICARE PRESCRIPTION DRUG AND MODERNIZATION ACT OF 2003

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 299, I call up the text of H.R. 1 is as follows:

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and printed.

The Speaker then pronounced the text of H.R. 1 in its heading, by striking “AND 1999” and inserting “, AND 1999’’; and

The Speaker read the following:

"MEDITATION PRESCRIPTION DRUG AND MODERNIZATION ACT OF 2003

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 299, I call up the bill (H.R. 1) to the title XXIV of the Social Security Act to provide for a voluntary program for prescription drug coverage under the Medicare Program, to modernize the Medicare Program, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Mr. LAHOOD. Pursuant to House Resolution 299, the bill is considered read for amendment.

The text of H.R. 1 is as follows:

H.R. 1

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; AMENDMENTS TO SOCIAL SECURITY ACT; REFERENCES TO BIPA AND SECRETARY; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the “Medicare Prescription Drug and Modernization Act of 2003’’.

(b) AMENDMENTS TO SOCIAL SECURITY ACT.—Except as otherwise specifically provided, whenever in this Act an amendment is expressed in terms of an amendment to or repeal of a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to that section or other provision of the Social Security Act.

(c) BIPA; SECRETARY.—In this Act:

(1) BIPA.—The term ‘‘BIPA’’ means the Medicare, Medicaid, and SCHIP Benefits Improvement and Protection Act of 2003, as enacted into law by section I(a)(6) of Public Law 106-554.

(2) SECRETARY.—The term ‘‘Secretary’’ means the Secretary of Health and Human Services.

(d) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents of this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; amendments to Social Security Act; references to BIPA and Secretary; table of contents.

TITLE I—MEDICARE PRESCRIPTION DRUG BENEFIT

Sec. 101. Establishment of a Medicare prescription drug benefit.

PART D—VOLUNTARY PRESCRIPTION DRUG BENEFIT PROGRAM

Sec. 16001. Benefits; eligibility; enrollment; and coverage period.

Sec. 16002. Requirements for qualified prescription drug coverage.

Sec. 16003. Beneficiary protections for qualified prescription drug coverage.

Sec. 16004. Requirements for and contracts with prescription drug plans.

Sec. 16005. Process for beneficiaries to select qualified prescription drug coverage.

Sec. 16006. Submission of bids and premiums.

Sec. 16007. Premium and cost-sharing subsidies for low-income individuals.

Sec. 16008. Subsidies for all Medicare beneficiaries for qualified prescription drug coverage.

Sec. 16009. Medicare Prescription Drug Trust Fund.

Sec. 16010. Definitions; application to Medicare advantage and EFFS programs; treatment of references to provisions in part II.

Sec. 102. Offering of qualified prescription drug coverage under Medicare Advantage and enhanced fee-for-service (EFFS) program.

Sec. 103. Medicaid amendments.

Sec. 104. Medigap transition.

Sec. 105. Medicare prescription drug discount card and assistance program.

Sec. 106. Disclosure of return information for purposes of carrying out Medicare catastrophic prescription drug program.


Sec. 108. Additional requirements for annual financial report and oversight on Medicare program, including prescription drug spending.

TITLE II—MEDICARE ENHANCED FEE-FOR-SERVICE AND MEDICARE ADVANTAGE PROGRAMS; MEDICARE COMPETITION

Sec. 200. Medicare modernization and revitalization.

Subtitle A—Medicare Enhanced Fee-for-Service Program

Sec. 201. Establishment of enhanced fee-for-service (EFFS) program under Medicare.

PART E—ENHANCED FEE-FOR-SERVICE PROGRAM

Sec. 16501. Offering of enhanced fee-for-service plans throughout the United States.

Sec. 16502. Offering of enhanced fee-for-service (EFFS) plans.
Subtitle D—Appeals and Recovery
Sec. 931. Transfer of responsibility for medi-
care appeals.
Sec. 932. Process for expedited access to re-
view of determinations.
Sec. 933. Revisions to Medicare appeals pro-
cess.
Sec. 934. Prepayment review.
Sec. 935. Recovery of overpayments.
Sec. 936. Provider enrollment process; right of ap-
peal.
Sec. 937. Process for correction of minor er-
rors and omissions without pur-
suing appeals process.
Sec. 938. Prior determination process for cer-
tain items and services; ad-
dvance beneficiary notices.
Subtitle V—Miscellaneous Provisions
Sec. 941. Policy development regarding eval-
uation and management (E & M) documentation guidelines.
Sec. 942. Improving access in oversight of tech-
nology and coverage.
Sec. 943. Treatment of hospitals for certain services under medicare sec-
ondary payer (MSP) provisions.
Sec. 944. EMTALA improvements.
Sec. 945. Emergency Medical Treatment and Active Labor Act (EMTALA)
plans and Medicare.
Sec. 946. Authorizing use of arrangements to
provide core hospice services in certain circumstances.
Sec. 947. Application of OSHA bloodborne pathogens standard to certain hospitals.
Sec. 948. BIPA-related technical amend-
ments and corrections.
Sec. 949. Conforming authority to waive a
program exclusion.
Sec. 950. Treatment of certain dental pla-
ys under section 1837(d).
Sec. 951. Furnishing hospitals with informa-
tion to compute dsh formula.
Sec. 952. Revisions to reassessment provi-
sions.
Sec. 953. Other provisions.
Sec. 954. Temporary suspension of OASIS re-
quirement for collection of data on non-medicare and non-med-
icaid patients.
TITLE X—MEDICAID
Sec. 1001. Medicaid disproportionate share hospital (DSH) payments.
Sec. 1002. Clarification of inclusion of inpa-
tient drug prices charged to cer-
tain public hospitals in the best price ex-
ceptions for the priority pharmaceutical program.
TITLE XI—ACCESS TO AFFORDABLE PHARMACEUTICALS
Subtitle A—Access to Affordable Pharmaceuticals
Sec. 1101. 30-month stay-of-effectiveness pe-
riod.
Sec. 1102. Forfeiture of 180-day exclusivity peri-
dode.
Sec. 1103. Bioavailability and bioequiva-
ience.
Sec. 1104. Conforming amendments.
Subtitle B—Ability of Federal Trade
Commission to Enforce Antitrust Laws
Sec. 1110. Definitions.
Sec. 1112. Filing deadlines.
Sec. 1113. Disclosure exemption.
health status-related factor described in section 2702(a)(1) of the Public Health Service Act or any other factor.

(ii) LATE ENROLLMENT PENALTY.—In the case of an individual who does not maintain such continuous prescription drug coverage (as described in subparagraph (C)), a PDP sponsor or an entity offering a MA-EFFS Rx plan that includes any such coverage (as defined in this title) may adjust the premium otherwise applicable with respect to qualified prescription drug coverage in a manner that reflects additional actuarial risk involved, such a risk shall be established through an appropriate actuarial opinion of the type described in section 2103(c)(4). The Administrator shall provide a mechanism for assisting such sponsors and entities in identifying eligible individuals which have not maintained such continuous prescription drug coverage.

(C) CONTINUOUS PRESCRIPTION DRUG COVERAGE.

An individual is considered for purposes of this part to be maintaining continuous prescription drug coverage on and after the date the individual first qualifies to elect prescription drug coverage under part D if the individual satisfies the applicable requirements described in section 2103(c)(4). The Administrator shall provide a mechanism for assisting such sponsors and entities in identifying eligible individuals which have not maintained such continuous prescription drug coverage.

(ii) COVERAGE UNDER PRESCRIPTION DRUG PLAN OR MA-EFFS RX PLAN.—Qualified prescription drug coverage under a prescription drug plan or under a MA-EFFS Rx plan.

(iii) MEDICAID PRESCRIPTION DRUG COVERAGE.—Prescription drug coverage under a medicare drug benefit plan under chapter 89 of title 5, United States Code, and a qualified retiree prescription drug plan.

(iv) VETERANS' COVERAGE OF PRESCRIPTION DRUGS.—Coverage under a prescription drug plan or under a MA-EFFS Rx plan.

(D) CERTIFICATION.—For purposes of carrying out paragraph (1)(A), the Secretary shall certify that such coverage provides benefits at least equivalent to the benefits under a qualified prescription drug plan.

(II) Waiver of limitations.

An individual may apply to the Administrator to waive the requirement that coverage of such type provide benefits at least equivalent to the benefits under a qualified prescription drug plan.

(ii) Waiver of limitations.

An individual may apply to the Administrator to waive the requirement that coverage of such type provide benefits at least equivalent to the benefits under a qualified prescription drug plan.

(III) Coverage under Medicare.

An individual may apply to the Administrator to waive the requirement that coverage of such type provide benefits at least equivalent to the benefits under a qualified prescription drug plan.

(iii) Coverage under Medicare.

An individual may apply to the Administrator to waive the requirement that coverage of such type provide benefits at least equivalent to the benefits under a qualified prescription drug plan.

(IV) State Pharmacy Assistance Program.

Coverage of prescription drugs under a State pharmaceutical assistance program, but only if (subject to subparagraph (E)(iii)) the coverage provides benefits at least equivalent to the benefits under a qualified prescription drug plan.

(V) Veterans' Coverage of Prescription Drugs.

Coverage of prescription drugs for veterans under chapter 17 of title 38, United States Code, but only if (subject to subparagraph (E)(iii)) the coverage provides benefits at least equivalent to the benefits under a qualified prescription drug plan.

(VI) Prescription Drug Coverage Under Certain Medicaid Policies.

Coverage under a medicare supplemental policy under section 1882 that provides benefits for prescription drugs and under such a policy that conforms to the standards for packages of benefits under section 1882(p)(1), but only if the policy was in effect on January 1, 2006, and if (subject to subparagraph (E)(iii)) the coverage provides benefits at least equivalent to the benefits under a qualified prescription drug plan.


Coverage under a medicare supplemental policy under section 1882 that provides benefits for prescription drugs and under such a policy that conforms to the standards for packages of benefits under section 1882(p)(1), but only if the policy was in effect on January 1, 2006, and if (subject to subparagraph (E)(iii)) the coverage provides benefits at least equivalent to the benefits under a qualified prescription drug plan.

(VIII) State Pharmaceutical Assistance Program.

Coverage of prescription drugs under a State pharmaceutical assistance program, but only if (subject to subparagraph (E)(iii)) the coverage provides benefits at least equivalent to the benefits under a qualified prescription drug plan.

(VI) Veterans' Coverage of Prescription Drugs.

Coverage of prescription drugs for veterans under chapter 17 of title 38, United States Code, but only if (subject to subparagraph (E)(iii)) the coverage provides benefits at least equivalent to the benefits under a qualified prescription drug plan.

(VI) Prescription Drug Coverage Under Certain Medicaid Policies.

Coverage under a medicare supplemental policy under section 1882 that provides benefits for prescription drugs and under such a policy that conforms to the standards for packages of benefits under section 1882(p)(1), but only if the policy was in effect on January 1, 2006, and if (subject to subparagraph (E)(iii)) the coverage provides benefits at least equivalent to the benefits under a qualified prescription drug plan.

(IX) Federal Employees Health Benefits Program.

Coverage of prescription drugs under chapter 89 of title 5, United States Code, but only if (subject to subparagraph (E)(ii)) the coverage provides benefits at least equivalent to the benefits under a qualified prescription drug plan.

(X) Coverage Under Prescription Drug Coverage.

Coverage under a prescription drug plan or under a MA-EFFS Rx plan.

(E) Disapproval Authority.

The Administrator shall review the offering of qualified prescription drug coverage under a prescription drug plan or a MA-EFFS Rx plan, the PDP sponsor offering the coverage is engaged in activities intended to discourage enrollment of classes of eligible Medicare beneficiaries otherwise eligible for prescription drug coverage than on the basis of their higher likelihood of utilizing prescription drug coverage, the Administrator may terminate the contract with the sponsor or organization under this part or part C or E.

(2) Application of Secondary Payor Provisions.

The provisions of section 1852(a)(4) shall apply under this part in the same manner as they apply under part C.

(3) Standard Coverage.

For purposes of this part, the 'standard coverage' of covered outpatient drugs (as defined in subsection (f)) that meets the following requirements:

(i) Equal to 20 percent.

(ii) Actuarially equivalent (using processes established under subsection (e)) to an average expected payment of 20 percent of such costs.

(4) Use of tiers.

Nothing in this part shall be construed as preventing a PDP sponsor from applying tiered copayments, so long as such tiered copayments are consistent with subparagraph (A).

(5) Initial Coverage Limit.

Subject to paragraph (4), the coverage has an initial coverage limit on the maximum costs that may be recognized for payment purposes—

(i) that is equal to $2,000; or

(ii) for a subsequent year, that is equal to the amount specified in this paragraph for the previous year plus the percentage shown in paragraph (5) for the year involved.

Any amount determined under subparagraph (B) that is not a multiple of $10 shall be rounded to the nearest multiple of $10.

(6) 20 percent Co-payments.

The coverage has cost-sharing for costs above the annual deductible specified in paragraph (1) and up to the initial coverage limit under paragraph (3) that is—

(i) equal to 20 percent; or

(ii) actuarially equivalent (using processes established under subsection (e)) to an average expected payment of 20 percent of such costs.

(7) Use of tiers.

Nothing in this part shall be construed as preventing a PDP sponsor from applying tiered copayments, so long as such tiered copayments are consistent with subparagraph (A).

(8) Initial Coverage Limit.

Subject to paragraph (4), the coverage has an initial coverage limit on the maximum costs that may be recognized for payment purposes—

(i) that is equal to $2,000; or

(ii) for a subsequent year, that is equal to the amount specified in this paragraph for the previous year plus the percentage shown in paragraph (5) for the year involved.

Any amount determined under subparagraph (B) that is not a multiple of $25 shall be rounded to the nearest multiple of $25.

(9) Catastrophic Protection.

Notwithstanding paragraph (3), the coverage provides benefits with no cost-sharing after the individual has incurred costs (as described in subparagraph (B)) that exceeds the catastrophic protection threshold specified in subparagraph (B).

(10) Annual Out-of-Pocket Threshold.

The coverage includes catastrophic coverage under part B, after the individual has incurred costs (as described in subparagraph (B)) that exceeds the catastrophic protection threshold.

(11) Inflation Increase.

For a year after June 26, 2003, the dollar amount specified in clause (i)
shall be increased by the annual percentage increase described in paragraph (5) for the year involved. Any amount determined under the previous sentence that is not a multiple of $100 shall be rounded to the nearest multiple of $100.

(5) AMOUNTS DETERMINED OTHER THAN UNDER PARAGRAPH (4).—

(i) the annual percentage increase specified in clause (iv); or

(ii) the amount so determined, less the amount specified in subclause (I)

(6) OPT OUT.—A prescription drug plan or MA-EFFS Rx plan may also offer an all-risk plan for the year determined under paragraph (5). For purposes of the amount specified in paragraph (5) for the year determined under paragraph (5), the amount specified in clause (iv) shall be increased by the annual percentage increase described in paragraph (5) for the year involved. Any amount determined under the previous sentence that is not a multiple of $100 shall be rounded to the nearest multiple of $100.

(7) ENROLLMENT YEAR.—For purposes of this section, the enrollment year means—

(i) the period beginning on January 1 of the calendar year beginning in the calendar year for which the plan year begins, and ending on December 31 of the calendar year beginning in the calendar year for which the plan year begins; or

(ii) the period beginning on the day immediately following the calendar year beginning in the calendar year for which the plan year begins, and ending on December 31 of the calendar year for which the plan year begins.

(8) OPT OUT.—A prescription drug plan or MA-EFFS Rx plan may also offer an all-risk plan for the year determined under paragraph (5). For purposes of the amount specified in paragraph (5) for the year determined under paragraph (5), the amount specified in clause (iv) shall be increased by the annual percentage increase described in paragraph (5) for the year involved. Any amount determined under the previous sentence that is not a multiple of $100 shall be rounded to the nearest multiple of $100.
(A) ASSURING EQUIVALENT VALUE OF TOTAL COVERAGE.—The actuarial value of the total coverage (as determined under subsection (e)) is equal to the actuarial value of costs in any standard coverage.

(B) ASSURING EQUIVALENT UNSUBSIDIZED VALUE OF COVERAGE.—The unsubsidized value of the coverage is at least equal to the unsubsidized value of standard coverage. For purposes of this subparagraph, the unsubsidized value of coverage is the amount by which the actuarial value of the coverage (as determined under subsection (e)) exceeds the actuarial value of the subsidy payments under section 1860D–2 with respect to such coverage.

(C) ASSURING STANDARD PAYMENT FOR COSTS AT INITIAL COVERAGE LIMIT.—The coverage is designed, upon an actuarially representative basis, to provide benefits which, determined under subsection (e), to provide for the payment, with respect to costs incurred that are equal to the initial coverage limit (as so determined) of an amount equal to at least the product of—

(i) the amount by which the initial coverage limit described in subparagraph (B)(3) exceeds the deductible described in subparagraph (B)(1); and

(ii) 100 percent minus the cost-sharing percentage specified in subparagraph (B)(2).

(2) CATASTROPHIC PROTECTION.—The coverage provides for beneficiaries the catastrophic protection described in subsection (b)(4). (4) APPLICATION OF GENERAL EXCLUSION PROVISIONS.—A prescription drug plan or MA-EFFS Rx plan may exclude from qualified prescription drug coverage any covered outpatient drug—

(A) for which payment would not be made under part A or enrolled under part B, shall

(B) which are not prescribed in accordance with state law or are for a medical use, which may be excluded from coverage.

(3) ACCESS TO COVERED BENEFITS.—Each PDP sponsor offering a prescription drug plan must furnish to each enrollee in a form easily understandable to such enrollee an explanation of benefits (in accordance with section 1806(a) or in a comparable manner) and a notice of the benefits in relation to initial coverage limit and the annual out-of-pocket threshold applicable to such enrollee for the current year, whenever prescription drug benefits are provided under this part (except that such notice need not be provided more often than monthly).

(4) CLAIMS INFORMATION.—Each PDP sponsor offering a prescription drug plan is required to furnish to each enrollee in a form easily understandable to such enrollee an explanation of benefits (in accordance with section 1806(a) or in a comparable manner) and a notice of the benefits in relation to initial coverage limit and the annual out-of-pocket threshold applicable to such enrollee for the current year, whenever prescription drug benefits are provided under this part (except that such notice need not be provided more often than monthly).

(5) AVAILABILITY OF DRUGS.—A drug prescribed for an individual that would otherwise be a covered outpatient drug under this part shall not be so considered under a plan if the plan excludes the drug under a formulary and such exclusion is not successfully appealed under section 1860D–2(f).

(6) DETERMINATION OF ACTUARIAL VALUES.—(A) In general.—Each PDP sponsor and entity offering a MA-EFFS Rx plan shall determine whether such actuarial values meet the requirements under subsection (c)(4). (B) Covered outpatient drugs defined.—In general.—Except as provided in this subsection, for purposes of this part, the term ‘covered outpatient drug’ means—

(A) a drug described in any prescription drug plan or MA-EFFS Rx plan and under this part, the requirements of section 1927(b)(3)(D) shall apply to information disclosed to the Administrator under this paragraph in the same manner as such provisions apply to information disclosed under such section.

(2) AUDITS AND REPORTS.—To protect against fraud and abuse and to ensure proper compliance and determinations under this part, in addition to any protections against fraud and abuse provided under section 1920D–4(b)(3)(C), the Administrator may periodically audit or review the processes, records and reports of PDP sponsor or entities offering a MA-EFFS Rx plan.

(3) DETERMINATION OF ACTUARIAL VALUES.—(A) PROCESSES.—For purposes of this section, the Administrator shall establish processes and methods—

(i) for determining the actuarial valuation of prescription drug coverage, including—

(A) an actuarial valuation of standard coverage and of the reinsurance subsidy payments under section 1920D–8.

(B) the use of generally accepted actuarial principles and methodologies; and

(C) applying the same methodology for determinations of alternative coverage described in subsection (c) as is used with respect to determinations of standard coverage under subsection (b); and

(B) for determining annual percentage increases described in subsection (b)(5).

Such methods for determining actuarial valuation shall take into account potential differences in the actuarial values of alternative coverage on drug utilization.

(4) USE OF OUTSIDE ACTUARIES.—Under the processes under paragraph (2)(A), PDP sponsors and entities offering MA-EFFS Rx plans may use actuarial opinions certified by independent, qualified actuaries to establish actuarial values, but the Administrator shall determine whether such actuarial values meet the requirements under subsection (c)(1).

(5) COVERED OUTPATIENT DRUGS DEFINED.—(A) In general.—Except as provided in this subsection, for purposes of this part, the term ‘covered outpatient drug’ means—

(A) a drug described in any prescription drug plan or MA-EFFS Rx plan and under this part, the requirements of section 1927(b)(3)(D) shall apply to information disclosed to the Administrator under this paragraph in the same manner as such provisions apply to information disclosed under such section.

(B) biological product described in clauses (i) through (iii) of subparagraph (B) of section 1927(b)(3)(D) and insulin described in subparagraph (B) of section 1927(b)(3)(D) (as defined in regulations of the Secretary) and such term includes a vaccine licensed under section 351 of the Public Health Service Act and any use of a covered outpatient drug for a medically accepted indication (as defined in section 1927(k)(6)).

(2) EXCLUSION OF DUPLICATE COVERAGE.—A drug prescribed for an individual that would otherwise be a covered outpatient drug under this part shall not be so considered under a plan if the plan excludes the drug under a formulary and such exclusion is not successfully appealed under section 1860D–2(f).

(3) APPLICATION OF FORMULARY RESTRICTIONS.—A drug prescribed for an individual that would otherwise be a covered outpatient drug under this part shall not be so considered under a plan if the plan excludes the drug under a formulary and such exclusion is not successfully appealed under section 1860D–2(f).

(4) APPLICATION OF GENERAL EXCLUSION PROVISIONS.—A prescription drug plan or MA-EFFS Rx plan may exclude from qualified prescription drug coverage any covered outpatient drug—

(A) for which payment would not be made under part D; or

(B) which are not prescribed in accordance with state law or are for a medical use, which may be excluded from coverage.
"(B) DISCOUNTS ALLOWED FOR NETWORK PHARMACIES.—A prescription drug plan and a MA-EFFS Rx plan may, notwithstanding subparagraph (A), reduce co-insurance or copayment for covered outpatient drugs through mail order, if the mail order furnisher is an entity providing a service by which the mail order furnisher shall provide for the delivery of covered outpatient drugs that is generally accepted in the area, and the plan offers to enrollees the same level of coverage for that drug as is offered by the carrier offering the MA-EFFS Rx plan.

"(C) CONVENIENT ACCESS FOR NETWORK PHARMACIES.—The PDP sponsor of the prescription drug plan and the entity offering a MA-EFFS Rx plan shall secure the participation in its network of a sufficient number of pharmacies that dispense (other than by mail order) drugs directly to patients to ensure convenient service in a time frame consistent with the standards published in the United States Pharmacopeia—Drug Information. The committee shall make available to the enrollees under the plan the Internet or otherwise the bases for the exclusion of coverage of any drug from the formulary.

"(D) PROVIDER AND PATIENT EDUCATION.—The committee shall establish policies and procedures to educate and inform health care providers and enrollees concerning the formulary.

"(E) NOTICE BEFORE REMOVING DRUG FROM FORMULARY FOR CHANGING PREFERRED OR TIER STATUS OF DRUG.—Any removal of a covered outpatient drug from a formulary and any change in the preferred or tier cost-sharing status of such a drug shall take effect only after appropriate notice is made available to enrollees and physicians.

"(F) PERIODIC EVALUATION OF PROTOCOLS.—In connection with the formulary, a prescription drug plan shall provide for the periodic evaluation and analysis of treatment protocols and processes.

"(G) GRIEVANCES AND APPEALS RELATING TO APPLICATION OF FORMULARIES.—For provisions relating to grievances and appeals of coverage, see subsections (e) and (f).

"(H) COST AND UTILIZATION MANAGEMENT; QUALITY ASSURANCE; MEDICATION THERAPY MANAGEMENT PROGRAM.—

"(i) an effective cost and drug utilization management program, including medically appropriate incentives to use generic drugs and therapeutic interchange, when appropriate;

"(ii) quality assurance measures and systems to reduce medical errors and adverse drug interactions, including side-effects, and improve medication use, including a medication therapy management program described in paragraph (2) and adding years beginning with 2007, an electronic prescription program described in paragraph (3); and

"(iii) a program to control fraud, abuse, and waste.

Nothing in this section shall be construed as impairing a PDP sponsor or entity from utilizing cost management tools (including differential payments) under all methods of operation.

"(2) MEDICATION THERAPY MANAGEMENT PROGRAM.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—A medication therapy management program described in this paragraph shall begin to be implemented no later than the beginning of the period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act. The program shall include:

"(i) a base clinical decisions on the strength of scientific evidence and standards of practice, including assessing peer-reviewed medical literature, such as randomized clinical trials, and outcomes research data, and on such other information as the committee determines to be appropriate; and

"(ii) shall take into account whether including in the formulary particular covered outpatient drugs has therapeutic advantages in terms of safety and efficacy.

"(B) INCLUSION OF ALL THERAPEUTIC CATEGORIES.—The formulary must include drugs within each therapeutic category and class of covered outpatient drugs (although drugs within the same drug classes may be excluded from such categories and classes). In establishing such classes, the committee shall take into account the standards published in the United States Pharmacopeia—Drug Information. The committee shall make available to the enrollees under the plan through the Internet or otherwise the bases for the exclusion of coverage of any drug from the formulary.

"(C) INSTRUCTIONS ON DEVELOPMENT AND USE OF FORMULARIES.—The formulary must include drugs within each therapeutic category and class of covered outpatient drugs (although drugs within the same drug classes may be excluded from such categories and classes). In establishing such classes, the committee shall take into account the standards published in the United States Pharmacopeia—Drug Information. The committee shall make available to the enrollees under the plan through the Internet or otherwise the bases for the exclusion of coverage of any drug from the formulary.

"(D) PROVIDER AND PATIENT EDUCATION.—The committee shall establish policies and procedures to educate and inform health care providers and enrollees concerning the formulary.

"(E) NOTICE BEFORE REMOVING DRUG FROM FORMULARY FOR CHANGING PREFERRED OR TIER STATUS OF DRUG.—Any removal of a covered outpatient drug from a formulary and any change in the preferred or tier cost-sharing status of such a drug shall take effect only after appropriate notice is made available to enrollees and physicians.

"(F) PERIODIC EVALUATION OF PROTOCOLS.—In connection with the formulary, a prescription drug plan shall provide for the periodic evaluation and analysis of treatment protocols and processes.

"(G) GRIEVANCES AND APPEALS RELATING TO APPLICATION OF FORMULARIES.—For provisions relating to grievances and appeals of coverage, see subsections (e) and (f).

"(H) COST AND UTILIZATION MANAGEMENT; QUALITY ASSURANCE; MEDICATION THERAPY MANAGEMENT PROGRAM.—

"(i) an effective cost and drug utilization management program, including medically appropriate incentives to use generic drugs and therapeutic interchange, when appropriate;

"(ii) quality assurance measures and systems to reduce medical errors and adverse drug interactions, including side-effects, and improve medication use, including a medication therapy management program described in paragraph (2) and adding years beginning with 2007, an electronic prescription program described in paragraph (3); and

"(iii) a program to control fraud, abuse, and waste.

Nothing in this section shall be construed as impairing a PDP sponsor or entity from utilizing cost management tools (including differential payments) under all methods of operation.

"(2) MEDICATION THERAPY MANAGEMENT PROGRAM.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—A medication therapy management program described in this paragraph shall begin to be implemented no later than the beginning of the period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act. The program shall include:

"(i) a base clinical decisions on the strength of scientific evidence and standards of practice, including assessing peer-reviewed medical literature, such as randomized clinical trials, and outcomes research data, and on such other information as the committee determines to be appropriate; and

"(ii) shall take into account whether including in the formulary particular covered outpatient drugs has therapeutic advantages in terms of safety and efficacy.

"(B) INCLUSION OF ALL THERAPEUTIC CATEGORIES.—The formulary must include drugs within each therapeutic category and class of covered outpatient drugs (although drugs within the same drug classes may be excluded from such categories and classes). In establishing such classes, the committee shall take into account the standards published in the United States Pharmacopeia—Drug Information. The committee shall make available to the enrollees under the plan through the Internet or otherwise the bases for the exclusion of coverage of any drug from the formulary.

"(D) PROVIDER AND PATIENT EDUCATION.—The committee shall establish policies and procedures to educate and inform health care providers and enrollees concerning the formulary.

"(E) NOTICE BEFORE REMOVING DRUG FROM FORMULARY FOR CHANGING PREFERRED OR TIER STATUS OF DRUG.—Any removal of a covered outpatient drug from a formulary and any change in the preferred or tier cost-sharing status of such a drug shall take effect only after appropriate notice is made available to enrollees and physicians.

"(F) PERIODIC EVALUATION OF PROTOCOLS.—In connection with the formulary, a prescription drug plan shall provide for the periodic evaluation and analysis of treatment protocols and processes.

"(G) GRIEVANCES AND APPEALS RELATING TO APPLICATION OF FORMULARIES.—For provisions relating to grievances and appeals of coverage, see subsections (e) and (f).

"(H) COST AND UTILIZATION MANAGEMENT; QUALITY ASSURANCE; MEDICATION THERAPY MANAGEMENT PROGRAM.—

"(i) an effective cost and drug utilization management program, including medically appropriate incentives to use generic drugs and therapeutic interchange, when appropriate;

"(ii) quality assurance measures and systems to reduce medical errors and adverse drug interactions, including side-effects, and improve medication use, including a medication therapy management program described in paragraph (2) and adding years beginning with 2007, an electronic prescription program described in paragraph (3); and

"(iii) a program to control fraud, abuse, and waste.

Nothing in this section shall be construed as impairing a PDP sponsor or entity from utilizing cost management tools (including differential payments) under all methods of operation.
"(iii) ADVISORY TASK FORCE.—In developing such standards and the standards described in subsection (c)(2)(B)(i) the Administrator shall establish a task force that includes representatives from plans, hospitals, pharmacies, beneficiaries, pharmacy benefit managers, individuals with expertise in information technology, and pharmacy benefit experts from the Centers of Veterans Affairs and Defense and other appropriate Federal agencies to provide recommendations to the Administrator on such standards, including recommendations relating to the following:

"(I) The range of available computerized prescribing software and hardware and their costs of implementation.

"(II) The extent to which such standards and systems reduce medication errors and can be readily implemented by physicians, pharmacists, and prescribers.

"(III) Efforts to develop uniform standards and a common software platform for the secure electronic communication of medication history, eligibility, benefit, and prescription information.

"(IV) Efforts to develop and promote universal connectivity and interoperability for the secure electronic exchange of such information.

"(V) The cost of implementing such systems in the range of hospital and physician office software for pharmacies, including hardware, software, and training costs.

"(VI) Implementation issues as they relate to part D, current Federal and State laws and regulations, and their impact on implementation of computerized prescribing.

"(VII) DEADLINES.—

"(I) The Administrator shall constitute the task force under clause (ii) by not later than January 1, 2005.

"(II) Under task force shall submit recommendations to Administrator by not later than June 26, 2003.

"(III) The Administrator shall provide for the development and promulgation, by not later than January 1, 2005, of national standards relating to the electronic prescription drug program described in clause (ii). Such standards shall be issued by a standards organization accredited by the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) and shall be compatible with standards established under title XI.

"(4) TREATMENT OF ACCREDITATION.—Section 1852(e)(4) relating to treatment of accreditation shall apply to prescription drug plans offered by PDP sponsors or a MA-EFFS Rx plan that applies to the following requirements, in the same manner as they apply to plans under part C with respect to the requirements described in a clause of section 1852(e)(4)(B):

"(A) Paragraph (1) (including quality assurance), including medication therapy management program under paragraph (2).

"(B) Subsection (c)(1) relating to access to covered benefits.

"(C) Subsection (g) relating to confidentiality and accuracy of enrollee records.

"(5) PUBLIC DISCLOSURE OF PHARMACEUTICAL PRICES FOR EQUIVALENT DRUGS.—Each PDP sponsor and each entity offering a MA-EFFS Rx plan shall provide that each pharmacy or other dispenser that arranges for the dispensing of a covered outpatient drug shall inform the beneficiary at the time of purchase of the drug of any differential between the price of the prescribed drug to the enrollee and the price of the lowest cost available generic drug covered under the plan that is therapeutically equivalent and bioequivalent.

"(e) GRIEVANCE MECHANISM, COVERAGE DETERMINATIONS, AND RECONSIDERATIONS.—

"(1) In general.—Each PDP sponsor shall provide meaningful procedures for hearing and resolving grievances between the organization (including any entity or individual through which the sponsor provides covered benefits) and enrollees with prescription drug plans of the sponsor under this part in accordance with section 1857(k)(6).

"(f) APPEALS.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), a PDP sponsor shall meet the requirements of paragraphs (a) and (c) of section 1855(g) with respect to covered benefits under the prescription drug plan it offers under this part in the same manner as such requirements apply to an organization with respect to benefits it offers under a plan under part C.

"(2) FORMALITY DETERMINATIONS.—An individual who is enrolled in a prescription drug plan offered by a PDP sponsor or a MA-EFFS Rx plan may appeal to obtain coverage for a covered outpatient drug that is not on a formulary of the sponsor or entity offering the plan if the prescribing physician determines that the formulary drug for treatment of the same condition either would not be effective for the individual or would have adverse effects for the individual or both.

"(g) CONFIDENTIALITY AND ACCURACY OF ENROLLEE RECORDS.—A PDP sponsor that offers a prescription drug plan shall meet the requirement of section 1857(k)(9)(A)(ii) with respect to enrollees under the plan in the same manner as such requirements apply to an organization with respect to covered benefits under a plan under part C.

"(h) PROCEDURES FOR TERMINATION.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—If the Administrator determines that the formulary drug for treatment of the same condition either would not be effective for the individual or would have adverse effects for the individual, or both.

"(I) SERVICE AREA REQUIREMENT.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—Each PDP sponsor of a prescription drug plan shall meet the following requirements:

"(1) LICENSURE.—(I) In general.—The sponsor is organized and licensed under State law as a risk-bearing entity eligible to offer health insurance or health benefits coverage in each State in which it offers such coverage.

"(2) APPLICATION OF COVERAGE DETERMINATION AND RECONSIDERATION PROVISIONS.—A PDP sponsor shall meet the requirements of paragraph (c) of section 1857(k)(5) with respect to covered benefits under the prescription drug plan it offers under this part in the same manner as such requirements apply to a plan under part C.

"(II) Application of tiered cost-sharing described in subsection (e)(3) in the same manner as such requirements apply to an organization with respect to benefits it offers under a plan under part C.

"(3)很喜欢
"'(c) WAIVER OF CERTAIN REQUIREMENTS TO EXPAND CHOICE.—

'(1) IN GENERAL.—In the case of an entity that seeks to offer a prescription drug plan in a State under section 1855 of this title, the Administrator shall waive the requirement of subsection (a)(1) that the entity be licensed in that State if the Administrator determines, based on the application and other information submitted to the Administrator, that any of the grounds for approval of the application described in paragraph (2) have been met.

'(2) GROUNDS FOR APPROVAL.—The grounds for approval under this paragraph are the grounds for approval described in subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C) of section 1855(a)(2), and also include the application by a State of any grounds other than those required under Federal law.

"'(a) APPLICATION OF WAIVER PROCEDURES.—With respect to an application for a waiver (or a waiver granted) under this subsection, the provisions of subparagraphs (E), (F), and (G) of section 1855(a)(2) shall apply.

"'(A) LICENSURE DOES NOT SUBSTITUTE FOR OR CONSTITUTE CERTIFICATION.—The fact that an entity is licensed in accordance with subsection (a)(1) does not mean the entity to meet other requirements imposed under this Act for a PDP sponsor.

"'(B) REFERENCES TO CERTAIN PROVISIONS.—For purposes of (i) subparagraphs (A) and (B) of section 1855(a)(2) under this subsection to prescription drug plans and PDP sponsors—

"'(1) A reference to a waiver application under section 1855 shall be treated as a reference to a waiver application under paragraph (1); and

"'(2) A reference to solvency standards shall be treated as a reference to solvency standards established under subsection (d).

"'(C) SOLVENCY STANDARDS FOR NON-LICENSED SPONSORS.—

"'(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Administrator shall establish, by not later than October 1, 2004, financial solvency and capital adequacy standards that any entity that does not meet the requirements of subsection (a)(1) must meet to qualify as a PDP sponsor under this part.

"'(2) COMPLIANCE WITH STANDARDS.—Each PDP sponsor that is not licensed by a State under subsection (a)(1) and for which a waiver application has been approved under subsection (a) (or a waiver granted) under this subsection to prescription drug plans and PDP sponsors shall—

"'(A) meet the requirements of paragraph (1); and

"'(B) establish solvency standards that, if the entity is offering a prescription drug plan to adjoining or additional areas or to establish such a plan (including the provision of annual comparability information, maintenance of a toll-free hotline, and the use of non-Federal entities), shall—

"'(1) meet standards established under this part.

"'(B) REQUIRED FOR DIFFERENT PLAN SPONSORS.—The requirement of subparagraph (A) is not satisfied with respect to an area if only one PDP sponsor or one entity that offers a MA-EFFS Rx plan offers all the qualifying plans in the area.

"'(C) GUARANTEEING ACCESS TO COVERAGE.—In order to assure access under paragraph (1) and consistent with paragraph (3), the Administrator may establish additional plan sponsors or waiving the application of authority under this subsection. The Administrator may provide partial underwriting of risk by PDP sponsors to expand the service area under an existing prescription drug plan to adjoining or additional areas or to establish such a plan (including offering such a plan on a regional or national basis), but only so long as (and to the extent necessary) to assure the access guaranteed under paragraph (1).

"'(D) LIMITATION ON AUTHORITY.—In exercising authority under this subsection, the Administrator—

"'(1) shall provide for the full underwriting of financial risk for any PDP sponsor; and

"'(2) shall seek to maximize the assumption of financial risk by PDP sponsors or entities offering a MA-EFFS Rx plan.

"'(E) REPORTS.—The Administrator shall, in each annual report to Congress under section 1860(b)(1), include information on the exercise of authority under this subsection. The Administrator also shall include such recommendations as may be appropriate to modify the exercise of such authority, including minimizing the assumption of financial risk.

"'(F) QUALIFYING PLAN DEFINED.—For purposes of this subsection, the term 'qualifying plan' means a prescription drug plan or a MA-EFFS Rx plan.

"'(1) IN GENERAL.—Each PDP sponsor shall submit to the Administrator the information described in paragraph (2) in the same manner as is submitted by an organization under section 1839.

"'(2) INFORMATION SUBMITTED.—The information described in paragraph (2) is the following:

"'(1) COVERAGE PROVIDED.—Information on the qualified prescription drug coverage to be provided.

"'(2) ACTUARIAL VALUE.—Information on the actuarial value of the coverage.

"'(3) BID AND PREMIUM.—Information on the bids and premium for the coverage, including whether an actuarial cost attributable to benefits in excess of standard coverage,

"'(4) THE REDUCTION IN SUCH BID RESULTING FROM THE REINSURANCE SUBSIDY PAYMENTS PROVIDED UNDER SECTION 1860–8.

"'(5) ADDITIONAL INFORMATION.—The information described in paragraph (2) shall include such other information as the Administrator may require to carry out this part.

"'(3) REVIEW OF INFORMATION; NEGOTIATION AND APPROVAL OF PREMUMS.—

"'(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), the Administrator shall review the information filed under paragraph (2) for the purpose of conducting negotiations and determining whether to accept the bids and premiums submitted under subsection only if the premium accurately reflects both (i) the actuarial value of the benefits provided, and (ii) the 73 percent average subsidy provided under section 1860–5 for the standard benefit.

"'(B) UNIFORM BID AND PREMIUM.—

"'(1) IN GENERAL.—The bid and premium for a prescription drug plan under this section shall not vary among enrollees in the plan in the same service area.

"'(2) CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in paragraph (1) shall be construed as preventing the imposition of a late enrollment penalty under section 1860–1(c)(1)(B).

"'(3) COLLECTION.—

"'(1) BENEFICIARY'S OPTION OF PAYMENT THROUGH WITHHOLDING FROM SOCIAL SECURITY PAYMENT OR USE OF ELECTRONIC FUNDS TRANSFER MECHANISM.—In accordance with regulations, a PDP sponsor shall permit each enrollee, at the enrollee's option, to make payments through withholding from benefit payments in the manner provided under section 1839 or through an electronic funds transfer mechanism (such as automatic charges of an account at a financial institution or a credit card) or otherwise. All premium payments that are withheld under this paragraph shall be...
credited to the Medicare Prescription Drug Trust Fund and shall be paid to the PDP sponsor involved.

(2) Offsetting.—Reductions in premiums for costs-sharing subsidies under paragraphs (1)(A) and (B) as a result of a selection of a MA-EFFS Rx plan may be used to reduce the premium otherwise imposed under paragraph (1).

(3) Premium Amount for Subsidized Low-Income Individuals.—If there is no standard prescription drug coverage (as defined in paragraph (2)) offered in an area, in the case of an individual who is eligible for a premium amount for individuals with incomes at 150 percent of the Federal poverty level, the Medicare Advantage monthly premium may be used in lieu of the reference premium amount for the purpose of applying this section if the individual residing in the area is the beneficiary premium (as defined in section 1854(b)(2)(B)).

(4) Reference Premium Amount As Full Premium for Subsidized Low-Income Individuals if No Standard (or Equivalent) Coverage in an Area.—If there is no standard prescription drug coverage (as defined in paragraph (2)) offered in an area, the PDP sponsor of any prescription drug plan offered in the area (and any entity offering a MA-EFFS Rx plan in the area) shall accept the reference premium amount (under paragraph (3)) as payment in full for the premium charge for qualified prescription drug coverage.

(2) Standard Prescription Drug Coverage Defined.—For purposes of this subsection, the term ‘standard prescription drug coverage’ means qualified prescription drug coverage (as described in section 1927(k)(7)(A)(I)) and for purposes of subparagraph (A), the term ‘reference premium amount’ means, with respect to qualified prescription drug coverage, the amount described in paragraph (1)(A) a prescription drug plan that—

(i) provides standard coverage (or alternative prescription drug coverage the actuarial value of which is greater than that of standard coverage), the plan's PDP premium; or

(ii) provides alternative prescription drug coverage the actuarial value of which is equivalent to that of standard coverage, the plan's PDP premium; or

(iii) meets the requirements described in subparagraph (D).

(3) Determination Of Eligibility.—

(A) Subsidy Eligible Individual Defined.—For purposes of this section, subject to subparagraph (D), the term ‘subsidy eligible individual’ means an individual who—

(i) is eligible for a subsidy equal to 100 percent of the amount described in subparagraph (b)(1) for individuals with incomes at 135 percent of such level to 6 percent of such amount for individuals with incomes at 150 percent of such level.

(ii) has income below 150 percent of the Federal poverty line; and

(iii) meets the requirements described in subparagraph (D).

(B) Determination of whether an individual residing in a State is a subsidy eligible individual and the amount of such individual’s income shall be determined under the State medicad plan for the Low-Income Individuals under title XIX or under any alternative State plan under section 1115, such determination shall be made under arrangements made by the Administrator. There are authorized to be appropriated to the Social Security Administration such sums as may be necessary for the determination of eligibility under this subparagraph.

(C) Income Determination.—For purposes of applying this section:

(i) income shall be determined in the manner described in section 1902(b)(1)(B); and

(ii) the official poverty line means the official poverty line (as defined by the Office of Management and Budget, and revised annually in accordance with section 672(b) of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981) applicable to a family of the size involved.

(D) Resource Standard Applied to Be Based on Three Times SSI Resource Standard.—The resource requirement of this subparagraph is that an individual’s resources (as determined under section 1613 for purposes of the Medicare income security program) do not exceed—

(i) for 2006 three times the maximum amount of resources that an individual may have and obtain benefits under that program; and

(ii) for a subsequent year the resource limitation established under this clause for the previous year multiplied by the annual percentage increase in the consumer price index (all items; U.S. city average) as of September of such previous year.

Any resource limitation established under this clause that is in a multiple of $10 shall be rounded to the nearest multiple of $10.

(1) In General.—The premium subsidy amount described in this subsection for an individual residing in an area is the benchmark premium amount (as defined in paragraph (3) for qualified prescription drug coverage offered under this section or any late enrollment period under section 1860D-1(c)(2)(B)); or

(2) Limitation on Charges.—In the case of an individual receiving cost-sharing subsidies under section (a)(1)(B), the PDP sponsor or entity offering a MA-EFFS Rx plan may not charge more than $5 per prescription.

(3) Application of Indexing Rules.—The provisions of subsection (a)(5) shall apply to the dollar amount specified in paragraph (2) in the same manner as they apply to the dollar amounts specified in subsections (a)(1)(A) and (B).

(4) Administration of Subsidy Program.—The Administrator shall provide a mechanism whereby an individual who is determined to be a subsidy eligible individual and who is enrolled in prescription drug plan or is enrolled in a MA-EFFS Rx plan

(1) the Administrator provides for a notification of the PDP sponsor or the entity offering the MA-EFFS Rx plan involved that the individual is determined to be a subsidy eligible individual as applicable; and

(2) Nothing in this subsection shall be construed as preventing a plan or provider from waiving or reducing the amount of cost-sharing otherwise applicable.

(5) Indexing Dollar Amounts.—

(A) Full Premium Subsidy Reduction and Revenue from Prescription Drug Premiums.—The amount described in paragraph (1)(B) for 2007 shall be the dollar amounts specified in such paragraph increased by the annual percentage increase described in section 1902(b)(5) (relating to growth in medicare prescription drug costs per beneficiary) for the year involved.

(B) Premium Subsidy Amount.—

(1) In General.—The premium subsidy amount described in this subsection for an individual residing in an area is the benchmark premium amount (as defined in paragraphs) for qualified prescription drug coverage offered by the prescription drug plan or the MA-EFFS Rx plan in which the individual is enrolled.

(2) Benchmark Premium Amount Defined.—For purposes of this subsection, the term ‘benchmark premium amount’ means, with respect to qualified prescription drug coverage the actuarial value of which is greater than that of standard coverage, the premium amount described in clause (i) multiplied by the ratio of (I) the actuarial value of standard coverage, to (II) the actuarial value of the alternative coverage.

(3) Indexing Dollar Amounts.—The amount described in paragraph (1)(B) for the preceding year increased by the annual percentage increase described in section 1902(b)(5) (relating to growth in medicare prescription drug costs per beneficiary) for the year involved.

(4) Determination of Eligibility.—

(A) Subsidy Eligible Individual Defined.—For purposes of this section, subject to subparagraph (D), the term ‘subsidy eligible individual’ means an individual who—

(i) is eligible for a subsidy equal to 100 percent of the amount described in paragraph (3) of such section for individuals with incomes at 135 percent of the Federal poverty level, the individual is entitled under this section to an income-related premium subsidy determined under this subparagraph.

(ii) has income below 150 percent of the Federal poverty level, the individual is entitled under this section to an income-related premium subsidy determined under this subparagraph.

(2) Construction.—Nothing in this section shall be construed as preventing a PDP sponsor or entity offering a MA-EFFS Rx plan from reducing to 0 the cost-sharing otherwise applicable to generic drugs.

(3) Construction.—Nothing in this section shall be construed as preventing a PDP sponsor or entity offering a MA-EFFS Rx plan from reducing to 0 the cost-sharing otherwise applicable to generic drugs.

(4) Treatment of Conforming Medicare Policies.—For purposes of this section, the term ‘pretax savings’ includes a medicare supplemental policy described in section 1860D-8(b)(4).

(5) Indexing Dollar Amounts.—

(A) In General.—The amount described in paragraph (1)(B) for a subsequent year shall be the dollar amounts specified in such paragraph increased by the annual percentage increase described in section 1902(b)(5) for the year involved.

(B) For Subsequent Years.—The dollar amounts applied under paragraphs (1)(B) for a subsequent year shall be the dollar amounts specified in such paragraph increased by the annual percentage increase described in section 1902(b)(5) for the year involved.

(6) Determination of Eligibility.—

(1) In General.—The premium subsidy amount described in this subsection for an individual residing in an area is the benchmark premium amount (as defined in paragraph (3) for qualified prescription drug coverage offered under this section or any late enrollment period under section 1860D-1(c)(2)(B)); or

(2) Limitation on Charges.—In the case of an individual receiving cost-sharing subsidies under subsection (a)(1)(B), the PDP sponsor or entity offering a MA-EFFS Rx plan may not charge more than $5 per prescription.

(3) Application of Indexing Rules.—The provisions of subsection (a)(5) shall apply to the dollar amount specified in paragraph (2) in the same manner as they apply to the dollar amounts specified in subsections (a)(1)(A) and (B).

(4) Administration of Subsidy Program.—The Administrator shall provide a mechanism whereby an individual who is determined to be a subsidy eligible individual and who is enrolled in prescription drug plan or is enrolled in a MA-EFFS Rx plan

(1) the Administrator provides for a notification of the PDP sponsor or the entity offering the MA-EFFS Rx plan involved that the individual is determined to be a subsidy eligible individual as applicable; and

(2) Nothing in this subsection shall be construed as preventing a plan or provider from waiving or reducing the amount of cost-sharing otherwise applicable.
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[3] Employer and union special subsidy amounts.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of subsection (a), the special subsidy payment amounts specified in paragraph (1) for prescription drug plans that do not cover retiree prescription drugs under section 1860D–2(b)(4) shall be increased by any such supplemental coverage (not including payment of any premium referred to in subparagraph (B)) that shall be treated as primary coverage to which section 1860D–2(b)(2) applies.

(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this section, the Federal Supplementary Medical Insurance Trust Fund under such section.

(ii) such a prescription drug plan or MA-EFFS Rx plan, that is supplemental to the standard coverage; or

(iii) the term 'benchmarked bid amount' means, with respect to qualified prescription drug coverage offered under—

(1) a prescription drug plan that—

(A) IN GENERAL.—There is created on the first day of January in each year a trust fund to be known as the 'Medicare Prescription Drug Trust Fund' (in this section referred to as the 'Trust Fund'). The Trust Fund shall consist of such gifts and bequests as may be accepted by the Medicare Trustee and be contributed to the Trust Fund under this section. The Trust Fund shall be held in trust for the use and benefit of the beneficiaries thereof and shall be invested in accordance with section 201(g).

(c) APPORTIONMENTS.—Any provision of law that relates to the application of section 1935(c).

(d) Relation to Solvency Requirements.—Any provision of law that relates to the solvency of the Trust Fund under this part shall take into account the Trust Fund and amounts receivable by, or payable from, the Trust Fund.

SEC. 1860D–10. DEFINITIONS; APPLICATION TO MEDICARE ADVANTAGE AND EFFS PROGRAMS; EFFECTS OF PROVISIONS IN PART C.

(a) Definitions.—For purposes of this part—

(1) COVERED OUTPATIENT DRUGS.—The term 'covered outpatient drugs' is defined in section 1860D–2(f).

(3) Initial Coverage Limit.—The term 'initial coverage limit' means such limit as established under section 1860D–2(b)(3), or, in the case of coverage that is not standard coverage, the comparable limit (if any) established under the coverage.

(5) Prescription Drug Plan.—The term 'prescription drug plan' means a plan that—

(a) is offered under a policy, contract, or plan by a PDP sponsor pursuant to, and in accordance with, a contract between the Administrator and the sponsor under section 1860D–4(b);

(b) provides qualified prescription drug coverage, and

(c) satisfies the requirements of the section 1860D–3 for a prescription drug plan.
"(6) Qualified prescription drug coverage.—The term ‘qualified prescription drug coverage’ is defined in section 1860D–2(b).

"(7) Standard coverage.—The term ‘standard coverage’ is defined in section 1860D–2(b).

"(8) Insurance risk.—The term ‘insurance risk’ means, with respect to a participating pharmacy, risk of the type commonly assumed only by insurers licensed by a State and does not include payment variations designed to reflect performance-based measures of activities within the control of the pharmacy, such as formulary compliance and pharmacy risk.

"(b) Offer of qualified prescription drug coverage under Medicare Advantage and EFS plans.—

"(1) Part D of Medicare Advantage plan.—Medicare Advantage organizations are required to offer Medicare Advantage plans that include qualified prescription drug coverage under part C pursuant to section 1851(j).

"(2) As part of EFS plans.—EFS organizations are required to offer EFS plans that include qualified prescription drug coverage under part E pursuant to section 1860–2(d).

"(c) Application of Part C provisions under this Part.—For purposes of applying provisions of part C under this part with respect to a prescription drug plan and a PDP sponsor, unless otherwise provided in this part, any reference to part C included a reference to a prescription drug plan.

"(d) Any reference to a Medicare Advantage or other plan included a reference to a prescription drug plan.

"(e) Any reference to a provider-sponsored organization included a reference to a PDP sponsor.

"(f) An enrollee to a contract under section 1856(z) included a reference to a contract under section 1860–4(b); and

"(g) Any reference to part C included a reference to this part.

Sec. 102. Offering of qualified prescription drug coverage under Medicare Advantage and ENHANCED Fee-For-Service (EFS) program.

(a) Medicare Advantage.—Section 1851 (42 U.S.C. 1395w–21) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(i) Availability of prescription drug benefits and subsidies.—

"(1) Offering of qualified prescription drug coverage.—A Medicare Advantage organization on and after January 1, 2006—

"(A) may not offer a Medicare Advantage plan described in section 1851(a)(2)(A) in an area unless either that plan or another Medicare Advantage plan offered by the organization in that area includes qualified prescription drug coverage and

"(B) may not offer the prescription drug coverage (other than that required under parts A and B) to an enrollee under a Medicare Advantage plan offered by the organization on and after January 1, 2006, with respect to such coverage unless the requirements of this subsection with respect to such coverage are met.

"(2) Requirement for election of part D coverage to obtain qualified prescription drug coverage.—For purposes of this part, an individual who has not elected qualified prescription drug coverage under section 1860D–1(b) shall be treated as being ineligible to enroll in a Medicare Advantage plan under this part that offers prescription drug coverage under this subsection, including a detailed description of the Secretary’s plans to implement this part in a manner consistent with applicable State and Federal laws designed to protect the safety and quality of care of patients of nursing facilities and other long-term care facilities.

"(3) Compliance with certain additional beneficiary protections for prescription drug coverage.—With respect to the offering of qualified prescription drug coverage by a Medicare Advantage organization under this part on and after January 1, 2006, the organization and plan shall meet the requirement of subsection (a)(3) of section 1860D–3 in the same manner as they apply to a PDP sponsor and a prescription drug plan under part D and shall submit to the Secretary the information described in section 1860D–6(a)(2). The Administrator shall waive such requirements to the extent the Administrator determines that such requirements otherwise applicable to the organization or plan under this part.
to enroll in an EFFS plan under this part that offers such coverage.

"(3) COMPLIANCE WITH CERTAIN ADDITIONAL BENEFICIARY PROTECTIONS FOR PRESCRIPTION DRUG COVERAGE.—With respect to the offering of qualified prescription drug coverage by an EFFS organization under this part, the organization and plan shall meet the requirements of paragraph (a) through (d) of section 1860D–3 in the same manner as they apply to a PDP sponsor and a prescription drug plan under part D and shall submit to the Administrator the information described in section 1860D–6(a)(2). The Administrator shall waive such requirements to the extent the Administrator determines that such requirements duplicate requirements otherwise applicable to the organization or plan under this part.

"(4) AVAILABILITY OF PREMIUM AND COST-SHARING SUBSIDIES.—In the case of low-income individuals who are enrolled in an EFFS plan that provides qualified prescription drug coverage, premium and cost-sharing subsidies are provided for such coverage under section 1860D–7.

"(5) AVAILABILITY OF DIRECT AND REIMBURSEMENT SUBSIDIES TO REDUCE BIDS AND PREMIUMS.—Payments are provided for direct and reinsurance subsidy payments for providing qualified prescription drug coverage under this part under section 1860D–8.

"(6) PHASED-IN FEDERAL ASSUMPTION OF PRESCRIPTION DRUG COSTS FOR DUALLY ELIGIBLE INDIVIDUALS.—In the case of an EFFS plan that includes qualified prescription drug coverage, with respect to an enrollee in such plan there shall be a single premium for both drug and non-drug coverage provided under the plan.

"(7) QUALIFIED PRESCRIPTION DRUG COVERAGE.—STANDARD COVERAGE.—For purposes of this part, the terms 'qualified prescription drug coverage' and 'standard coverage' have the meanings given such terms in section 1860D–2.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 1851 (42 U.S.C. 1395w–21) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1)—

(A) by inserting "(other than qualified prescription drug benefits)" after "benefits";

(B) by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (B) and inserting a comma; and

(C) by adding after and below subparagraph (B) the following:

"(e) PHASED-IN FEDERAL ASSUMPTION OF MEDICAID RESPONSIBILITY FOR PREMIUM AND COST-SHARING SUBSIDIES FOR DUALLY ELIGIBLE INDIVIDUALS.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 1903(a)(1) (42 U.S.C. 1396a(a)) is amended—

(A) by inserting "(other than qualified prescription drug coverage)" after "medicare benefits";

(B) by striking the period at the end of subsection (c)(2)(B) and inserting a semicolon; and

(C) by adding after and below subparagraph (B) the following:

"(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section apply to coverage provided on or after January 1, 2006.

SEC. 103. MEDICAID AMENDMENTS.

(a) DETERMINATIONS OF ELIGIBILITY FOR LOW-INCOME SUBSIDIES.—

(1) REQUIREMENT.—Section 1902(a)(42) U.S.C. 1396a(a) is amended—

(A) by striking "and" at the end of paragraph (4);

(B) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (6) and inserting "; and"; and

(C) by inserting after paragraph (6) the following new paragraph:

"(6) The following determinations shall be made:

(A) Eligibility for low-income eligibility determinations under section 1935(a).

(2) NEW SECTION.—Title XIX is further amended by redesignating section 1935 as section 1936; and

(b) by inserting after section 1934 the following new section:

"(d) MEDICAID BENEFACTOR PROTECTIONS RELATING TO LOW-INCOME PRESCRIPTION DRUG BENEFIT

"SEC. 1935. (a) REQUIREMENT FOR MAKING ELIGIBILITY DETERMINATIONS FOR LOW-INCOME SUBSIDIES.—As a condition of its State plan under this title under section 1902(a)(66) and receipt of any Federal financial assistance under section 190(a), a State shall—

"(1) inform the Administrator of the Medicaid program of the extent to which such determinations in cases in which such eligibility is established; and

"(2) provide such administrative determinations in cases in which such eligibility is established; and

"(3) otherwise provide such Administrator with such information as may be required to carry out part D of title XVIII (including section 1860D–7).

(b) PAYMENTS FOR ADDITIONAL ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The amounts expended by a State in carrying out subsection (a) are, subject to paragraph (2), expenditures reimbursable under the appropriate paragraph of section 190(a); except that, notwithstanding any other provision of such section, the applicable Federal matching rates with respect to such expenditures under such section shall be increased as follows (but in no case shall the rate as so increased exceed 100 percent):

"(i) 2006 is 3⁄4 percent;

"(ii) 2007 is 3⁄2 percent; or

"(iii) 2008 is 5⁄4 percent.

"(2) PHASED-IN FEDERAL ASSUMPTION OF MEDICAID RESPONSIBILITY FOR PREMIUM AND COST-SHARING SUBSIDIES.—As a condition of its State plan under this title under section 1902(a)(66), a State shall—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of section 1903(a) (42 U.S.C. 1396a(a)), the amount provided for medical assistance under section 1106 of such title for the provision of covered outpatient drugs (as defined in section 1860D–2(f)) is increased by the applicable percent (as defined in clause (ii)) of the amount otherwise payable (but for this subsection) by the State.

"(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall not apply to individuals who are eligible to obtain qualified prescription drug coverage under section 1860D–1.

(d) TREATMENT OF TERRITORIES.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 1955 as so inserted and amended, is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(2) PHASED-IN FEDERAL ASSUMPTION OF MEDICAID RESPONSIBILITY FOR PREMIUM AND COST-SHARING SUBSIDIES FOR DUAL ELIGIBLE INDIVIDUALS.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 1903(a)(1) (42 U.S.C. 1396a(a)) is amended by inserting after the semicolon the following: "(i) 2006 is 93 1⁄3 percent; or

(ii) 2007 is 91 2⁄3 percent; or

(iii) 2008 is 90 percent.

"(2) COORDINATION.—The State shall provide the Federal assistance in cases in which the State and the Medicaid program of the State shall be increased by the amount specified in paragraph (1). The amounts determined in such a case shall be increased by the applicable percent, as defined in clause (ii) of paragraph (1), of the amount otherwise payable under such section.

"(3) AMOUNT DESCRIBED.—Section 1903(a)(1), as amended, is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(e) MEDICAID PROVIDING WRAP-AROUND BENEFITS.—Section 1955, as so inserted and amended, is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(f) ADDITIONAL PROVISIONS.—

"(1) MEDICAID AS SECONDARY PAYOR.—In the case of an individual who is entitled to qualified prescription drug coverage under a prescription drug plan under part D of title XVIII (or under a MA-EFFS Rx plan under this part) that offers such coverage, the amount otherwise payable under such section shall be increased by the applicable percent (as defined in section 1860D–2(f)) to the extent payment is made by the Medicaid program for similar coverage under such section.

"(2) IN GENERAL.—The amount specified for a year is equal to the product of—

"(I) the aggregate amount specified in subparagraph (B); and

"(II) the applicable percent.

"(3) INCREASED AMOUNT.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—The amount specified in paragraph (2) is increased by the applicable percent for—

"(i) 2006 is 3⁄4 percent;

"(ii) 2007 is 3⁄2 percent; or

"(iii) 2008 is 5⁄4 percent.

"(B) PHASED-IN FEDERAL ASSUMPTION OF MEDICAID RESPONSIBILITY FOR PREMIUM AND COST-SHARING SUBSIDIES.—As a condition of its State plan under this title under section 1902(a)(66), a State shall—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of section 1903(a), a State shall—

"(A) provide medical assistance with respect to the provision of prescription drugs to medicare beneficiaries, the amount otherwise determined under section 1106 of such title (as increased under section 1108(g)) for the State shall be increased by the amount specified in paragraph (2).

"(2) PLAN.—The plan described in paragraph (1) is a plan that—

"(A) provides medical assistance with respect to the provision of covered outpatient drugs (as defined in section 1860D–2(f)) to low-income medicare beneficiaries;

"(B) assures that additional amounts received by the State that are attributable to the operation of this subsection are used only for such assistance.
"(ii) the amount specified in section 1108(g)(1) for that State, divided by the sum of the amounts specified in such section for all such States.

"(B) AEGREGATE AMOUNT.—The aggregate amount specified in this subparagraph for—

"(i) 2006, is equal to $25,000,000; or

"(ii) a subsequent year, is equal to the aggregate amount specified in this subparagraph for the previous year increased by annual percentage increase specified in section 18003(b)(5) for the year involved.

"(4) The Administrator shall submit to Congress a report on the application of this subsection and may include in the report recommendations as the Administrator deems appropriate.

"(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 1108(f) (42 U.S.C. 1395l(f)) is amended by inserting "and" after subsection (h)(1)(B) after "Subject to subsection (g)."

"(e) AMENDMENT TO BEST PRICE.—Section 1927(c)(3)(C)(i) (42 U.S.C. 1395h-8(c)(3)(C)(i)) is amended—

"(1) by striking "and" at the end of subclause (iii);

"(2) by striking the period at the end of subclause (iv) and inserting "; and"; and

"(3) by adding at the end the following new subclause:

"(V) any prices charged which are negotiated by a prescription drug plan under part D of title XVIII, by a MA-EFFS Rx plan under part C or E of such title with respect to covered prescription drugs, or by a qualified retiree prescription drug plan (as defined in section 1860D-8(f)(1)) with respect to such drugs on behalf of entities entitled to benefits under part A or enrolled under part B of such title.

SECTION 104. MEDIGAP TRANSITION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1882 (42 U.S.C. 1395ss) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(iv) COVERAGE OF PRESCRIPTION DRUGS.—(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, except as provided in paragraph (3) no new medicare supplemental policy that provides coverage of expenses for prescription drugs may be issued under this section or after January 1, 2006, to an individual unless it replaces a medicare supplemental policy that was issued to that individual before January 1, 2006, and from continuing to receive benefits under such policy on and after such date.

"(2) ISSUANCE OF SUBSTITUTE POLICIES FOR BENEFICIARIES ENROLLED WITH A PLAN UNDER PART D.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—The issuer of a medicare supplemental policy—

"(i) may deny or condition the issuance or effectiveness of a medicare supplemental policy that has a benefit package classified as 'A', 'B', 'C', 'D', 'E', 'F', or 'G' under the standards established under subparagraph (p)(2) and that is offered and is available for issuance to new enrollees by such issuer;

"(ii) may not discriminate in the pricing of such policy, because of health status, claims experience, receipt of health care, or medical condition; and

"(iii) shall not impose an exclusion of benefits based on a pre-existing condition under such policy;

in the case of an individual described in subparagraph (B) who seeks to enroll under the policy not later than 63 days after the date of the termination of enrollment described in such paragraph and who submits evidence of the continuation of enrollment, or disenrollment, and along with the application for such medicare supplemental policy.

"(B) INDIVIDUAL COVERED.—An individual described in this subparagraph is an individual who—

"(i) enrolls in a prescription drug plan under part D; and

"(ii) at the time of such enrollment was enrolled and terminates enrollment in a medicare supplemental policy which has a benefit package classified as 'A', 'B', 'C', 'D', 'E', 'F', or 'G' under the standards referred to in subparagraph (A) or (i) terminates enrollment in a policy to which such standards do not apply but which provides benefits for prescription drugs.

"(C) ENFORCEMENT.—The provisions of paragraph (4) of subsection (s) shall apply to the requirements of this paragraph in the same manner as they apply to the requirements of such subsection.

"(3) NEW STANDARDS.—In applying subsection (p)(1)(E) (including permitting the NAIC to revise its model regulations in response to changes in law) with respect to the change in benefits resulting from title I of the Medicare Prescription Drug and Modernization Act of 2003, with respect to policies issued to individuals who are enrolled in a plan under part D, the changes in standards shall provide for maintaining (for the benefit packages described in paragraph (2)(B)(iii) that included coverage for prescription drugs) two benefit packages that may provide for coverage of cost-sharing (other than the prescription drug deductible) with respect to qualified prescription drug coverage under such part. The two benefit packages shall be consistent with the following:

"(A) FIRST NEW POLICY.—The policy described in this subparagraph has the following benefits, notwithstanding any other provision of this section relating to a core benefit package:

"(i) Coverage of 50 percent of the cost-sharing otherwise applicable under parts A and B, except for coverage of 100 percent of any cost-sharing otherwise applicable for preventive benefits.

"(ii) No coverage of the part B deductible.

"(iii) Coverage for all hospital inpatient care for long stays (as in the current core benefit package).

"(iv) A limitation on annual out-of-pocket expenditures under parts A and B to $4,000 in 2005 (or, in a subsequent year, to such limitation for the previous year increased by an appropriate inflation adjustment specified by the Secretary).

"(B) SECOND NEW POLICY.—The policy described in this subparagraph has the same benefits as the policy described in subparagraph (A), except:

"(i) Substitute '75 percent' for '50 percent' in clause (i) of such subparagraph.

"(ii) Substitute '$2,000' for '$4,000' in clause (iv) of such subparagraph.

"(D) CONSTRUCTION.—Any provision in this section or in a medicare supplemental policy relating to guaranteed renewability of coverage shall be deemed to have been met through the offering of other coverage under this subsection.

"(2) NAIC REPORT TO CONGRESS ON MEDIGAP MODERNIZATION.—The Secretary shall request the National Association of Insurance Commissioners to submit to Congress, not later than 18 months after the enactment of this Act, a report that includes recommendations on the modernization of coverage under the medigap program under section 1882 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395ss).

SECTION 105. MEDICARE PRESCRIPTION DRUG DISCOUNT CARD AND ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title XVIII is amended by inserting after section 1806 the following new sections:

"(1) SEC. 1807. (a) ESTABLISHMENT OF PROGRAM.—

"(A) TO PROVIDE PRESCRIPTION DRUG DISCOUNT CARDS TO ELIGIBLE BENEFICIARIES.—The Secretary shall establish a program to provide prescription drug discount cards to eligible beneficiaries.

"(B) TO PROVIDE FOR PRESCRIPTION DRUG ACCOUNTS AND PUBLIC CONTRIBUTIONS INTO SUCH ACCOUNTS.—The Secretary shall make available to medicare beneficiaries information regarding endorsed programs and accounts under this section.

"(2) LIMITATION OF PERIOD OF OPERATION.—The Secretary shall begin—

"(A) the card endorsement part of the program under paragraph (1)(A) as soon as practical, but which provides benefits for prescription drug discounts.

"(B) the prescription drug account part of the program under paragraph (1)(B) as soon as practical, or as soon as possible, but in no case later than September 2004.

"(3) TRANSITION.—The program under this section shall continue through 2005 throughout the United States. The Secretary shall provide for an appropriate transition and termination of such program on January 1, 2006.

"(4) VOLUNTARY NATURE OF PROGRAM.—Nothing in this section shall be construed as requiring an eligible beneficiary to enroll in the program under this section.

"(B) ELIGIBLE BENEFICIARY; ELIGIBLE ENTITY; PRESCRIPTION DRUG ACCOUNT.—For purposes of this section:

"(i) ELIGIBLE BENEFICIARY.—The term 'eligible beneficiary' means an individual who is eligible for benefits under part A or enrolled under part B who is not enrolled in a Medicare Advantage plan that offers qualified prescription drug coverage.

"(ii) ELIGIBLE ENTITY.—The term 'eligible entity' means any entity that the Secretary determines to be appropriate to provide the benefits under this section, including—

"(A) a pharmaceutical benefit management companies;

"(B) wholesale and retail pharmacy delivery systems;

"(C) insurers;

"(D) Medicare Advantage organizations;

"(E) other entities; or

"(F) any combination of the entities described in subparagraphs (A) through (E).

"(3) PRESCRIPTION DRUG ACCOUNT.—The term 'prescription drug account' means, with respect to an eligible beneficiary, an account established for the benefit of that beneficiary under section 1807A.

"(C) ENROLLMENT IN ENDORSED PLAN.—

"(1) ESTABLISHMENT OF PROCESS.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall establish a process through which an eligible beneficiary may make an election to enroll under an endorsed program.

"(B) REQUIREMENT OF ENROLLMENT.—An eligible beneficiary must enroll under this section with an endorsed program.

"(2) REQUIREMENT OF ENROLLMENT.—An eligible beneficiary may make an election to enroll under this section with an endorsed program.

"(3) LIMITATION ON ENROLLMENT.—

"(I) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided under this subparagraph in such exceptional circumstances as the Secretary may provide, an eligible individual shall have the opportunity to enroll under this section during the initial, general enrollment period as soon as possible after the date of the enactment of this section and annually thereafter.
The Secretary shall specify the form, manner, and timing of such election but shall permit the exercise of such election at the time the individual is eligible to enroll. The annual open enrollment periods shall be coordinated with those provided under the Medicare Advantage program under part C.

(ii) Reenrollment after termination of enrollment in the Medicare Advantage program under part C. In the case of an individual who is enrolled under this section and who subsequently enrolls in a Medicare Advantage plan that provides qualified prescription drug coverage under part C, the individual shall be given the opportunity to reenroll under this section at the time the individual discontinues the enrollment under such plan.

(iii) Late enrollment. The Secretary shall permit individuals to elect to enroll under this section at times other than as permitted under the previous provisions of this paragraph.

(D) Termination of enrollment. An enrollee under this section shall be disenrolled—

(i) upon enrollment in a Medicare Advantage plan under part C that provides qualified prescription drug coverage;

(ii) upon the applicable enrollment fee under subsection (f);

(iii) upon termination of coverage under part A or part B; or

(iv) if a notice submitted to the Secretary in such form, manner, and time as the Secretary shall provide.

Terminations of enrollment under this subparagraph shall be effective as specified by the Secretary in regulations.

(2) Enrollment periods.

(A) In general. Except as provided under this subparagraph, an eligible beneficiary may not enroll in the program under this part during any period after the beneficiary's initial enrollment period under part B (as determined under section 1837).

(B) Open enrollment period for current beneficiaries. The Secretary shall establish a period, which shall begin on the date on which the Secretary first begins to accept elections for enrollment under this section and shall end not earlier than 3 months later, during which any eligible beneficiary under this section may elect to enroll in a Medicare Advantage program and enroll under such program during any period after the beneficiary's initial enrollment period under part B (as determined under section 1837).

(C) Special enrollment period in case of termination of coverage under a group health plan. The Secretary shall provide for a special enrollment period beginning under this section in the same manner as is provided under section 1837(i) with respect to part B, except that for purposes of this subparagraph any reason of the individual's (or the individual's spouse's) current employment status shall be treated as being deleted.

(3) Period of coverage.

(A) In general. Except as provided in subparagraph (B) and subject to subparagraph (C), an eligible beneficiary's coverage under this section shall not be effective for the period provided under section 1838, as if that section applied to the individual.

(B) Enrollment during open and special enrollment. Subject to subparagraph (C), an eligible beneficiary who enrolls under the program under this section during any period after the enrollment period described in subparagraph (B) or (C) of paragraph (2) shall be entitled to the benefits under this section beginning on the first day of the month following the month in which such enrollment occurs.

(d) Selection of an eligible entity for access to negotiated prices.

(1) Process.

(A) In general. The Secretary shall establish a process through which an eligible beneficiary who is enrolled under this section shall select any eligible entity, that has been awarded a contract under this section and serves the State in which the beneficiary resides, to provide access to negotiated prices under this paragraph.

(B) Rules. In establishing the process under subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall use rules similar to the rules for enrollment and disenrollment under a Medicare Advantage program under section 1851 (including the special election periods under subsection (e)(4) of such section), including—

(i) an individual shall only be permitted to select more than one eligible entity at any time; and

(ii) an individual shall only be permitted (except for unusual circumstances) to change the selection made under this paragraph.

In carrying out clause (ii), the Secretary may consider a change in residential setting (such as placement in a nursing facility) to be an unusual circumstance.

(C) Default selection. In establishing such process, the Secretary shall provide an equitable method for selecting an eligible entity for individuals who enroll under this section and fail to make such a selection.

(2) Competition. Eligible entities with a contract under this section shall compete for beneficiaries on the basis of discounts, formularies, drugs, and other services provided for under the contract.

(3) Providing enrollment, selection, and coverage information to beneficiaries. (A) Activities. The Secretary shall provide for activities under this section to broadly disseminate information to eligible beneficiaries (and prospective eligible beneficiaries) regarding enrollment under this section, the selection of eligible entities, and the prescription drug coverage made available by eligible entities with a contract under this section.

(B) Special rule for first enrollment under the program. To the extent practicable, the activities described in paragraph (1) shall ensure that eligible beneficiaries are provided with such information at least 60 days prior to the first enrollment period described in subsection (c).

(i) Enrollee fee. (1) Except as provided in paragraph (3), the annual enrollment fee under this section is conditioned upon payment of an annual enrollment fee of $30. Such fee for 2004 shall include any portion of the $30 in the special enrollment program is implemented under this section.

(ii) Collection of enrollment fee. The annual enrollment fee shall be collected and deposited in the Medicare Trust Fund in the same manner as is provided under section 1839(l)(2) relating to default enrollment of section 1851(g) (relating to priority and limitation on termination of enrollment) shall apply to selection of eligible entities under this paragraph.

(B) Nondiscrimination. An eligible entity offering prescription drug coverage under this section shall not establish a service area in a manner that would (i) relate to health status-related factors (described in section 2702(a)(1) of the Public Health Service Act) or any other factor and may not be charged and the premium or other fee as a condition of such acceptance.

(ii) The provisions of paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 1851(g) (other than subparagraph (D)) shall apply to enrollment under this section.

(C) Coverage of all portions of a State. An eligible entity with a contract under this section serves any part of a State it shall serve the entire State.

(2) Dissemination of information. (A) General. An eligible entity who has selected the entity functions.

(i) How any formulary used by the eligible entity compares with the formulary used by other eligible entities in the State and to a pharmacy network.

(ii) Any summary information about price differences.

(iii) Any summary information about negotiated prices (including discounts) for covered outpatient drugs.

(iv) Any summary information about drug coverage.

(B) Dissemination of information. (A) General. An eligible entity that has elected to provide prescription drug coverage under this section shall not be denied selection based on any health status-related factor (described in section 1837(i)) to such beneficiary. An eligible entity may apply procedures similar to those established by the Secretary under this subsection with respect to the enrollment of any additional eligible beneficiary.
(F) **Confidentiality and accuracy of enrollee records.** An eligible entity shall meet the requirements of section 1852(h) with respect to enrollees under this section the same as such provisions apply to a Medicare Advantage organization with respect to enrollees under part C. The eligible entity shall implement policies and procedures to safeguard the use and disclosure of enrollee individually identifiable health information in a manner consistent with the Federal regulations (concerning the privacy of individually identifiable health information) promulgated under section 264(c) of the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996. The eligible entity shall be treated as a covered entity for purposes of the provisions of subpart E of title 45, Code of Federal Regulations, adopted pursuant to the authority of the Secretary under section 264(c) of the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996.

(9) **Periodic reports and oversight.** The eligible entity shall submit to the Secretary periodic reports on performance, utilization, finances, and such other matters as the Secretary may require in accordance with the requirements of this subsection, including verifying the discounts and services provided.

(10) **Additional beneficiary protections.** Insofar as enrollees are not entitled to such additional requirements as the Secretary identifies to protect and promote the interest of enrollees, including requirements that ensure that enrollees may not be charged more than the lower of the negotiated retail price or the usual and customary price.

(11) **Benefits under the program through mail order.** An eligible entity (and any pharmacy contracting with such entity for the provision of prescription drugs) may dispense prescription drugs through mail order. For purposes of this paragraph, the term "prescription drugs" is not limited to covered outpatient drugs, but does not include any over-the-counter drug that is not a covered outpatient drug. The prices negotiated by an eligible entity under this paragraph shall be at no less than the usual and customary price. The term "prescription drugs" shall only be available for drugs included in such formulary.

(12) **Prohibition on charges for required services.** An eligible entity (and any pharmacy contracting with such entity for the provision of a discount under this section) shall not charge any beneficiary any amount for any services required to be provided by the entity under this section.

(13) **Restrictions on contributions.** There shall be only an annual Federal contribution under paragraph (1) for an individual if the individual is not eligible for coverage of, or assistance for, outpatient prescription drugs under the following:

(a) A Medicare plan under title XIX (including under any waiver approved under section 1115).

(b) An enrollment under a group health plan or health insurance coverage.

(c) Enrollment under a Medicare supplemental insurance policy.

(2) **Annual Federal contribution amount.** Subject to paragraph (3), in the case of an account maintained pursuant to this subsection, the annual Federal contribution amount for a plan year is $800, or more than 135 percent, but not more than 150 percent, of the poverty line, the annual Federal contribution amount for a year is $500, or more than 150 percent of the poverty line, the annual Federal contribution amount for a year is $100.

(3) **Income eligibility determinations.** The determination of whether an individual residing in a State is eligible for a contribution under paragraph (1) shall be determined under the State medicaid plan for the State under section 1902(a) or by the Social Security Administration. In the case of a State that does not operate such a medicaid plan (either under title XIX or under a statewide waiver granted under section 1115), such determination shall be made under arrangements made by the Secretary. There are authorized to be appropriated to the Social Security Administration such sums as may be necessary for the determination of eligibility under this paragraph.

(4) **Calendar year.** Insofar as the provisions of this subsection and section 1807A are not implemented for all months in 2004, the annual contribution amount under this subsection shall be prorated to reflect the portion of that year in which such provisions are in effect.

(5) **Restriction on contributions.** There shall be only an annual Federal contribution under paragraph (1) for an individual if the individual is not eligible for coverage of, or assistance for, outpatient prescription drugs under the following:

(a) A Medicare plan under title XIX (including under any waiver approved under section 1115).

(b) Enrollment under a group health plan or health insurance coverage.

(c) Enrollment under a Medicare supplemental insurance policy.

(6) **Determination of income eligibility.** In the case of an individual residing in a State that does not operate a medicaid plan (either under title XIX or under a statewide waiver granted under section 1115), the following determination shall be made under arrangements made by the Secretary:

(a) An individual is not eligible for a contribution under paragraph (1) if the individual resides in a State that does not operate such a medicaid plan (either under title XIX or under a statewide waiver granted under section 1115).

(b) An individual is not eligible for a contribution under paragraph (1) if the individual resides in a State that does not operate such a medicaid plan (either under title XIX or under a statewide waiver granted under section 1115).
"(6) Appropriation to cover net program expenditures.—There are authorized to be appropriated from time to time, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, funds to be used by the Secretary to cover net program expenditures, which term shall mean the difference between the disbursements made by the Secretary from moneys in the Treasury for the purpose of paying the costs of providing the benefits under this section and the amounts made available to the Secretary under section 1807A, in an amount equal to the amount by which the benefits and administrative costs of the benefits payable under this section exceed the sum of the portion of the enrollment fees retained by the Secretary.

(k) Definitions.—In this part and section 1807A—

(I) Covered outpatient drug.—

(A) In general.—Except as provided in this paragraph, for purposes of this section, the term 'covered outpatient drug' means—

(i) a drug that may be dispensed only upon a prescription and that is described in subparagraph (A)(i) or (A)(ii) of section 1927(k)(2); or

(ii) a biological product described in clause (i) through (iii) of subparagraph (B) of section 1861(m) or described in subparagraph (C) of such section and medical supplies associated with the injection of insulin (as defined in regulations of the Secretary), and any such term includes a vaccine licensed under section 351 of the Public Health Service Act and any use of a covered outpatient drug for a medical accepted indication (as defined in section 1927(k)(6)).

(B) Exclusions.—

(i) in general.—Such term does not include drugs or classes of drugs, or their medical uses, which may be excluded from coverage or otherwise restricted under section 1927(m)(2), other than subparagraph (E) thereof (relating to smoking cessation agents), or under section 1927(m)(7).

(ii) Avoidance of duplicate coverage.—A drug prescribed for an individual that would otherwise be a covered outpatient drug under this section shall not be so considered if payment for such drug is available under part A or B for an individual entitled to benefits under part A and enrolled under part B.

(C) Application of formulary restrictions.—A drug prescribed for an individual that would otherwise be a covered outpatient drug under this section shall not be so considered if payment for such drug is available under part A or B for an individual entitled to benefits under part A and enrolled under part B.

(D) Application of general exclusion provisions.—An eligible entity offering an endorser program that was not excluded from covered drug coverage by reason of such drug being a covered outpatient drug—

(i) for which payment would not be made if section 1927(a) applied to part D; or

(ii) which are not prescribed in accordance with the program or this section. Such exclusions are determinations subject to review pursuant to subsection (h)(5).

(Power line.—The term 'power line' means the income official poverty line (as defined by the Office of Management and Budget, and revised annually in accordance with section 6732 of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981) applicable to a family of the size involved.

(1) Authorization of Appropriations.—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this section and section 1807A.

(e) Regulatory authority.—In order to carry out this section and section 1807A in a timely manner, the Secretary may promulgate regulations that take effect on a date determined by the Secretary, after notice and pending opportunity for public comment.
account holder under this paragraph on the account holder's enrollment under section 1807 with an eligible entity that is recognized or approved by that plan.

''(2) Other amounts.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Any individual may also contribute to the account of that individual or the account of any other individual under this paragraph on the account of any other individual under this subsection.

''(B) LIMITATION.—The total amount that may be contributed to an account under subparagraph (A) during any year may not exceed the amount, regardless of who makes such contribution.

''(3) NO CONTRIBUTION PERMITTED TO RESERVE ACCOUNT.—No contribution may be made under this subsection to a reserve account.

''(4) FORM AND MANNER OF CONTRIBUTION.—The Secretary shall specify the form and manner of contributions under this subsection.

''(f) STATE CONTRIBUTIONS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—A State may enter into arrangements with the Secretary for the crediting of amounts for account holders.

''(2) FORM AND MANNER OF CONTRIBUTION.—The Secretary shall specify the form and manner of contributions under this subsection.

''(3) MEDICARE TREATMENT.—Amounts credited to accounts under this paragraph shall not be treated as medical assistance for purposes of title XIX or child health assistance for purposes of title XXI for individuals who are not qualified for such assistance.

''(4) EXCLUSION OF COSTS FROM DETERMINATION OF PART B MONTHLY PREMIUM.—Section 1839(g) (42 U.S.C. 1395r(g)) is amended—

''(A) by striking ''attributable to the application of section'' and inserting ''attributable to'';

''(B) by striking the period following the semicolon and inserting a period; and

''(C) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(2) the Voluntary Medicare Outpatient Prescription Drug Discount and Security Program under sections 1907 and 1907A.''

''(e) STATE ELIGIBILITY DETERMINATIONS.—Section 1935, as added by section 103(a)(2), is amended—

''(1) in subsection (a)(1), by inserting ''and'' before the semicolon;

''(2) in subsection (a)(3), by inserting ''and'' after ''1900D--2(b)(4)(D)(ii)''; and

''(b) UNAUTHORIZED DISCLOSURE.—Paragraph (1) of section 6103 of such Code is amended by striking ''the Secretary but not to exceed the number of representatives under paragraphs (1) and (2).''.

''(c) DEVELOPMENT OF PROPOSAL.—The Commission shall develop the proposal described in subsection (a) in a manner consistent with the following principles:

''(1) Protection of the interests of program participants in a manner that is least burdensome to states and that includes a single point of contact for enrollment and processing of benefits.

''(2) Protection of the financial and flexibility of States of interests of States, as appointed by the Secretary but not to exceed the number of representatives under paragraphs (1) and (2).''.

''(d) REPORT.—By not later than January 1, 2005, the Commission shall submit to the President and the Congress a report that contains a detailed proposal (including specific legislative or administrative recommendations, if any) and such other recommendations as the Commission deems appropriate.

''(e) SUPPORT.—The Secretary shall provide the Commission with the administrative support services necessary for the Commission to carry out its responsibilities under this section.

''(f) TERMINATION.—The Commission shall terminate 30 days after the date of submission of the report under subsection (d).

''(g) SEC. 108. ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS FOR ANNUAL FINANCIAL REPORT AND OVERSIGHT OF MEDICARE PRESCRIPTION DRUG SPENDING.

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 1817 (42 U.S.C. 1395i) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:
(A) OVERALL SPENDING FROM THE GENERAL FUND OF THE TREASURY.—A statement of total amounts obligated during the preceding fiscal year from the General Revenues of the Treasury to the Trust Funds for payment for benefits covered under this title, stated in terms of the total amount and in terms of the percentage such amount bears to all other amounts obligated from such General Revenues during such fiscal year.

(2) REVIEW OF SPENDING.—From the date of the inception of the program of insurance under this title through the fiscal year involved, a statement of the total amounts referred to in subparagraph (A).

(3) 10-YEAR AND 75-YEAR PROJECTIONS.—An estimate of total amounts referred to in subparagraph (A) required to be obligated for payment for benefits covered under this title for each of the 10 fiscal years succeeding the fiscal year involved and for the 75-year period beginning with the succeeding fiscal year.

(4) RELATION TO GDP GROWTH.—A comparison of the rate of growth of the total amounts referred to in subparagraph (A) to the rate of growth in the gross domestic product for the same period.

(2) Publication.—Each report submitted under paragraph (1) shall be published jointly by the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Energy and Commerce as a public document and shall be made available by such Committees on the Internet.

(b) Effective Date.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to the fiscal year beginning on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

TITLE II—MEDICARE ENHANCED FEE-FOR-SERVICE AND MEDICARE ADVANTAGE PROGRAMS, MEDICARE COMPETITION

SEC. 200. MEDICARE MODERNIZATION AND REVITALIZATION.

This title provides for—

(1) establishment of the medicare enhanced fee-for-service (EFFS) program under which medicare beneficiaries are provided access to a range of enhanced fee-for-service (EFFS) plans that include preferred provider organizations to offer an enhanced range of benefits; and

(2) establishment of a Medicare Advantage program that offers improved managed care plans with coordinated care and competitive bidding, in the style of the Federal Employees Health Benefits program (FEHBP), among enhanced fee-for-service plans and Medicare Advantage plans in order to promote greater efficiency and responsiveness to medicare beneficiaries.

Subtitle A—Medicare Enhanced Fee-for-Service Program

SEC. 201. ESTABLISHMENT OF ENHANCED FEE-FOR-SERVICE (EFFS) PROGRAM UNDER MEDICARE.

(a) In General.—In subsections (a)(1)(A), (a)(1)(B), (a)(1)(C), and (a)(1)(D) of section 1851, as amended by section 101(a)(1), are amended—

(1) by redesignating part E as part F; and

(2) by inserting after part D the following new part:

"PART E—ENHANCED FEE-FOR-SERVICE PROGRAM

OFFERING OF ENHANCED FEE-FOR-SERVICE PLANS THROUGHOUT THE UNITED STATES

SEC. 1860E–1. (a) ESTABLISHMENT OF PROGRAM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall establish under this part beginning January 1, 2006, an enhanced fee-for-service (EFFS) program under which enhanced fee-for-service plans (as defined in subsection (b)) are offered to EFFS-eligible individuals (as so defined) in EFFS regions throughout the United States.

(2) EFFS REGIONS.—For purposes of this part the Administrator shall establish EFFS regions throughout the United States by determining how the regions should be established. The regions shall be established in a manner to take into consideration maximizing full access for all EFFS-eligible individuals, especially those residing in rural areas.

(b) Definitions.—For purposes of this part:

(1) EFFS ORGANIZATION.—The 'EFFS organization' means an entity that the Administrator certifies as meeting the requirements and standards applicable to such organization established under this part.

(2) ENHANCED FEE-FOR-SERVICE PLAN; EFFS REGION.—The terms 'enhanced fee-for-service plan' and 'EFFS region' mean health benefits coverage offered under a policy, contract, or plan by an EFFS organization pursuant to and in accordance with a contract pursuant to section 1850c–4(c), but only if the plan provides benefits to EFFS-eligible individuals as described in the following subparagraph (A) or preferred provider coverage described in the following subparagraph (B):

(A) FEE-FOR-SERVICE COVERAGE.—The plan—

(i) reimburses hospitals, physicians, and other providers at a rate determined by the plan on a fee-for-service basis without placing the provider at financial risk;

(ii) does not vary such rates for such provider based on utilization relating to such provider; and

(iii) does not restrict the selection of providers among those who are lawfully authorized to provide the covered services and agree to accept the terms and conditions of payment established by the plan.

(2) PREFERRED PROVIDER COVERAGE.—The plan—

(i) has a network of providers that have agreed to a contractually specified reimbursement for covered benefits with the organization offering the plan; and

(ii) provides for reimbursement for all covered benefits regardless of whether such benefits are provided within such network of providers.

(3) EFFS ELIGIBLE INDIVIDUAL.—The term 'EFFS eligible individual' means an individual described in section 1850c(a)(3).

(4) EFFS REGION.—The term 'EFFS region' means a region established under subsection (a)(2).

(3) APPLICATION OF CERTAIN ELIGIBILITY, ENROLLMENT, ETC. REQUIREMENTS.—The provisions of section 1851 (other than subsection (h)(4)(A)), shall apply to EFFS plans offered by an EFFS organization in an EFFS region, including subsection (g) (relating to guaranteed issue and renewal).

OFFERING OF ENHANCED FEE-FOR-SERVICE (EFFS) PLANS

SEC. 1860E–2. (a) PLAN REQUIREMENTS.—No EFFS plan may be offered under this part in an EFFS region unless the requirements of this part are met with respect to an EFFS plan offered in an EFFS region.

(1) IN GENERAL.—The plan must be offered to all EFFS-eligible individuals residing in the region.

(2) ASSURING ACCESS TO SERVICES.—The plan shall comply with the requirements of section 1850c–4(c).

(c) BENEFITS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Each EFFS plan shall provide to members enrolled in the plan under this part benefits, through providers and other persons that meet the applicable requirements of this title and part A of title X.

(A) for the items and services described in section 1852(a)(1);

(B) that are uniform for the plan for all EFFS-eligible individuals residing in the same EFFS region;

(C) that include a single deductible applicable to benefits under parts A and B and include a catastrophic limit on out-of-pocket expenditures for such benefits; and

(D) that include benefits for prescription drug coverage for each enrollee who elects under part D to be provided qualified prescription drug coverage under a prescription drug plan.

(2) DISAPPROVAL AUTHORITY.—The Administrator shall not approve a plan of an EFFS organization if the Administrator determines pursuant to the last sentence of section 1850c–2(b)(1)(A) that the benefits are designed to substantially discourage enrollment by certain EFFS eligible individuals with such organization.

(d) OUTPATIENT PRESCRIPTION DRUG COVERAGE.—For rules concerning the offering of prescription drug coverage under EFFS plans, see the amendment made by section 102(b) of the Medicare Prescription Drug and Modernization Act of 2003.

(e) OTHER ADDITIONAL PROVISIONS.—The provisions of section 1852 (other than subsection (a)(1)) shall apply under this part to EFFS plans. For the application of chronic care improvement payment provisions, see the amendment made by section 722(b).

SUBMISSION OF BIDS; BENEFICIARY SAVINGS; PAYMENT PLANS

SEC. 1860E–3. (a) Submission of Bids.—

(1) Requirement.—(A) EFFS MONTHLY BID AMOUNT.—For each year (beginning with 2006), an EFFS organization shall submit to the Administrator an EFFS monthly bid amount for each EFFS plan offered in each region. Each such bid is referred to in this section as the 'EFFS monthly bid amount'.

(B) FORM.—Such bid amounts shall be submitted for each such plan and region in a form and manner and time specified by the Administrator, and shall include information described in paragraph (2).

(2) Uniform Bid Amount.—Each EFFS monthly bid amount submitted under paragraph (1) by an EFFS organization under this part for an EFFS plan in an EFFS region may not vary among EFFS eligible individuals residing in the EFFS region involved.

(b) Submission of bid amount information by EFFS organizations.—

(1) Information to be submitted.—The information described in this subparagraph is

(ii) The EFFS monthly bid amount for each EFFS plan shall be for provision of all items and services under this
part, which amount shall be based on average costs for a typical beneficiary residing in the region, and the actuarial basis for determining such amount.

(ii) the proportion of such bid amount that are attributable to—

(1) the provision of statutory non-drug benefits (such portion referred to in this part as the ‘non-drug portion of an EFFS statutory non-drug monthly bid amount’);

(2) the provision of statutory prescription drug benefits; and

(3) the provision of non-statutory benefits;

and the actuarial basis for determining such proportions.

(iii) such additional information as the Administrator may require to verify the actuarial bases described in clauses (i) and (ii).

(B) STATUTORY BENEFITS DEFINED.—For purposes of this part—

(1) The term ‘statutory non-drug benefits’ means benefits under section 1852(a)(1).

(2) The term ‘statutory prescription drug benefits’ means benefits under part D.

(C) NON-DRUG BENCHMARK AMOUNT.—The Administrator has the authority to negotiate regarding monthly bid amounts submitted under subparagraph (A) (and the proportion described in subparagraph (A)(ii)), and for such purpose, the Administrator has negotiation authority that the Administrator determines that such amount or proportion is not supported by the actuarial bases provided under subparagraph (A).

(2) CONTRACT AUTHORITY.—The Administrator shall—

(i) enter into contracts for the offering of EFFS plans under chapter 89 of title 5, United States Code. The Administrator may reject such a bid amount or proportion if the Administrator determines that such amount or proportion is not supported by the actuarial bases provided under subparagraph (A).

(ii) FORM OF REBATE.—A rebate required under this paragraph shall be provided—

(1) in the form of an advance to each EFFS plan offered in an EFFS region, with respect to coverage of an individual under this part in an EFFS region for a month in a year, an amount equal to 1/12 of the average (weighted by number of regions) of the annual capitation rate as calculated under section 1853(c)(1) for that area.

(3) COMPUTATION OF EFFS REGION-SPECIFIC NON-DRUG MONTHLY BENCHMARK AMOUNT.—For purposes of this part, the term ‘EFFS region-specific non-drug monthly benchmark amount’ means, with respect to an EFFS region for a month in a year, an amount equal to 1/12 of the average (weighted by number of regions) of the annual capitation rate as calculated under section 1853(c)(1) for that area.

(4) PAYMENT OF PLANS BASED ON BID AMOUNTS.—

(1) NON-DRUG BENEFITS.—Under a contract under section 1860E–4(c) and subject to section 1853(g) (as made applicable under subsection (d)), the Administrator shall make payments under this subsection in the following manner.

(A) PLANS WITH BIDS AT OR ABOVE BENCHMARK.—In the case of a plan for which there are average per capita monthly savings described in subsection (b)(2)(C), the payment under this paragraph for the adjusted EFFS statutory non-drug monthly bid amount, adjusted under paragraphs (3) and (4), plus the amount of the monthly rebate computed under subsection (b)(3)(A) for that plan and year.

(B) PLANS WITH BIDS AT OR ABOVE BENCHMARK.—In the case of a plan for which there are average per capita monthly savings described in subsection (b)(2)(C), the payment under this paragraph for the adjusted EFFS statutory non-drug monthly bid amount, adjusted under paragraphs (3) and (4), plus the amount of the monthly rebate computed under subsection (b)(3)(A) for that plan and year.

(3) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this part—

(A) EFFS MONTHLY BASIC BENEFICIARY PREMIUM.—The term ‘effs monthly basic beneficiary premium’ means, with respect to an EFFS plan—

(i) described in section 1860E–3(c)(1)(A) (relating to plans providing rebates), zero; or

(ii) described in section 1860E–3(c)(1)(B), the amount (if any) by which the unadjusted EFFS statutory non-drug monthly bid amount exceeds the EFFS region-specific non-drug monthly benchmark amount (as defined in section 1860E–3(b)(3)).

(B) EFFS MONTHLY PRESCRIPTION DRUG BENEFICIARY PREMIUM.—The term ‘EFFS monthly prescription drug beneficiary premium’ means, with respect to an EFFS plan, the payment under this paragraph for the adjusted EFFS statutory non-drug monthly bid amount submitted under clause (i) of section 1860E–3(a)(3)(A) for the year that is attributable under such section to the provision of statutory prescription drug benefits.

(C) EFFS MONTHLY SUPPLEMENTAL BENEFICIARY PREMIUM.—The term ‘EFFS monthly supplemental beneficiary premium’ means, with respect to an EFFS plan, the payment under this paragraph for the aggregate monthly bid amount submitted under clause (i) of section 1860E–
3(a)(3)(A) for the year that is attributable under such section to the provision of non-statutory benefits.

(b) ORGANIZATIONAL AND FINANCIAL REQUIREMENTS.—The provisions of section 1855 shall apply to an EFS plan offered by an EFS organization under this part.

(c) Application of provisions of paragraphs (1), (3), and (4) of section 1856(b) shall apply to an EFS plan offered by an EFS organization under this part.

(d) APPLICATION OF EFS ORGANIZATIONS.—The provisions of section 1857 shall apply to an EFS plan offered by an EFS organization under this part, except that any reference in such section to part C is deemed a reference to this part.

(e) APPLICATION OF MEDIGAP PROVISIONS TO EFS PLANS.—Section 1885 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395s) shall be administered as if any reference to a Medicare+Choice organization offering a Medicare+Choice plan under part C of title XVIII of such Act were a reference both to a Medicare Advantage organization offering a Medicare Advantage plan under such part and an EFS organization offering an EFS plan under part E of such title.

Subtitle B—Medicare Advantage Program

CHAPTER 1—IMPLEMENTATION OF PROGRAM

SEC. 211. IMPLEMENTATION OF MEDICARE ADVANTAGE PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—There is hereby established the Medicare Advantage Program. The Medicare Advantage program shall consist of the program under part C of title XVIII of the Social Security Act, as amended by this title.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference to the program under part C of title XVIII of the Social Security Act shall be deemed a reference to the Medicare Advantage program and, with respect to such part, any reference to “Medicare+Choice” is deemed a reference to “Medicare Advantage”.

SEC. 212. MEDICARE ADVANTAGE IMPROVEMENTS.

(a) EQUALIZING PAYMENTS WITH Fee-FOR-SERVICE.

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 1853(c)(1) (42 U.S.C. 1395w–23(c)(1)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(D) BASED ON 100 PERCENT OF Fee-FOR-SERVICE COSTS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—For 2004, the adjusted average per capita cost for the year involved, determined under section 1876(a)(4) for the Medicare Advantage program area for services covered under parts A and B for individuals entitled to benefits under part A and enrolled under part B who are not enrolled in a Medicare Advantage plan under this part for the year, but adjusted to exclude costs attributable to payments under section 1866(h).

“(ii) IN GENERAL.—For 2004, the adjusted average per capita cost for the year involved, determined under section 1876(a)(4) for the Medicare Advantage payment area for services covered under parts A and B for individuals entitled to benefits under part A and enrolled under part B who are not enrolled in a Medicare Advantage plan under this part for the year, but adjusted to exclude costs attributable to payments under section 1866(h).

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Such section is further amended, in the matter before paragraph (A), by striking “(or” “and” and inserting “) and”.

(b) CHANGE IN BUDGET NEUTRALITY FOR BLEND.—Section 1853(c) (42 U.S.C. 1395w–23(c)) is amended.

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 1853(c)(1)(A), by inserting “(for a year other than 2004)” after “multiplied”; and

(2) in paragraph (5), by inserting “(other than 2004)” after “for each year”.

(c) INCREASING MINIMUM PERCENTAGE INCREASE TO NATIONAL GROWTH RATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 1853(c)(1)(U) (42 U.S.C. 1395w–23(c)(1)(U)) is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking “The sum” and inserting “For a year before 2005, the sum”; and

(B) in subparagraph (B)(iv), by striking “and each succeeding year” and inserting “2003, and 2004”;

(2) IN GENERAL.—Section 1853(c)(1)(V), by striking “and each succeeding year” and inserting “and 2003”;

(D) by adding at the end of subparagraph (C) of this section, a new paragraph (F)

(F) For 2004 and each succeeding year, the greater of—

(i) 102 percent of the annual Medicare Advantage capitation rate under this paragraph for the area for the previous year; or

(ii) the annual Medicare Advantage capitation rate under this paragraph for the area for the previous year increased by the national per capita Medicare Advantage growth percentage, described in paragraph (6) for that succeeding year, but not taking into account any additional per capita Medicare Advantage growth percentage for such area as provided under paragraph (6)(C) for a year before 2004.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 1853(c)(1)(C) (42 U.S.C. 1395w–23(c)(1)(C)) is amended by inserting before the period at the end the following: “, except that for purposes of paragraph (1)(C)(vi)(II), no such adjustment shall be made for a year before 2004.

(d) INCLUSION OF COSTS OF DOD AND VA MILITARY FACILITY SERVICES TO MEDICARE-ELIGIBLE BENEFICIARIES IN CALCULATION OF MEDICARE ADVANTAGE CAPITATION RATES.—Section 1853(c)(3) (42 U.S.C. 1395w–23(c)(3)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking “subparagraph (B)” and inserting “paragraphs (B) and (E)”, and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(E) INCLUSION OF COSTS DOD AND VA MILITARY FACILITY SERVICES TO MEDICARE-ELIGIBLE BENEFICIARIES.—In determining the area-specific Medicare+Choice capitation rate under subparagraph (A) for a year beginning with 2004, the annual per capita rate of payment for 1997 determined under section 1853(c)(3)(A) shall be adjusted to include for purposes of subparagraph (A) on a per capita basis, of the amount of additional payments that would have been made in the area involved under this title if individuals entitled to benefits under this title had not received services from facilities of the Department of Defense or the Department of Veterans Affairs.

(2) EXTENDING SPECIAL RULE FOR CERTAIN INPATIENT HOSPITAL STAYS TO REHABILITATION HOSPITALS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 1853(g) (42 U.S.C. 1395w–23(g)) is amended—

(A) by inserting “or from a rehabilitation facility (as defined in section 1886(f)(4)(A)(i))” after “1886(d)(1)(B)”;

(B) in subparagraph (B), by inserting “or section 1886(f), as the case may be,” after “1886(d)”; and

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by paragraph (1) shall apply to benefit years beginning on or after January 1, 2004.

(e) MEDPAC STUDY OF AAPCC.

(1) STUDY.—The Medicare Payment Advisory Commission shall conduct a study that assesses the medical benefit for determining the adjusted average per capita cost (AAPCC) (as amended by subsection (b)) of the Medicare Advantage payment under the Medicare Advantage program, for the area involved under this title if individuals entitled to benefits under such title are deemed entitled to benefits under Medicare Advantage under this part for the preceding year, but not taking into account any adjustment under section 1853(c)(1)(A) of such Act (as amended by subsection (a)). Such study shall include an examination of—

(A) the bases for variation in such costs between different areas, including differences in input prices, utilization, and practice patterns;

(B) the appropriate geographic area for payment under the Medicare Advantage program under part C of title XVIII of such Act; and

(C) the accuracy of risk adjustment methods in reflecting differences in costs of providing care to Medicare Advantage enrollees of beneficiaries served under such program.

(2) REPORT.—Not later than 18 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commission shall submit to Congress a report on the study conducted under paragraph (1).

(g) REPORT ON IMPACT OF INCREASED FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO MEDICARE ADVANTAGE PLANS.—Not later than July 1, 2006, the Medicare Beneficiary Trust Fund shall submit to Congress a report that describes the impact of additional financing provided under this Act and other Acts (including the Medicare, Medicaid, and SCHIP Balanced Budget Refinement Act of 1999 and BIPA) on the availability of Medicare Advantage plans in different areas and its impact on lowering premiums and increasing benefits under such plans.

(h) ANNOUNCEMENT OF REVISED MEDICARE ADVANTAGE PAYMENT RATES.—Within 6 weeks after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall determine, and shall announce (in a manner intended to provide notice to interested parties) Medicare Advantage capitation rates under section 1853 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w–23) for 2004, revised in accordance with the provisions of this section.

CHAPTER 2—IMPLEMENTATION OF COMPETITION PROGRAM

SEC. 221. COMPETITION PROGRAM BEGINNING IN 2006.

(a) SUBMISSION OF EFFS-LIKE BIDDING INFORMATION BEGINNING IN 2006.—Section 1854 (42 U.S.C. 1395w–24) is amended—

(1) by amending the section heading to read as follows:

“PREMIUMS AND BID AMOUNT”;

(2) in subsection (a)(3)(A)—

(A) by striking “(A)(i)” and inserting “(A)(i)” if the following year is before 2006”, and

(B) by inserting before the semicolon at the end the following: “, or (ii) if the following year is 2006 or later, the information described in paragraph (3) or (6)(A) for the type of plan involved”; and

(3) by adding at the end of subsection (a) the following:

“(6) SUBMISSION OF BID AMOUNTS BY MEDICARE ADVANTAGE ORGANIZATIONS.—

“(A) INFORMATION TO BE SUBMITTED.—The information described in this subparagraph as follows:

“(i) The monthly aggregate bid amount for provision of all items and services under such plan, which amount shall be based on average costs for a typical beneficiary residing in the area, and the actuarial basis for determining such amount.

“(ii) The proportions of such bid amount that are attributable to—

“(I) the provision of statutory non-drug benefits (such portion referred to in this part as the "unadjusted Medicare Advantage statutory non-drug monthly bid amount");

“(II) the provision of statutory prescription drug benefits; and

“(III) the provision of non-statutory benefits; and the actuarial basis for determining such proportions.

SEC. 222. MEDICARE ADVANTAGE ORGANIZATIONS.
(iii) Such additional information as the Administrator may require to verify the actuarial bases described in clauses (i) and (ii).

(B) Statutory benefits defined.—For purposes of this subparagraph:

(i) The term ‘statutory non-drug benefits’ means benefits under section 1852(a)(1).


(iii) The term ‘statutory non-drug benefits’ means statutory prescription drug benefits and statutory non-drug benefits.

(C) Acceptance and negotiation of bid amounts.—

(i) In general.—Subject to clause (ii)—

(I) the Administrator has the authority to negotiate such statutory non-drug bid amounts submitted under subparagraph (A) (and the proportion described in subparagraph (A)(iii)), and for such purpose and subject to such clause, the Administrator has negotiation authority that the Director of the Office of Personnel Management has with respect to health benefits plans under chapter 89 of title 5, United States Code; and

(II) the Administrator may reject such a bid amount or proportion if the Administrator determines that such amount or proportion is not supported by the actuarial bases provided under subparagraph (A).

(ii) Exception.—In the case of a plan described in section 1851(a)(2)(C), the provisions of clause (i) do not apply and the provisions of paragraph (5)(B), prohibiting the review, approval, or disapproval of amounts described in such paragraph, shall apply to the negotiation and rejection of the monthly bid amounts and proportion referred to in subparagraph (A).

(D) Determination of average per capita monthly savings.—The average per capita monthly savings described in this subparagraph is equal to the amount (if any) by which—

(i) the risk-adjusted benchmark amount computed under subparagraph (B)(i), exceeds

(ii) the risk-adjusted bid computed under subparagraph (B)(ii).

(E) Authorization to determine risk adjustment factors.—The Administrator may provide for the determination and application of risk adjustment factors under this paragraph on the basis of areas other than the Metropolitan Statistical Areas or Combined Statistical Areas.

(F) Beneficiary’s option of payment through withholding from social security payment or use of electronic funds transfer mechanism.—A Medicare Advantage organization shall permit each enrollee, at the enrollee’s option, to make payment of premiums under this part to the plan directly through withholding from benefit payments in the manner provided under section 1940 with respect to monthly premiums under section 1853 for the year.

(G) Medicare Advantage plan defined.—For purposes of this section, the term ‘Medicare Advantage plan’ means a Medicare Advantage organization or an organization which is approved by the Administrator as an organization to offer Medicare Advantage plans, and the Medicare Advantage plan of an organization shall be considered to be the plan of the organization that is approved by the Administrator to offer such plan.

(H) Reimbursement of payments made under this part.—Any payment made under this part to an individual or entity that is not a Medicare Advantage plan shall be returned to the Federal Supplementary Medical Insurance Trust Fund (as defined in section 1857(d)(3)(B)(iv)) by such payer.

(I) Payment through withholdings.—For purposes of this section, amounts withheld under section 1940 shall be treated as payments made under this section.

(J) Authorization of state option.—The Administrator and the Secretary shall by regulation, by缔约或通过其他方式, accept and approve plans of organizations to offer Medicare Advantage plans and to provide such plan in States that require such plans to be offered by States or that require such plans to be approved by the States.

(K) Authorization of other plans.—The Administrator shall by regulation or through withholding from benefit payments in the manner provided under section 1940, allow other plans to be offered in States that require such plans to be offered by States or that require such plans to be approved by the States.

(L) Authorization of plans.—The Administrator may by regulation or through withholding from benefit payments in the manner provided under section 1940 authorize other plans to be offered in States that require such plans to be offered by States or that require such plans to be approved by the States.

(M) Authorization of plans.—The Administrator may by regulation or through withholding from benefit payments in the manner provided under section 1940 authorize other plans to be offered in States that require such plans to be offered by States or that require such plans to be approved by the States.
"(ii) described in section 1853(a)(1)(A)(ii), the amount (if any) by which the unadjusted Medicare Advantage statute non-drug monthly bid amount exceeds the Medicare Advantage specific non-drug monthly benchmark amount.

"(B) MEDICARE ADVANTAGE MONTHLY PRESCRIPTION DRUG BENEFICIARY PREMIUM.—The term "Medicare Advantage monthly prescription drug beneficiary premium" means, with respect to a Medicare Advantage plan, that portion of the bid amount submitted under subsection (b) of the Medicare Advantage plan that is attributable under such section to the provision of statutory prescription drug benefits.

"(C) MEDICARE ADVANTAGE MONTHLY SUPPLEMENTAL BENEFICIARY PREMIUM.—The term 'Medicare Advantage monthly supplemental beneficiary premium' means, with respect to a Medicare Advantage plan, the portion of the aggregate monthly bid amount submitted under clause (i) of subsection (a)(6)(A) for the year that is attributable under such section to the provision of nonstatutory benefits."

(3) REQUIREMENT FOR UNIFORM PREMIUM AND BID AMOUNTS.—Section 1854(c) (42 U.S.C. 1395w–24(c)) is amended to read as follows:

"(c) UNIFORM PREMIUM AND BID AMOUNTS.—The Medicare Advantage monthly bid amount submitted under subsection (b) of a Medicare Advantage organization that offers such plan may restrict the enrollment of individuals and for periods before January 1, 2007, the following:

"(i) the calendar year concerned with respect to each Medicare Advantage payment area, the portion of such amount that is attributable under such section to the provision of nonstatutory prescription drug benefits.

"(ii) the respective calendar year'' and all that follows inserting the following:

"(ii) those items and services (other than hospice care) for which benefits are available under parts A and B to individuals residing in the area served by the plan.''

"(iii) Section 1857(d)(1) (42 U.S.C. 1395w–27(d)(1)) is amended by striking "'title XI'' and inserting the following:

"(ii) items and services (other than hospice care) for which benefits are available under parts A and B to individuals residing in the area served by the plan.''

"(g) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to payments and premiums for months beginning with January 2006.

CHAPTER 3—ADDITIONAL REFORMS

SECTION 232. MAKING PERMANENT CHANGE IN MEDICARE ADVANTAGE REPORTING DEADLINES AND ANNUAL, COORDINATED ELECTION PERIOD.

(a) CHANGE IN REPORTING DEADLINES.—Section 1854(a)(1) (42 U.S.C. 1395w–24(a)(1)), as amended by section 302(b)(1) of the Public Health Security and Bioterrorism Preparedness and Response Act of 2002, is amended by striking "'2002, 2003, and 2004 (or July 1 of each other year)'' and inserting "'2002 and each subsequent year'".

(b) DELAY IN ANNUAL, COORDINATED ELECTION PERIOD.—Section 1854(e)(3)(B) (42 U.S.C. 1395w–24(e)(3)(B)), as amended by section 1839(a)(2)(A)(ii) of such Act and section 532(c)(1)(A) of the Public Health Security and Bioterrorism Preparedness and Response Act of 2002, is amended—

"(1) by striking "'2002'"; and

"(2) by striking "'2004', and inserting "'2002 and each subsequent year'".

(c) ANNUNCIATION OF PAYMENT REQUIREMENTS.—Section 1853(b)(1) (42 U.S.C. 1395w–23(b)(1)), as amended by section 532(d)(1)(A) of the Public Health Security and Bioterrorism Preparedness and Response Act of 2002, is amended—

"(1) by striking "'and after 2005'"; and

"(2) by striking "'2004', and inserting "'and each subsequent year'".

(d) PROVISION OF AVAILABLE INFORMATION.—Section 1853(b)(3) (42 U.S.C. 1395w–23(b)(3)), relating to health status adjustment, is amended to read as follows:

"(3) RELATION TO STATE LAWS.—The standards established under this subsection shall supersede any State law or regulation (other than State licensing laws or State laws relating to plan solvency) with respect to Medicare Advantage plans which are offered by Medicare Advantage organizations under this part.''

(4) SPECIALIZED MEDICARE ADVANTAGE PLANS FOR SPECIAL NEEDS BENEFICIARIES.—

"(a) TREATMENT AS COORDINATED CARE PLAN.—Section 1854(a)(2)(A) (42 U.S.C. 1395w–24(a)(2)(A)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(f) RESTRICTION ON ENROLLMENT FOR SPECIAL NEEDS BENEFICIARIES.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘specialized Medicare Advantage plan for special needs beneficiaries’ means a Medicare Advantage plan that exclusively serves special needs beneficiaries (as defined in subparagraph (B)) for individuals with severe or disabling chronic conditions.

"(B) SPECIAL NEEDS BENEFICIARY.—The term ‘special needs beneficiary’ means a Medicare Advantage eligible individual who—

"(i) is institutionalized (as defined by the Secretary);

"(ii) is entitled to medical assistance under a State plan under title XIX; or

"(iii) meets such requirements as the Secretary may determine would benefit from enrollment in such a specialized Medicare Advantage plan described in paragraph (A) for individuals with severe or disabling chronic conditions.

"(c) RESTRICTION ON ENROLLMENT PERMITTED.—Section 1859 (42 U.S.C. 1395w–29) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(f) EFFECTIVE DATES.—

"(A) DEPARTMENTAL DIRECTOR TO DESIGNATE OTHER PLANS AS SPECIALIZED MEDICARE ADVANTAGE PLANS.—In promulgating regulations to carry out the last sentence of section 1859(a)(1) of the Social Security Act (as added by section 2(b) of the Medicare and Medicaid延伸 sections and section 1859(b)(4) of such Act as added by subsection (b), and section 1859(c)(1)(A) of the Social Security Act (as added by section 2(b) of the Medicare and Medicaid Extension sections and section 1859(b)(4) of such Act), the Secretary may direct that such regulations apply to the offering of specialized Medicare Advantage plans by Medicare Advantage plans that disproportionately serve special needs beneficiaries who are frail, elderly Medicare beneficiaries.

"(B) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than December 31, 2005, the Medicare and Medicaid Extension sections Administrator shall submit to Congress a report that assesses the impact of specialized Medicare Advantage plans for special needs beneficiaries on the costs and quality of services provided to enrollees. Such report shall include an assessment of the costs and savings to the Medicare program as a result of the amendments made by subsections (a), (b), and (c).
(1) In general.—The amendments made by subsections (a), (b), and (c) shall take effect upon the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) Deadline for issuance of requirements for special needs beneficiaries; transition.—No later than 6 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall issue interim final regulations to implement requirements for special needs beneficiaries under section 1859(b)(4)(B)(iii) of the Social Security Act, as added by subsection (b).

SEC. 258. EXEMPTION FROM REPORTING ENROLLEE ENCOUNTER DATA.—

(a) Exemption from reporting enrollee encounter data.—

(1) In general.—Section 1852(e)(1) (42 U.S.C. 1395w–22(e)(1)) is amended by inserting “other than MSA plans” after “plans.”

(2) Conforming amendments.—Section 1852 (42 U.S.C. 1395w–22) is amended—

(A) in subsection (c)(1), by inserting before the period at the end the following: “if required under such section”;

(B) in subparagraphs (A) and (B) of subsection (e)(2), by striking “a non-network MSA plan,” and “non-network MSA plans,” each place it appears.

(b) Making program permanent and eliminating requirements.—Section 1851(e)(5)(A) (42 U.S.C. 1395w–21(e)(5)(A)) is amended—

(1) by striking the second sentence of subparagraph (A); and

(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking “1,500 individuals.”

(c) Applying limitations on balance billing.—Section 1852(k)(1) (42 U.S.C. 1395w–22(k)(1)) is amended by inserting “with or an organization offering a MSA plan” after “section 1851(a)(2)(A).”

(d) Additional amendment.—Section 1851(e)(5)(A) (42 U.S.C. 1395w–21(e)(5)(A)) is amended—

(1) by adding “or” at the end of clause (i);

(2) by striking “, or” at the end of clause (ii) and inserting a semicolon; and

(3) by striking clause (iii).

SEC. 259. EXTENSION OF REASONABLE COST CONTRACTS.

Subparagraph (C) of section 1876(h)(5)(4) (42 U.S.C. 1395m(h)(5)) is amended to read as follows:

“(C)(i) Subject to clause (ii), may be extended or renewed under this subsection indefinitely.

“(ii) Any period beginning on or after January 1, 2008, a reasonable cost reimbursement contract under this subsection may not be extended or renewed for a service area insofar as such service area, during the entire previous year, was within the service area of 2 or more plans which were coordinated care Medicare Advantage plans under part C or 2 or more enhanced fee-for-service plans under part E and each of which met the requirements for such year for the area involved meets the following minimum enrollment requirements:

“(I) With respect to any portion of the area involved that is within a Metropolitan Statistical Area with a population of more than 250,000 citizens, a contiguous to such Metropolitan Statistical Area, 5,000 individuals.

“(II) With respect to any other portion of such area, 1,500 individuals.”

SEC. 260. EXTENSION OF MUNICIPAL HEALTH SERVICE DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS.


SEC. 261. STUDY OF PERFORMANCE-BASED PAYMENT SYSTEMS.

(a) General.—The Secretary shall request the Institute of Medicine of the National Academy of Sciences to—

(1) conduct a study that reviews and evaluates the experiences in establishing performance measures and payment incentives under the Medicare program and linking performance to payment; and

(2) submit a report to the Committee on Labor and Commerce, not later than 18 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, regarding such study.

(b) Study.—The study under subsection (a) shall—

(1) include a review and evaluation of incentives that have been or could be used to encourage quality performance, including those aimed at health plans and their enrollees, providers and their patients, and other incentives that encourage quality-based health care purchasing and collaborative efforts to improve performance; and

(2) examine how these measures and incentives might be applied in the Medicare Advantage program and Medicare Part D drug program, and traditional fee-for-service programs.

(c) Report recommendations.—The report under subsection (b) shall—

(1) include recommendations regarding appropriate performance measures for use in assessing and paying for quality; and

(2) identify actions for updating performance measures.

Subtitle C—Application of FEHBP-Style Competitive Reforms

SEC. 241. APPLICATION OF FEHBP-STYLE COMPETITIVE REFORM BEGINNING IN 2010.

(a) Identification of Competitive EFFS Regions.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 1860E–3, as added by section 202(a), is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(e) Application of competition.—

“(1) Determination of competitive EFFS regions for each year.—

“(A) EFFS component.—The product of

(1) the fee-for-service market share percentage (determined under paragraph (5) of the previous year, the Medicare Benefits Schedule percentage) of the EFFS eligible individuals in the United States who are enrolled in Medicare Advantage plans during March of the previous year.

“(i) EXCEPTION.—In the case of an EFFS region that was a competitive EFFS region for the previous year, the Medicare Benefits Administrator may continue to treat the region as meeting the requirements of subparagraph (A) if the region meets such requirement but for a de minimis reduction below the percentage specified in clause (i).

“(ii) Competitive EFFS NON-MONTHLY BENCHMARK AMOUNT.—For purposes of paragraph (1) of this subsection, for purposes of paragraph (3), the term ‘competitive EFFS non-monthly benchmark amount’ means, with respect to an EFFS region in a year and subject to paragraph (8), the sum of the 2 components described in paragraph (3) for the region and year. The Administrator shall determine the competitive EFFS non-monthly benchmark amount for each competitive EFFS region before the beginning of each annual, coordinated election period under section 1851(e)(3)(B) for each year (beginning with 2010) in which it is designated as such a region.

“(3) 2 COMPONENTS.—For purposes of paragraph (2), the 2 components described in this paragraph for an EFFS region and a year are the following:

“(A) EFFS component.—The product of the following:

“(i) WEIGHTED AVERAGE OF PLAN BIDS IN REGION.—The weighted average of the EFFS plan bids for the region and year (as determined under paragraph (4)) to the fee-for-service market share percentage determined under paragraph (5) for the region and year.

“(B) FEE-FOR-SERVICE COMPONENT.—The product of the following:


“(ii) FEE-FOR-SERVICE MARKET SHARE.—The fee-for-service market share percentage (determined under paragraph (5)) for the region and year.

“(C) DETERMINATION OF WEIGHTED AVERAGE EFFS PLAN BIDS FOR A REGION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of paragraph (3)(A)(i), the weighted average of plan bids for a region and a year is the sum of the following products for EFFS plans described in subparagraph (C) in the region and year:

“(I) ADJUSTED EFFS STATUTORY NON-DRUG MONTHLY BID AMOUNT.—The unadjusted EFFS statutory non-drug monthly bid amount (as defined in subsection (a)(3)(A)(i)(III)) for the region and year.

“(II) PLAN’S SHARE OF EFFS ENROLLMENT IN REGION.—The number of individuals described in subparagraph (B), divided by the total number of such individuals for all EFFS plans described in subparagraph (C) for that region and year.

“(B) COUNTING OF INDIVIDUALS.—The Administrator shall count each plan described in subparagraph (C) for an EFFS region and year, the number of individuals who reside in the region and who were enrolled under such plan during this period as defined in subsection (a)(3)(A)(i)(III) for the region and year.

“(C) EXCLUSION OF PLANS NOT OFFERED IN PREVIOUS YEAR.—For an EFFS region and year, the EFFS plans described in this subparagraph are plans that are offered in the region and year and were offered in the region in March of the previous year

“(D) COMPARISON OF EFFS TO FEHBP-MARKET SHARE PERCENTAGE.—The Administrator shall determine, for a year and an EFFS region, the proportion (in this subsection referred to as the ‘fee-for-service market share percentage’) of the EFFS eligible individuals who are residents of the region during March
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of the previous year, of such individuals who were not enrolled in an EFS plan or in a Medicare Advantage plan or, if greater, such proportion determined for individuals nationally.

(6) Fee-for-Service Region-specific Non-drug Amount.—

(A) In General.—For purposes of paragraph (3) and section 1836(h)(2)(A), subject to subparagraph (C), the term 'fee-for-service region-specific non-drug amount' means, for a competitive EFS region and a year, the weighted average per capita cost for the year involved, determined under section 1876(a)(4) for such region for services covered under part C for the year, but adjusted to exclude costs attributable to payments under section 1886(h).

(B) Use of Full Risk Adjustment to Standardize Fee-for-service Costs to Typical Beneficiary.—In determining the adjusted average per capita cost for a region and year under subparagraph (A), such costs shall be adjusted to take into account the demographic and health status risk factors established under subsection (C)(2) so that such per capita costs reflect the average costs for a typical beneficiary residing in the region.

(C) Inclusion of Costs of VA and DOD Military Facilities to Medicare Eligible Beneficiaries.—In determining the adjusted average per capita cost under subparagraph (A) for a year, such cost shall be adjusted to include the Administrator's estimate, on a per capita basis, of the amount of additional payments that would have been made in the region involved under this title if individuals under this title who had not received services from facilities of the Department of Veterans Affairs or the Department of Defense.

(7) Application of Competition.—In the case of an EFS region that is a competitive EFS region for a year, for purposes of applying subsections (b) and (c)(1) and section 1890E-4(a), any reference to an EFS region-specific non-drug monthly benchmark amount shall be treated as a reference to the competitive EFS non-drug monthly benchmark amount calculated under paragraph (2) for the region and year.

(8) Phase-in of Benchmark for Each Region.—

(A) Use of Blended Benchmark.—In the case of a region that has not been a competitive EFS region for each of the 4 years prior to the competitive EFS non-drug monthly benchmark amount shall be treated as a reference to the competitive EFS non-drug monthly benchmark amount calculated under paragraph (2) for the region and year.

(B) Phase-in of Benchmark for Each Region.—

(i) Use of Blended Benchmark.—In the case of a region that has not been a competitive EFS region for each of the 4 years prior to the competitive EFS non-drug monthly benchmark amount shall be equal to the sum of the following:

(1) New competitive component.—The product of

(1) the weighted average phase-in proportion for that area and year, as specified in subparagraph (B); and

(2) Old competitive component.—The product of

(i) the weighted average phase-in proportion for that region and year; and

(ii) the EFS region-specific non-drug benchmark amount for the region and year, determined under paragraph (2) without regard to this paragraph.

(ii) Old competitive component.—The product of

(1) the percentage, as estimated by the Administrator, of EFS eligible individuals in the United States who are enrolled in EFS plans during March of the previous year; and

(2) the percentage, as estimated by the Administrator, of Medicare Advantage eligible individuals in the United States who are enrolled in Medicare Advantage plans during March of the previous year.

(iii) Exception.—In the case of an area that was a competitive region for the previous year, the Medicare Benefits Administrator determines, in an EFS plan, whether to meet the requirement of subparagraph (A)(ii) if the area would meet such requirement but for a de minimis reduction below the percentage specified in clause (i).

(ii) Competitive Region in Previous Year.—If the region for which the weighted average phase-in proportion for the year is equal to a.

(iii) Competitive Region in Previous Year.—If the region for which the weighted average phase-in proportion for the year is equal to the weighted average phase-in proportion for the previous year under this subparagraph for the region for the previous year plus one percent more than one percent.

(2) Conforming Amendments.—

(A) Such section 1890E-3 is further amended—

(i) in subsection (b), by adding at the end the following new sentence:

(4) Application in Competitive Regions.—For special rules applying this subsection in competitive EFS regions, see subsection (e)(7).

(ii) in subsection (c)(1), by inserting 'and subsection (e)(7)' after 'as made applicable under subsection (d)'; and

(iii) in subsection (d) by striking 'and' and inserting 'and (e) and (k)'.

(B) Section 1890E-4(a)(1), as inserted by section 202(a)(2), is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

(5) Application of Competition.—

(i) In General.—Section 1853, as amended by section 221(b)(3), is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

(6) Fee-for-service Component.—The product of the following:

(1) Fee-for-service area-specific non-drug amount (as defined in paragraph (6)) for the area and year.

(ii) Non-FFS Market Share.—1 minus the fee-for-service market share percentage, determined under paragraph (5) for the area and year.

(iii) Determination of Weighted Average Medicare Advantage Bid for an Area.—

(A) In General.—For purposes of paragraph (3)(A)(i), the weighted average of plan bids for an area for a year is the sum of the following products for Medicare Advantage plans described in subparagraph (C) in the area and year:

(1) Monthly Medicare Advantage statutory non-drug bid amount.—The fee-for-service area-specific non-drug amount (as defined in paragraph (6)) for the area and year.

(ii) Plan's Share of Medicare Advantage Enrollment in Area.—The number of individuals described in subparagraph (B), divided by the total number of such individuals for all Medicare Advantage plans described in subparagraph (C) for that area and year.

(B) Counting of Individuals.—The Administrator shall count, for each Medicare Advantage plan described in subparagraph (C) for an area and year, the number of individuals who reside in the area and who were enrolled under such plan under this part during March of the previous year.

(i) Exclusion of the First Year Offered.—For the purpose of section 1890E-4(a)(1), any reference to a plan under this part which was not offered during the annual, coordinated election period under section 1851(e)(3)(B) under this part before the beginning of each annual, coordinated election period under section 1851(e)(3)(B) for each year (beginning with 2003) in which it is designated as such area.

(3) Components.—For purposes of paragraph (2), the components described in this paragraph for a competitive Medicare Advantage area and a year are the following:

(A) Medicare Advantage Component.—The product of the following:

(1) Fee-for-service area-specific non-drug amount.—The fee-for-service area-specific non-drug amount (as defined in paragraph (6)) for the area and year.

(ii) Non-FFS Market Share.—1 minus the fee-for-service market share percentage, determined under paragraph (5) for the area and year.

(iii) Determination of Weighted Average Medicare Advantage Bid for an Area.—

(A) In General.—For purposes of paragraph (3)(A)(i), the weighted average of plan bids for an area for a year is the sum of the following products for Medicare Advantage plans described in subparagraph (C) in the area and year:

(1) Monthly Medicare Advantage statutory non-drug bid amount.—The adjusted statutory non-drug monthly bid amount.

(ii) Plan's Share of Medicare Advantage Enrollment in Area.—The number of individuals described in subparagraph (B), divided by the total number of such individuals for all Medicare Advantage plans described in subparagraph (C) for that area and year.

(iii) Counting of Individuals.—The Administrator shall count, for each Medicare Advantage plan described in subparagraph (C) for an area and year, the number of individuals who reside in the area and who were enrolled under such plan under this part during March of the previous year.

(5) Computation of Fee-for-service Market Share Percentage.—The Administrator shall determine, for a year and a competitive Medicare Advantage area, the proportion (in this subsection referred to as the 'fee-for-service market share percentage') of Medicare Advantage eligible individuals residing in the area who were enrolled during the year in a Medicare Advantage plan in the area and who were not enrolled in an EFS plan or in a Medicare Advantage plan that is not a competitive Medicare Advantage plan or a Medicare Advantage plan that was not in competition with an EFS plan during the year.
The (6) Fee-for-service area-specific non-drug amount.—

(A) In general.—For purposes of paragraph (3)(B)(i) and section 1839(f)(1)(A), subject to paragraph (C), the term "fee-for-service area-specific non-drug amount" means, for a competitive Medicare Advantage area and a year, the adjusted average per capita non-drug amount determined under section 1876(a)(4) for such area for services covered under parts A and B for individuals entitled to benefits under part A and enrolled under this part (determined without regard to subparagraph (C)), as specified in the area and year, as determined under paragraph (2) for the area and year.

(B) Use of full risk adjustment to standardize fee-for-service costs to typical beneficiary.—In determining the adjusted average per capita costs for an area and year under subparagraph (A), such costs shall be adjusted to fully take into account the demographic and health status risk factors established under subsection (a)(1)(A) so that such per capita costs reflect the average costs for a typical beneficiary residing in the area.

(C) Inclusion of costs of VA and DOD military health services to Medicare-eligible beneficiaries.—In determining the adjusted average per capita cost under subparagraph (A), such cost shall be reduced by an amount equal to the per capita cost of the Medicare Advantage area-specific non-drug monthly benchmark amount (or such comparable amount) as adjusted in the manner described in paragraph (3) for the area and year as determined under paragraph (3)(C)(i) for the area.

(2) Application.—Section 1854 (42 U.S.C. 1395w–24) is amended by—

(A) in subsection (b)(3)(C)(i), as added by section 221(b)(1)(A), by striking "(i) REQUIREMENT—The" and inserting "(i) REQUIREMENT FOR NON-COMPETITIVE AREA.—In the case of a Medicare Advantage payment area that is not a competitive Medicare Advantage area designated under section 1853(k)(1)(A), the";

(B) in subsection (b)(3)(C), as so added, by inserting after clause (i) the following new clause:

(ii) RECOMMENDATION.—For purposes of subparagraph (A)(i)(ii), the term 'Medicare Advantage area-wide non-drug monthly benchmark amount' means, for an area and year, the weighted average of the amounts described in section 1853(j) for Medicare Advantage payment areas or areas included in the area (based on the number of traditional fee-for-service enrollees in such payment area or areas) and year.

(2) Application.—The Medicare Advantage area-wide non-drug benchmark amount (as defined in section 1853(k)(6)(A)) shall be treated as a reference to the competitive Medicare Advantage area in which the individual resides (based on the number of traditional fee-for-service enrollees in such payment area or areas) and year.

(B) Use of full risk adjustment to standardize fee-for-service costs to typical beneficiary.—In determining the adjusted average per capita costs for an area and year under subparagraph (A), such costs shall be adjusted to fully take into account the demographic and health status risk factors established under subsection (a)(1)(A) so that such per capita costs reflect the average costs for a typical beneficiary residing in the area.

(C) Inclusion of costs of VA and DOD military health services to Medicare-eligible beneficiaries.—In determining the adjusted average per capita cost under subparagraph (A), such cost shall be reduced by an amount equal to the per capita cost of the Medicare Advantage area-specific non-drug monthly benchmark amount (or such comparable amount) as adjusted in the manner described in paragraph (3) for the area and year as determined under paragraph (3)(C)(i) for the area.

(2) Application.—Section 1854 (42 U.S.C. 1395w–24) is amended by—

(A) in subsection (b)(3)(C), as added by section 221(b)(1)(A), by striking "(i) REQUIREMENT—The" and inserting "(i) REQUIREMENT FOR NON-COMPETITIVE AREA.—In the case of a Medicare Advantage payment area that is not a competitive Medicare Advantage area designated under section 1853(k)(1), the";

(B) in subsection (b)(3)(C), as so added, by inserting after clause (i) the following new clause:

(ii) RECOMMENDATION.—For purposes of subparagraph (A)(i)(ii), the term 'Medicare Advantage area-wide non-drug monthly benchmark amount' means, for an area and year, the weighted average of the amounts described in section 1853(j) for Medicare Advantage payment areas or areas included in the area (based on the number of traditional fee-for-service enrollees in such payment area or areas) and year.

(2) Application.—The Medicare Advantage area-wide non-drug benchmark amount (as defined in section 1853(k)(6)(A)) shall be treated as a reference to the competitive Medicare Advantage area in which the individual resides (based on the number of traditional fee-for-service enrollees in such payment area or areas) and year.

(B) Use of full risk adjustment to standardize fee-for-service costs to typical beneficiary.—In determining the adjusted average per capita costs for an area and year under subparagraph (A), such costs shall be adjusted to fully take into account the demographic and health status risk factors established under subsection (a)(1)(A) so that such per capita costs reflect the average costs for a typical beneficiary residing in the area.

(C) Inclusion of costs of VA and DOD military health services to Medicare-eligible beneficiaries.—In determining the adjusted average per capita cost under subparagraph (A), such cost shall be reduced by an amount equal to the per capita cost of the Medicare Advantage area-specific non-drug monthly benchmark amount (or such comparable amount) as adjusted in the manner described in paragraph (3) for the area and year as determined under paragraph (3)(C)(i) for the area.

(2) Application.—The Medicare Advantage area-wide non-drug benchmark amount (as defined in section 1853(k)(6)(A)) shall be treated as a reference to the competitive Medicare Advantage area in which the individual resides (based on the number of traditional fee-for-service enrollees in such payment area or areas) and year.

(B) Use of full risk adjustment to standardize fee-for-service costs to typical beneficiary.—In determining the adjusted average per capita costs for an area and year under subparagraph (A), such costs shall be adjusted to fully take into account the demographic and health status risk factors established under subsection (a)(1)(A) so that such per capita costs reflect the average costs for a typical beneficiary residing in the area.

(C) Inclusion of costs of VA and DOD military health services to Medicare-eligible beneficiaries.—In determining the adjusted average per capita cost under subparagraph (A), such cost shall be reduced by an amount equal to the per capita cost of the Medicare Advantage area-specific non-drug monthly benchmark amount (or such comparable amount) as adjusted in the manner described in paragraph (3) for the area and year as determined under paragraph (3)(C)(i) for the area.

(2) Application.—The Medicare Advantage area-wide non-drug benchmark amount (as defined in section 1853(k)(6)(A)) shall be treated as a reference to the competitive Medicare Advantage area in which the individual resides (based on the number of traditional fee-for-service enrollees in such payment area or areas) and year.

(B) Use of full risk adjustment to standardize fee-for-service costs to typical beneficiary.—In determining the adjusted average per capita costs for an area and year under subparagraph (A), such costs shall be adjusted to fully take into account the demographic and health status risk factors established under subsection (a)(1)(A) so that such per capita costs reflect the average costs for a typical beneficiary residing in the area.

(C) Inclusion of costs of VA and DOD military health services to Medicare-eligible beneficiaries.—In determining the adjusted average per capita cost under subparagraph (A), such cost shall be reduced by an amount equal to the per capita cost of the Medicare Advantage area-specific non-drug monthly benchmark amount (or such comparable amount) as adjusted in the manner described in paragraph (3) for the area and year as determined under paragraph (3)(C)(i) for the area.

(2) Application.—The Medicare Advantage area-wide non-drug benchmark amount (as defined in section 1853(k)(6)(A)) shall be treated as a reference to the competitive Medicare Advantage area in which the individual resides (based on the number of traditional fee-for-service enrollees in such payment area or areas) and year.

(B) Use of full risk adjustment to standardize fee-for-service costs to typical beneficiary.—In determining the adjusted average per capita costs for an area and year under subparagraph (A), such costs shall be adjusted to fully take into account the demographic and health status risk factors established under subsection (a)(1)(A) so that such per capita costs reflect the average costs for a typical beneficiary residing in the area.

(C) Inclusion of costs of VA and DOD military health services to Medicare-eligible beneficiaries.—In determining the adjusted average per capita cost under subparagraph (A), such cost shall be reduced by an amount equal to the per capita cost of the Medicare Advantage area-specific non-drug monthly benchmark amount (or such comparable amount) as adjusted in the manner described in paragraph (3) for the area and year as determined under paragraph (3)(C)(i) for the area.
The amount of the adjustment (if any) under subparagraph (A)(iii) without regard to this subparagraph (A)(ii) is determined as follows: if the fee-for-service region-specific non-drug amount (as defined in section 1800E–3(e)(6)) for a region for a month is

(i) the number of consecutive years (in the 5-year period ending with the year involved) in which such region was a competitive Medicare Advantage area; divided by

(ii) 5.

Paragraph (2) is redesignated as subparagraph (B) of paragraph (2), and paragraph (3)(A) is further amended—

(A) by striking the first sentence and inserting the following:

"(i) the number of consecutive years (in the 5-year period ending with the year involved) in which such region was a competitive Medicare Advantage area; divided by

(ii) 5."

(2) E FFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on

(1) in paragraph (1)(A), by moving the indentation of clauses (ii) through (v) 2 ems to the left; and

(ii) by redesigning clauses (i) through (iii) as clauses (a) through (c) respectively, and by inserting before clause (ii), as so redesignated, the following new clause:

"(i) AUTHORITY TO MAKE CONDITIONAL PAYMENT.—The Secretary shall make a payment under this title with respect to an item or service if a primary plan described in subparagraph (A)(iii) has not made or cannot reasonably be expected to make payment with respect to such item or service promptly (as determined in accordance with regulations).

(b) in subparagraph (B), by striking "promptly in accordance with regulations"; and

(c) in subparagraph (C), by striking the first sentence and inserting the following:

"(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall reimbursed to the appropriate Trust Fund in accordance with the succeeding provisions of this subsection.

(2) E FFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by paragraph (1) shall be effective as if included in the enactment of title III of the Medicare and Medicaid Budget Reconciliation Amendments of 1984 (Public Law 98-369).

(3) C LARIFYING AMENDMENTS TO CONDITIONAL PAYMENT PROVISIONS.—Section 1862(b)(2) (42 U.S.C. 1395w(b)(2)) is further amended—

(A) by striking the first sentence and inserting the following:

"(A)ระยะ (B) OTHER EQUIPMENT AND SUPPLIES .—

any entity that has received payment from a primary plan, or otherwise) to make payment with respect to the same item or service (or any portion thereof) under a primary plan. The United States may, in accordance with paragraphs (A) and (B), collect double damages against any such entity. In addition, the United States may recover under this clause from any entity that has received payment from a primary plan or from the proceeds of a primary plan's payment to any entity.

''(C) Waiver of certain provisions. —

(i) among competitive acquisition areas over a period of not longer than 3 years in a manner so that the competition under the programs occurs in—

(ii) at least 5% of such areas in 2006; and

(iii) at least 3% of such areas in 2006; and

(iv) among items and services in a manner such that the programs apply to the highest cost and highest volume items and services first.

(C) Waiver of certain provisions.—In carrying out the programs, the Secretary may waive such provisions of the Federal Acquisition Regulation as are necessary for the efficient implementation of this section, other than provisions relating to confidentiality of information, unless the waiver is appropriate to carry out the purposes of this section.

(1) D URABLE MEDICAL EQUIPMENT AND MEDICAL SUPPLIES.—Covered items (as defined in section 1834(a)), excluding items and services (as described in section 1834(c)(2) of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990) may be received and "(a) D URABLE MEDICAL EQUIPMENT AND MEDICAL SUPPLIES.—Covered items (as defined in section 1834(a)), excluding items and services (as described in section 1834(c)(2)(D) other than enteral nutrients)."
(C) OFF-THE-SHELF ORTHOTICS.—Orthotics (described in section 1861(s)(9)) for which payment is otherwise made under section 1834(h) which require minimal self-adjustment use and does not require expertise in trimming, bonding, molding, assembling, or customizing to fit to the patient.

(3) EXCEPTION AUTHORITY.—In carrying out the programs under this section, the Secretary may exempt—

(A) rural areas and areas with low population density within urban areas that are not competitive, unless there is a significant national market through mail order for a particular item or service; and

(B) items and services for which the application of competitive acquisition is not likely to result in significant savings.

(4) BID RULES FOR CERTAIN RENTED ITEMS OF DURABLE MEDICAL EQUIPMENT.—In the case of a covered item for which payment is made on a rental basis under section 1834(a), the Secretary shall establish a procedure by which rental agreements for the covered items entered into before the application of the competitive acquisition program under this section shall be awarded on a rental basis under section 1834(a).

(5) PHYSICIAN AUTHORIZATION.—The Secretary may exempt an item or service if the item or service involved is clinically more appropriate than other similar items or services.

(6) APPLICATION.—For each competitive acquisition area in which the program is implemented, the payment basis determined under the competitive acquisition program shall be based on the payment determined under section 1834(a).

(7) CONTRACT REQUIREMENTS.—In general, this section shall apply to items and services entered into before the applicable contract award is made.

(8) AUTHORITY TO CONTRACT FOR EDUCATION.—The Secretary may exempt—

(A) for which payment is otherwise made under section 1833(h) or 1834(d)(1) (relating to colorectal cancer screening tests); and

(B) which are furnished by entities that did not have a face-to-face encounter with the individual.

(2) TERMINATION.—The Secretary shall carry out this section for such items and services, and beneficiary satisfaction.

(3) CONSIDERATION IN DETERMINING CATEGORY.—In determining whether an item or service is subject to competitive acquisition under this section, the term 'bid' means a request for an item or service that includes the cost of the item or service, and where applicable, any services that are attendant to the provision of the item or service.

(4) CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed as delaying the effective date of the implementation of the competitive acquisition program under this section.

(5) CONTENTS OF CONTRACT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—A contract entered into with an entity under the competition conducted pursuant to paragraph (1) is subject to terms and conditions that the Secretary may specify.

(B) Term of contracts.—The Secretary shall recompete contracts under this section not less often than once every 3 years.

(6) LIMIT ON NUMBER OF CONTRACTORS.—In general, the Secretary may limit the number of contractors in a competitive acquisition area to the number needed to meet projected demand for items and services in such area. In awarding contracts, the Secretary shall take into account the ability of bidding entities to furnish items or services in sufficient quantities to meet the anticipated needs of beneficiaries for such items or services in the geographic area covered under the contract on a timely basis.

(7) CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed as delaying the effective date of the implementation of the competitive acquisition program under this section.

(8) PAYMENT.—Payment under this part for competitively priced items and services described in subsection (a)(2) shall be based on the bids submitted and accepted under this section for such items and services.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) 1834(a).—Section 1834(a) (42 U.S.C. 1395m(a)) shall not apply.

(B) THE sec—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed as delaying the effective date of the implementation of the competitive acquisition program under this section.

(B) Additional duties.—The Committee shall perform such additional functions to assist the Secretary in carrying out this section as the Secretary may specify.

(4) INAPPLICABILITY OF FACA.—The provisions of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.) shall not apply.

(5) ANNUAL REPORTS.—The Secretary shall submit to Congress an annual management report on the programs conducted under this section. Each such report shall include information on savings, reductions in beneficiary cost-sharing, access to and quality of items and services, and beneficiary satisfaction.

(e) Demonstration project for clinical laboratory services.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall conduct a demonstration project on the application of competitive acquisition under this section to clinical diagnostic laboratory tests.

(A) for which payment is otherwise made under section 1833(h) or 1834(d)(1) (relating to colorectal cancer screening tests); and

(B) which are furnished by entities that did not have a face-to-face encounter with the individual.

(2) TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—Such project shall be subject to the conditions that they are applicable to items and services described in subsection (a)(2).

(3) REPORT.—The Secretary shall submit to Congress a report not later than June 30, 2003, and (b) which are furnished by entities that did not have a face-to-face encounter with the individual.

(4) COMPLIANCE REPORT.—The Secretary shall—

(A) submit an initial report on the project not later than June 30, 2003, and

(B) submit final reports on the project not later than December 31, 2003.

(c) Conforming amendments.—

(1) DURABLE MEDICAL EQUIPMENT; ELIMI—NATION OF INHERENT REASONABLENESS AUTHORITY.—Section 1834(a) (42 U.S.C. 1395m(a)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1)(E) by striking 'paragraph (1)(E), and inserting 'paragraph (1)(E)(i)';

(B) in paragraph (1)(C), by striking 'paragraph (1)(C)' after 'subsection' and inserting 'paragraph (1)(C)(i)'; and

(C) by adding at the end of paragraph (1) the following new subparagraph:

(E) APPLICATION OF COMPETITIVE ACQUISITION; ELIMINATION OF INHERENT REASONABLENESS AUTHORITY.—In the case of covered items and services that are included in a competitive acquisition program in a competitive acquisition area under section 1847(a) and

(i) the payment basis under this subsection for such items and services furnished in such area shall be the payment basis determined under such competitive acquisition program; and

(ii) the Secretary may use information on the payment basis determined under such competitive acquisition programs to adjust the payment amount otherwise recognized under
subparagraph (B)(ii) for an area that is not a competitive acquisition area under section 1847 and in the case of such adjustment, paragraph (3)(B) shall not be applied."; and (B) in paragraph (1)(B), by inserting "Subject to clause (3) of subparagraph (B) after "under this subsection".

(2) OFF-THE-SHELF ORTHOTICS: ELIMINATION OF INHERENT REASONABLENESS AUTHORITY.—Section 1847(h)(4) (42 U.S.C. 1395w–4(h)(4)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1)(B), by striking "and (E)" and inserting "(E)" and (H)(ii), by striking "This subsection" and inserting "Subject to subparagraph (H)(ii)";

(B) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

"(H) APPLICATION OF COMPETITIVE ACQUISITION TO ORTHOTICS; ELIMINATION OF INHERENT REASONABLENESS AUTHORITY.—In the case of orthotics described in paragraph (2)(B) of section 1847(a) that are included in a competitive acquisition program in a competitive acquisition area under such section, clause (ii) of such paragraph under such subsection for such orthotics furnished in such area shall be the payment basis determined under such competitive acquisition program and—

(i) the Secretary may use information on the payment determined under such competitive acquisition programs to adjust the payment basis recognized under subparagraph (B)(ii) for an area that is not a competitive acquisition area under section 1847, and in the setting of such adjustment, paragraphs (8) and (9) of section 1842(b) shall not be applied;".

(c) REPORT ON ACTIVITIES OF SUPPLIERS.—The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the extent to which (if any) suppliers of covered items of durable medical equipment that are subject to the competitive acquisition program under section 1847 of the Social Security Act, as amended by subsection (a), are soliciting physicians to prescribe the specific brands or modes of delivery of covered items based on profitability.

(d) GAO STUDY ON SAFE AND EFFECTIVE HOME INFUSION AND INHALATION THERAPY; STANDARDS.—

(1) STUDY.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study of the standards, professional services, and related functions relating to the provision of safe and effective home infusion and inhalation therapy.

(2) REPORT.—Not later than May 1, 2004, the Comptroller General shall submit to Congress a report on the study conducted under paragraph (1).

(e) USE OF FINDINGS IN DEVELOPING STANDARDS.—In promulgating regulations to carry out section 1847 of the Social Security Act, as amended by subsection (a), the Secretary shall ensure that quality standards developed under paragraph (2)(B) of such section reflect the findings of the Comptroller General set forth in the report under paragraph (2).

"SEC. 303. COMPETITIVE ACQUISITION OF COVERED OUTPATIENT DRUGS AND BIOLOGICALS.

(1) ADJUSTMENT TO PHYSICIAN FEE SCHEDULE.—

(A) ADJUSTMENT IN PRACTICE EXPENSE RELATIVE VALUE UNITS.—Section 1847(c)(2) (42 U.S.C. 1395w–4(c)(2)) is amended—

(A) by striking "and" at the end of subparagraph (D);

(B) by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (E) and inserting "; and"; and

(C) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

"(F) adjustments in practice expense relative value units for 2005 under subsection (c)(2)(H)."

(2) TREATMENT OF OTHER SERVICES CURRENTLY IN THE NON-PHYSICIAN WORK POOL.—The Secretary shall make adjustments to the non-physician work pool methodology and uniform term as described in paragraph (1)(B) using such methodology as promulgated by the Secretary in the Federal Register as of December 31, 2002 for determination of practice expense relative value units for services determined under such methodology as are not affected relative to the practice expense relative value units of other services not determined under such non-physician work pool methodology as is the result of any amendments made by (1) paragraph (1); (b) PAYMENT BASED ON COMPETITION.—Title XIX is amended by inserting after section 1847 (42 U.S.C. 1395w–3), as amended by section 302, the following new sections:

"SEC. 1847A. IMPLEMENTATION OF COMPETITIVE ACQUISITION.

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall establish and implement competitive acquisition program under which—

(i) competitive acquisition areas are established throughout the United States for contract award purposes for acquisition of covered outpatient drugs and biologicals (as defined in paragraph (2)) under this part;

(ii) each physician who elects to obtain drugs and biologicals under the program makes an annual selection under paragraph (5) of the contractor through which drugs and biologicals will be acquired and delivered to the physician under this part; and

(B) IMPLEMENTATION.—The Secretary shall implement the program so that the program applies to—

(i) the oncology category beginning in 2005; and

(ii) the non-oncology category beginning in 2006.

This section shall not apply in the case of a physician who elects section 1847B to apply.

"(C) WAIVER OF CERTAIN REQUIREMENTS.—In order to promote competition, efficient service, and product quality, in carrying out the program the Secretary may waive such provisions of the Federal Acquisition Regulation as are necessary for the efficient implementation of this section, other than provisions relating to confidentiality of information and such other provisions as the Secretary determines appropriate.

"(D) EXCLUSION AUTHORITY.—The Secretary may exclude covered outpatient drugs and biologicals (including a class of such drugs and biologicals) from the competitive bidding system under this section if the drugs or biologicals (or class) are not appropriate for competitive bidding due to low volume of utilization by beneficiaries under this part or a unique mode or method of delivery or similar reasons.

"SEC. 1847B. COVERED OUTPATIENT DRUGS AND BIOLOGICALS, CATEGORIES, PROGRAM DEFINED.—For purposes of this section—

(A) COVERED OUTPATIENT DRUGS AND BIOLOGICALS DEFINED.—"Covered outpatient drugs and biologicals" means drugs and biologicals to which section 1842(o) applies and which are not covered under section 1847(b) (relating to the payment for categories of covered outpatient drugs (for items of durable medical equipment). Such term does not include the following:
(i) Blood clotting factors.

(ii) Drugs and biologicals furnished to individuals in connection with the treatment of end stage renal disease.

(iii) 2003 biologicals.

(iv) Vaccines.

(2) Categories.—Each of the following shall be a separate category of covered outpatient drugs and biologicals, as identified by the Secretary:

(i) Oncology category.—A category (in this section referred to as the ‘oncology category’ or of those covered outpatient drugs and biologicals that, as determined by the Secretary, are typically billed by oncologists or are otherwise used at cancer centers.

(ii) Non-oncology categories.—Such numbers of categories in this section referred to as the ‘non-oncology categories’ consisting of covered outpatient drugs and biologicals not described in clause (i), and appropriate subcategories of such drugs and biologicals as the Secretary may specify.

(3) Program.—The term ‘program’ means the competitive acquisition program under this section.

(4) Competitive acquisition area and area.—The terms ‘competitive acquisition area’ and ‘area’ mean an appropriate geographic region established by the Secretary under the program.

(5) Contractor.—The term ‘contractor’ means an entity that has entered into a contract with the Secretary under this section.

(a) Application of program payment methodology.—With respect to covered outpatient drugs and biologicals which are supplied under the program in an area and which are prescribed by a physician who has not elected section 1847B of this title to apply—

(i) the claim for such drugs and biologicals shall be submitted by the contractor that supplied the drugs and biologicals; and

(ii) the collection of amounts of any deductible and coinsurance applicable with respect to such drugs and biologicals shall be the responsibility of such contractor and shall not be collected unless the drug or biological is administered to the beneficiary involved; and

(b) the payment under this section (and related coinsurance amounts) for such drugs and biologicals—

(i) shall be made only to such contractor;

(ii) shall be conditioned upon the administration of such drugs and biologicals; and

(iii) shall be based on the average of the bid prices for such drugs and biologicals in the area and the average of the bid prices for such drugs and biologicals within that category and area.

The Secretary shall provide a process for recoupment in the case in which payment is made. Such a process shall be made only to such contractor.

(c) The payment under this section (and related coinsurance amounts) for such drugs and biologicals—

(i) shall be conditioned upon the administration of such drugs and biologicals; and

(ii) shall be based on the average of the bid prices for such drugs and biologicals in the area and the average of the bid prices for such drugs and biologicals within that category and area.

The Secretary shall provide a process for recoupment in the case in which payment is made. Such a process shall be made only to such contractor.

(d) The bid prices for such drugs and biologicals shall be the reconfigured drug and biological acquisition area with respect to which the contractor under section that will supply the drugs and biologicals within that category and area. Such selection shall also include the list of contractors under this section that will supply the drugs and biologicals within that category and area. Such selection shall also include contractors described in section 1867(b).

(6) Information on contractors.—The Secretary shall make available to physicians and suppliers a directory posted on the Department’s Internet website or otherwise and upon request, a list of the contractors under this section in the different competitive acquisition areas.

(e) Selecting physician defined.—For purposes of this section, the term ‘selecting physician’ means, with respect to a contract, and category and competitive acquisition area—

(i) the contractor shall select a list of contractors.

(ii) the contractor shall select a list of contractors.

(f) The Secretary may specify.

(7) Terms of contracts.—

(a) In general.—A contract entered into with an entity under the competition conducted pursuant to paragraph (1) is subject to terms and conditions that the Secretary may specify consistent with this section.

(b) Period of contracts.—A contract under this section shall be for a term of 2 years, but may be terminated by the Secretary for cause.

(c) Integrity of drug and biological distribution system.—The Secretary shall require that, for all drug and biological products distributed by a contractor under this section that are acquired directly from the manufacturer or from a distributor that has acquired the products directly from the manufacturer, and

(i) the contractor shall comply with such additional product integrity safeguards as may be determined to be necessary.

(d) Implementation of anti-counterfeiting, quality, safety, and record-keeping requirements.—The Secretary shall require each contractor to implement (through the use of quality assurance measures, agents, and employees) requirements relating to the storage and handling of covered outpatient drugs and biologicals and for the establishment and maintenance of distribution records for such drugs and biologicals. A contract under this section may include requirements relating to the following:

(i) Secure facilities.

(ii) Safe and appropriate storage of drugs and biologicals.

(iii) Examination of drugs and biologicals received, and disposition of damaged and outdated drugs and biologicals.

(iv) Record keeping and written policies and procedures.

(v) Compliance personnel.

(e) Compliance with code of conduct and fraud and abuse rules.—Under the contract—

(i) the contractor shall comply with a code of conduct, specified or recognized by the Secretary, that includes standards relating to conflicts of interest; and

(ii) the contractor shall comply with all applicable provisions relating to prevention of fraud and abuse, including compliance with the certification requirements of the Department of Justice and the Inspector General of the Department of Health and Human Services.

(f) Such other factors as the Secretary may specify.

(g) Application of program payment methodology.—With respect to covered outpatient drugs and biologicals which are supplied under the program in an area and which are prescribed by a physician who has not elected section 1847B of this title to apply—

(i) the claim for such drugs and biologicals shall be submitted by the contractor that supplied the drugs and biologicals; and

(ii) the collection of amounts of any deductible and coinsurance applicable with respect to such drugs and biologicals shall be the responsibility of such contractor and shall not be collected unless the drug or biological is administered to the beneficiary involved; and

(iii) the payment under this section (and related coinsurance amounts) for such drugs and biologicals—

(A) shall not apply for a category of drugs for an area if the physician prescribing the covered outpatient drug in such category and area has elected to apply section 1847B instead of this section.

(B) addition, such a category shall be a separate category of covered outpatient drugs and biologicals, as determined by the Secretary.
"(F) DIRECT DELIVERY OF DRUGS AND BIOLOGICALS TO PHYSICIANS.—Under the contract the contractor shall only supply covered outpatient drugs and biologicals directly to physicians and not directly to beneficiaries, except under circumstances and settings where a beneficiary currently receives a drug or biological in the beneficiary’s home or other non-physician office setting as the Secretary may provide. The contractor shall not deliver drugs and biologicals to a selecting physician except upon the written prescription for such drugs and biologicals, and such necessary data as may be required by the Secretary to carry out the intent of the prescription for drugs for a single treatment or a course of treatment.

(5) PERMITTING ACCESS TO DRUGS AND BIOLOGICALS.—The Secretary shall establish rules under this section for the dispensing of drugs and biologicals which are acquired through a contractor under this section may be used to resupply inventories of such drugs and biologicals administered in locations that are consistent with safe drug practices and with adequate safeguards against fraud and abuse. The previous sentence shall apply if the physician determines that it is necessary as it applies to information disclosed under such section, except that any reference—

(A) that a covered outpatient drug or biological for which an average bid price has not been previously determined.

(B) Without regard to the extent to which the Secretary determines that the average bid prices submitted in a contract offer for a covered outpatient drug or biological shall—

(1) include all costs related to the delivery of the drug or biological to the selecting physician or other point of delivery; and

(2) include the costs of dispensing (including shipping) of such drug or biological and managing the drug or biological, and may not include any costs related to the administration of the drug or biological, or wastage, spillage, or spoilage.

(7) PRICE ADJUSTMENTS DURING CONTRACT PERIOD; DISCLOSURE OF COSTS.—Each contract award shall provide for—

(A) disclosure to the Secretary the contract prices including the adjustment for costs for periods specified by the Secretary, not more often than quarterly, of the contract; and

(B) appropriate price adjustments over the period of the contract to reflect significant increases or decreases in a contractor’s cost of acquiring, reasonable, net acquisition costs, as so disclosed.

(8) COMPUTATION OF AVERAGE BID PRICES FOR A CATEGORY AND AREA.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—For each year or other contract period for each covered outpatient drug or biological and area with respect to which a competition is conducted under the program, the Secretary shall compute an area average of the bid prices submitted, in contract offers accepted for the category and area, for that year or other contract period.

(2) SPECIAL RULES.—The Secretary shall establish rules regarding the use under this section of the alternative payment amount provided under section 1847b to the use of a price for specific covered outpatient drugs and biologicals in the following cases:

(A) NEW DRUGS AND BIOLOGICALS.—A covered outpatient drug or biological for which an average bid price has not been previously determined.

(B) OTHER CASES.—Such other exceptional circumstances and settings where a beneficiary currently receives a drug or biological in the beneficiary’s home or other non-physician office setting as the Secretary may provide.

(9) COLLECTION.—Such coinsurance shall be implemented with respect to categories of drugs and biologicals defined in subsection (c)(6)(D), 100 percent of the amount determined under paragraph (4).

(10) IN GENERAL.—If this section applies with respect to a covered outpatient drug or biological, the amount payable for the drug or biological (based on a minimum dosage unit) is, subject to applicable deductible and coinsurance—

(A) in the case of a multiple source drug (as defined in subsection (c)(6)(D)), 100 percent (or in the case of covered outpatient drugs and biologicals furnished during 2005 and 2006, 112 percent) of the amount determined under paragraph (4).

(B) in the case of a single source drug (as defined in subsection (c)(6)(D)), 100 percent (or in the case of covered outpatient drugs and biologicals furnished during 2005 and 2006, 112 percent) of the amount determined under paragraph (4).
The manufacture of a covered outpatient drug shall specify the unit associated with each National Drug Code as part of the submission of data under section 1927(b)(3)(A)(iii).

(B) UNIT DEFINED.—In this section, the term "unit" means with respect to a covered outpatient drug, the lowest identifiable quantity (such as a capsule or tablet, milligram of molecules, or grams) of the drug that is the basis of any discount without reference to volume measurements pertaining to liquids.

(2) Multiple Source Drug.—For all drug products included within the same multiple source drug, the amount specified in this paragraph is the volume-weighted average of the national drug code average sales prices reported under section 1927(b)(3)(A)(iii) computed as follows:

(A) The manufacturer's average sales price for the drug is computed using the methodology applied under paragraph (3).

(B) Divide the sum computed under sub paragraph (A) by the sum of the total number of units specified under paragraph (2) sold, as reported under section 1927(b)(3)(A)(iii).

(3) Single Source Drug.—The amount specified in this paragraph for a single source drug is the lesser of the following:

(A) MANUFACTURER'S AVERAGE SALES PRICE.—The manufacturer's average sales price for a national drug code, as computed using the methodology applied under paragraph (3).

(B) WHOLESALE ACQUISITION COST (WAC).—The wholesale acquisition cost (as defined in subsection (c)(6)(B)) reported for the single source drug.

(4) BASIS FOR DETERMINATION.—The payment amounts shall be determined under this subsection based on information reported under subsection (e) and without regard to any special packaging, labeling, or identifiers on the dosage form or product or packaging.

(c) MANUFACTURER'S AVERAGE SALES PRICE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this subsection, subject to paragraphs (2) and (3), the manufacturer's average sales price for a covered outpatient drug or biological with a covered outpatient drug or biological with a National Drug Code of a covered outpatient drug of a manufacturer, subject to paragraphs (2) and (3), the manufacturer's average sales price for the drug shall be determined by the manufacturer under this subsection on a quarterly basis. In determining the average sales price, for each drug subject to paragraphs (2) and (3), the Secretary shall apply a methodology established by the Secretary based on a 12-month rolling average for the manufacturer to estimate costs attributable to rebates and markups.

(B) UPDATES IN RATES.—The payment rates under subsection (b)(1) and (b)(2)(A) shall be updated by the Secretary on a quarterly basis, and shall be applied based upon the manufacturer's average sales price determined for the most recent calendar quarter.

(C) USE OF CONTRACTORS; IMPLEMENTATION.—The issuer may use a carrier, fiscal intermediary, or other contractor to determine the payment amount under subsection (b). Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the issuer may implement any provision of this section by program memorandum or otherwise, any of the provisions of this section.

(d) DEFINITIONS AND OTHER RULES.—In this section:

(1) QUARTERLY REPORT ON AVERAGE SALES PRICE.—For requirements for reporting the manufacturer's average sales price, and for a covered outpatient drug, see section 1927(b)(3)(A).

(B) WHOLESALE ACQUISITION COST.—The wholesale acquisition cost from section 1927(k)(2)(B).

(C) MULTIPLE SOURCE DRUG.—The term "multiple source drug" means, for a calendar quarter, a covered outpatient drug for which there are 2 or more drug products which:

(i) a drug product is pharmaceutically equivalent (under the Food and Drug Administration's standards) to another drug product, or

(ii) except as provided in subparagraph (E), are pharmaceutically equivalent and bioequivalent, as determined under subpart (F) and as determined by the Food and Drug Administration, and

(iii) are sold or marketed in the United States during the quarter.

(D) SINGLE SOURCE DRUG.—The term "single source drug" means a covered outpatient drug that is not a multiple source drug and which is produced or distributed under an original new drug application approved by the Food and Drug Administration, including any product produced by a licensed or licensed by the new drug application, or which is a biological.

(E) EXCEPTION FROM PHARMACEUTICAL EQUIVALENCE AND BIOEQUIVALENCE REQUIREMENTS.—Subparagraph (C)(ii) shall not apply if the Food and Drug Administration determines, in a publication described in subparagraph (C)(i), in order for drug products to be rated as therapeutically equivalent, they must be pharmaceutically equivalent and bioequivalent, as defined in subparagraph (F).

(F) DETERMINATION OF PHARMACEUTICAL EQUIVALENCE AND BIOEQUIVALENCE.—For purposes of this paragraph—

(i) drug products are pharmaceutically equivalent if the products contain identical chemical substances in the same dosage form and meet the applicable standards of strength, purity, quality, and identity; and

(ii) drug products are bioequivalent if they present no known or potential bioequivalence problem, or, if they present such a problem, they are shown to meet an appropriate standard of bioequivalence.

(G) INCLUSION OF VACCINES.—In applying the provisions of section 1927 under this section, other than a vaccine is deemed deleted from section 1927(b)(3).
"(f) Restriction on Administrative and Judicial Review.—There shall be no administrative or judicial review under section 1886(d)(5)(F) made by this section, the Secretary shall give preference to those risk entities that the Secretary determines have demonstrated more than 3 years direct management experience and a proficiency for cost control or recovery arising from such overpayment."

"(e) GAO Study.—

"(I) Study.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study to assess the impact of the amendments made by this section on the delivery of services, including their effect—

(A) beneficiary access to drugs and biologicals for which payment is made under part B of title XVIII of the Social Security Act; and

(B) the site of delivery of such services.

(2) Report.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment, the Comptroller General shall submit to Congress a report on the study conducted under paragraph (1).

(3) Report.—

(A) in paragraph (3), by inserting "subject to clause (xiv) and (xv) of clause (iv), by inserting "subject to clause (iv) and" before "for discharges occurring";

(B) in clause (viii), by striking "the disproportionate share adjustment percentage otherwise determined under clause (iv) (other than subsection (I)) and under clause (viii), (x), (xi), (xii), or (xiii), the disproportionate share adjustment percentage for any such hospital (relating to large, urban hospitals)."

(2) Under subsection (I), the disproportionate share adjustment percentage shall not exceed 10 percent for a hospital that is not classified as a rural referral center under subparagraph (C).

(3) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

"(I) Section 1886(d)(5)(F) (42 U.S.C. 1395ww(d)(5)(F)) is amended by adding at the end the following new clause: "(x) In the case of a hospital that is not classified as a rural referral center under subparagraph (C),"

"(II) In the case of a hospital that is classified as a rural referral center under subparagraph (C),"
to discharges occurring on or after October 1, 2003.

SEC. 402. IMMEDIATE ESTABLISHMENT OF UN-
FORMALIZED AMOUNT IN RURAL AND SMALL URBAN AREAS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1886(d)(3)(A) (42 U.S.C. 1395ww(d)(3)(A)) is amended—

(1) in the heading, by striking "in" and inserting "on or before September 30, 2003," before "October 1, 1995;" and

(2) by redesignating clauses (i) and (ii) as clauses (ii) respectively, and inserting after clause (ii) the following new clause:

"(iii) Almost all physicians described in section 1861(r)(1) in such area have privileges at the hospital and provide their inpatient services without billing for such services.".

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) COMPUTING DRG-SPECIFIC RATES.—Section 1886(d)(3)(D) (42 U.S.C. 1395ww(d)(3)(D)) is amended—

(A) in the heading, by striking "in different areas";

(B) in the matter preceding clause (i) by striking "each of", and inserting "in";

(C) in clause (i)—

(i) in the matter preceding subclause (I), by striking "for fiscal years before fiscal year 2003", before "for hospitals"; and

(ii) in subclause (II), by striking "and" after the subclause at the end; and

(D) in clause (ii)—

(i) in the matter preceding subclause (I), by striking "for fiscal years before fiscal year 2004", before "for hospitals"; and

(ii) in subclause (II), by striking the period at the end and inserting ";"; and

(E) by adding at the end the following new clause:

"(iii) for a fiscal year beginning after fiscal year 2003, for hospitals located in all areas, to the extent practicable."

"(ii) Beneficiaries in nearby areas would be adversely affected if the hospital were to close as the hospital provides specialized knowledge and services to a network of smaller hospitals and critical access hospitals.

"(iii) Medicare beneficiaries would have difficulty in accessing care if the hospital were to close because the hospital provides significant subsidies to support ambulatory care in local clinics, including mental health clinics and to support primary care.

"(iv) The hospital has a commitment to provide graduate medical education in a rural area.

A hospital classified as an essential rural hospital may not change such classification under this part or as waiving any requirement for billing for such services."

(2) HOSPITAL OUTPATIENT SERVICES.—Section 1395t(t)(13) (42 U.S.C. 1395t(t)(13)) is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

"(H) ENSURE ESSENTIAL RURAL HOSPITAL PROGRAM.—In the case of a hospital classified as an essential rural hospital under section 1861(mm)(14) for a cost reporting period, the payment under this subsection for inpatient and outpatient services during the period shall be based on 102 percent of the reasonable costs for such services. Nothing in this subparagraph shall be construed as requiring the application or amount of deductibles or copayments otherwise applicable to such services under this part or as waiving any requirement for billing for ambulatory services."

SEC. 403. MORE FREQUENT UPDATE IN WEIGHTS USED IN HOSPITAL MARKET BASKET.

(a) INCREASE IN PAYMENT AMOUNTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Sections 1834(i), 1834(g)(1), and 1835(a)(3) (42 U.S.C. 1395f(i), 1395m(g)(1); 42 U.S.C. 1395f(a)(3)) are each amended by inserting "equal to 102 percent of" before "the reasonable costs".

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by paragraph (1) shall apply to payments for services furnished during cost reporting periods beginning on or after October 1, 2004.

(b) COVERAGE OF COSTS FOR CERTAIN EMERGENCY ROOM ON-CALL PROVIDERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 1842(g)(5) (42 U.S.C. 1395m(g)(5)) is amended—

(A) in the heading—

(i) by inserting "certain" before "emergency"; and

(ii) by striking "physicians" and inserting "providers";

(B) by striking "emergency room physicians who are on-call (as defined by the Secretary)" and inserting "physicians, physician assistants, nurse practitioners, and clinical nurse specialists who are on-call (as defined by the Secretary) to provide emergency services in an emergency room on-call program";

(C) by striking "patients'" and inserting "services covered under this title".

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by paragraph (1) shall apply with respect to costs incurred for services provided on or after January 1, 2004.

(3) MODIFICATION OF THE ISOLATION TEST FOR COST-BASED CAH AMBULANCE SERVICES.

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 1833(b)(2) (42 U.S.C. 1395m(b)(2)), as added by section 205(a) of the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 (Public Law 105-33), is amended by adding at the end the following: "The limitation described in the matter following subparagraph (B) in the previous sentence shall not apply if the ambulance services are furnished by such a provider or supplier of ambulance services who is a first responder to
emergencies in accordance with local protocols (as determined by the Secretary)."

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by paragraph (1) shall apply to ambulatory payments made after the first cost reporting period that begins after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(d) AMENDMENT OF PERIODIC INTERIM PAYMENT (PIP).—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 1813(e)(2) (42 U.S.C. 1395m(e)(2)) is amended—

(A) in the matter before subparagraph (A), by inserting "15 beds" as a reference to "25 beds", but only if no more than 10 beds in the hospital are at any time used for non-acute care services. A hospital that makes such an election is not eligible for the increase provided under subsection (c)(3)(A).

(B) The limitations in numbers of beds under section 1813(e)(2)(E) of the Social Security Act, as added by paragraph (1), the Secretary shall develop alternative methods for such payments that are based on expenditures of the hospital.

(3) REINSTATEMENT OF PIP.—The amendments made by paragraph (1) shall apply to payments made after January 1, 1996.

(4) CONDITION FOR APPLICATION OF SPECIAL PHYSICIAN PAYMENT ADJUSTMENT.—

(A) in paragraph (3), by striking "(E)", and by inserting after subparagraph (D) the following new subparagraph:

"(E) inpatient critical access hospital services;"

(2) DEVELOPMENT OF ALTERNATIVE METHODS OF PERIODIC INTERIM PAYMENTS.—With respect to periodic interim payments to critical access hospitals for inpatient critical access care, as provided by section 1813(e)(2)(E) of the Social Security Act, as added by paragraph (1), the Secretary shall develop and test alternative methods for such payments that are based on expenditures of the hospital.

(5) CLOSING OF GAPS IN NEGOTIATION PROCEEDINGS.—In the case of a hospital that enters into a negotiation proceeding under subpart I of part B of chapter 139 of title 42, United States Code, the Secretary shall close any gaps in the agreement under such proceeding that are due to the failure of the hospital to provide the information required under section 1395ww(w)(3)(E)(i) of such title.

(6) ECONOMIC GAPS.—The amendment made by paragraph (5) shall be effective for cost reporting periods beginning on or after January 1, 2004.

SEC. 399. REDISTRIBUTION OF UNSED RESIDENT POSITIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1886(h)(4) (42 U.S.C. 1395ww(h)(4)) is amended by adding after subparagraph (B) the following new subparagraph:

"(C) in subsection (c)(3)(A) of this section, the approved resident amount for the hospital shall be increased by 75 percent of the national average per resident amount (as determined by the Secretary) based on a first-come-first-served basis and not to exceed an increase of 25 full-time equivalent permanent positions with respect to any hospital.

(b) APPLICABILITY.—In determining which hospitals the increase in the otherwise applicable resident positions attributable to the amendment provided under subsection (I) is deemed to be equal to the locality adjusted national average per resident amount, with respect to additional residency positions in a hospital attributable to the increase provided under subsection (I), the Secretary shall take into account the need for such an increase by specialty and location involved, consistent with subsection (C).

(c) REPORT ON EXTENSION OF APPLICATIONS TO RURAL AND SMALL URBAN AREAS.—In determining for which hospitals the increase in the otherwise applicable resident positions attributable to the amendment provided under subsection (I) is deemed to be equal to the locality adjusted national average per resident amount, with respect to additional residency positions in a hospital attributable to the increase provided under subsection (I), the Secretary shall take into account the need for such an increase by specialty and location involved, consistent with subsection (C).

(d) IMPLEMENTATION.—The Secretary shall first distribute the increase to programs of hospitals located in rural areas or in urban areas that are not large urban areas (as defined for purposes of subsection (E)) on a first-come-first-served basis and not to exceed an increase of 25 full-time equivalent permanent positions with respect to any hospital.
the deadline for applications for an increase in resident limits under section 1886(n)(4)(I)(ii)(III) of the Social Security Act (as added by subsection (a)).

SEC. 407. TWO-YEAR EXTENSION OF HOSPICE ROLE OF PRACTITIONERS FOR SMALL RURAL HOSPITALS AND SOLE COMMUNITY HOSPITALS UNDER PROSPECTIVE PAYMENT SYSTEM FOR HOSPITAL OUTPATIENT DEPARTMENT SERVICES.

(a) HOLD HARMLESS PROVISIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 1833(t)(7) of title 42 U.S.C. 1395(t)(7)(D)(ii) is amended—

(A) in the heading, by striking "small" and inserting "certain"; and

(B) by inserting after "a sole community hospital (as defined in section 1886(d)(5)(D)(iii) located in a rural area" after "100 beds"; and

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a)(2) shall apply with respect to payment for OPD services furnished on and after January 1, 2004.

(b) STUDY.—The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine if, under the prospective payment system for hospital outpatient department services (as defined in section 1886(d)(5)(D)(iii)), costs incurred by small rural providers of services by ambulatory payment classification groups (APCs) exceed those costs incurred by urban providers of services.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a)(2) shall apply with respect to payment for OPD services furnished on and after January 1, 2004.

SEC. 408. EXCLUSION OF CERTAIN RURAL HEALTH CLINIC AND FEDERALLY QUALIFIED HEALTH CENTER SERVICES FROM THE IMPROVEMENT IN EMERGENCY CAPACITY FOR AMBULANCE SERVICES IN RURAL AREAS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the case of home health services furnished in a rural area (as defined in section 1886(d)(2)(D)(ii) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395ww(d)(2)(D)(ii))) during 2004 and 2005, the Secretary shall—

(1) exclude from applying the modifiers listed in subparagraph (B), the Secretary shall provide for a percent increase in the base rate in the lowest quartile as compared to the average cost for the base rate for such services that is in the highest quartile of all rural county populations.

(b) QUALIFIED RURAL AREA DEFINED.—For purposes of subparagraph (A), the term "qualified rural area" is—

(1) an assessment of the validity of the geographic adjustment factors used for each component of the fee schedule;

(2) an evaluation of the methods used to calculate the factors used in professional liability insurance premiums and relative weights for the malpractice component.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall apply to such services furnished on or after January 1, 2004.

SEC. 409. PROVISIONS RELATING TO ATTENDING NURSE PRACTITIONERS AS ATTENDING PHYSICIANS TO SERVE HOSPICE PATIENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1861(dd)(3)(B) (42 U.S.C. 1395y(e)(2)(A)) is amended—

(1) in clause (ii), by striking "(ii)" and inserting "(ii)" and "(iii)"; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new clause:

(iv) EXCLUSION OF CERTAIN RURAL HEALTH CLINIC AND FEDERALLY QUALIFIED HEALTH CENTER SERVICES FROM THE IMPROVEMENT IN EMERGENCY CAPACITY FOR AMBULANCE SERVICES IN RURAL AREAS.

SEC. 410. IMPROVEMENT IN EMERGENCY CAPACITY FOR AMBULANCE SERVICES IN RURAL AREAS.

Section 1831(i) (42 U.S.C. 1395n(i)) is amended—

(1) by redesigning paragraph (8), as added by section 223(a) of BIPA (114 Stat. 2763A-486), as paragraph (9); and

(2) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

(10) ASSISTANCE FOR RURAL PROVIDERS FURNISHING SERVICES IN LOW MEDICARE POPULATION DENSITY AREAS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—In the case of ground ambulance services furnished on or after January 1, 2004, for which the transportation originates in a qualified rural area (as defined in subparagraph (B)), the Secretary shall provide for a percent increase in the base rate of the fee schedule for a trip established under this subsection. In establishing such percent increase, the Secretary shall estimate the average cost per trip for the base rate in the lowest quartile as compared to the average cost for the base rate for such services that is in the highest quartile of all rural county populations.

(B) QUALIFIED RURAL AREA DEFINED.—For purposes of subparagraph (A), the term "qualified rural area" is—

(1) an assessment of the validity of the geographic adjustment factors used for each component of the fee schedule;

(2) an evaluation of the methods used to calculate the factors used in professional liability insurance premiums and relative weights for the malpractice component.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to payment for OPD services furnished on and after January 1, 2004.

(b) STUDY.—The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine if, under the prospective payment system for hospital outpatient department services (as defined in section 1886(d)(5)(D)(iii)), costs incurred by rural providers of services by ambulatory payment classification groups (APCs) exceed those costs incurred by urban providers of services.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a)(2) shall apply with respect to payment for OPD services furnished on and after January 1, 2004.

SEC. 411. PROVISIONS RELATING TO HOME HEALTH SERVICES FURNISHED IN A RURAL AREA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the case of home health services furnished in a rural area (as defined in section 1886(d)(2)(D)(ii) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395ww(d)(2)(D)(ii))) during 2004 and 2005, the Secretary shall—

(1) exclude from applying the modifiers listed in subparagraph (B), the Secretary shall provide for a percent increase in the base rate in the lowest quartile as compared to the average cost for the base rate for such services that is in the highest quartile of all rural county populations.

(b) WAIVING BUDGET NEUTRALITY.—The Secretary shall not reduce the standard prospective payment amount (or amounts) under section 1886 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395wwf) for such services by 5 percent.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to payment for OPD services furnished on and after January 1, 2004.

SEC. 412. PROVIDING SAFE HARBOR FOR CERTAIN COLLABORATIVE EFFORTS THAT BENEFIT MEDICALLY UNDER-SERVED POPULATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1128B(b)(3) (42 U.S.C. 1320a-7(b)(3), as amended by section 101(b)(2), is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(3), by striking "and (F), by striking "and" after the semicolon at the end;

(2) in subparagraph (G), by striking the period at the end and inserting "; and"; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

(4) any remuneration between a public or nonprofit private health center entity and any other public or nonprofit private health center entity pursuant to a contract, lease, grant, loan, or other agreement, if such agreement contributes to the ability of the health center entity to maintain or increase the availability, or enhance the quality, of services provided to a medically underserved population served by the health center entity.

(b) PROVISIONS RELATING TO EXCEPTION FOR HEALTH CENTER ENTITY ARRANGEMENTS.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services shall establish, after hearing testimony referred to as the "Secretary") shall establish, on an expedited basis, standards relating to

the exception described in section 1128B(b)(3)(H) of the Social Security Act, as added by subsection (a), for health center entity arrangements to the antikickback penalties.

(B) FACTORS TO CONSIDER.—The Secretary shall consider the following factors, among others, in establishing standards relating to the prohibition on health center entity arrangements under subparagraph (A):

(i) Whether the arrangement between the health center entity and the other party results in savings in Federal, State or local funds or increased revenues to the health center entity.

(ii) Whether the arrangement between the health center entity and the other party results in limiting a patient's freedom of choice.

(iii) Whether the arrangement between the health center entity and the other party protects a health care professional's independent medical judgment regarding medically appropriate treatment.

The Secretary may also include other standards and criteria that is consistent with the intent of Congress in enacting the exception established under this section.

(2) INTERIM FINAL EFFECT.—No later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall publish a rule in the Federal Register consistent with the factors under paragraph (1)(B). Such rule shall be effective and final immediately, subject to such change and revision, after public notice and opportunity (for a period of not more than 60 days) for public comment, as is consistent with this subsection.

SEC. 413. GAO STUDY OF GEOGRAPHIC DIFFERENCES IN PAYMENTS FOR PHYSICIANS' SERVICES.

(a) STUDY.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study of differences in payment amounts under the prospective payment system in section 1888(h)(4)(I)(ii)(II) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w-4) for physicians' services in different geographic areas. Such study shall include—

(1) an assessment of the validity of the geographic adjustment factors used for each component of the fee schedule;

(2) an evaluation of the measures used for such adjustment, including the frequency of revisions; and

(3) an evaluation of the methods used to determine professional liability insurance costs in the malpractice component, including a review of increases in professional liability insurance premiums and a comparison in such areas among the rates and physician specialty and methods used to update the geographic cost of practice index and relative weights for the malpractice component.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall submit to Congress a report on the study conducted under subsection (a). The report shall include recommendations regarding the use of more current data in computing cost of practice indices as well as the use of data directly representative of physicians' costs (rather than proxy measures of such costs).

SEC. 414. TREATMENT OF MISSING COST REPORTING PERIODS FOR SOLE COMMUNITY HOSPITALS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1905(l)(2)(B) (42 U.S.C. 1396b(l)(2)(B)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

(3) In no case shall a hospital be denied treatment as a sole community hospital or payment (on the basis of a target rate as such a hospital) because data are unavailable for any cost reporting period due to changes in ownership, changes in fiscal intermediary, or other extraordinary circumstances, so long as data for at least one
applicable base cost reporting period is available.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to cost reporting periods beginning on or after January 1, 2004.

SEC. 415. EXTENSION OF TELEMEDICINE DEMONSTRATION PROJECT.

Section 424(c) of the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 (Public Law 105-33) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(4), by striking "4-year" and inserting "8-year"; and

(2) by striking '$30,000,000' and inserting '$60,000,000'.

SEC. 416. ADJUSTMENT TO THE MEDICARE INPATIENT HOSPITAL PPSS WAGE INDEX TO THE LABOR-RELATED SHARE OF SUCH INDEX.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1886(d)(3)(E) (42 U.S.C. 1395ww(d)(3)(E)) is amended—

(1) by striking "WAGE LEVELS.—" and inserting "(a) in general—Section 1886(d)(3)(E) (42 U.S.C. 1395ww(d)(3)(E)) is amended—

(2) by adding at the end the following new clause:

"(ii) ALTERNATIVE PROPORTION TO BE APPLIED IN FISCAL YEAR 2004.—

"(I) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in clause (i), the Secretary and";

and (3) by striking "wage levels".

SEC. 417. MEDICARE INCENTIVE PAYMENT PROGRAM—IMPROVEMENTS FOR PHYSICIAN SCARCITY.

(a) ADDITIONAL BONUS PAYMENT FOR CERTAIN PHYSICIAN SCARCITY AREAS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 1833 (42 U.S.C. 1395s) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(a) IMPROVING TIMELINESS OF DATA COLLECTION.—

"(1) by striking 'and' at the end of subclause (XVIII),

"(2) after 'and' inserting ''for each of fiscal years 2004 through 2006, the market basket percentage increase minus 0.4 percentage points for hospitals in all areas,'',

"(b) SCOPE OF PROJECT.—The Secretary shall conduct the project under this section with respect to no more than 3 hospice programs for a period of not longer than 5 years each.

(c) COMPLIANCE WITH CONDITIONS.—Under the demonstration project:

"(1) the hospice program shall comply with otherwise applicable requirements, except that it shall not be required to offer services outside of the home or to physicians or beneficiaries determined under section 1861(d)(2)(A)(iii) of the Social Security Act; and

"(2) payments for hospice care shall be made at the rates otherwise applicable to such care under title XVIII of such Act.

The Secretary may require the program to comply with such additional quality assurance standards for its provision of services in its facility as the Secretary deems appropriate.

(d) REPORT.—The report shall be submitted to Congress on or before January 1, 2004.

SEC. 418. RURAL HOSPICE DEMONSTRATION PROJECT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall conduct a demonstration project for the delivery of hospice care to Medicare beneficiaries in rural areas. Under the project Medicare beneficiaries in rural areas shall have access to hospice care in the home for lack of an appropriate caregiver are provided such care in a facility of 20 or fewer beds which offers, within its walls, the full range of services provided by hospice programs under section 1861(dd) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395ww(b)(3)(B)).

(b) SCOPE OF PROJECT.—The Secretary shall conduct the project under this section—

"(1) for the purpose of demonstrating the feasibility of the project;

"(2) to be carried out in rural areas; and

"(3) in any area for which the Secretary has not been notified of the availability of hospice services under section 1861(d)(2)(A)(iii) of the Social Security Act; and

(c) PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION.—

"(1) the Secretary shall conduct the demonstration project in the manner that the Secretary determines to be best for the purposes of the demonstration project.
beneficiaries as follows:

(i) Under such criteria, a service or technology shall not be denied treatment as a new service or technology on the basis of the period of time in which the service or technology represents an advance in medical technology before the end of the 2-to-3-year period that begins on the effective date of implementation of a new medical service or technology (or a successor coding methodology) that enables the identification of specific discharges in which the service or technology has been used.

(2) Adjustment of Threshold.—Section 1886(d)(5)(K)(ii)(I) (42 U.S.C. 1395ww(d)(5)(K)(ii)(I)) is amended by inserting in paragraph (1), is further amended by adding at the end the following new clauses:

(i) The Secretary shall accept comments, recommendations, and data from the public regarding whether the service or technology represents a substantial improvement.

(ii) The Secretary shall provide for a meeting at which organizations representing hospitals, physicians, Medicare beneficiaries, manufacturers, and any other interested parties provide comments, recommendations, and data to the clinical staff of the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services before publication of a notice of proposed rulemaking for the new service or technology represents a substantial improvement.

(3) Preference for Use of DRG Adjustment.—Section 1886(d)(5)(K) (42 U.S.C. 1395ww(d)(5)(K)) is further amended by adding at the end the following new clause:

(i) The Secretary shall provide for a mechanism established pursuant to paragraph (1) (A) to identify one or more diagnosis-related groups associated with such technology, based on similar clinical or anatomical characteristics and the cost of the technology, and the Secretary shall assign an eligible new technology into a diagnosis-related group where the average costs of care most closely approximate the costs for such diagnosis-related group.

(4) Process for Public Input.—Section 1886(d)(9) (42 U.S.C. 1395ww(d)(9)) is amended by inserting at the beginning the following new paragraph:

(i) In general.—The Secretary shall implement the amendments made by this section so that they apply to classification for fiscal years beginning with fiscal year 2005.

(ii) Equalization of Standards for Fiscal Year 2004 That Are Denied.—In the case of an application for a classification of a medical service or technology for fiscal year 2004 that is denied, the Secretary shall consider the application as an application for a classification for fiscal year 2005, and the Secretary shall provide for a meeting at which organizations representing hospitals, physicians, Medicare beneficiaries, manufacturers, and any other interested parties provide comments, recommendations, and data to the clinical staff of the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services before publication of a notice of proposed rulemaking for the new service or technology represents a substantial improvement.

(iii) Effectiveness Date.—In general.—The Secretary shall implement the amendments made by this section so that they apply to classification for fiscal years beginning with fiscal year 2005.

(iv) Equalization of Standards for Fiscal Year 2004 That Are Denied.—In the case of an application for a classification of a medical service or technology under section 1886(d)(5)(K) (the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395ww(d)(5)(K)) that was filed for fiscal year 2004 and that is denied—

(A) the Secretary shall reconsider the application as an application for classification for fiscal year 2005 under the amendments made by this section; and

(B) the period otherwise permitted for such classification of the service or technology shall be extended by 12 months.

SEC. 503. INCREASE IN FEDERAL RATE FOR HOSPITALS IN PUERTO RICO.

Section 1886(d)(9) (42 U.S.C. 1395ww(d)(9)) is amended—

(i) in subparagraph (A)—

(A) in clause (i), by striking for discharges occurring on or after October 1, 1987, and before October 1, 1997, the applicable Puerto Rico percentage is 50 percent and the applicable Federal percentage is 75 percent; and

(B) by adding at the end the following new clause:

(ii) For purposes of subparagraph (A), for discharges occurring on or after October 1, 1997, and before October 1, 1998, the applicable Puerto Rico percentage is 50 percent and the applicable Federal percentage is 75 percent.

(ii) during fiscal year 2004, the applicable Puerto Rico percentage is 41 percent and the applicable Federal percentage is 59 percent; and

(iii) during fiscal year 2005, the applicable Puerto Rico percentage is 33 percent and the applicable Federal percentage is 67 percent.

(a) In general.—Section 1886(d) (42 U.S.C. 1395ww(d)) is amended by adding at the end the following paragraph:

(i) After the location of residence of hospital employed by a hospital that resides in any higher wage index area, the Secretary shall establish a process, upon application of a subsection (d) hospital that establishes that it is a qualifying hospital described in subparagraph (B), for an increase of the wage index applied under paragraph (3)(E) for the hospital in the amount computed under subparagraph (D). A qualifying hospital described in this subparagraph is a subsection (d) hospital—

(A) in which the average wages of which exceed the average wages for the area in which the hospital is located; and

(B) which has at least 10 percent of its employees who reside in one or more higher wage index areas.

(C) For purposes of this paragraph, the term 'higher wage index area' means, with respect to a hospital, an area with a wage index that exceeds that of the area in which the hospital is located.

(D) The increase in the wage index under subparagraph (A) for a hospital shall be the percentage of the wage index of the hospital that resides in any higher wage index area multiplied by the sum of the products, for each higher wage index area of—

(i) the difference between (I) the wage index for such area, and (II) the wage index of the area in which the hospital is located before the application of this paragraph; and

(ii) the number of employees of the hospital that reside in such higher wage index area divided by the total number of such employees that reside in all high wage index areas.

(E) The process under this paragraph shall be based upon the process used by the Medicare Geographic Classification Review Board under paragraph (10) with respect to data submitted by hospitals to the Board on the location of residence of hospital employees under the wage index schedule established for geographic reclassification.

(F) A reclassification under this paragraph shall be effective for a period of 3 fiscal years, except that the Secretary shall establish procedures under which a subsection (d) hospital may elect to terminate such reclassification before the end of such period.

(G) A hospital that is reclassified under this paragraph for a period is not eligible for

related group classification) under this subsection until the fiscal year that begins after such date.

(b) Eligibility Standard for Technology Outline.—The Secretary shall establish an outline of new technologies as follows:

(i) In general.—The Secretary shall accept comments, recommendations, and data from the public regarding whether the service or technology represents a substantial improvement.

(ii) The Secretary shall provide for a meeting at which organizations representing hospitals, physicians, Medicare beneficiaries, manufacturers, and any other interested parties provide comments, recommendations, and data to the clinical staff of the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services before publication of a notice of proposed rulemaking for the new service or technology represents a substantial improvement.

(iii) Preference for Use of DRG Adjustment.—The Secretary shall accept comments, recommendations, and data from the public regarding whether the service or technology represents a substantial improvement.

(iv) Process for Public Input.—The Secretary shall implement the amendments made by this section so that they apply to classification for fiscal years beginning with fiscal year 2005.

(v) Equalization of Standards for Fiscal Year 2004 That Are Denied.—In the case of an application for a classification of a medical service or technology under section 1886(d)(5)(K) (the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395ww(d)(5)(K)) that was filed for fiscal year 2004 and that is denied—

(A) the Secretary shall reconsider the application as an application for classification for fiscal year 2005 under the amendments made by this section; and

(B) the period otherwise permitted for such classification of the service or technology shall be extended by 12 months.

SEC. 504. WAGE INDEX ADJUSTMENT RECLASSIFICATION REFORM.

(a) In general.—Section 1886(d) (42 U.S.C. 1395ww(d)) is amended by adding at the end the following paragraph:

(i) In general.—The Secretary shall implement the amendments made by this section so that they apply to classification for fiscal years beginning with fiscal year 2005.

(ii) Equalization of Standards for Fiscal Year 2004 That Are Denied.—In the case of an application for a classification of a medical service or technology under section 1886(d)(5)(K) (the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395ww(d)(5)(K)) that was filed for fiscal year 2004 and that is denied—

(A) the Secretary shall re-
reclassification under paragraphs (8) or (10) during that period.

'(H) Any increase in a wage index under this paragraph for a hospital shall not be taken into account for purposes of—

'(i) computing the wage index for the area in which the hospital is located or any other area; or

'(ii) applying any budget neutrality adjustment with respect to such index under paragraph (8)(D).

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall first apply to the wage index for discharges occurring on or after October 1, 2004.

SEC. 565. MEDPAC REPORT ON SPECIALTY HOSPITALS

(a) MedPAC Study.—The Medicare Payment Advisory Commission shall conduct a study of specialty hospitals compared with other similar general acute care hospitals under the medicare program. Such study shall examine—

'(1) whether there are excessive self-referrals;

'(2) quality of care furnished;

'(3) the impact of specialty hospitals on such general acute care hospitals; and

'(d) differences in the scope of services, medicare utilization, and uncompensated care furnished.

(b) Study.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report on the study conducted under subsection (a), and statutory recommendations for legislation or administrative change as the Secretary determines appropriate.

Subtitle B—Other Provisions

SEC. 511. PAYMENT FOR COVERED SKILLED NURSING FACILITY SERVICES

(a) Adjustment to RUGS for AIDS Residents.—Paragraph (12) of section 1886(e) (42 U.S.C. 1395yy(e)) is amended to read as follows:

'(12) Adjustment for residents with AIDS.—

'(A) In general.—Subject to subparagraph (B), in the case of a resident of a skilled nursing facility who is afflicted with acquired immune deficiency syndrome (AIDS), the per diem amount of payment otherwise applicable is increased by 128 percent to reflect increased costs associated with such residents.

'(B) Sunset.—Subparagraph (A) shall not apply to services furnished during a period that would have been redeemed by reason of the clerical error, and matured by reason of the clerical error.

SEC. 512. COVERAGE OF HOSPICE CONSULTATION SERVICES

(a) Coverage of Hospice Consultation Services.—Section 1838(a)(2)(A) (42 U.S.C. 1395w–4(a)(2)(A)) is amended—

'(1) by striking ''and'' at the end of paragraph (4) and inserting ''(C) advising the individual regarding advanced care planning.'';

'(2) by striking ''Section 1814(i)'' (42 U.S.C. 1395w–4(f)(2)) and inserting in its place ''(D) adjusting the per diem amount of payment otherwise applicable to reflect increased costs associated with such residents.'';

'(3) by striking ''and'' at the end of subparagraph (C) and inserting ''and'';

'(4) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (4) and inserting ''(C) advising the individual regarding advanced care planning.'';

'(5) by striking ''and'' at the end of paragraph (4) and inserting ''(C) advising the individual regarding advanced care planning.'';

'(6) by striking paragraph (4) and inserting in its place—

'(4) The amount paid to a hospice program with respect to the services under section 182a(a)(5) for which payment may be made under the medicare program shall be reduced by an amount equivalent to the amount established for an office or other outpatient visit for evaluation and management associated with preventative care, as determined by the Secretary of Health and Human Services, for such course of care or service.''

(b) Payment.—Section 1814(i) (42 U.S.C. 1395w–4(f)(2)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

'(4) The amount paid to a hospice program with respect to the services under section 182a(a)(5) for which payment may be made under the medicare program shall be reduced by an amount equivalent to the amount established for an office or other outpatient visit for evaluation and management associated with preventative care, as determined by the Secretary of Health and Human Services, for such course of care or service.''

SEC. 513. CORRECTION OF TRUST FUND HOLDINGS

(a) In General.—Not later than 120 days after the effective date of this section, the Secretary shall request the Comptroller General to conduct a study on the results of the study described in section 1812(a)(5) and insertions that are necessary to carry out this section.

(b) Obligations Issued and Redeemed.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall—

'(1) issue to the Trust Fund obligations under chapter 31 of title 31, United States Code, that bear issue dates, interest rates, and maturity dates as the obligations that—

'(A) would have been issued to the Trust Fund if the clerical error had not occurred; or

'(B) were issued to the Trust Fund and were redeemed by reason of the clerical error; and

'(2) redeem from the Trust Fund obligations that would have been redeemed from the Trust Fund if the clerical error had not occurred.

(c) Appropriation to Trust Fund.—Within 120 days after the effective date of this section, there shall be appropriated to the Trust Fund, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, an amount determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Secretary of Health and Human Services, to be equal to the interest income lost by the trust fund through the date of credit by reason of the clerical error.

(d) Clerical Error Defined.—For purposes of this section, the term "clerical error" means the failure to have transferred to the Trust Fund any amount attributable to the practice expense component.

(e) Effective Date.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to services furnished on or after January 1, 2004.

SEC. 602. STUDIES ON ACCESS TO PHYSICIANS' SERVICES

(a) GAO Study on Benefit Access to Physicians' Services.—Not later than 18 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study on access to medicare beneficiaries to physicians' services under the medicare program.

(b) Report.—The Comptroller General shall submit to Congress a report on the results of the study described in this section, including any recommendations for legislation.

(c) Effective Date.—The amendments made by paragraph (1) shall apply to services furnished on or after October 1, 2003.

TITLIE VI—PROVISIONS RELATING TO PHYSICIANS' SERVICES

SUBTITLE A—Physicians' Services

SEC. 601. REVISION OF UPDATES FOR PHYSICIANS' SERVICES

(a) Update for 2004 and 2005.—(1) Section 1896(g) (42 U.S.C. 1395w–4(g)) is amended—

'(1) by striking ''and'' at the end of paragraph (4) and inserting in its place—

'(4) Update for 2004 and 2005.—The update to the conversion factor established in paragraph (1)(C) for each of 2004 and 2005 shall be not less than 1.5 percent.''

(b) Conforming Amendment.—Paragraph (4)(B) of such section is amended, in the matter before clause (i), by inserting "and paragraph (5)" after "subparagraph (D)".

SUBTITLE B—Other Provisions

SEC. 602. STUDIES ON ACCESS TO PHYSICIANS' SERVICES

(a) GAO Study on Benefit Access to Physicians' Services.—Not later than 18 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall conduct a study on access to medicare beneficiaries to physicians' services under the medicare program.

(b) Report.—The Comptroller General shall submit to Congress a report on the results of the study described in this section, including any recommendations for legislation.
SEC. 603. MEDPAC REPORT ON PAYMENT FOR PHYSICIANS' SERVICES.

(a) PRACTICE EXPENSE COMPONENT.—Not later than the date of the enactment of this Act, the Medicare Payment Advisory Commission shall submit to Congress a report on the effect of refinements to the practice expense component of payment for physicians' services, after the transition to a full resource-based payment system in 2002, under section 1848 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w-4). Such report shall examine the following matters by physician specialty:

(1) the effect of such refinements on payment for physicians' services;

(2) the interaction of the practice expense component with other components of and adjustments to payment for physicians' services under such section;

(3) the appropriateness of the amount of compensation by reason of such refinements;

(4) the effect of such refinements on access to care by Medicare beneficiaries to physicians' services;

(5) the effect of such refinements on physician participation under the Medicare program.

(b) VOLUME OF PHYSICIAN SERVICES.—The Medicare Payment Advisory Commission shall submit to Congress a report on the extent to which increases in the volume of physicians' services under part B of the Medicare program are a result of care that improves the health and well-being of Medicare beneficiaries. The study shall include the following:

(1) an analysis of recent and historic growth in the components of the Secretary includes under the sustainable growth rate (under section 1840(f) of the Social Security Act);

(2) an examination of the relative growth of volume in physician services between Medicare beneficiaries and other populations;

(3) an analysis of the degree to which new technology, including coverage determinations of the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services, has affected the volume of physician services;

(4) an examination of the impact on volume of demographic changes;

(5) an examination of shifts in the site of services to determine the influence that these changes have on the intensity of services furnished in physicians' offices and the extent to which changes in reimbursement rates to other providers may contribute to these changes;

(6) an evaluation of the extent to which the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services takes into account the impact of law and regulations on the sustainable growth rate.

SEC. 604. INCLUSION OF PODIATRISTS AND DENTISTS UNDER PRIVATE CONTRACTING AUTHORITY.

Section 182b(5)(B) (42 U.S.C. 1395a(b)(5)(B)) is amended—

(A) by striking "section 1831(h)(1)" and inserting "(paragraphs 1, 2, and 3 of section 1861(e)";

(B) by striking "and" before "(6)"; and

(C) by striking "(7)" and inserting "(8)".

SEC. 605. ESTABLISHMENT OF FLOOR ON WORK GEOGRAPHIC INDEX.

(a) MINIMUM INDEX.—Section 1848(e)(1) (42 U.S.C. 1395w-4(e)(1)) is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

"(E) FLOOR AT 1.0 ON WORK GEOGRAPHIC INDEX.

(i) IN GENERAL.—Subject to clause (ii), after calculating the work geographic index in subparagraph (A)(iii), for purposes of payment for services furnished on or after January 1, 2004, and before January 1, 2006, the Secretary shall increase the work geographic index to 1.00 for any locality for which such work geographic index is less than 1.00.

(ii) SECRETARIAL DISCRETION.—Clause (i) shall have no force or effect in law if the Secretary determines, taking into account the report of the Comptroller General under section 605(b)(2) of the Medicare Prescription Drug and Modernization Act of 2003, that there is no sufficient evidence for the implementation of that clause.".

(b) GAO REPORT.—

(1) EVALUATION.—As part of the study on geographic refinements for payments for physicians' services conducted under section 413, the Comptroller General of the United States shall evaluate the following:

(A) whether there is a sound economic basis for the implementation of the adjustment of the work geographic index under section 1848(e)(1) of the Social Security Act under subsection (a) in those areas in which the adjustment applies;

(B) the effect of such adjustment on physician location and retention in areas affected by such adjustment, taking into account—

(i) differences in recruitment costs and retention rates for physicians, including specialists, between large urban areas and other areas;

(ii) the mobility of physicians, including specialists, over the last decade;

(C) the appropriateness of establishing a floor of 1.0 for the work geographic index.

(2) REPORT.—By not later than September 1, 2004, the Comptroller General shall submit to Congress and to the Secretary a report on the evaluation conducted under paragraph (1).

Subtitle B—Preventive Services

SEC. 611. COVERAGE OF AN INITIAL PREVENTIVE PHYSICIAN EXAMINATION.

(a) COVERAGE.—Section 1861(s)(2) (42 U.S.C. 1395x(s)(2)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (U), by striking "and"

at the end;

(2) in subparagraph (V), by inserting "and" at the end; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

"(W) an initial preventive physical examination (as defined in subsection (ww)).".

(b) SERVICES DESCRIBED.—Section 1861 (42 U.S.C. 1395x), as amended by section 611(b), is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"Initial Preventive Physical Examination

(ww) The term 'initial preventive physical examination' means physicians' services furnished on or after January 1, 2005, under subsection (a) in those areas in which the Secretary includes under the sustainable growth rate (under section 1840(f)) the following:

(1) EVALUATION.—As part of the study on geographic refinements for payments for physicians' services conducted under section 413, the Comptroller General of the United States shall evaluate the following:

(A) whether there is a sound economic basis for the implementation of the adjustment of the work geographic index under section 1848(e)(1) of the Social Security Act under subsection (a) in those areas in which the adjustment applies;

(B) the effect of such adjustment on physician location and retention in areas affected by such adjustment, taking into account—

(i) differences in recruitment costs and retention rates for physicians, including specialists, between large urban areas and other areas;

(ii) the mobility of physicians, including specialists, over the last decade;

(C) the appropriateness of establishing a floor of 1.0 for the work geographic index.

(2) REPORT.—By not later than September 1, 2004, the Comptroller General shall submit to Congress and to the Secretary a report on the evaluation conducted under paragraph (1).

Subtitle C—Blood Lipid Screening Tests

SEC. 612. COVERAGE OF CHOLESTEROL AND OTHER BLOOD LIPID SCREENING TESTS.

(a) COVERAGE.—Section 1861(s)(2) (42 U.S.C. 1395x(s)(2), as amended by section 611(a), is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (V), by striking "and" at the end;

(2) in subparagraph (W), by inserting "and" at the end; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

"(XX) cholesterol and other blood lipid screening tests (as defined in subsection (XX)).".

(b) SERVICES DESCRIBED.—Section 1861 (42 U.S.C. 1395x), as amended by section 611(b), is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"Cholesterol and Other Blood Lipid Screening Test

(XX) The term 'cholesterol and other blood lipid screening test' means diagnostic testing of cholesterol and other lipid levels of the blood for the purpose of early detection of abnormal cholesterol and other lipid levels.

(2) Whether there is a sound economic basis for the implementation of the adjustment of the work geographic index under section 1848(e)(1) of the Social Security Act under subsection (a) in those areas in which the adjustment applies;

(3) the appropriateness of establishing a floor of 1.0 for the work geographic index.

(2) REPORT.—By not later than September 1, 2004, the Comptroller General shall submit to Congress and to the Secretary a report on the evaluation conducted under paragraph (1).
and services furnished on or after January 1, 2004.

SEC. 614. IMPROVED PAYMENT FOR CERTAIN MAMMOGRAPHY SERVICES.

(a) EXCLUSION FROM OPP FEE SCHEDULE.—Section 1833(t)(1)(B)(iv) (42 U.S.C. 1395f(t)(1)(B)(iv)) is amended by inserting before the period at the end the following: ‘‘does not include screening mammography (as defined in section 1927(j)(1)) and unilateral and bilateral diagnostic mammography’’.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to mammography performed on or after January 1, 2004.

Subtitle C—Other Services

SEC. 621. HOSPITAL OUTPATIENT DEPARTMENT (HOPD) PAYMENT REFORM.

(a) PAYMENT FOR DRUGS.—

(1) MODIFICATION OF AMBULATORY PAYMENT CLASSIFICATION (APC) GROUPS.—Section 1833(t)(2) (42 U.S.C. 1395f(t)(2)) is amended—

(A) by redesignating paragraph (13) as paragraph (14); and

(B) by inserting after paragraph (12) the following new paragraph:

‘‘(13) DRUG APC PAYMENT RATES.—

‘‘(A) In general.—With respect to payment for covered OPD services that includes a specified covered outpatient drug (defined in subparagraph (B)), the amount provided for payment under such drug under the payment system under this subsection for services furnished on or after January 1, 2003, shall be in the case of ambulatory procedure codes calculated and applied by the Secretary for purposes of this paragraph.

‘‘(B) SPECIFIED COVERED OUTPATIENT DRUG DEFINED.—

‘‘(i) in general.—In this paragraph, the term ‘specified covered outpatient drug’ means, subject to clause (ii), a covered outpatient drug (as defined in 1927(k)(2), that is—

‘‘(I) a radiopharmaceutical; or

‘‘(II) a drug or biological for which payment was made under the payment system under section 1847A, as calculated and applied by the Secretary for purposes of this paragraph.

‘‘(ii) specific covered outpatient drug means—

‘‘(I) a drug for which payment is first made on or after January 1, 2003, under paragraph (6); or

‘‘(II) a drug for which a temporary HCPCS code has not been assigned.

‘‘(C) TRANSITION TOWARDS HISTORICAL AVERAGE ACQUISITION COST.—The transition percentage under this subparagraph for drugs furnished in a year is determined in accordance with the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘‘(D) PAYMENT FOR NEW DRUGS UNTIL TEMPORARY HCPCS CODE ASSIGNED.—With respect to payment for covered OPD services that includes a specified covered outpatient drug (as defined in subparagraph (B)), the amount provided for payment for such drug under the payment system under this subsection shall be equal to 95 percent of the average wholesale price for the drug.

‘‘(E) CLASSES OF DRUGS.—For purposes of this paragraph, Class I drugs shall be treated as separate classes of drugs:

‘‘(i) SOLE SOURCE DRUGS.—A sole source drug which for purposes of this paragraph means a drug that is a multiple source drug (as defined in subsections (I) and (II) of section 1927(k)(7)(A)(i)) and is not a drug approved under an abbreviated new drug application on or after January 1, 2003, by the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act.

‘‘(ii) INNOVATOR MULTIPLE SOURCE DRUGS.—Innovator multiple source drugs (as defined in section 1927(k)(7)(A)(ii)).

‘‘(iii) NONINNOVATOR MULTIPLE SOURCE DRUGS.—Noninnovator multiple source drugs (as defined in section 1927(k)(7)(A)(iii)).

‘‘(f) INAPPLICABILITY OF EXPENDITURES IN DETERMINING CONVERSION FACTORS.—Additional expenditures resulting from this para-graph and paragraph (14)(C) in a year shall not be taken into account in establishing the conversion factor for that year.’’. (2) REDUCTION IN THRESHOLD FOR SEPARATE DRUGS.—Section 1833(t)(14), as redesignated by paragraph (13)(A), is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

‘‘(B) THRESHOLD FOR ESTABLISHMENT OF SEPARATE DRUGS.—For drugs, the threshold for the establishment of separate ambulatory payment classification groups with respect to drugs to 50 per administration.’’

‘‘(3) EXCLUSION OF SEPARATE DRUG APCS FROM OUTLIER PAYMENTS.—Section 1833(t)(3)(A), as amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

‘‘(C) EXCLUSION OF SEPARATE DRUG APCS FROM OUTLIER PAYMENTS.—For drugs, the threshold for the establishment of separate ambulatory payment classification groups with respect to drugs to 50 per administration.’’

(4) PAYMENT FOR PASS THROUGH DRUGS.—Clause (1) of section 1833(t)(6)(D) (42 U.S.C. 1395f(t)(6)(D)) is amended by inserting after ‘‘under section 1927(o)’’ the following: ‘‘(or if the drug is covered under a competitive acquisition contract under section 1847A for an area, an amount determined by the Secretary for purposes of this paragraph to be the average price for the drug for that area established under such section as calculated and applied by the Secretary for purposes of this paragraph).’’

(5) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this subsection shall apply to services furnished on or after January 1, 2004.

(b) SPECIAL PAYMENT FOR BRACHYTHERAPY DEVICES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 1833(t)(14), as so redesignated and amended by subsection (a), is amended—

(A) by redesignating paragraph (13) as paragraph (14); and

(B) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

‘‘(C) PAYMENT FOR DEVICES OF BRACHYTHERAPY THERAPY AT CHARGES ADJUSTED TO COST.—Notwithstanding the preceding provisions of this section, for a device of brachytherapy furnished on or after January 1, 2004, and before January 1, 2007, the payment basis for the device under this subsection shall be equal to the hospital’s charges for each device furnished, adjusted to cost.’’. (2) SPECIFICATION OF GROUPS FOR BRACHYTHERAPY DEVICES.—Section 1833(t)(2) (42 U.S.C. 1395f(t)(2)) is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (F), by striking ‘‘and’’; and

(B) in subparagraph (G), by striking the period at the end and inserting ‘‘; and’’; and

(C) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

‘‘(G) with respect to devices of brachytherapy, the Secretary shall create additional groups of covered OPD services that classify such devices separately from the other services (or group of services) paid for under this subsection in a manner reflecting the number, isotope, and radioactive intensity of such devices, including separate groups for palladium-103 and iodine-125 devices.’’. (3) GAO REPORT.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study to determine appropriate payment amounts under section 1833(t)(13)(B) of the Social Security Act, as added by paragraph (1), for devices of brachytherapy furnished on or after January 1, 2005, the Comptroller General shall submit to Congress a report on the study conducted under this paragraph, and shall make recommendations for appropriate payments for such devices.

(c) APPLICATION OF FUNCTIONAL EQUIVALENCE TEST.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 1833(t)(6) (42 U.S.C. 1395f(t)(6)) is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

‘‘(F) LIMITATION ON APPLICATION OF FUNCTIONAL EQUIVALENCE STANDARD.—The Secretary may not apply a ‘functional equivalence’ payment standard (including such standard promulgated on November 1, 2002) or any other similar standard in order to deem a particular product to be functionally equivalent (or a similar standard) unless the Commissioner of Food and Drugs establishes a functional equivalence standard and certifies, under such standards, that the two products are functionally equivalent. If the Commissioner makes such a certification with respect to two or more products, the Secretary may, after complying with applicable rulemaking requirements, implement a standard with respect to such products under this subsection.’’. (2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by paragraph (1) shall apply to the application of a functional equivalence standard to a drug or biological on or after the date of the enactment of this Act, unless such application was being made to such drug or biological prior to June 30, 2003.

(d) HOSPITAL ACQUISITION COST STUDY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall conduct a study on the costs incurred by hospitals in acquiring certain drugs for which payment is made under section 1833(t) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395f(t)).

(2) DRUGS COVERED.—The study in paragraph (1) shall not include those drugs for which the acquisition costs is less than $50 per administration.

(e) REPRESENTATIVE SAMPLE OF HOSPITALS.—In conducting the study under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall collect data from a statistically valid sample of hospitals with an urban/rural stratification.

(f) REPORT.—Not later than January 1, 2006, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report on the study conducted under paragraph (1), and shall include recommendations with respect to the following:

(A) Whether the study should be repeated, and if so, how frequently

(B) Whether the study produced useful data on hospital acquisition cost

(C) Whether data produced in the study is appropriate for use in developing recommendations for payments to drugs and biologicals under section 1847A of the Social Security Act.

(D) Whether separate estimates can be made of overhead costs, including handling and administering costs for drugs.

SEC. 622. PAYMENT FOR AMBULANCE SERVICES.

(a) PHASE-IN PROVIDING FLOOR USING BLEND OF OPP FEE SCHEDULE AND REGIONAL FEE SCHEDULE.—Section 1834(l) (42 U.S.C. 1395m(l)), as amended by section 410(a), is amended—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 1834(l)(6) (42 U.S.C. 1395m(l)(6)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

‘‘II. AMOUNTS TO BE PAID.—For purposes of this paragraph, the payment basis for ambulance services furnished under this subsection shall be the average wholesale price for the drug or biological prior to June 13, 2003.’’

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by paragraph (1) shall apply to payments under this subsection on or after the date of the enactment of this Act, unless such application was being made to such drug or biological prior to June 13, 2003.

(3) HOSPITAL ACQUISITION COST STUDY.—In conducting the study under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall collect data from a statistically valid sample of hospitals with an urban/rural stratification.

(4) REPORT.—Not later than January 1, 2006, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report on the study conducted under paragraph (1), and shall include recommendations with respect to the following:

(A) Whether the study should be repeated, and if so, how frequently

(B) Whether the study produced useful data on hospital acquisition cost

(C) Whether data produced in the study is appropriate for use in developing recommendations for payments to drugs and biologicals under section 1847A of the Social Security Act.

(D) Whether separate estimates can be made of overhead costs, including handling and administering costs for drugs.
(1) in paragraph (2)(E), by inserting "consistent with paragraph (11)" after "in an efficient and fair manner"; and
(2) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(11) PHASE-IN PROVIDING FLOOR USING BLEND OF FEE SCHEDULE AND REGIONAL FEE SCHEDULES.—In carrying out the phase-in under paragraph (2), for each level of service furnished in a year, the portion of the payment amount that is based on the fee schedule shall be the greater of the amount determined under the fee schedule (without regard to this paragraph) or the following blended rate of the fee schedule under paragraph (1) and of a regional fee schedule for the region in which the service was furnished:

(A) For 2004, the blended rate shall be based 20 percent on the fee schedule under paragraph (1) and 80 percent on the regional fee schedule.

(B) For 2005, the blended rate shall be based 40 percent on the fee schedule under paragraph (1) and 60 percent on the regional fee schedule.

(C) For 2006, the blended rate shall be based 60 percent on the fee schedule under paragraph (1) and 40 percent on the regional fee schedule.

(D) For 2007, 2008, and 2009, the blended rate shall be based 80 percent on the fee schedule under paragraph (1) and 20 percent on the regional fee schedule.

(E) For 2010 and each succeeding year, the blended rate shall be based 100 percent on the fee schedule under paragraph (1)."

For purposes of this paragraph, the Secretary shall establish a regional fee schedule for each of the 9 Census divisions using the methodology (used in establishing the fee schedules under paragraph (1)) to calculate a regional conversion factor and a regional mileage rate and using the same payment adjustments and the same relative value units as used in the fee schedule under such paragraph.

(b) ADJUSTMENT IN PAYMENT FOR CERTAIN LONG TRIPS.—Section 1834(l), as amended by subsection (a), is further amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(12) ADJUSTMENT IN PAYMENT FOR CERTAIN LONG TRIPS.—In the case of ground ambulance services furnished in a year, the portion of the amount described in subparagraph (C) in effect on the date of enactment of this Act shall be increased by 1⁄4 of the payment rate for mileage for a trip above 50 miles for a trip above 50 miles the per mile rate otherwise established shall be increased by 1⁄4 of the payment per mile otherwise applicable to such mile."

(c) GAO REPORT ON COSTS AND ACCESS.—Not later than December 31, 2005, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to Congress an initial report on how costs differ among the types of ambulance providers, services, supply, and the availability of ambulance services in those regions and States that have a reduction in payment that is made under the Medicare ambulance fee schedule (under the recommendations of the Institute of Medicine of the National Academy of Sciences to identify conditions or diseases that should justify conducting an assessment of the need to waive the therapy caps under section 1395g(4) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395g(4)).

(1) PRELIMINARY REPORT.—Not later than January 1, 2004, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a preliminary report on the conditions and diseases identified under paragraph (1).

(2) FINAL REPORT.—Not later than September 1, 2004, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a final report on such conditions and diseases.

(d) GAO STUDY OF PATIENT ACCESS TO PHYSICAL THERAPIST SERVICES.—

(1) STUDY.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study on access to physical therapist services in States authorizing such services without a physician referral and in States that require such a referral.

(2) REPORT.—The Comptroller General shall submit to Congress a report on the study conducted under paragraph (1) not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 623. RENAL DIALYSIS SERVICES.

(a) DEMONSTRATION OF ALTERNATIVE DELIVERY MODELS.—

(1) USE OF ADVISORY BOARD.—In carrying out demonstration project relating to improving care for people with end-stage renal disease through alternative delivery models (as published in the Federal Register of June 4, 2003), the Secretary shall establish an advisory board comprised of representatives described in paragraph (2) to provide advice and recommendations with respect to the establishment and operation of such demonstration project.

(2) REPRESENTATIVES.—Representatives referred to in paragraph (1) include representatives of the following:

(A) Patient organizations.

(B) Clinicians.

(C) The Medicare payment advisory commission, established under section 1805 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395b-6).

(D) The National Kidney Foundation.

(E) The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, the National Cancer Institute, and the National Institutes of Health.

(F) End-stage renal disease networks.

(G) Medicare contractors to monitor quality of care.

(i) providers of services and renal dialysis facilities furnishing end-stage renal disease services.

(j) Economists.

(k) Researchers.

(b) REDUCTION OF COMPOSITE RATE EXCEPTIONS FOR PEDIATRIC FACILITIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 422(a)(2) of BIPA is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking "and" and inserting ", and", (C), and (D);

(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking "In the case in which" and inserting "Subject to paragraph (A),"; and

(c) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

"(D) INAPPLICABILITY TO PEDIATRIC FACILITIES.—Subparagraphs (A) and (B) shall not apply, as of October 1, 2002, to pediatric facilities that do not have an exception rate described in subparagraph (C) in effect on the date of enactment of this Act.

"(2) USE OF ADVISORY BOARD.—In the case of ground ambulance services furnished on or after January 1, 2004, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a preliminary report on the conditions and diseases identified under paragraph (1).

(2) REPORT.—Not later than September 1, 2004, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a final report on such conditions and diseases.

(b) RESTORING COMPOSITE RATE EXCEPTIONS FOR PEDIATRIC FACILITIES FURNISHING END-STAGE RENAL DISEASE SERVICES.—Section 1395l(g)(4) is amended by striking "and 2002".

(c) INCREASE IN RENAL DIALYSIS COMPOSITE RATE FOR SERVICES FURNISHED IN 2004.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, with respect to payment under part B of title X, the Secretary shall establish a composite payment rate for renal dialysis services furnished in 2004, the composite payment rate otherwise established under section 1395l(b)(7) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1395l(b)(7)) shall be increased by 1.6 percent.

SEC. 624. ONE-YEAR MORATORIUM ON THERAPY CAPS; PROVISIONS RELATING TO PHYSICAL THERAPIST SERVICES.—

(a) 1-YEAR MORATORIUM ON THERAPY CAPS.—Section 1393g(4)(A) (42 U.S.C. 1395g(4)) is amended by striking "and 2002" and inserting "and 2003".

(b) PROMPT SUBMISSION OF OVERDUE REPORTS ON PAYMENT AND UTILIZATION OF OUTPATIENT THERAPY SERVICES.—Not later than December 31, 2003, the Secretary shall submit to Congress the reports required under section 1395l(d)(2) of the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 (relating to utilization of a single annual dollar cap on outpatient therapy and under section 221(d) of the Medicare, Medicaid, and SCHIP Balanced Budget Reconciliation Act of 2000) and the report required under section 1395l(d)(2) of the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 (relating to utilization patterns for outpatient therapy).

(c) IDENTIFICATION OF CONDITIONS AND DISEASES JUSTIFYING WAIVER OF THERAPY CAP.—Not later than December 31, 2004, the Secretary shall request the Institute of Medicine of the National Academy of Sciences to identify conditions or diseases that should justify conducting an assessment of the need to waive the therapy caps under section 1395g(4) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395g(4)).

(d) GAO STUDY OF PATIENT ACCESS TO PHYSICAL THERAPIST SERVICES.—

(1) STUDY.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study on access to physical therapist services in States authorizing such services without a physician referral and in States that require such a referral.

(2) REPORT.—The Comptroller General shall submit to Congress a report on the study conducted under paragraph (1) by not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 625. ADJUSTMENT TO PAYMENTS FOR SERVICES FURNISHED IN AMBULATORY SURGICAL CENTERS.

Section 1395f(l)(2)(C), as added by section 1395l(g)(4) is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

"(C) INCREASE IN RENAL DIALYSIS COMPOSITE RATE FOR SERVICES FURNISHED IN 2004.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, with respect to payment under part B of title X, the Secretary shall establish a composite payment rate for renal dialysis services furnished in 2004, the composite payment rate otherwise established under section 1395l(b)(7) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1395l(b)(7)) shall be increased by 1.6 percent."
"(C) In accordance with procedures established by the Secretary, an individual entitled to benefits with respect to such shoes described in section 1861(h)(12) may substitute medical care for such shoes in the case of a beneficiary or individual who is 65 years of age or older, who is 56 lbs. or less and who has not had an arm or leg amputated, that results in the requirement of such medical care during the period for which payment is made by this section, for the payment amount established under section 1834(h), a payment amount that the Secretary estimates will assure that there are no net increases in expenditures under this subsection as a result of this subpart."

4. CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—(1) Section 1861(h)(4)(C) (42 U.S.C. 1395f(h)(4)(C)) is amended by inserting "(and includes shoes described in section 1861(s)(12))" after "in" in section 1861.

(2) Section 1825(s)(2) (42 U.S.C. 1835(s)(2)) is amended by striking subparagraph (C).

5. EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to items furnished on or after January 1, 2004.
SEC. 702. ESTABLISHMENT OF REDUCED COPAYMENT—

(a) by striking "or coinsurance" and inserting "coinsurance, or copayment"; and

(b) by striking "or (a)(4)" and inserting "(a)(4), or (a)(5)".

SEC. 703. MEDPAC STUDY ON MEDICARE MARGINS OF HOME HEALTH AGENCIES.

(a) STUDY.—The Medicare Payment Advisory Commission shall conduct a study of payment margins under the home health prospective payment system under section 1895 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395fff). Such study shall evaluate the systematic differences in payment margins are related to differences in case mix (as measured by home health resource groupings (HHRGs)) among such agencies. The study shall be completed by fiscal year 2009.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commission shall submit to Congress a report on the study under subsection (a).

SEC. 704. DEMONSTRATION PROJECT TO CLARIFY THE DEFINITION OF HOMEBOUND.

(a) DEMONSTRATION PROJECT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall conduct a two-year demonstration project under part B of title XVIII of the Social Security Act under which medicare beneficiaries with permanent and severe condition that will not improve; (B) the beneficiary requires the individual to receive assistance from another individual with at least 3 out of the 5 activities of daily living for the rest of the individual’s life; (C) the beneficiary requires skilled nursing services on a permanent basis and the skilled nursing is more than medication management; (D) either (A) a attendant is needed during the day to ensure that the beneficiary’s medical condition, or (B) the beneficiary needs daily skilled nursing on a permanent basis and the skilled nursing is more than medication management; and (E) the beneficiary requires technological assistance or the assistance of another person to leave the home.

(b) DEMONSTRATION PROJECT SITES.—The demonstration project sites shall be chosen by the Secretary to represent the Northeast, Midwest, and Western regions of the United States. The study shall use the partial or full-service groups (HHRGs) among such agencies.

(c) LIMITATION ON NUMBER OF PARTICIPATING PROJECT SITES.—The Secretary may not exceed 15 demonstrations of title XVIII of the Social Security Act for acts prohibited under such titles, including penalties for false certifications for purposes of claiming a reimbursement for services under the medicare program.

(d) W AIVER AUTHORITY.—The Secretary shall waive compliance with the requirements of title XVIII of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395 et seq.) to such extent and for such period as the Secretary determines is necessary to conduct demonstration projects.

SEC. 705. VOLUNTARY CHRONIC CARE IMPROVEMENT FOR HOME HEALTH SERVICES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1877(e)(1)(A) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w(e)(1)(A)) is amended by inserting "6/30/2003" after "3/31/2003."
"(I) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall estab-
lish a process for providing chronic care im-
provement programs in each CCIA region for
medicare beneficiaries who are not en-
rolled under Part C or E and who have cer-
tain chronic conditions, such as congestive
heart failure, diabetes, chronic obstructive
pulmonary disease (COPD), stroke, prostate
and colon cancer, hypertension, or other dis-
orders as identified by the Secretary as appro-
priate for chronic care improvement. Such a
process shall begin to be implemented no later
than 1 year after the date of the enact-
ment of this section.

(2) TERMINOLOGY.—For purposes of this
section—

(A) CCIA REGION.—The term ‘CCIA region’
means a chronic care improvement adminis-
tration region delineated under subsection
(b)(2).

(B) CHRONIC CARE IMPROVEMENT
PROGRAM.—The terms ‘chronic care improve-
ment program’ and ‘program’ means such a
program provided by a contractor under this
section.

(C) CONTRACTOR.—The term ‘contractor’
means an entity with a contract to provide a
chronic care improvement program in a CCIA
region under this section.

(D) INDIVIDUAL PLAN.—The term ‘indi-
vidual plan’ means a chronic care improve-
ment plan established under subsection (c)(5)
for an individual.

(3) CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this sec-
tion shall be construed as expanding the am-
OUNT, DURATION, OR SCOPE OF BENEFITS UNDER
an individual plan as defined in subsection
(b)(3)(F), for an individual.

(4) CONTRACT TERMS.—(1) IN GENERAL.—A
contract under this section shall provide for
the operation of a chronic care improve-
ment program by a contractor in a CCIA
region consistent with this section.

(A) Notification that the contractor offer-
ing a program may contact the beneficiary
directly concerning such participation.

(B) A description of the method for the
beneficiary to select the single program in
which the beneficiary wishes to participate
and the terms that the beneficiary would need
to meet in order to be considered for the pro-
gram for obtaining additional information con-
cerning such participation.

(C) Participation.—A Medicare bene-
ficiary shall be eligible to enroll in only one
program under this section and may terminate
participation at any time in a manner specified
by the Secretary.

(D) Elements of individual plan.—Each
individual plan shall include a single point of
contact to coordinate care and the following,
as appropriate:

(i) Self-improvement education for the
beneficiary (such as education for disease
management through medical nutrition ther-
apy, comparison of pertinent clinical informa-
tion, and colon cancer, hypertension, or other dis-
orders such as vital signs, symptomatic informa-
tion, and health self-assessment.

(ii) Coordination of health care services,
such as application of a prescription drug
regimen and home health services.

(iii) Collaboration with physicians and
other providers to enhance communication of
relevant clinical information.

(iv) The use of monitoring technologies
that enable patient guidance through the ex-
change of pertinent clinical information,
such as vital signs, symptomatic informa-
tion, and health self-assessment.

(v) The provision of information about
hospice care, pain and palliative care, and
definitive-care-end of life care.

(C) CONTRACTOR RESPONSIBILITIES.—In es-
tablishing and carrying out individual plans
under a program, a contractor shall, directly
or through subcontracts—

(i) guide participants in managing their
health, including all their co-morbidities,
in performance as specified under the ele-
ments of the plan;

(ii) use decision support tools such as evi-
dence-based practice guidelines or other cri-
eria as determined by the Secretary; and

(iii) develop a clinical information data-
base to track and monitor each participant
across settings and to evaluate outcomes.

(E) CONTRACT TERMS.—The Secre-
tary shall establish additional require-
ments for programs and contractors under
this section.

(F) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—
There are authorized to be appropriated to
the Secretary, in appropriate part from the
Hospital Insurance Trust Fund and the Sup-
plementary Medical Insurance Trust Fund,
such sums as may be necessary to provide for
contracts with chronic care improvement
programs under this section.

(G) LIMITATION ON FUNDING.—In no case
shall the funding under this section exceed
$60,000,000 over a period of 5 years.

SEC. 725. CHRONIC CARE IMPROVEMENT UNDER
MEDICARE ADVANTAGE AND ENHANCED FEE-SERVICE
PROGRAMS.

(A) UNDER MEDICARE ADVANTAGE
PROGRAM.—Section 1852 (42 U.S.C. 1395w–22) is
amended—

(1) by amending subsection (e) to read as
follows:

"(1) IMPLEMENTATION OF CHRONIC CARE
IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS FOR BENEFICIARIES
WITH MULTIPLE OR SUFFICIENTLY SEVERE
CHRONIC CONDITIONS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Each Medicare Advan-
tage organization with respect to each Medi-
care Advantage plan it offers shall have in

(B) beneficiary and provider satisfaction;

(C) health outcomes; and

(D) financial outcomes.

(7) PHASED IN IMPLEMENTATION.—Nothing
in this section shall be construed as pre-
venting the Secretary from phasing in the
implementation of programs.

(B) ANNUAL OUTCOME REPORTS.—The
Secretary shall submit to the Congress an-
nual reports on the implementation of this
section. Each such report shall include infor-
mation on—

(i) the scope of implementation (in terms
of both regions and chronic conditions);

(ii) program design; and

(iii) improvements in health outcomes and
financial efficiencies that result from such
implementation.

(C) CLINICAL TRIALS.—The Secretary shall
conduct randomized clinical trials, that compare
program participants with medicare beneficiaries
who are offered, but decline, to participate, in
order to assess the potential of programs to—

(i) reduce costs under this title; and

(ii) improve health outcomes under this
title.

(D) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—
There are authorized to be appropriated to
the Secretary, in appropriate part from the
Hospital Insurance Trust Fund and the Sup-
plementary Medical Insurance Trust Fund,
such sums as may be necessary to provide for
contracts with chronic care improvement
programs under this section.
effect, for enrollees with multiple or sufficiently severe chronic conditions, a chronic care improvement program that is designed to manage the needs of such enrollees and that meets the requirements of this subsection.

"(2) ENROLLEE WITH MULTIPLE OR SUFFICIENTLY SEVERE CHRONIC CONDITIONS.—For purposes of this section, the term "enrollee with multiple or sufficiently severe chronic conditions' means, with respect to an enrollee in a Medicare Advantage plan of a Medicare Advantage organization, an enrollee in the plan who has one or more chronic conditions, such as congestive heart failure, high blood pressure, COPD, stroke, prostate and colon cancer, hypertension, or other disease as identified by the organization as appropriate for chronic care improvement.

(3) GENERAL REQUIREMENTS.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—Each chronic care improvement program under this subsection shall be conducted consistent with this subsection.

"(B) IDENTIFICATION OF ENROLLEES.—Each such program shall have a method for monitoring and identifying enrollees with multiple or sufficiently severe chronic conditions that meet the organization's criteria for participation under the program.

"(C) DEVELOPMENT OF PLANS.—For an enrollee (as determined by the Secretary) for whom the Secretary shall, directly or through subcontracts—

(i) develop a clinical information data-base to track and monitor each participant to its outcomes, including all pertinent clinical information, and support education for health care providers, primary caregivers, and family members.

(ii) Coordination of health care services, such as assistance of a prescription drug regimen and home health services.

(iii) Collaboration with physicians and other providers to enhance communication of relevant clinical information.

(iv) The use of monitoring technologies that enable patient guidance through the exchange of pertinent clinical information, such as symptom monitoring, information, and health self-assessment.

(v) The provision of information about hospice care, pain and palliative care, and end-of-life care.

(E) ORGANIZATION RESPONSIBILITIES.—In establishing and carrying out chronic care improvement plans for participants under this subsection, a Medicare Advantage organization shall, directly or through subcontracts—

(i) guide participants in managing their health, including their co-morbidities, and in performing the activities as specified under the elements of the plan;

(ii) use decision support tools such as evidence-based practice guidelines or other criteria as determined by the Secretary; and

(iii) develop a clinical information database to track and monitor each participant across the facility to which they are referred.

(3) ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS.—The Secretary shall establish additional requirements for chronic care improvement programs that are not otherwise required under this subsection.

(4) ACCREDITATION.—The Secretary may provide that chronic care improvement programs that are accredited by qualified organizations that meet such requirements under this subsection as the Secretary may specify.

(5) OUTCOMES REPORT.—Each Medicare Advantage organization with respect to its chronic care improvement program under this subsection shall monitor and report to the Secretary information on the quality of care and efficacy of such program as the Secretary may require.

(6) CHRONIC CARE IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM.—A description of the organization's chronic care improvement program shall be submitted to the Secretary under subsection (b).

(b) APPLICATION UNDER ENHANCED Fee-FOR-Service PROGRAM.—Section 1850c-2(c)(3), as inserted by section 203(a), is amended by inserting "(ii) use decision support tools such as evidence-based practice guidelines or other criteria as determined by the Secretary", after 

"(iii) develop a clinical information data-base to track and monitor each participant's outcomes, benefits, and adverse events;"

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply for contract years beginning on or after 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 722. INSTITUTE OF MEDICINE REPORT.

(a) STUDY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services shall contract with the Institute of Medicine of the National Academic of Sciences to conduct a study of the barriers to effective integrated care improvement for Medicare beneficiaries with multiple or sufficiently severe chronic conditions and over time to submit a report under subsection (b).

(2) SPECIAL STUDIES.—The study shall examine the following:

(A) Clinical, financial, or administrative requirements in the Medicare program that present barriers to effective, seamless transitions across care settings.

(B) Policies that impede the establishment of administrative and clinical information systems to track health status, utilization, cost, and quality data across settings.

(C) State-level requirements that may present barriers to better care for Medicare beneficiaries.

(D) Consultants that review the study findings and recommendations, directly or through consultation with experts in the field of chronic care, consumers, and family caregivers, working to integrate care delivery and create more seamless transitions across settings and over time.

(b) REPORT.—The report under this subsection shall be submitted to the Secretary and Congress not later than 18 months after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 724. MEDPAC REPORT.

(a) EVALUATION.—shall conduct an evaluation that includes a description of the status of the implementation of chronic care improvement programs under section 1808 of the Social Security Act, the quality of health care services provided to individuals in such programs, the health status of the participants of such program, and the cost savings attributed to implementation of such program.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 2 years after the date of implementation of such chronic care improvement programs, the Commission shall submit a report on such evaluation.

Subtitle D—Other Provisions

SEC. 731. MODIFICATIONS TO MEDICARE PAYMENT ADVISORY COMMISSION REPORT.

(a) EXAMINATION OF BUDGET CONSEQUENCES.—Before making any recommendations, the Commission shall examine the budget consequences of such recommendations, directly or through consultation with appropriate expert entities.

(2) CONSIDERATION OF PROVIDE R OF SERVICES.—Section 1805(b)(2)(B)(i) (42 U.S.C. 1395b–6(b)(2)(B)(i)) is amended by inserting "the efficient provision of after "expenditures".

(c) APPLICATION OF DISCLOSURE REQUIREMENT TO MEDICARE ADVISORY COMMISSION.—In general.—Section 1805(c)(2)(D) (42 U.S.C. 1395b–6(c)(2)(D)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(ii) to the extent that the Secretary in consultation with appropriate expert entities.".

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by paragraph (1) shall take effect on January 1, 2004.

(d) ADDITIONAL REPORTS.—

(1) DATA NEEDS AND SOURCES.—The Medicare Payment Advisory Commission shall conduct a study, and submit a report to Congress by not later than June 1, 2004, on the need for current data, and sources of current data available, to determine the solvency and financial circumstances of hospitals and other Medicare providers of services. The study shall examine data on uncompensated care, as well as the sharing of uncompensated care accounted for by the expenses for treating illegal aliens.

(2) USE OF TAX-RELATED RETURNS.—Using return information provided under Form 990 of the Internal Revenue Service, the Commission shall submit to Congress, not later than June 1, 2004, a report on the following:

(A) Investments, endowments, and fundraising of hospitals participating under the Medicare program and related foundations.

(B) Access to capital financing for private and not-for-profit hospitals.

SEC. 732. DEMONSTRATION PROJECT FOR MEDICAL ADULT DAY CARE SERVICES.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—Subject to the succeeding provisions of this section, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall establish a demonstration project which consists of substitute medical adult day care services, in each case referred to as the "demonstration project") under which the Secretary shall, as part of a plan of an episode of care for home health services established for a Medicare beneficiary, permit a home health agency, directly or under arrangements with a medical adult day care facility, to provide medical adult day care services as a substitute for a portion of home health services that would otherwise be provided in the beneficiary's home.

(b) PAYMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The amount of payment for an episode of care for home health services established for a Medicare beneficiary which consists of substitute medical adult day care services, under the demonstration project shall be made at a rate equal to 95 percent of the amount that would otherwise apply for such home health care under a plan of an episode of care for home health services established for a Medicare beneficiary, permitting a home health agency, directly or under arrangements with a medical adult day care facility, to provide medical adult day care services as a substitute for a portion of home health services that would otherwise be provided in the beneficiary's home.

(2) BUDGET NEUTRALITY FOR DEMONSTRATION PROJECT.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary shall provide for an appropriate reduction in the aggregate amounts payable under section 1895 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395ff) to reflect any increase in
(c) Demonstration Project Sites.—The project sites established under this section shall be conducted in not more than 5 States selected by the Secretary that license or certify providers of services that furnish medical adult day care services.

(d) Duration.—The Secretary shall conduct the demonstration project for a period of 3 years.

(e) Voluntary Participation.—Participation of Medicare beneficiaries in the demonstration project shall be voluntary. The total number of such beneficiaries that may participate in the project at any given time may not exceed 15,000.

(f) Required Selecting Agencies.—In selecting home health agencies to participate under the demonstration project, the Secretary shall give preference to those agencies that are currently licensed or certified through common ownership and control to furnish medical adult day care services.

(g) Waiver Authority.—The Secretary may waive such requirements of title XVIII of the Social Security Act as may be necessary for the purposes of carrying out the demonstration project, other than having the requirement that an individual be home-bound in order to be eligible for benefits for home health services.

(h) Evaluation and Report.—The Secretary shall conduct an evaluation of the clinical and cost-effectiveness of the demonstration project. Not later than 30 months after the commencement of the project, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report on the evaluation, and shall include in the report the following:

(1) Summary of the patient outcomes and costs of furnishing care to the Medicare beneficiaries participating in the project as compared to such outcomes and costs to beneficiaries receiving only home health services for the same health conditions.

(2) Such recommendations regarding the extension, expansion, or termination of the project as the Secretary determines appropriate.

(i) Definitions.—In this section:

(1) Medicare Adult Day Care Facility.—The term "medicare adult day care facility" means a facility—

(A) that has a program of supervised activities furnished in a group setting in the facility that—

(i) meet such criteria as the Secretary determines appropriate; and

(ii) is designed to provide physical and mental health of the individuals; and

(C) such other services as the Secretary may specify.

(2) Medicare Beneficiary.—The term "medicare beneficiary" means an individual entitled to benefits under part A of this title, enrolled under part B of this title, or both.

SEC. 734. IMPROVEMENTS IN NATIONAL AND LOCAL COVERAGE DETERMINATION PROCESS TO RESPOND TO CHANGES IN TECHNOLOGY.

(a) National and Local Coverage Determination Process.—

(1) In General.—Section 1862 (42 U.S.C. 1395y) is amended—

(A) in the twelfth sentence of subsection (a) by inserting "consistent with subsection (k)" after "the Secretary shall ensure"; and

(B) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

(2) United States of America and Canada Determination Process.—

(1) Factors and Evidence Used in Making National Coverage Determinations.—The Secretary shall make available to the public the factors considered in making national coverage determinations of whether an item or service is reasonable and necessary. The Secretary shall make such determinations by publishing documents to carry out this paragraph in a manner similar to the development of guidance documents under section 702(h) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 373(h)).

(2) Timeframe for Decisions on Requests for National Coverage Determinations.—In the case of a request for a national coverage determination that—

(A) does not require a technology assessment, consultation, or deliberation from the Medicare Coverage Advisory Committee, the decision on the request shall be made not later than 6 months after the date of the request; and

(B) requires such an assessment or deliberation and in which a clinical trial is not requested, the decision on the request shall be made not later than 9 months after the date of the request.

(3) Process for Public Comment on National Coverage Determinations.—At the end of the 30-day period for requests described in paragraph (2)(B) that begins on the date a request for a national coverage determination is made, the Secretary shall—

(A) make a draft of proposed decision on the request available to the public through the Medicare Internet site of the Department of Health and Human Services or other appropriate means;

(B) provide a 30-day period for public comment on such draft;

(C) make a final decision on the request within 60 days of the conclusion of the 30-day period referred to under subparagraph (B); and

(D) include in such final decision summaries of the comments received and responses thereto;

(E) make available to the public the clinical evidence and other data used in making such a decision when the decision differs from the recommendations of the Medicare Coverage Advisory Committee; and

(F) in the case of a decision to grant the coverage of the item or service, assign a temporary or permanent code and implement the coding change.

(4) Consultation with outside experts in certain national coverage determinations.—With respect to a request for a national coverage determination for which there is not a review by the Medicare Coverage Advisory Committee, the Secretary shall consult with appropriate outside clinical experts.

(b) Medicinal Drug Exemption.—Section 1862(a)(2)(B) and (2)(C) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w–4(i)) is amended by adding at the end the following new provisions:

(1) Local Coverage Determination Process.—With respect to local coverage determinations made on or after January 1, 2004—

(A) Plan to Promote Consistency of Coverage Determinations.—The Secretary shall develop a plan to evaluate new local coverage determinations to determine which determinations should be adopted nationally and what extent equity can be achieved among local coverage determinations.

(B) Consultation.—The Secretary shall require the fiscal intermediaries or carriers providing services within the same area to consult on all new local coverage determinations made in the area.

(C) Dissemination of Information.—The Secretary shall make available to the public information on the determinations among fiscal intermediaries and carriers to reduce duplication of effort.

(b) National and Local Coverage Determinations Defined.—For purposes of this subsection, the terms 'national coverage determination' and 'local coverage determination' have the meaning given such terms in paragraphs (3)(B) and (2)(B), respectively, of section 1864(a)(1).

(2) Effective Date.—The amendments made by paragraph (1) shall apply to national and local coverage determinations as of January 1, 2004.

(c) Medicare Coverage of Routine Costs Associated with Certain Clinical Trials.—

(1) In General.—With respect to the coverage of routine costs of care for beneficiaries participating in a qualifying clinical trial, as set forth on the date of the enactment of this Act in National Coverage Determination 30-1 of the Medicare Coverage Issues Manual, the Secretary shall deem clinical trials conducted in accordance with an investigational device exemption approved under section 520(g) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (42 U.S.C. 360(g)) to be automatically qualified for such coverage.

(2) Rule of Construction.—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed as authorizing or requiring the Secretary to modify the regulations set forth on the date of the enactment of this Act at subpart B of part 405 of title 42, Code of Federal Regulations, or subpart B of part 411 of such title, relating to national coverage determinations to determine which determinations shall be used among local carriers or in subpart D of part 8 of such title, relating to national coverage determinations to determine which determinations shall be used among local carriers.

(d) Issuance of Temporary National Coverage Determinations.—The Secretary shall implement revised procedures within the area.

(e) Issuance of Temporary National Coverage Determinations.—The Secretary shall implement revised procedures for the issuance of temporary national coverage determinations under title XVIII of the Social Security Act.

SEC. 735. TREATMENT OF CERTAIN PHYSICIAN PATHOLOGY SERVICES.

(a) In General.—Section 1841(i) (42 U.S.C. 1395w–4(i)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

(4) Treatment of Certain Inpatient Physician Pathology Services.—

(A) In General.—With respect to services furnished on or after January 1, 2004, and before January 1, 2009, if an independent laboratory furnishes the histology or cytopathology component of a physician pathology service to a fee-for-service Medicare beneficiary who is an inpatient or outpatient of a covered hospital, the laboratory shall treat such service for which payment shall be made to the laboratory under this section and not as...
an inpatient hospital service for which payment is made to the hospital under section 1886(d) or as a hospital outpatient service for which payment is made to the hospital under section 1833(c).

(b) Definitions.—In this paragraph:

(1) Covered hospital.—

(i) In general.—The term ‘covered hospital’ with respect to an inpatient or outpatient, a hospital that had an arrangement with an independent laboratory that was in effect as of July 22, 1999, under which a laboratory furnished the technical component of physician pathology services to fee-for-service Medicare beneficiaries who were hospital inpatients or outpatients, respectively. For purposes of this paragraph, terms for payment for such component to a carrier with a contract under section 1842 and not to the hospital.

(II) Change in ownership does not affect determination of whether such hospital is a covered hospital for purposes of such subclause.

(iii) Fee-for-service Medicare beneficiary.—The term ‘fee-for-service Medicare beneficiary’ means an individual who is entitled to Medicare benefits under part A, or enrolled under part B of such title who is diagnosed as having one or more chronic conditions (as defined in this subparagraph as ‘diabetes’).

(II) Design of Projects.—

(1) In general.—In establishing the demonstration projects under this section, the Secretary shall evaluate practices employed by group health plans and practices under State plans for medical assistance under the Medicaid program under title XIX of the Social Security Act and the differences in outcomes and costs to self-direct the provision of personal care services.

(2) Scope of Services.—The Secretary shall determine the appropriate scope of personal care services that would apply under the demonstration projects.

(g) Voluntary Participation.—Participation of Medicare beneficiaries in the demonstration projects shall be voluntary.

(h) Demonstration Projects Sites.—Not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall conduct no fewer than 3 demonstration projects established under this section. Of those demonstrations, the Secretary shall conduct at least one in each of the following areas:

1. An urban area.
2. A rural area.

(i) An area that the Secretary determines has a Medicare population with a rate of incidence of diabetes that significantly exceeds the national average.

(j) Evaluation and Report.—

(1) Evaluation.—The Secretary shall conduct evaluations of the clinical and cost effectiveness of the demonstration projects.

(2) Reports.—Not later than 2 years after the commencement of the demonstration projects, and biannually thereafter, the Secretary shall report on the evaluation, and shall include in the report the following:

(A) An analysis of the patient outcomes and costs of furnishing care to the Medicare beneficiaries participating in the projects as compared to such outcomes and costs to other beneficiaries for the same health conditions.

(B) Evaluation of patient satisfaction under the demonstration projects.

(k) Such recommendations regarding the extension, termination, or modification of the projects as the Secretary determines appropriate.

TITLE VII—MEDICARE BENEFITS ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 801. ESTABLISHMENT OF MEDICARE BENEFITS ADMINISTRATION.

(a) In General.—There is established in the Department of Health and Human Services an agency to be known as the Medicare Benefits Administration.

(b) Administrator; Deputy Administrator; Chief Actuary.

(1) Administrator.—

(A) In general.—The Medicare Benefits Administration shall be headed by an administrator to be known as the ‘Medicare Benefits Administrator’ (in this section referred to as the ‘Administrator’) who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

(B) Compensation.—The Administrator shall be paid at the rate of basic pay payable for level III of the Executive Schedule under section 5314 of title 5, United States Code.

(C) Term of Office.—The Administrator shall be appointed for a term of 4 years. In any case in which a successor does not take office at the end of an Administrator’s term of office, that Administrator may continue in office until the entry upon office of such a successor. An Administrator appointed to a term of office after the commencement of the term, and not to carry out the functions of the Administrator. The regulations prescribed by the Administrator shall be subject to the rulemaking procedures established under section 533 of title 5, United States Code. The Administrator shall serve all powers and the discharge of all duties of the Administrator who shall be appointed by the Administrator of the Medicare Benefits Administration who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

(2) Deputy Administrator.—

(A) In general.—There shall be a Deputy Administrator of the Medicare Benefits Administration who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

(B) Compensation.—The Deputy Administrator shall be paid at the rate of basic pay payable for level IV of the Executive Schedule under section 5315 of title 5, United States Code.

(C) Term of Office.—The Deputy Administrator shall be appointed for a term of 4 years. In any case in which a successor does not take office at the end of a Deputy Administrator’s term of office, such Deputy Administrator may continue in office until the entry upon office of such a successor. A Deputy Administrator appointed to a term of office after the commencement of such a term may serve under such appointment only for the remainder of such term.

(D) Duties.—The Deputy Administrator shall perform such duties as are assigned to him and shall exercise such powers as the Administrator shall from time to time assign or delegate. The Deputy Administrator shall be Acting Administrator of the Administration during the absence or disability of the Administrator and, unless the President designates another officer of the Government as Acting Administrator, in the event of a vacancy in the office of the Administrator.

(3) Chief Actuary.—

(A) In general.—There is established in the Medicare Benefits Administration the Office of Actuary. The Chief Actuary shall be appointed by, and in direct line of authority to, the Administrator of such Administration. The Chief Actuary shall be responsible for the issuance of new regulations to carry out parts C, D, and E.
expertise in the actuarial sciences. The Chief Actuary may be removed only for cause.

"(B) Compensation.—The Chief Actuary shall be compensated at the highest rate of basic pay of an officer of the Executive Office under section 5302(b) of title 5, United States Code.

"(C) Duties.—The Chief Actuary shall exercise such duties as are appropriate for the office of the Chief Actuary and in accordance with professional standards of actuarial independence.

"(4) Secretarial coordination of program administration.—The Secretary shall ensure appropriate coordination between the Administrator of the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services and Medicare beneficiaries in carrying out the programs under this title.

"(B) other duties.—The Administrator shall carry out any duty provided for under part D or E, including—

"(i) negotiating, entering into, and enforcing contracts with PDP sponsors for the offering of prescription drug plans under part D.

"(ii) Negotiating, entering into, and enforcing contracts with PDP sponsors for the offering of prescription drug coverage under such plans,

"(iii) negotiating, entering into, and enforcing contracts with PDP sponsors for the offering of prescription drug plans under part E.

"(B) Other duties.—The Administrator shall carry out any duty provided for under part C or part E, including—

"(i) developing and implementing methodologies to assess risk and to establish risk adjustment rates under such parts; and

"(ii) paying providers for the services furnished to Medicare beneficiaries.

"(B) prescription drug card.—The Administrator shall carry out section 1877 (referred to in section 1849(o)(h) of the Balanced Budget Act of 1997, medicare cost- contractors under section 1876(h), and through a Medicare Advantage project that demonstrates the application of capitation payment rates for frail elderly Medicare beneficiaries through the use of an interdisciplinary team and through the provision of primary care services to such beneficiaries by means of such a team at the nursing facility involved.

"(C) prescription drug card.—The Administrator shall carry out section 1877 (referred to in section 1849(o)(h) of the Balanced Budget Act of 1997, medicare cost- contractors under section 1876(h), and through a Medicare Advantage project that demonstrates the application of capitation payment rates for frail elderly Medicare beneficiaries through the use of an interdisciplinary team and through the provision of primary care services to such beneficiaries by means of such a team at the nursing facility involved.

"(D) noninterference.—In carrying out its duties with respect to the provision of Medicare drug coverage under such parts, the Administrator may not—

"(i) require a particular formulary or institution for the reimbursement of covered outpatient drugs;

"(ii) interfere in any way with negotiations between PDP sponsors and Medicare Advantage organizations and EFS organizations and drug manufacturers, wholesalers, or other suppliers of covered outpatient drugs; and

"(iii) otherwise interfere with the competitive nature of providing such coverage through such sponsors and organizations.

"(E) Annual reports.—Not later than March 31 of each year, the Administrator shall submit to Congress and the President a report on the administration of parts C, D, and E during the previous fiscal year.

"(A) in general.—The Administrator, with the approval of the Secretary, may employ, without regard to chapter 31 of title 5, United States Code, the services of such assistants and other employees as are necessary to administer the activities to be carried out under this title, and of Medicare Benefits Administration.

"(B) Office of beneficiary assistance.—The Secretary shall establish within the Medicare Benefits Administration an Office of Beneficiary Assistance to coordinate functions relating to outreach and education of Medicare beneficiaries under this title, including the functions described in paragraph (2). The Office shall be separate operating division within the Administration.

"(C) Dissemination of information on benefits and appeals rights.—

"(D) Dissemination of benefits information.—The Office of Beneficiary Assistance shall disseminate, directly or through contracts with third-party entities, by mail, by posting on the Internet site of the Medicare Benefits Administration and through a toll-free telephone number, information with respect to the obligations of Medicare beneficiaries and the rights of Medicare beneficiaries.

"(E) reports.—The Secretary shall submit to Congress and the President a report on the administration of parts C, D, and E during the previous fiscal year.

"(B) Topics described.—Reports required under subparagraph (A) may include the following topics:

"(i) Fosterling competition.—Recommendations or proposals to increase competition under parts C, D, and E for services furnished to Medicare beneficiaries.

"(ii) Dissemination methods.—Recommendations for the improvement of efforts to provide Medicare beneficiaries information and education on the program under this title and, specifically parts C, D, and E, and the program for enrollment under the title.

"(iii) Implementation of risk-adjustment payment system.—Recommendations to improve competition and access to parts C, D, and E in rural areas.

"(iv) Other matters.—Recommendations relating to the implementation under section 1853(a)(5)(C) of the risk adjustment methodology to payment rates under that section to Medicare Advantage organizations offering Medicare Advantage plans (and the corresponding payment provisions under part E) that accounts for variations in per capita costs based on health status, geography, and other demographic factors.

"(E) Board.—The Board shall directly submit to Congress reports required under paragraph (A) a description of procedural (including grievance and appeals procedures) of beneficiaries under the original Medicare fee-for-service programs and Medicare Advantage plans under part C and EFFS plans under part E.

"(B) Dissemination of appeals rights information.—The Office of Beneficiary Assistance shall disseminate to Medicare beneficiaries, the Secretary, and the Board the information described in subparagraph (A) a description of procedural (including grievance and appeals procedures) of beneficiaries under the original Medicare fee-for-service programs and Medicare Advantage plans under part C and EFFS plans under part E.

(4) Board.—The Secretary, the Administrator, and the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services shall establish an appropriate transition of responsibility in order to redelegate the administrator of part C from the Secretary of the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services to the Administrator as is appropriate to carry out the purposes of this Act.

"(B) Transfer of data and information.—The Secretary shall ensure that the Administrator of the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services transfers to the Administrator of the Medicare Benefits Administration such information and data in the possession of the Administrator of the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services as the Administrator determines appropriate for legislative or administrative changes to improve the administration of such parts, including the topics described in subparagraph (B).

"(C) Office of beneficiary assistance.—The Secretary shall establish within the Medicare Benefits Administration an Office of Beneficiary Assistance to coordinate functions relating to outreach and education of Medicare beneficiaries under this title, including the functions described in paragraph (2). The Office shall be separate operating division within the Administration.
paragraph (2)(A), not later than 90 days after the report is submitted, the Administrator of the Medicare Benefits Administration shall submit to Congress and the President an analysis and recommendations made by the Board in such report. Each such analysis shall be published in the Federal Register.

(4) MEMBERSHIP.—

(A) APPOINTMENT.—Subject to the succeeding provisions of this paragraph, the Board shall consist of seven members to be appointed as follows:

(i) Two members shall be appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate with the advice of the chairperson and the ranking minority member of the Senate Committee on Finance.

(ii) Two members shall be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, with the advice of the chairperson and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means and on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives.

(iii) Two members shall be appointed by the President.

(B) QUALIFICATIONS.—The members shall be chosen on the basis of their integrity, impartiality, and good judgment, and shall be individuals who, by reason of their education, training, or experience are necessary to carry out this section. (C) TERM OF OFFICE.

(A) Term of members of the Board shall be 3 years.

(B) Terms of initial appointees.—As designated by the President at the time of appointment, of the members first appointed—

(i) one shall be appointed for a term of 1 year;

(ii) three shall be appointed for terms of 2 years; and

(iii) three shall be appointed for terms of 3 years.

(C) REAPPOINTMENTS.—Any person appointed as a member of the Board may not serve for more than 8 years.

(D) Acting member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring before the expiration of the term for which the member’s predecessor was appointed shall be appointed only for the remainder of that term. A member may serve after the expiration of that member’s term until a successor has taken office. A vacancy in the Board shall be filled in the manner provided in this subsection, except that the original appointment was made.

(7) CHAIR.—The Chair of the Board shall be elected by the members. The term of office of the Chair shall be 3 years.

(8) MEETINGS.—The Board shall meet at the call of the Chair, but in no event less than three times during each fiscal year.

(9) DIRECTOR AND STAFF.—

(A) APPOINTMENT OF DIRECTOR.—The Board shall have a Director who shall be appointed by the Chair.

(B) GENERAL.—With the approval of the Board, the Director may appoint, without regard to chapter 31 of title 5, United States Code, such additional personnel as the Director considers advisable.

(C) FLEXIBILITY WITH RESPECT TO COMPENSATION.—

"(i) IN GENERAL.—The Director and staff of the Board shall, subject to clause (ii), be paid without regard to the provisions of chapter 51 and chapter 55 of such title (relating to classification and grade of employees and pay rates).

(ii) MAXIMUM RATE.—In no case may the rate of compensation determined under clause (i) exceed the rate of basic pay payable at level IV of the Executive Schedule under section 5315 of title 5, United States Code.

(10) CONTRACT AUTHORITY.—The Board may contract with and compensate government and private agencies and individuals to carry out its duties under this subsection, without regard to section 702 of the Revised Statutes (43 U.S.C. 5).

(11) FUNDING.—There is authorized to be appropriated, in appropriate part from the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund and from the Federal Supplementary Medical Insurance Trust Fund (including the Medicare Prescription Drug Account), such sums as are necessary to carry out this section.

(12) COMPLAINTS.—An individual who believes that any administrative action of the Board is not in accordance with law may file a complaint in the manner prescribed by the Director. The Director shall, within 30 days, provide a written determination and written notice to the complaining party. If the Director determines that an administrative action of the Board is not in accordance with law, the Director may issue a written order or decision directing the Board to take such action as the Director considers necessary to correct the administrative action.

(13) FLEXIBILITY.—The Board shall have flexibility with respect to the classification and schedule pay rates.

(14) CONSTRUCTION; DEFINITION OF SUPPLEMENT.—

SEC. 901. CONSTRUCTION; DEFINITION OF SUPPLEMENT.

(1) CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this title shall be construed—

(a) CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this title shall be construed—

(1) to compromise or affect existing legal remedies for addressing fraud or abuse, whether it be criminal prosecution, civil enforcement, or administrative remedies, in- cluding the provisions under section 1395z7 of title 31, United States Code (known as the False Claims Act); or

(2) to prevent or impede the Department of Health and Human Services, or any of its components, from its ongoing efforts to eliminate waste, fraud, and abuse in the Medicare program.

Furthermore, the consolidation of Medicare administrative contracting set forth in this Act does not constitute consolidation of the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Supplementary Medical Insurance Trust Fund or reflect any position on that issue.

(b) DEFINITION OF SUPPLIER.—Section 1861 (42 U.S.C. 1395d) is amended by inserting after subsection (c) the following new subsection:

"Supplier"

"(d) The term 'supplier' means, unless the context otherwise requires, a physician or other practitioner, a facility, or other entity (other than a provider of services) that furnishes items or services under this title."

(b) ISSUANCE OF REGULATIONS.—

SEC. 902. ISSUANCE OF REGULATIONS.

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 1871(a) (42 U.S.C. 1395i(b), 1395t(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(3) The Secretary, in consultation with the Administrator of the Medicare Benefits and Budget, shall establish and publish a regular timeline for the publication of final regulations based on the previous publication of a proposed regulation or an interim final regulation.

"(b) Such timeline may vary among different regulations based on differences in the complexity of the issue, the number and scope of comments received, and other relevant factors, but shall not be longer than 3 years except under exceptional circumstances. If the Secretary intends to vary such timeline with respect to the publication of a final regulation, the Secretary shall cause to have published in the Federal Register notice of the different timeline by not later than the timeline previously established with respect to such regulation. Such notice shall include a brief explanation of the justification for such variation.

"(C) In the case of interim final regulations, upon the expiration of the regular timeline established under this paragraph for the publication of a final regulation after opportunity for public comment, the interim final regulation shall not continue in effect unless the Secretary publishes (at the end of the regular timeline and, if applicable, at the end of each succeeding 1-year period) a notice of continuation of the regulation that includes an explanation of why the regular timeline (and any subsequent 1-year extension) was not complied with. If such a notice is published, the regulation is treated as such (timeline as previously extended under this paragraph) for publication of the final regulation shall be treated as having been extended for 1 additional year.

"(D) The Secretary shall annually submit to Congress a report that describes the instances in which the Secretary failed to publish a final regulation within the applicable regular timeline under this paragraph and that provides an explanation for such failures.

"(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by paragraph (1) shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act. The Secretary shall provide for an appropriate backlog of previously published interim final regulations.
CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE
June 26, 2003

H6058

(b) LIMITATIONS ON NEW MATTER IN FINAL REGULATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 1871(a) (42 U.S.C. 1395hh(a)), as amended by subsection (a), is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(4) If the Secretary publishes a final regulation that includes a provision that is not a logical or consistent change from the previous regulation, the Secretary shall provide notice of proposed rulemaking or interim final rule, such provision shall be treated as a proposed regulation and shall not take effect until the Secretary gives public notice and opportunity for public comment and a publication of the provision again as a final regulation.".

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by paragraph (1) shall apply to final regulations published on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 903. COMPLIANCE WITH CHANGES IN REGULATIONS AND POLICIES.

(a) NO RETROACTIVE APPLICATION OF SUBSTANTIVE CHANGES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 1871 (42 U.S.C. 1395hh), as amended by section 902(a), is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(e)(1) A substantive change in regulations, manual instructions, interpretive rules, statements of policy, or guidelines of general applicability under this title shall not be treated as a logical or consistent change from the previous regulation or otherwise retroactively to items and services furnished before the effective date of the change, unless the Secretary determines that—

"(i) such retroactive application is necessary to comply with statutory requirements; or

"(ii) failure to apply the change retroactively would be contrary to the public interest.

"(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by paragraph (1) shall apply to substantive changes issued on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) TIMELINE FOR COMPLIANCE WITH SUBSTANTIVE CHANGES AFTER NOTICE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 1871(e)(1), as added by subsection (a), is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(b)(i) Except as provided in clause (ii), a substantive change referred to in subparagraph (A) shall not become effective before the end of the 30-day period that begins on the date that the Secretary has issued or published, as the case may be, the substantive change.

"(ii) The Secretary may provide for such a substantive change to take effect on a date that precedes the end of the 30-day period under clause (i) if the Secretary finds that waiver of such 30-day period is necessary to comply with statutory requirements or that the application of such 30-day period is contrary to the public interest. If the Secretary provides for an earlier effective date pursuant to this clause, the Secretary shall include in the issuance or publication of the substantive change a finding described in the first sentence of subparagraph (A) and a brief statement of the reasons for such finding.

"(C) No action shall be taken against a provider of services or supplier with respect to noncompliance with such a substantive change for items and services furnished before the effective date of such a change.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by paragraph (1) shall apply to compliance actions undertaken on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) IN GENERAL.—Section 1871(e)(1), as added by subsection (a), is further amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(i) a provider of services or supplier follows the written guidance (which may be transmitted electronically) provided by the Secretary or by a Medicare contractor (as defined in section 1889(g)) acting within the scope of the contractor's authority, and supplying, furnishing, or delivering items or services and submission of a claim for benefits for such items or services with respect to such provider or supplier;

"(ii) the guidance was in error; or

"(iii) the guidance was in error, the provider of services or supplier has accurately presented the circumstances relating to such items, services, and claim to the contractor in writing.

"(D) Subparagraph (A) shall be construed as preventing the recoupment or repayment (without any additional penalty) related to an overpayment as if the overpayment was solely the result of a clerical or technical operational error.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by paragraph (1) shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act but shall not apply to any sanction for which notice was provided on or before the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 904. REPORTS AND STUDIES RELATING TO REGULATORY REFORM.

(a) GAO STUDY ON ADVISORY OPINION AUTHORITY.—

(1) STUDY.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study to determine the extent to which the provisions of establishing in the Secretary authority to provide legally binding advisory opinions on appropriate interpretation and application of regulations to carry out the Medicare program under title XVIII of the Social Security Act. Such study shall examine the appropriate timeframe for issuing such advisory opinions and shall consider the need for additional staff and funding to provide such opinions.

(2) REPORT.—The Comptroller General shall submit to Congress a report on the study conducted under paragraph (1) by not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) REPORT ON LEGAL AND REGULATORY INCONSISTENCIES.—Section 1871 (42 U.S.C. 1395hh), as amended by section 2(a), is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(f)(1) Not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of this subsection, and not less frequently, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report with respect to the incidence and consistency and conflict among the various provisions of law relating to the performance of a particular function with respect to a specific provider of services or supplier (or classes of such providers of services or suppliers). The report shall include a description of efforts by the Secretary and contractors to further reduce inconsistency or conflict among the various provisions of law relating to the performance of a particular function.

"(2) A provider of services or supplier has accurately presented the circumstances relating to such items, services, and claim to the contractor in writing.

"(3) The Secretary determines appropriate to further reduce inconsistency or conflict; and

"(4) If the Secretary publishes a final regulation (A) that takes effect at the end the following:

"(A) the Secretary has demonstrated capability to carry out such function; or

"(B) the provider complies with such conflict of interest standards as are generally applicable to Federal acquisition and procurement, (C) the entity meets such other requirements as the Secretary may impose.

(3) MEDICARE ADMINISTRATIVE CONTRACTOR DEFINED.—For purposes of this title and title X, the term "medicare administrative contractor" means an agency, organization, or other person with a contract under this section and the appropriate Medicare administrative contractor is the medicare administrative contractor that has a contract under this section with respect to the performance of that function in relation to that individual, provider of services or supplier, or class of such providers of services or suppliers.

(c) FUNCTIONS DESCRIBED.—The functions referred to in paragraph (1) include such functions as are payable under part A or enrolled under part B, or both, a specific provider of services or supplier (or classes of such providers of services or suppliers), the "appropriate" medicare administrative contractor that has a contract under this section with respect to the performance of that function in relation to that individual, provider of services or supplier, or class of such providers of services or suppliers.

(4) DETERMINATION OF PAYMENT AMOUNTS.—Determining (subject to the provisions of section 1820) the amount of any payment under this title and title X, the Secretary determines appropriate to further reduce inconsistency or conflict among the various provisions of law relating to the performance of a particular function.

(5) REPORT.—The Secretary shall submit to Congress a report on the study conducted under paragraph (1) by not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(6) PROVIDER CONSULTATIVE SERVICES.—With respect to the performance of a particular function with respect to a specific provider of services or supplier (or classes of such providers of services or suppliers), the "appropriate" medicare administrative contractor that has a contract under this section with respect to the performance of that function in relation to that individual, provider of services or supplier, or class of such providers of services or suppliers.

(7) COMMUNICATION WITH PROVIDERS.—The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the extent to which the provisions of this Act are necessary for purposes of this title and title X, the Secretary determines appropriate to further reduce inconsistency or conflict among the various provisions of law relating to the performance of a particular function.

(8) CONTRACTORS.
contractor by the Secretary, and facilitating communication between such providers and suppliers and the Secretary.

(F) Provider Education and Technical Assistance. The functions of the Secretary under this section, including providing education, training, and technical assistance.

(G) Additional Functions. Performing such other functions as are necessary to carry out the purposes of this title.

(5) Relationship to MIP Contracts.

(A) Duplication of Duties. In entering into contracts under this section, the Secretary shall assure that functions of Medicare administrative contractors in carrying out activities under Part A and B do not duplicate the functions of such contractors.

(B) Conditions. The Secretary may not enter into a contract with any Medicare administrative contractor under this section unless the contractor agrees—

(i) to follow all policies and procedures of the Medicare program.

(ii) to maintain such records and afford such access thereto as the Secretary finds necessary to assure the correctness and completeness of the information and reports under subparagraph (A); and

(iii) to maintain such records and afford such access thereto as the Secretary finds necessary to assure the correctness and verification of the information and reports under subparagraph (A) and otherwise to carry out the purposes of this title.

(6) Application of Federal Acquisition Regulation. The implementation of this title with data used in the Medicare program.

(7) Consultation. In developing such requirements, the Secretary may consult with providers of services and suppliers.

(8) Incentives for Medicare Administrative Contractors. The Secretary shall provide incentives for Medicare administrative contractors consistent with the requirements of this title.

(9) Medicare Integrity Program. The Secretary shall provide incentives for Medicare administrative contractors consistent with the requirements of this title.

(10) Construction. An entity shall not be treated as a Medicare administrative contractor merely by reason of having entered into a contract with the Secretary under section 1893.

(G) Additional Functions. Performing such other functions as are necessary to carry out the purposes of this title.
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standards described in sections 1816(f)(2) of such Act (relating to timely processing of reconsiderations and applications for exemptions) and section 1842(b)(2)(B) of such Act (relating to timely review of determinations and fair hearing requests), as such sections were in effect before the date of the enactment of this Act.

(d) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS TO SECTION 1816 (RELATING TO FISCAL INTERMEDIARIES).—
Section 1816 (42 U.S.C. 1395f) is amended as follows:
(1) The heading is amended to read as follows:
"PROVISIONS RELATING TO THE ADMINISTRATION OF PART A".
(2) Subsection (a) is amended to read as follows:
"(a) The administration of this part shall be conducted through contracts with medicare administrative contractors under section 1874A."
(3) Subsection (b) is repealed.
(4) Subsection (c) is amended—
(A) by striking paragraph (1); and
(B) in each of paragraphs (2)(A) and (3)(A), by striking "agreement under this section" and inserting "contract under section 1874A that provides for making payments under this part".
(5) Subsections (d) through (i) are repealed.
(6) Subsections (j) and (k) are each amended—
(A) by striking "An agreement with an agency or organization under this section and inserting "A contract with a medicare administrative contractor under section 1874A with respect to the administration of this part"; and
(B) by striking "such agency or organization" and inserting "such medicare administrative contractor" each place it appears.
(7) Subsection (l) is repealed.
(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS TO SECTION 1842 (RELATING TO CARRIERS).—Section 1842 (42 U.S.C. 1395u) is amended as follows:
(1) The heading is amended to read as follows:
"PROVISIONS RELATING TO THE ADMINISTRATION OF PART B".
(2) Subsection (a) is amended to read as follows:
"(a) The administration of this part shall be conducted through contracts with medicare administrative contractors under section 1874A."
(3) Subsection (b) is amended—
(A) by striking paragraph (1); and
(B) in paragraph (2), by striking "agreement under this section" and inserting "contract under section 1874A that provides for making payments under this part".
(4) Subsections (c) through (j) are repealed.
(5) Subsections (k) and (l) are each amended—
(A) by striking "The contractor" each place it appears; and
(B) by striking "carrier,"; and
(C) after "Secretary", inserting "the Secretary" each place it appears.
(d) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS TO SECTION 1874 (RELATING TO MEDICAID APPLICANTS AND BENEFICIARIES).—
Section 1874 (42 U.S.C. 1395dd) is amended as follows:
(1) EFFECTIVE DATE; TRANSITION RULE.—
(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided under this Act, all contracts for functions of medicare administrative contractors for annual contract periods that begin on or after October 1, 2010, and for functions of medicare administrative contractors under section 1874A that provide for making payments under this part shall be conducted through contracts under such section (as inserted by subsection (a)(3)(A)(i)(I) of section 1874A of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1395dd(d)(2))) that provide for an appropriate transition from contracts in effect before the date specified in this subsection, the amendments provided in this subsection, and any reference in such provisions to an agreement or contract shall be deemed to include a contract under section 1874 of such Act, as inserted by subsection (a)(3)(A), that describes the activities referred to in such provisions.
(B) GENERAL TRANSITION RULES.—The Secretary shall take such steps, consistent with paragraph (1)(B) and (1)(C), as are necessary to provide for an appropriate transition from contracts under section 1874A of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1395dd(d)(2)) to contracts under section 1874A, as added by subsection (a)(3)(A).
(C) AUTHORIZING CONTINUATION OF MFP FUNCTIONS UNDER CURRENT CONTRACTS AND AGREEMENTS AND OVER ROLL-OVER CONTRACTS.—The provisions contained in the exception in section 1874A(c)(2)(B) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1395dd(d)(2)) shall continue to apply notwithstanding the amendments made by this section, and any reference in such provisions to an agreement or contract shall be deemed to include a contract under section 1874A of such Act, as inserted by subsection (a)(3)(A), that describes the plan for implementation of such provisions.
(D) REPORTS ON IMPLEMENTATION.—
(1) PLAN FOR IMPLEMENTATION.—By not later than October 1, 2003, the Secretary shall submit a report to Congress and the Comptroller General of the United States that describes the plan for implementation of the amendments made by this section. The Comptroller General shall conduct an evaluation of such plan and shall submit to Congress, not later than 6 months after the report is received, a report on such evaluation and shall include in such report such recommendations as the Comptroller General deems appropriate.
(E) STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION.—The Secretary shall submit a report to Congress not later than October 1, 2008, that describes the status of implementation of such amendments and that includes a description of the following:
(A) The number of contracts that have been competitively bid as of such date.
(B) The distribution of functions among contracts under subsection (d)(1), any reference to a fiscal intermediary or carrier under title XI or XIX of the Social Security Act (or any regulation, manual instruction, interpretive rule, statement of policy, or guideline issued to carry out such title) that be deemed a reference to a medicare administrative contractor (as provided under section 1874A of the Social Security Act).
(2) REPORTS ON IMPLEMENTATION.—
(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided under this Act, all contracts for functions of medicare administrative contractors to adapt to full competition.
(B) CONSTRUCTION FOR CURRENT CONTRACTS.—Such amendments shall not apply to contracts in effect before the date specified under subparagraph (A) that continue to retain the terms and conditions in effect on such date (except as otherwise provided under this Act, other than under this section, until such date), subject to such contract is let out for competitive bidding under such amendments.
(C) DEADLINE FOR COMPETITIVE BIDDING.—The Secretary shall provide for the letting by competitive bidding all contracts for functions of medicare administrative contractors for annual contract periods that begin on or after October 1, 2010.
(3) WAIVER OF PROVIDER NOMINATION PROVISIONS DURING TRANSITION.—During the period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act and before the date specified under subparagraph (A), the Secretary may enter into new agreements under section 1816 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395f) without regard to any of the provider nomination provisions of such section.
(2) GENERAL TRANSITION RULES.—The Secretary shall take such steps, consistent with paragraph (1)(B) and (1)(C), as are necessary to provide for an appropriate transition from contracts under section 1874A of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1395dd(d)(2)) to contracts under section 1874A, as added by subsection (a)(3)(A).
(E) REFERENCES.—On and after the effective date provided under subsection (d)(1), any reference to a fiscal intermediary or carrier under title XI or XIX of the Social Security Act (or any regulation, manual instruction, interpretive rule, statement of policy, or guideline issued to carry out such title) that be deemed a reference to a medicare administrative contractor (as provided under section 1874A of the Social Security Act).
(F) REPORTS ON IMPLEMENTATION.—
(1) PLAN FOR IMPLEMENTATION.—By not later than October 1, 2003, the Secretary shall submit a report to Congress and the Comptroller General of the United States that describes the plan for implementation of the amendments made by this section. The Comptroller General shall conduct an evaluation of such plan and shall submit to Congress, not later than 6 months after the report is received, a report on such evaluation and shall include in such report such recommendations as the Comptroller General deems appropriate.
(E) STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION.—The Secretary shall submit a report to Congress not later than October 1, 2008, that describes the status of implementation of such amendments and that includes a description of the following:
(A) The number of contracts that have been competitively bid as of such date.
(B) The distribution of functions among contracts under subsection (d)(1), any reference to a fiscal intermediary or carrier under title XI or XIX of the Social Security Act (or any regulation, manual instruction, interpretive rule, statement of policy, or guideline issued to carry out such title) that be deemed a reference to a medicare administrative contractor (as provided under section 1874A of the Social Security Act).
(C) A timeline for complete transition to full competition.
(D) A detailed description of how the Secretary has modified or managed medicare contractors to adapt to full competition.
SEC. 912. REQUIREMENTS FOR INFORMATION SECURITY FOR MEDICARE ADMINISTRATIVE CONTRACTORS.

(a) In General.—Section 1874A, as added by section 912(a)(1), is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(1) DEVELOPMENT OF INFORMATION SECURITY PROGRAM.—A medicare administrative contractor that performs the functions referred to in subparagraphs (A) and (B) of subsection (a)(4) (relating to determining and making payments as a fiscal intermediary or carrier under section 1395u) in the same manner as they apply to medicare administrative contractors under such provisions.

(2) DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES.—The Secretary shall—

(i) maintain a system for identifying who provided the information referred to in subparagraph (B), including whether to use such methodology in assessing medicare contractor performance in the processing or reviewing of medicare claims, coverage, and other aspects of medicare contractors; and

(ii) provide information security for the operation and administration of such information security programs imposed on medicare contractors (as defined in subsection (b)(3)).

SEC. 921. PROVIDER EDUCATION AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.

(a) Coordination of Education Funding.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Title XVIII is amended by inserting after section 1888 the following new section:

"SEC. 1889. (a) COORDINATION OF EDUCATION FUNDING.—The Secretary shall coordinate the educational activities provided through medicare contractors under section 1395u) in the same manner as they apply to medicare contractors under such provisions.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by paragraph (1) shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) M Onitoring of Contractor Performance.—

The Secretary shall ensure that each medicare administrative contractor complies with the requirements of this section and related information security policies, procedures, standards and guidelines, including policies and procedures as may be prescribed by the Director of the Office of Health and Human Services Congressionally sponsored by section 354d(b) of title 44, United States Code (other than the requirements under paragraphs (2)(O)(i), (S)(A), and (3)(B) of such section).

(2) INDEPENDENT AUDITS.—

(A) PERFORMANCE OF ANNUAL EVALUATIONS.—Each year a medicare administrative contractor that performs the functions referred to in subparagraphs (A) and (B) of subsection (a)(4) (relating to determining and making payments as a fiscal intermediary or carrier under section 1395u) in the same manner as they apply to medicare administrative contractors shall provide, for those individuals entitled to benefits under part A or enrolled under part B, or both, concerning the programs under this title within 45 business days of the date of receipt of such inquiries.

(c) REPORTS ON USE OF METHODOLOGY IN ASSESSING CONTRACTOR PERFORMANCE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than October 1, 2004, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report that describes how the methodology under section 1874A(f) of the Social Security Act, as added by paragraph (1), and include in the report such recommendations as the Comptroller General determines are necessary to achieve compliance with respect to the methodology.

(2) PROVIDER EDUCATION AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—

(1) New Contractors.—In the case of a medicare administrative contractor covered by this subsection that has not previously performed the functions referred to in subparagraph (A) and (B) of subsection (a)(4) (relating to determining and making payments as a fiscal intermediary or carrier under section 1395u) in the same manner as they apply to medicare administrative contractors, the Secretary shall provide the necessary education and training to such contractor before such functions are commenced.

(2) TO THE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES.—The results of independent evaluations under subparagraph (A) shall be submitted to the Inspector General of the Department of Health and Human Services.

(i) TO CONGRESS.—The Inspector General of the Department of Health and Human Services shall submit to Congress annual reports on the results of such evaluations, including assessments of the scope and sufficiency of such evaluations.

(3) GAO REPORT ON ADEQUACY OF METHODOLOGY.—Not later than October 1, 2004, the Inspector General of the Department of Health and Human Services shall submit to the Inspector General of the Department of Health and Human Services a report on the adequacy of the methodology under section 1874A(f) of the Social Security Act, as added by paragraph (1), and shall include in the report such recommendations as the Comptroller General determines are necessary to achieve compliance with respect to the methodology.

(4) PROVIDER EDUCATION AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—

(1) New Contractors.—In the case of a medicare administrative contractor covered by this subsection that has not previously performed the functions referred to in subparagraph (A) and (B) of subsection (a)(4) (relating to determining and making payments as a fiscal intermediary or carrier under section 1395u) in the same manner as they apply to medicare administrative contractors, the Secretary shall—

(i) maintain a system for identifying who provided the information referred to in paragraphs (2) and (3); and

(ii) monitor the accuracy, consistency, and timeliness of the information so provided.

(2) DEPARTMENT OF STANDARDS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall—

(i) establish and make public standards to monitor the accuracy, consistency, and timeliness of the information provided in response to written and telephone inquiries under this title.

(2) PROVIDER EDUCATION AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Each medicare administrative contractor shall, for the providers of services and suppliers which submit claims to the contractor for claims processing and for those individuals entitled to benefits under part A or enrolled under part B, or both, maintaining a toll-free telephone number at which such individuals, providers of services and suppliers may obtain information regarding billing, coding, claims, coverage, and other appropriate information under this title.
“(ii) EVALUATION.—In conducting evaluations of individual medicare administrative contractors, the Secretary shall take into account the results of the monitoring conducted under subparagraph (A), taking into account as performance requirements the standards established under clause (i). The Secretary shall, in consultation with organizations representing providers of services or suppliers, and individuals entitled to benefits under part A or enrolled under part B, or both, establish standards relating to the accuracy, consistency, and timeliness of the information so provided.

“(C) DIRECT MONITORING.—Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed as preventing the Secretary from directing and monitoring administrative contractors to gather information that would conform to the requirements of the Medicare program.

“(3) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by paragraph (1) shall take effect October 1, 2004.

(3) APPLICATION TO FISCAL INTERMEDIARIES AND CARRIERS.—The provisions of section 1874A(g) of the Social Security Act, as added by paragraph (1), shall apply to each fiscal intermediary under section 1816 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395 et seq.) and each carrier under section 1816 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395 et seq.) in the same manner as they apply to medicare administrative contractors under such provisions.

(d) IMPROVED PROVIDER EDUCATION AND TRAINING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 1889, as added by subsection (a) and as amended by subsections (d) and (e), is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsections:

“(b) ENHANCED EDUCATION AND TRAINING.—

“(1) ADDITIONAL RESOURCES.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary (in appropriate part from the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Supplementary Medical Insurance Trust Fund) $25,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2005 and 2006 and such sums as may be necessary for succeeding fiscal years.

“(2) USE.—The funds made available under this section shall be used to increase the accuracy, consistency, and timeliness of contractor responses.

“(c) EDUCATION AND TRAINING ACTIVITIES FOR SMALL PROVIDERS OR SUPPLIERS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Insofar as a medicare administrative contractor conducts education and training activities, it shall tailor such activities to meet the special needs of small providers of services or suppliers (as defined in paragraph (2)).

“(2) SMALL PROVIDER OF SERVICES OR SUPPLIER.—In this subsection, the term ‘small provider of services or supplier’ means—

“(A) a provider of services with fewer than 25 full-time-equivalent employees; or

“(B) a supplier with fewer than 10 full-time-equivalent employees.

“(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by paragraph (1) shall take effect on October 1, 2004.

(e) REQUIREMENT TO MAINTAIN INTERNET SITES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 1889, as added by subsection (a) and as amended by subsection (d), is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(d) INTERNET SITES; FAQS.—The Secretary, and each medicare administrative contractor as defined in section 1877(w) of the Social Security Act, shall maintain an Internet site which provides answers in an easily accessible format to frequently asked questions, and which—

“(i) provides answers in an easily accessible format to frequently asked questions, and

“(ii) includes other published materials of the contractor, that relate to providers of services and suppliers under the programs under this title or to medicare insurors as it relates to such programs.”.

“(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by paragraph (1) shall take effect on October 1, 2004.

(f) ADDITIONAL PROVIDER EDUCATION PROVISIONS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 1889, as added by subsection (a) and as amended by subsections (d) and (e), is further amended by adding after the end the following new subsections:

“(e) ENCOURAGEMENT IN EDUCATION PROGRAM ACTIVITIES.—A medicare contractor may not use a record of attendance at (or failure to attend) education activities for a small provider of services or supplier that participates in the demonstration program to determine program compliance and to suggest more efficient or effective means of achieving such compliance.

“(f) CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed as allowing for a small provider of services or suppliers to determine program compliance and to suggest more efficient or effective means of achieving such compliance.

(2) E FFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by paragraph (1) shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 922. SMALL PROVIDER TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall establish a demonstration program (in this section referred to as a ‘demonstration program’) under which technical assistance described in this paragraph is provided for a small provider of services or supplier that participates in the demonstration program.

“(2) USE.—The funds made available under this section shall be used to increase the accuracy, consistency, and timeliness of contractor responses.

“(b) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—The technical assistance described in this paragraph is—

“(A) evaluation and recommendations regarding billing and related systems; and

“(B) information and assistance regarding policies and procedures under the medicare program, including coding and reimbursements.

“(c) SMALL PROVIDERS OF SERVICES OR SUPPLIERS.—In this section, the term ‘small provider of services or suppliers’ means—

“(A) a provider of services with fewer than 25 full-time-equivalent employees; or

“(B) a supplier with fewer than 10 full-time-equivalent employees.

“(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by paragraph (1) shall take effect on October 1, 2004.

(e) REQUIREMENT TO MAINTAIN INTERNET SITES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 1889, as added by subsection (a) and as amended by subsection (d), is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(d) INTERNET SITES; FAQS.—The Secretary, and each medicare administrative contractor as defined in section 1877(w) of the Social Security Act, shall maintain an Internet site which provides answers in an easily accessible format to frequently asked questions, and which—

“(i) provides answers in an easily accessible format to frequently asked questions, and

“(ii) includes other published materials of the contractor, that relate to providers of services and suppliers under the programs under this title or to medicare insurors as it relates to such programs.”.

“(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by paragraph (1) shall take effect on October 1, 2004.

(f) ADDITIONAL PROVIDER EDUCATION PROVISIONS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 1889, as added by subsection (a) and as amended by subsections (d) and (e), is further amended by adding after the end the following new subsections:

“(e) ENCOURAGEMENT IN EDUCATION PROGRAM ACTIVITIES.—A medicare contractor may not use a record of attendance at (or failure to attend) education activities for a small provider of services or supplier that participates in the demonstration program to determine program compliance and to suggest more efficient or effective means of achieving such compliance.

“(f) CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed as allowing for a small provider of services or suppliers to determine program compliance and to suggest more efficient or effective means of achieving such compliance.

“(2) E FFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by paragraph (1) shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 923. MEDICARE PROVIDER OMBUDSMAN; MEDICARE BENEFICIARY OMBUDSMAN.

(a) MEDICARE PROVIDER OMBUDSMAN.—Section 1889(g)(2) of the Social Security Act is amended—

(1) for fiscal years 2005, $1,000,000, and

(2) for fiscal year 2006, $6,000,000.
(1) by adding at the end of the heading the following: "; MEDICARE PROVIDER OMBUDSMAN;";

(2) by inserting "PRACTICING PHYSICIANS ADVISORY COMMITTEE." after "(a);"

(3) in paragraph (1), as so redesignated under paragraph (2), by striking "in this section" and inserting "in this subsection;"

(b) in redesignating subsections (c) as paragraphs (2) and (3), respectively; and

(5) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(b) PROVIDING MEDICARE BENEFICIARY OMBUDSMAN.—The Secretary shall appoint within the Department of Health and Human Services a Medicare Beneficiary Ombudsman. The Ombudsman shall—

"(1) provide assistance, on a confidential basis, to providers of services and suppliers with complaints, grievances, and requests for information concerning the programs under this title (including provisions of title XI of such Act as they relate to this title and are not administered by the Office of the Inspector General of the Department of Health and Human Services) and in the resolution of unclear or conflicting guidance given by the Secretary and medical contractors to such providers of services and suppliers regarding such programs and provisions and requirements under this title and such provisions; and

"(2) submit recommendations to the Secretary for improvement in the administration of this title and such provisions, including—

(A) recommendations to respond to recurring patterns of confusion in this title and such provisions (including recommendations regarding suspending imposition of sanctions where there is widespread confusion in program administration), and

(B) recommendations to provide for an appropriate and consistent response (including not providing for audits) in cases of self-identified overpayments by providers of services and suppliers.

The Ombudsman shall not serve as an advocate for any increases in payments or new coverage of services, but may identify issues and problems in payment or coverage policies.

"(b) MEDICARE BENEFICIARY OMBUDSMAN.—Title XVIII, as previously amended, is amended, in subsections (a) and (b), by redesignating subsections (c) as paragraphs (2) and (3), respectively; and

(5) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(b) PROVIDING MEDICARE BENEFICIARY OMBUDSMAN.—The Secretary shall appoint within the Department of Health and Human Services a Medicare Beneficiary Ombudsman. The Ombudsman shall—

"(1) provide assistance, on a confidential basis, to providers of services and suppliers with complaints, grievances, and requests for information concerning the programs under this title (including provisions of title XI of such Act as they relate to this title and are not administered by the Office of the Inspector General of the Department of Health and Human Services) and in the resolution of unclear or conflicting guidance given by the Secretary and medical contractors to such providers of services and suppliers regarding such programs and provisions and requirements under this title and such provisions; and

"(2) submit recommendations to the Secretary for improvement in the administration of this title and such provisions, including—

(A) recommendations to respond to recurring patterns of confusion in this title and such provisions (including recommendations regarding suspending imposition of sanctions where there is widespread confusion in program administration), and

(B) recommendations to provide for an appropriate and consistent response (including not providing for audits) in cases of self-identified overpayments by providers of services and suppliers.

The Ombudsman shall not serve as an advocate for any increases in payments or new coverage of services, but may identify issues and problems in payment or coverage policies.

"(c) MEDICAID BENEFICIARY OMBUDSMAN.—Title XVII, as previously amended, is amended, in subsections (a) and (b), by redesignating subsections (c) as paragraphs (2) and (3), respectively; and

(5) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(b) PROVIDING MEDICAID BENEFICIARY OMBUDSMAN.—The Secretary shall appoint within the Department of Health and Human Services a Medicaid Beneficiary Ombudsman. The Ombudsman shall—

"(1) provide assistance, on a confidential basis, to providers of services and suppliers with complaints, grievances, and requests for information concerning the programs under this title (including provisions of title XI of such Act as they relate to this title and are not administered by the Office of the Inspector General of the Department of Health and Human Services) and in the resolution of unclear or conflicting guidance given by the Secretary and medical contractors to such providers of services and suppliers regarding such programs and provisions and requirements under this title and such provisions; and

"(2) submit recommendations to the Secretary for improvement in the administration of this title and such provisions, including—

(A) recommendations to respond to recurring patterns of confusion in this title and such provisions (including recommendations regarding suspending imposition of sanctions where there is widespread confusion in program administration), and

(B) recommendations to provide for an appropriate and consistent response (including not providing for audits) in cases of self-identified overpayments by providers of services and suppliers.

The Ombudsman shall not serve as an advocate for any increases in payments or new coverage of services, but may identify issues and problems in payment or coverage policies.

"(d) MEDICARE PROVIDER OMBUDSMAN.—The Secretary shall appoint within the Department of Health and Human Services a Medicare Provider Ombudsman. The Ombudsman shall—

"(1) provide assistance, on a confidential basis, to providers of services and suppliers with complaints, grievances, and requests for information concerning the programs under this title (including provisions of title XI of such Act as they relate to this title and are not administered by the Office of the Inspector General of the Department of Health and Human Services) and in the resolution of unclear or conflicting guidance given by the Secretary and medical contractors to such providers of services and suppliers regarding such programs and provisions and requirements under this title and such provisions; and

"(2) submit recommendations to the Secretary for improvement in the administration of this title and such provisions, including—

(A) recommendations to respond to recurring patterns of confusion in this title and such provisions (including recommendations regarding suspending imposition of sanctions where there is widespread confusion in program administration), and

(B) recommendations to provide for an appropriate and consistent response (including not providing for audits) in cases of self-identified overpayments by providers of services and suppliers.

The Ombudsman shall not serve as an advocate for any increases in payments or new coverage of services, but may identify issues and problems in payment or coverage policies.
SEC. 931. TRANSFER OF RESPONSIBILITY FOR MEDICAID APPEALS.

(a) TRANSITION PLAN.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than October 1, 2004, the Commissioner of Social Security and the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to Congress and the Comptroller General of the United States a plan under which the functions of administrative law judges responsible for hearing cases under the Social Security Act (and related provisions in title XI of such Act) are transferred from the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services and its contractors to the Secretary of Health and Human Services.

(b) GAO EVALUATION.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall evaluate the plan and, not later than the date that is 6 months after the date on which the plan is received by the Comptroller General, shall submit to Congress a report on such evaluation.

SEC. 932. PROCESS FOR EXPEDITED ACCESS TO REVIEW.

(a) EXPEDITED ACCESS TO JUDICIAL REVIEW.—Sec. 1869(f)(1) (42 U.S.C. 1395ff(f)(1)) as amended by BIPA, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (3)(A), by inserting ‘‘, subject to paragraph (2),’’ before ‘‘to judicial review under the process established by this title.’’;

(2) in paragraph (3)(B), by striking ‘‘PROCEEDING’’ and all that follows ‘‘and, to the extent that the Secretary’s final decision’’ and inserting ‘‘DETERMINATIONS AND RECONSIDERATIONS’’ and ‘‘(B) in redesignating subparagraphs (I) and (II) as clauses (i) and (ii) and by moving the indentation of such subparagraphs (and the matter that follows) 2 sems to the left; and’’;

and by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

(2) EXPEDITED ACCESS TO JUDICIAL REVIEW.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall establish a process of appeals from any decision made by a provider of services or supplier that furnishes an item or service or an individual entitled to benefits under part A or enrolled under part B, or both, for purposes of making such determination that no review panel that no review panel has the authority to decide; or

(B) PROMPT DETERMINATIONS.—If, after or coincident with appropriately filing a request for review of an administrative determination, the appellant requests a determination by the appropriate review panel that no review panel has the authority to decide the question of law or regulation relevant to the matters in controversy and that there is no material issue of fact in dispute, the appellee may make such request only once with respect to a question of law or regulation in a case of an appeal as established by this section shall apply to the Secretary for the purpose of making such determination.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to appeals filed on or after October 1, 2004.

(d) EXPEDITED REVIEW OF CERTAIN PROVIDER AGREEMENT DETERMINATIONS.—Sec. 1922(b)(1) (42 U.S.C. 1395cc(b)(1)) is amended—

(1) by inserting ‘‘(A)’’ after ‘‘(A)’’;

and by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

(2) an institution or agency described in subparagraph (A) that has filed for a hearing under subparagraph (A) shall have expedited access to judicial review under this subparagraph in the same manner as providers of services or suppliers, sees judicially entitled to benefits under part A or enrolled under part B, or both, may obtain expedited access to judicial review under this section established under section 1922(b)(2). Nothing in this subparagraph shall be construed to affect the application of any remedy imposed under section 1919(h)(8) of title 19, United States Code, for failure to provide an appeal under this paragraph.

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to appeals filed on or after October 1, 2004.

(f) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to appeals filed on or after October 1, 2004.
proceedings under sections 1866(h) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395c(h)) in which the remedy of termination of participation, or a remedy described in clause (i) or (ii) of subsection (b) of section 1866(h) (42 U.S.C. 1395f-3(h)(2)(B)) which is applied on an immediate basis, has been imposed. Under such process priority shall be provided in cases of termination.

(2) INCREASED FINANCIAL SUPPORT.—In addition to any amounts otherwise appropriated, to reduce by 50 percent the average time for administrative determination of appeals under section 1866(h) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395c(h)), there are authorized to be appropriated from the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Supplementary Medical Insurance Trust Fund to the Secretary such additional sums for fiscal year 2005 and each subsequent fiscal year as may be necessary. The purposes for which such amounts are available include increasing the number of administrative law judges and their staffs and the appellate level staff at the Departmental Appeals Board of the Department of Health and Human Services and educating such judges and staffs on long-term care issues.

(e) PROCESS FOR REINSTATEMENT OF APPEAL OF CERTAIN SNF TRAINING PROGRAMS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a termination of approval of a nurse aide training program described in paragraph (2) of a skilled nursing facility, the Secretary shall develop and implement a process for the reinstatement of approval of such program before the end of the mandatory 2 year disapproval period if the facility and its program is certified by the Secretary, in coordination with the applicable State survey and certification agency and after public notice, as being in compliance with applicable requirements and as having remedied any deficiencies in the facility or program that resulted in noncompliance.

(2) TERMINATION OF APPROVAL DESCRIBED.—A termination of approval of a training program described in this paragraph is a mandatory 2 year disapproval provided for under section 1866(h)(2)(B)(iii) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395f-3(h)(2)(B)(iii)) if the only basis for the mandatory disapproval was the assessment of a civil money penalty of not less than $5,000.

SEC. 933. REVISIONS TO MEDICARE APPEALS PROCESS.

(a) REQUIRING FULL AND EARLY PRESENTATION OF EVIDENCE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 1869(b) (42 U.S.C. 1395f(b)), as amended by BIPA and as amended by section 932(a), is further amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(3) REQUIRING FULL AND EARLY PRESENTATION OF EVIDENCE.—A provider of services or supplier may not introduce evidence in any appeal under this section that was not presented at the reconsideration conducted by the qualified independent contractor under subsection (c), unless there is good cause which precluded the introduction of such evidence at or before that reconsideration."

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by paragraph (1) shall take effect on October 1, 2004.

(2) USE OF PATIENTS' MEDICAL RECORDS.—Section 1869(c)(3)(B)(i) (42 U.S.C. 1395f(c)(3)(B)(i)), as amended by BIPA, is amended—

(1) by inserting "(including the medical records of the individual involved)" after "clinical experience".

(c) NOTICE REQUIREMENTS FOR MEDICARE APPEALS.—

(1) INITIAL DETERMINATIONS AND REDETERMINATIONS.—Section 1869(a) (42 U.S.C. 1395f(a)), as amended by BIPA, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

"(4) REQUIREMENTS OF NOTICE OF DETERMINATION.—With respect to an initial determination insofar as it results in a denial of a claim for benefits—

(A) the written notice on the determination shall include—

(i) the reasons for the determination, including whether a local medical review policy or a local coverage determination was used;

(ii) the procedures for obtaining additional information concerning the determination described in subparagraph (B); and

(iii) notification of the right to seek a redetermination or otherwise appeal the determination and instructions on how to initiate such a redetermination under this section; and

(B) the person provided such notice may obtain, upon request, the specific provision of the policy, manual, or regulation used in making the determination.

(5) REQUIREMENTS OF NOTICE OF REDETERMINATION.—With respect to a redetermination insofar as it results in a denial of a claim for benefits—

(A) the written notice on the redetermination shall include—

(i) the specific reasons for the redetermination;

(ii) as appropriate, a summary of the clinical or scientific evidence used in making the redetermination;

(iii) a description of the procedures for obtaining additional information concerning the redetermination; and

(iv) notification of the right to appeal the redetermination and instructions on how to initiate such appeal under this section.

(2) RECONSIDERATIONS.—Section 1869(c)(3)(E) (42 U.S.C. 1395f(c)(3)(E)), as amended by BIPA, is amended—

(A) by inserting "be written in a manner calculated to be understood by the individual entitled to benefits under part A or enrolled under part B, or both, and shall include (to the extent appropriate)" after "in writing,";

and

(B) by inserting "and a notification of the right to appeal such determination and instructions on how to initiate such appeal under this section" after "such decision.

(3) APPEALS.—Section 1869(d) (42 U.S.C. 1395f(d)), as amended by BIPA, is amended—

(A) in the heading, by inserting "Notice" after "SECRET;

and

(B) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(4) NOTICE.—Notice of the decision of an administrative law judge shall be in writing in a manner calculated to be understood by the individual entitled to benefits under part A or enrolled under part B, or both, and shall include—

(A) the specific reasons for the determination (including, to the extent appropriate, a summary of the clinical or scientific evidence used in making the determination);

(B) the procedures for obtaining additional information concerning the decision; and

(C) notification of the right to appeal the decision and instructions on how to initiate such an appeal under this section.".

(4) SUBMISSION OF RECORD FOR APPEAL.—Section 1869(c)(3)(J)(i) (42 U.S.C. 1395f(c)(3)(J)(i)) by striking "prepare" and inserting "submit" and by striking "with respect to" and all that follows through "and relevant policies".

(d) QUALIFIED INDEPENDENT CONTRACTORS.—

(1) ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS OF QUALIFIED INDEPENDENT CONTRACTORS.—Section 1869(c)(3)(C) (42 U.S.C. 1395f(c)(3)), as amended by BIPA, is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking "sufficient training and expertise in medical science and legal matters" and inserting "sufficient medical, legal, and other expertise (including knowledge of the program under this title) and sufficient staffing"; and

(B) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

"(K) INDEPENDENCE REQUIREMENTS.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Subject to clause (ii), a qualified independent contractor shall not conduct any activities in a case unless the entity—

(ii) is not a related party (as defined in subsection (g)(3));

(iii) does not have a material familial, financial, or professional relationship with such a party in relation to such case; and

(iv) does not otherwise have a conflict of interest with such a party.

(2) EXCEPTION FOR REASONABLE COMPENSATION.—Nothing in clause (i) shall be construed to prohibit receipt of compensation by a qualified independent contractor of compensation from the Secretary for the conduct of activities under this section if the compensation is provided consistent with clause (iii).

(3) LIMITATIONS ON ENTITY COMPENSATION.—Compensation provided by the Secretary to a qualified independent contractor under a contract with respect to a case section shall not be contingent on any decision rendered by the contractor or by any reviewing professional.

(e) QUALIFICATIONS OF REVIEWERS.—

(1) ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS FOR REVIEWERS.—Section 1869 (42 U.S.C. 1395f), as amended by BIPA, is amended—

(A) by amending subsection (c)(3)(D) to read as follows:

"(D) QUALIFICATIONS FOR REVIEWERS.—The requirements of subsection (g) shall be met (relating to qualifications of reviewing professionals)";

and

(B) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(g) QUALIFICATIONS OF REVIEWERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In reviewing determinations under this section, a qualified independent contractor shall assure that—

(A) each individual conducting a review shall meet the qualifications of paragraph (2); and

(B) compensation provided by the contractor to each such reviewer is consistent with paragraph (3);

and

(2) APPEALS.—Each appeal by a panel described in subsection (c)(3)(B) composed of physicians or other health care professionals (each in this subsection referred to as a 'reviewing professional'), a reviewing professional meets the qualifications described in paragraph (4) and, where a claim is regarding the furnishing of treatment by a physician (allopathic or osteopathic) or the provision of items or services by a physician (allopathic or osteopathic), a reviewing professional shall be a physician (allopathic or osteopathic)."

(2) INDEPENDENCE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), each individual conducting a review shall—

(i) not be a related party (as defined in paragraph (5));
"(ii) not have a material familial, financial, or professional relationship with such a party in the case under review; and

"(iii) not otherwise have a conflict of interest arising from such a party.

"(B) EXCEPTION.—Nothing in subparagraph (A) shall be construed to—

"(i) prohibit an individual, solely on the basis of having been employed or furnished the health care items or services at issue, from serving as a reviewer professional;

"(ii) limit review to or on behalf of such intermediary, carrier, or other contractor, from serving as a reviewing professional if—

"(III) the individual is not involved in the provision of items or services in the case under review;

"(iii) the fact of such an agreement is disclosed to the Secretary and the individual (or authorized representative), and neither party objects; and

"(IV) the individual is not an employee of the intermediary, carrier, or contractor and does not provide services exclusively or primarily to or on behalf of such intermediary, carrier, or contractor;

"(V) neither party in the case under review; and

"(VI) the fact of such an agreement is disclosed to the Secretary and the individual (or authorized representative) and neither party objects; or

"(III) prohibit receipt of compensation by a reviewing professional from a contractor if the compensation is provided consistent with paragraph (3)."

For purposes of this paragraph, the term ‘participation agreement’ means an agreement relating to the provision of health care services by the individual and does not include the provision of services as a reviewer under this subsection.

"(3) LIMITATIONS ON REVIEWER COMPENSATION.—During a random prepayment review only to develop a contractor-wide or program-wide claims payment error rates or under such additional circumstances as may be specified under regulations, developed in consultation with providers of services and suppliers.

"(b) USE OF STANDARD PROTOCOLS WHEN CONDUCTING PREPAYMENT REVIEWS.—When a medicare administrative contractor conducts a random prepayment review, the contractor may conduct such review only in accordance with a standard protocol for random prepayment audits developed by the Secretary.

"(c) APPLICATION TO FISCAL INTERMEDIARIES AND CARRIERS.—The provisions of section 1874A(h) of the Social Security Act, as added by subsection (a), shall apply to each fiscal intermediary under section 1816 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395h) and each carrier under section 1842 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1395u) in the same manner as they apply to medicare administrative contractors under such provisions.

"(4) LIMITATIONS ON NON-RANDOM PREPAYMENT REVIEW.—For purposes of subparagraph (A), the repayment of an overpayment (or overpayments) within 30 days by a provider of services or supplier, of an overpayment under this title would constitute a hardship (as defined in subparagraph (B)) if—

"(I) the amount paid under this title to the provider of services or supplier for the prior payment period covered by the most recently submitted cost report exceeds 10 percent of the amount paid under this title to the provider of services or supplier for the prior payment period covered by the most recently submitted cost report;

"(II) the amount paid under this title to the provider of services or supplier for the prior payment period covered by this cost report exceeds 10 percent of the amount paid under this title to the provider of services or supplier for the prior payment period covered by the most recently submitted cost report; or

"(III) the amount paid under this title to the provider of services or supplier for the prior payment period covered by the most recently submitted cost report exceeds 10 percent of the amount paid under this title to the provider of services or supplier for the prior payment period covered by the cost report submitted to the medicare administrative contractor with respect to the previous calendar year.

"(5) RULE OF APPLICATION.—The Secretary shall establish rules for the application of this subparagraph in the case of a provider of services or supplier that was not paid under this title during the previous year or was paid under this title with respect to a specific overpayment amount under this title during the previous year; and

"(6) TREATMENT OF PREVIOUS OVERPAYMENTS.—If a provider of services or supplier has entered into a repayment plan under subparagraph (A) with respect to a specific overpayment amount under this title, the repayment amount under such repayment plan shall not be considered a hardship (as defined in subparagraph (B)) with respect to subsequent overpayment amounts.

"(7) EXCEPTION.—Subparagraph (A) shall not apply if—

"(I) the Secretary has reason to suspect that the payment of services or supplier may file for bankruptcy or otherwise cease to do business or discontinue participation in the program under this Act.

"(II) there is an indication of fraud or abuse committed against the program.
OFFER.—Before offering a provider of services or supplier fails to make a payment in accordance with a repayment plan under this paragraph, the Secretary may immediately seek to offset or otherwise recover the total balance outstanding (including applicable interest) under the repayment plan.

(E) EFFECTIVE DATES AND DEADLINES.—

(1) USE OF REPAYMENT PLANS.—Section 1893(f)(3) of the Social Security Act, as added by subsection (a), shall apply to requests for repayment plans made after the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) LIMITATION ON RECoupMENT.—Section 1893(f)(2) of the Social Security Act, as added by subsection (a), shall apply to statistically valid random samples initiated after the date one year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

PROVISION OF SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION.—Section 1893(f)(4) of the Social Security Act, as added by subsection (a), shall apply to consent settlements entered into after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(4) NOTICE OF OVERUTILIZATION.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall first establish a standard methodology for selection of sample claims for abnormal billing patterns under section 1893(f)(8) of the Social Security Act, as added by subsection (a).

(5) PAYMENT AUDITS.—Section 1893A(f)(7) of the Social Security Act, as added by subsection (a), shall apply to audits initiated after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(7) STANDARD METHODOLOGY FOR PROBE SAMPLING.—The Secretary shall establish a standard methodology for Medicare contractors to use in selecting a sample of claims for review in the case of an abnormal billing pattern.

SEC. 938. PROVIDER ENROLLMENT PROCESS: RIGHT OF APPEAL.

In general.—Section 1866 (42 U.S.C. 1395w–26) is amended—

(1) by adding at the end the following: """"ENROLLMENT PROCESSES"""";

and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

""""(i) Enrollment Process for Providers of Services and Suppliers.—

(1) In General.—The Secretary shall establish by regulation a process for the enrollment of providers of services and suppliers under this title.

(2) Deadlines.—The Secretary shall establish by regulation procedures under which there are deadlines for actions on applications for enrollment (and, if applicable, renewal of enrollment) under this title, which shall monitor the performance of Medicare administrative contractors in meeting the deadlines established under this subparagraph.

(3) Consultation Before Changing Provider Enrollment Forms.—The Secretary shall consult with providers of services and suppliers before making changes in the provider enrollment forms that would make it difficult for providers and suppliers to be eligible to submit claims for which payment may be made under this title.

(4) Hearing Rights in Cases of Denial or Non-Renewal.—A provider of services or supplier whose application to enroll (or, if applicable, to renew enrollment) under this title has been denied may have a fair and impartial review of such denial under the procedures that apply under subsection (h)(1)(A) to a valid random sample; or

(ii) a consent settlement.

The opportunity provided under clause (ii) does not waive any appeal rights with respect to the alleged overpayment involved.

(D) CONSENT SETTLEMENT DEFINED.—For purposes of this paragraph, the term "consent settlement" means an agreement between the Secretary and a provider of services or supplier whereby both parties agree to settle a proceeding based on less than a statistically valid sample of claims and the provider of services or supplier agrees not to appeal the claims involved.

(E) NOTICE OF OVERUTILIZATION.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall first establish a standard methodology for selection of sample claims for abnormal billing patterns under section 1893(f)(8) of the Social Security Act, as added by subsection (a).

SEC. 939. PROVIDER ENROLLMENT PROCESS: RIGHT OF APPEAL.

In general.—Section 1866 (42 U.S.C. 1395w–26) is amended—

(1) by adding at the end the following: """"ENROLLMENT PROCESSES"""";

and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

""""(i) Enrollment Process for Providers of Services and Suppliers.—

(1) In General.—The Secretary shall establish by regulation a process for the enrollment of providers of services and suppliers under this title.

(2) Deadlines.—The Secretary shall establish by regulation procedures under which there are deadlines for actions on applications for enrollment (and, if applicable, renewal of enrollment) under this title.
provider of services that is dissatisfied with a determination by the Secretary.'’.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATES.—

(1) ENROLLMENT PROCESS.—The Secretary shall establish the enrollment process under section 1866(j)(1) of the Social Security Act, as added by subsection (a), as applied by sub-section (a)(2), shall apply to denials occurring on or after such date (not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act) as the Secretary specifies.

SEC. 907. PROCESS FOR CORRECTION OF MINOR ERRORS AND OMISSIONS WITHOUT PURSUING APPEALS PROCESS.

(a) CLAIMS.—The Secretary shall develop, in consultation with appropriate Medicare contractors (as defined in section 1886(g) of the Social Security Act, as inserted by section 301(a)(2) and representatives of providers of services and suppliers, a process whereby, in case of minor errors or omissions, the contractor detects that are included in the submission of claims under the programs enacted after title XVIII of such Act, a provider or supplier is given an opportunity to correct such an error or omission without the need to initiate an appeal. Such process shall include the ability to submit corrected or supplementary data.

(b) PERMITTING USE OF CORRECTED AND SUPPLEMENTARY DATA.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 1886(d)(10)(D)(vi) (42 U.S.C. 1395ww(d)(10)(D)(vi)) is amended by adding after subclause (II) at the end the following:

"(iii) notwithstanding subsection (I), a hospital may submit, and the Secretary may accept, a claim for the correction of or supplement to data described in such subsection an eligible requester may submit to the contractor a request for a determination. In the case of a request submitted by an eligible requester who is described in subparagraph (C), the Secretary may make an adjustment in the amount involved with respect to the item or service involved as to whether the item or service involved as to whether the item or service is covered under this title consistent with the applicable requirements of section 1848(f) for purposes of calculating the sustainable growth rate under such section.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATES.—

The amendment made by paragraph (1) shall apply to fiscal years beginning with fiscal year 2004.

SEC. 918. PRIOR DETERMINATION PROCESS FOR CERTAIN ITEMS AND SERVICES; ADJUSTMENT TO ADVANCE BENEFICIARY NOTICES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a hospital may submit (or resubmit) an application for a change described in subparagraph (III) of section 1874A that is covered under title XVIII of the Social Security Act for fiscal year 2004 if the hospital demonstrates on a timely basis to the satisfaction of the Secretary that the use of corrected or supplementary data under the amendment made by paragraph (1) would materially affect the approval of such an application.

(b) APPLICATION OF BUDGET NEUTRALITY.—If one or more hospital’s applications are approved as a result of paragraph (1) and subparagraph (A) for fiscal year 2004, the Secretary shall include a budget neutrality adjustment in the standardized amounts determined under section 1886(d)(3) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395ww(d)(3)) for fiscal year 2004 to assure that approval of such applications does not result in aggregate payments under section 1886(d) of such Act that are greater or less than those that would otherwise be applicable under paragraph (1) and subparagraph (A) did not apply.

SEC. 919. PRIOR DETERMINATION PROCESS FOR CERTAIN ITEMS AND SERVICES; ADJUSTMENT TO ADVANCE BENEFICIARY NOTICES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1899 (42 U.S.C. 1395f(b)), as amended by sections 521 and 522 of title III and section 333(b)(1) of title III, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(h) PRIOR DETERMINATION PROCESS FOR CERTAIN ITEMS AND SERVICES.—

(i) Establishment of process.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—With respect to a Medicare provider, when a contractor has a contract under section 1874A that provides for making payments under this title with respect to eligible items and services described in such contract, the Secretary shall establish a prior determination process that meets the requirements of this subsection and that shall be applied by such contractor, in the case of an eligible requester.

(B) Eligible requester.—For purposes of this subsection, each of the following shall be an eligible requester:

(1) a physician, but only with respect to eligible items and services for which the physician may be paid directly.

(2) a provider of services or supplier is given an opportunity to correct such an error or omission without the need to initiate an appeal. Such process shall include the ability to submit corrected or supplementary data.

(c) ELIGIBLE ITEMS AND SERVICES.—For purposes of this subsection and subject to paragraph (2), eligible items and services are those for which the physician’s services (as defined in paragraph (4)(A) of section 1848(f) for purposes of calculating the sustainable growth rate under such section). The Secretary shall establish by regulation reasonable limits on the categories of eligible items and services for which a prior determination of coverage may be requested under this subsection. In establishing such limits, the Secretary may consider the dollar amount under subsection (a)(2)(A) of item involved as to whether the item or service, administrative costs and burdens, and other relevant factors.

(3) REQUEST FOR PRIOR DETERMINATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), under the process established under this subsection an eligible requester may submit to the contractor a request for a determination, before the furnishing of an eligible item or service involved as to whether the item or service is covered under this title consistent with the applicable requirements of section 1848(f) for purposes of calculating the sustainable growth rate under such section.

(B) ACCOMPANYING DOCUMENTATION.—The Secretary may require that the request be accompanied by a brief explanation of the item or service, supporting documentation relating to the medical necessity for the item or service, and any other appropriate documentation. In the case of a request submitted by an eligible requester who is described in paragraph (1)(B)(ii), the Secretary may require that the request also be accompanied by a copy of the advance beneficiary notice involved.

(4) RESPONSE TO REQUEST.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Under such process, the contractor shall include in notice to the eligible requester with written notice of a determination to as whether:

(i) the item or service is covered;

(ii) the item or service is not so covered; or

(iii) the contractor lacks sufficient information to make a coverage determination.

If the contractor makes the determination described in clause (iii), the contractor shall include in the notice a description of the additional information required to make the coverage determination.

(B) DEADLINE TO RESPOND.—Such notice shall be provided within the same time period as the time period applicable to pre-service determinations relating to pre-service determinations made under paragraph (5)(B)), relating to pre-service determinations, claims are not subject to further administrative appeal or judicial review under this section or otherwise.

(5) EFFECT OF DETERMINATIONS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall establish the prior determination process under the amendment made by subsection (a) in a manner as to ensure that the acceptance of requests for determinations under such process filed not later than 18 months after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(B) TRANSITION.—During the period in which the amendment made by subsection (a) becomes effective, determinations relating to a claim for benefits under section 1866(j)(1)(A) may be requested.
(a) has become effective but contracts are not provided under section 1874A of the Social Security Act with Medicare administrative contractors, any reference in section 1855 of the Social Security Act (as added by such amendment) to such a contractor is deemed a reference to a fiscal intermediary or carrier with an agreement under section 1858 or contract under section 1852, respectively, of such Act.

(3) LIMITATION ON APPLICATION TO SGR.—For purposes of applying section 1848(f)(2)(D) of the Social Security Act (as added by such amendment), the amendment by section (a) shall not be considered to be a change in law or regulation.

(c) PROVISIONS RELATING TO ADVANCE BENEFICIARY NOTICES; REPORT ON PRIOR DETERMINATION PROCESS.—

(1) STUDY.—The Secretary shall carry out a study of the matters described in paragraph (2). The Secretary shall submit to Congress a report on such study not later than one year after the date on which section 1855(g) of the Social Security Act (as added by such amendment) takes effect.

(2)wm) MATTERS DESCRIBED.—The matters referred to in paragraph (1) are—

(A) the development of a simpler, alternative system of requirements for documenting and managing claims for which payment is made under title XVIII of the Social Security Act and (B) any other matters related to reducing the level of non-clinically pertinent and burdensome documentation time and content in the physician's medical record.

(3) LIMITATION ON APPLICATION TO SGR.—For purposes of applying section 1848(f)(2)(D) of the Social Security Act (as added by such amendment), the amendment by section (a) shall not be considered to be a change in law or regulation.

(4) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—(A) Not later than one year after the date on which section 1855(g) of the Social Security Act (as added by such amendment) takes effect, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to Congress a report on the use of advance beneficiary notices and other arrangements in which a beneficiary indicates on such a notice that the beneficiary does not intend to seek to have the item or service that is the subject of the notice furnished.

(b) Pilot Projects to Test Evaluation and Management Documentation Guidelines.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall conduct under this subsection appropriate and representative pilot projects to test new evaluation and management documentation guidelines referred to in subsection (a).

(2) LENGTH AND CONSULTATION.—Each pilot project under this subsection shall—

(A) be voluntary;

(B) be of sufficient length as determined by the Secretary to allow for preparation of physician and Medicare contractor education, analysis, and use and assessment of potential evaluation and management guidelines;

(C) be conducted, in development and throughout the planning and operational stages of the project, in consultation with practicing physicians, including both generalists and specialists.

(3) RANGE OF PILOT PROJECTS.—Of the pilot projects conducted under this subsection—

(A) a (to be determined by the Secretary) shall conduct an analysis of the results of the study conducted under paragraph (1).

(B) Not later than October 1, 2005, the Secretary shall conduct a study of the appropriateness of coding in cases of extended office visits in which there is no diagnosis made. Not later than one year after the date on which section 1855(g) of the Social Security Act (as added by such amendment) takes effect, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to Congress a report on such study and shall include recommendations on how to code appropriately for such visits in a manner that takes into account the amount of time the physician spent with the patient.

(4) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

(A) the term "teaching setting" has the meaning given in section 1833(n) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w(n)); and

(B) the term "teaching setting" is a setting where physicians bill under physicians' services in teaching settings and at least one shall be conducted in a setting other than a teaching setting.

(b) Council for Technology and Innovation.—Section 1855(d) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w(d)); and (A) the term "teaching setting" is a setting where physicians bill under physicians' services in teaching settings and at least one shall be conducted in a setting other than a teaching setting.

SEC. 942. IMPROVEMENT IN OVERSIGHT OF TECHNOLOGIES.

(a) Council for Technology and Innovation.—Section 1866(e) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395gg(e))
amended by section 92(a), is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(c) COUNCIL FOR TECHNOLOGY AND INNOVATION.—

"(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary shall establish a Council for Technology and Innovation (hereafter referred to as 'CMS') within the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (in this section referred to as 'CMS').

"(2) COMPOSITION.—The Council shall be comprised of the Secretaries of staff and shall be chaired by the Executive Coordinator for Technology and Innovation (appointed or designated under paragraph (4)).

"(3) FUNCTIONS.—The Council shall provide guidance on new technologies and procedures, including new drug therapies, and shall coordinate the exchange of information on new technologies between CMS and other entities that make similar decisions.

"(A) The Council shall make only after consideration of such tests, or both) furnished without a face-to-face encounter between the individual entitled to benefits under part A or enrolled under part B, or both, and the hospital involved in such a delay would jeopardize the health or safety of the individual referred to as 'new tests'.

"(B) R EPORT.—by not later than October 1, 2004, the Comptroller General shall submit to the Congress a report to Congress on the study under paragraph (1).

"(ii) make available to the public the results of any study conducted under subparagraph (A) that is based on the data on which such recommendations are based.

"(ii) shall convene such further public meetings to receive comments and recommendations (and not on the patient's principal diagnosis). When making such determinations, the Secretary shall:

"(B) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(ii) A code shall be considered to be 'substantially revised' if there is a substantive change in the procedure or process or in the medical condition to which the code applies (as new cases or a new analyte, or a new methodology for measuring an existing analyte-specific test).

"(B) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(D) The Secretary shall also request such a review before making a compliance determination as part of the process of terminating a hospital's participation under this title for violations related to the appropriateness of a medical screening examination, stabilizing treatment, or an appropriate transfer as required by this section, and shall provide a period of 5 days for such review.

"(A) by designating all that follows "(a)" of this section, and shall coordinate the exchange of information on new technologies between CMS and other entities that make similar decisions.

"(B) by aligning such paragraph with the paragraph added by paragraph (3); and
CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE
H6071
June 26, 2003

(C) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(2) EXCEPTION FOR CERTAIN CASES.—The requirement for an appropriate medical screening examination under paragraph (1) shall not apply in the case of an individual who comes to the emergency department and neither the individual, nor another person on the individual's behalf, requests examination or treatment for an emergency medical condition (such as a request solely for preventive services, such as blood pressure screening or is transery laboratory and diagnostic tests)."

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by paragraph (1) shall apply to terminations initiated on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 945. EMERGENCY MEDICAL TREATMENT AND ACTIVE LABOR ACT (EMTALA) TECHNICAL ADVISORY GROUP.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary shall establish a Technical Advisory Group (in this section referred to as the "Advisory Group") to review issues related to the Emergency Medical Treatment and Labor Act (EMTALA) and its implementation. In this section, the term "EMTALA" refers to the provisions of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395dd).

(b) MEMBERSHIP.—The Advisory Group shall be composed of 19 members, including the Administrator of the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services and the Inspector General of the Department of Health and Human Services and of which—

(1) shall be representatives of hospitals, including at least one public hospital, that have experience with the application of EMTALA and are 2 of which have not been cited for EMTALA violations;

(2) shall be practicing physicians drawn from the fields of emergency medicine, cardiology or cardiothoracic surgery, orthopedic surgery, neurosurgery, pediatrics or a pediatric subspecialty, obstetrics-gynecology, and psychiatry, with no more than one physician from any particular field;

(3) 2 shall represent patients;

(4) 2 shall be staff involved in EMTALA investigations from different regional offices of the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services; and

(5) 1 shall be from a State survey office involved in EMTALA investigations and 1 shall be from organizations of which 2 of whom shall be from areas other than the regions represented under paragraph (4). In selecting members described in paragraphs (1) through (3), the Secretary shall consult with certain individuals nominated by organizations representing providers and patients.

(c) GENERAL RESPONSIBILITIES.—The Advisory Group—

(1) shall review EMTALA regulations;

(2) may provide advice and recommendations to the Secretary with respect to those regulations and their application to hospitals and physicians;

(3) shall solicit comments and recommendations from hospitals, physicians, and the public regarding the implementation of such regulations; and

(4) may disseminate information on the application of such regulations to hospitals, physicians, and the public.

(d) ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS.—

(1) CHAIRPERSON.—The members of the Advisory Group shall elect a member to serve as chairperson of the Advisory Group for the life of the Advisory Group.

(2) MEETINGS.—The Advisory Group shall meet at the direction of the Secretary. The Advisory Group shall then meet twice per year and at such other times as the Advisory Group may provide.

(e) TERMINATION.—The Advisory Group shall terminate 30 months after the date of its first meeting.

(f) WAIVER OF ADMINISTRATIVE LIMITATION.—The Secretary shall establish the Advisory Group notwithstanding any limitation that may apply to the number of advisory committees that shall be established (within the Department of Health and Human Services or otherwise).

SEC. 946. AUTHORIZING USE OF ARRANGEMENTS TO PROVIDE CORE HOSPICE SERVICES IN CERTAIN CIRCUMSTANCES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1861(dd)(5) (42 U.S.C. 1395xddd(5)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(D) In extraordinary, exigent, or other non-routine circumstances, such as unanticipated periods of high loads, staffing shortages due to illness or other events, or temporary travel of a patient outside a hospice program's service area, a hospice program may enter into arrangements with another hospice program for the provision by that other program of services described in paragraph (2)(A)(ii)(I) that other program of services described in paragraph (2)(A)(ii)(I) shall apply with respect to the services provided under such arrangements.

"(E) A hospice program may provide services described in paragraph (1)(A) other than directly by the program if the services are highly specialized services of a registered professional that provide care routinely and so infrequently so that the provision of such services directly would be impracticable and prohibitively expensive.

"(F) IN ORDER TO PROVIDE CORE HOSPICE AND OTHER SERVICES.—Section 1814(i) (42 U.S.C. 1395ii(i)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(4) In the case of hospice care provided by a hospice program under arrangements under section 1861(dd)(5)(D) made by another hospice program, the program that made the arrangements shall bill and be paid for the hospice care.

"(G) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to hospice care provided on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 947. APPLICATION OF OSHA BLOODBORNE PATHOGENS STANDARD TO CERTAIN HOSPICE PROGRAMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1866 (42 U.S.C. 1395cc) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking ""clause (iv)'' and ''paragraph (1)(A)'', respectively; and

(2) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''clause (i)(IV)'' and ''clause (i)(III)'' and inserting ''clause (i)(IV)'' and ''clause (i)(III)'' and inserting subparagraph (A)(iv) and subparagraph (A)(iii), respectively; and

(b) CONFORMING PAYMENT PROVISION.—Section 1907(i)(3)(C) (42 U.S.C. 1395yy(g)(3)(C)) is amended by striking ''(C)'' and inserting ''(D)''.

SEC. 948. BIPA-RELATED TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS AND CORRECTIONS.

(a) TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS RELATING TO ADVISORY COMMITTEE UNDER BIPA SECTION 522.—(1) Subsection (i) of section 1142 (42 U.S.C. 1314)—

(A) is transferred to section 1892 and added at the end of such section; and

(B) is redesignated as subsection (j).

(2) Section 1892 (42 U.S.C. 1319y) is amended—

(A) in the last sentence of subsection (a), by striking "established under section 1142(f)''; and

(B) in subsection (i), as so transferred and redesignated—

(i) by striking "'under subsection (f)'''; and

(ii) by striking "'section 1892(a)(1)''' and inserting "'subsection (a)(1)'''.

(b) TERMINOLOGY CORRECTIONS.—(1) Section 1869(c)(3)(i)(D) (42 U.S.C. 1395ff(c)(3)(i)(D)) is amended by section 521 of BIPA, as amended by section 522 of BIPA, is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A)(iv), by striking "subparagraph (ii), (ii), or (iii)'' and inserting "subparagraphs (ii), (ii), or (iii)'';

(2) in subparagraph (B), by striking "clause (i)(IV)'' and "clause (i)(III)'' and inserting subparagraph (A)(iv) and subparagraph (A)(iii), respectively; and

(3) in subparagraph (C), by striking "clause (ii), ''subparagraph (IV), and subparagraph (A)''; "clause (ii)'' and "subparagraph (A)'', respectively each place it appears.

(c) REFERENCE CORRECTIONS.—Section 1866(f)(4) (42 U.S.C. 1395cc(f)(4)) is amended by adding after subsection (a) the following new subparagraph:

"(g) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—The provisions of this section (other than this paragraph) shall be construed in such a manner as to further the purposes of title XIX of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396 et seq.) and title XXI of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1387 et seq.) and shall be used to the maximum extent feasible to further the purposes of such Acts (other than title I of the Social Security Act)."

SEC. 949. CONFORMING AUTHORITY TO WAIVE A PROGRAM EXCLUSION.

The first sentence of section 1128(c)(3)(B) (42 U.S.C. 1320a-7(c)(3)(B)) is amended to read as follows: "Subject to subparagraph (G), in the case of an exclusion under subsection (a), the minimum period shall not be less than five years, except that, upon the request of the administrator of a Federal health care program (as defined in section 1128(f)) who determines that the exclusion would impose a hardship on individuals entitled to benefits under part A of title XVIII or enrolled under part B of such title, or both, A hospital may waive the exclusion under subsection (a)(1), (a)(3), or (a)(4) with respect to that program in the case of an individual or entity that is the sole community provider of a service or a specialized service in a community.

SEC. 950. TREATMENT OF CERTAIN DENTAL CLAIMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1862 (42 U.S.C. 1319y) is amended by adding after subsection (g) the following new subsection:
"(h)(3) Subject to paragraph (2), a group health plan (as defined in subsection (1)(A)(iv)) providing supplemental or secondary coverage to individuals also entitled to such coverage under title XVIII of the Social Security Act shall not require an inpatient Medicare claims determination under this title for benefits specifically excluded under subsection (1)(B) as a condition of making payment for such benefits under the group health plan.

(2) A group health plan may require a claims determination under this title in cases involving or appearing to involve inpatient hospital services or services expressly covered under this title pursuant to actions taken by the Secretary.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect on the date that is 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

Sec. 951. Furnishing Hospitals With Information to Compute DSH Formula

Beginning not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall arrange to furnish to subsection (d) hospitals (as defined in section 1395w–4(b)(3) of the Social Security Act, 42 U.S.C. 1395ww(d)(3)(B)) the data necessary for such hospitals to compute the number of patient days used in computing the disproportionate patient percentage under such section for fiscal years beginning on or after the current reporting year. Such data shall also be furnished to other hospitals which would qualify for additional payments under part A of title XVIII of the Social Security Act on the basis of such data.

Sec. 952. Revisions to Reassignment Provisions

(a) in General.—Section 1824(b)(6)(A) (42 U.S.C. 1395u(b)(6)(A)) is amended by striking "or (ii)" (where the service was provided in a hospital, critical access hospital, clinic, or other facility (as defined by the Secretary), to the entity if, under the contractual arrangement, the entity submits the bill for the service and the contractual arrangement meets the requirements and other safeguards as the Secretary may determine to be appropriate).

(b) Requiring Payment.—The second sentence of section 1824(b)(6) (42 U.S.C. 1395u(b)(6)) is amended by striking "except to an employer, facility or other person" and inserting "except to an employer, facility, or other person".

(c) Effective Date.—The amendments made by section shall apply to payments made on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

Sec. 953. other provisions.

(a) GAO Reports on the Physician Compensation.

(1) SUSTAINABLE GROWTH RATE AND UPDATES.—Not later than 6 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to Congress a report on the appropriateness of the updates in the conversion factor under subsection (d)(3) of section 1848 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w–4), including the appropriateness of the sustainable growth rate formula under subsection (f) of such section for 2002 and succeeding years. Such report shall examine the stability of the sustainable growth rate and alternatives for the use of such rate in the updates.

(2) PHYSICIAN COMPENSATION GENERALLY.—Not later than 12 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall submit to Congress a report on the appropriateness of the updates in the physician fee schedule under title XVIII of the Social Security Act, and how such updates interact and the effect on appropriate compensation for physician services furnished under title XVIII of such title (42 U.S.C. 1395f).

(b) Annual Publication of List of National Coverage Determinations.—The Secretary shall provide, in an appropriate format to the public, a list of national coverage determinations made under title XVIII of the Social Security Act in the previous year and information on how to get more information with respect to such determinations.

(c) GAO REPORT ON FLEXIBILITY IN APPLYING USE OF HOSPITAL LIFETIME RESERVE DAYS DEPENDANTS.—Not later than 6 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall submit to Congress a report on the implications of the potential impact of such flexible application of the lifetime reserve days and the recipients of such services and an analysis of methods for monitoring the quality of care for such recipients.

(d) OIG REPORT ON NOTICES RELATING TO USE OF HOSPITAL LIFETIME RESERVE DAYS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Inspector General of the Department of Health and Human Services shall submit a report to Congress on:

(1) the extent to which hospitals provide notice to Medicare beneficiaries in accordance with applicable requirements before the hospital provides a notice to Medicare beneficiaries.

(2) the appropriateness and feasibility of hospitals providing notice to Medicare beneficiaries before they completely exhaust such lifetime reserve days.

Sec. 954. Temporary Suspension of OASIS Reporting and Collection of Data on Non-Medicare and Non-Medicaid Patients.

(a) in General.—For the period described in subsection (b), the Secretary may not require, under section 4022(e) of the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 or otherwise under OASIS, a home health agency to gather or submit information that relates to an individual who is not eligible for benefits under either title XVIII or title XIX of the Social Security Act (such information in this section referred to as "non-medicare/medicaid OASIS information").

(b) Period of Suspension.—The period described in this subsection—

(1) begins on the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(2) ends on the last day of the 2nd month following the date on which the Secretary has published final regulations regarding the collection and use by the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services of non-medicare/medicaid OASIS information following the submission of the report required under subsection (c).

(c) REPORT.—

(1) STUDY.—The Secretary shall conduct a study on how non-medicare/medicaid OASIS information is and can be used by large home health agencies and other facilities to improve the quality of care provided to such recipients.

(2) REPORT.—The Secretary shall submit to Congress a report on the study conducted under paragraph (1) by not later than 18 months after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(d) CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed as prohibiting home health agencies from collecting non-medicare/medicaid OASIS information for their own use.

Title X—Medicaid

Sec. 1001. Medicaid Disproportionate Share Hospital (DSH) Payments.


(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking "subparagraph (B)" and inserting "subparagraphs (B) and (C)"; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subparagraphs:

"(ii) Special, Temporary increase in allotments on a one-time, non-cumulative basis.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, for fiscal year 2004 equal to 120 percent of the DSH allotment for the State for fiscal year 2003 under this paragraph, notwithstanding subparagraph (B); and

"(iii) for each succeeding fiscal year equal to the DSH allotment for the State for fiscal year 2004 or, in the case of fiscal years 2005 and 2006, with the exception specified in subparagraph (D) for that State, the percentage change in the consumer price index for all urban consumers (all items; U.S. city average), for the previous fiscal year specified in subparagraph (C)(iii), the fiscal year specified in this subparagraph for a State is the first fiscal year for which the Secretary estimates that the DSH allotment for that State will equal (or no longer exceed) the DSH allotment for that State under the law as in effect before the date of the enactment of this subparagraph."
Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 355)(i) is amended—

(3) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by striking subparagraph (B) and inserting in its place the following:

"(B) NOTICE OF OPINION THAT PATENT IS INVALID OR WILL NOT BE INFRINGED.—"

(ii) by inserting after subparagraph (B) the following:

"(ii) NO INDEPENDENT CAUSE OF ACTION.—"

(4) in paragraph (3)—

(A) by inserting after subparagraph (C) the following:

"(D) CIVIL ACTION TO OBTAIN PATENT CONFIDENTIALITY.—For purposes of subsection (b), the document described in this subclause is a document providing a right of confidential access for the sole and limited purpose of evaluating possible infringement of the patent that is the subject of the certification under paragraph (2)(A)(vii)(IV) and for no other purpose, and may not disclose information of no relevance to any issue of patent infringement to any person other than a person providing a right of confidential access. Further, the application may be redacted by the applicant to remove any information of no relevance to any issue of patent infringement.

(b) APPLICATIONS GENERALLY.—Section 505 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 355) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) by striking paragraph (3) and inserting the following:

"(3) NOTICE OF OPINION THAT PATENT IS INVALID OR WILL NOT BE INFRINGED.—"

(ii) by inserting after subparagraph (A) the following:

"(D) CIVIL ACTION TO OBTAIN PATENT CONFIDENTIALITY.—"
"(C) Recipients of Notice.—An applicant required under this paragraph to give notice shall give notice to—

(1) each owner of the patent that is the subject of the certification (or a representative of the owner designated to receive such a notice); and

(2) the holder of the approved application under subsection (b)(2)(A)(ii)(I) before the date on which the application may be redacted by the applicant, unless before the expiration of the term '180-day exclusivity period' the applicant provides a complete application containing a certification described in paragraph (4).

(2) Declaratory Judgment Absent Infringement Action.—

"(i) In General.—If an owner of the patent that is the subject of the certification is not notified that the patent is invalid or not infringed, the approval shall be made effective on—

aa) the date on which the court of appeals decides that the patent is invalid or not infringed (including any substantive determination that there is no cause of action for patent infringement or invalidity); or

bb) the date the consent decree signed and entered by the court stating that the patent is invalid or not infringed is the subject of the certification under subsection (b)(2)(A)(ii)(I); and

(ii) the date of a settlement order or consent decree signed and entered by the court under subsection (b)(2)(A)(ii)(I)

(3) Effect of Determination on Subsequent Certification.—

"(i) In General.—Any person provided a right of confidential access under subsection (b)(2)(A)(ii)(I) before the date on which the application may be redacted by the applicant shall contain such restrictions as to access to the application of the applicant relevant to any issue of patent infringement.
Substantially complete application. — As used in this subsection, the term ‘substantially complete application’ means an application under this subsection that on its face contains all information necessary to permit substantive review and contains all the information required by paragraph (2)(A).

(A) TENTATIVE APPROVAL.—The term ‘tentative approval’ means notification to an applicant by the Secretary that an application under this subsection meets the requirements of paragraph (2)(A), but cannot receive effective approval because the application does not meet the requirements of this subparagraph, there is no exclusivity for the listed drug under subparagraph (E) or section 505A, or there is a 7-year period of exclusivity for the listed drug under section 527.

(B) LIMITATION.—A drug that is granted tentative approval by the Secretary is not an approved drug and shall not have an effective approval until the Secretary issues an approval after any necessary additional review of the application.

(II) EFFECTIVENESS OF APPLICATION.—Subject to subparagraph (D), if the application contains the information described in paragraph (2)(A)(iv) and is for a drug for which a first applicant has submitted an application containing such a certification, the application shall be made effective under clause (ii) if the date that is 180 days after the date of the first commercial marketing of the drug (including the commercial marketing either of the listed drug or another drug marketed by another manufacturer) and (2) by inserting after subparagraph (C) the following:

‘‘(D) FORFEITURE OF 180-DAY EXCLUSIVITY PERIOD.—

‘‘(i) DEFINITION OF FORFEITURE EVENT.—In this subparagraph, the term ‘forfeiture event’ means the occurrence of any of the following:

‘‘(aa) the earlier of the date that is—

‘‘(AA) 75 days after the date on which the application of the first applicant is made effective under subparagraph (B)(iii); or

‘‘(BB) 30 months after the date of submission of the application of the first applicant; or

‘‘(bb) with respect to the first applicant or any other applicant which otherwise qualifies the first applicant for the 180-day exclusivity period under subparagraph (B)(iv), at least 1 of the following has occurred:

‘‘(AA) In an infringement action brought against the first applicant with respect to the patent or in a declaratory judgment action brought by a person with respect to the patent, a court enters a final decision from which no appeal (other than a petition to the Supreme Court for a writ of certiorari) has been or can be taken that the patent is invalid or not infringed.

‘‘(BB) In an infringement action or a declaratory judgment action described in subparagraph (AA), a court shall grant a permanent order or decree that enters a final judgment that includes a finding that the patent is invalid or not infringed.

‘‘(DD) The patent is withdrawn by the holder of the application approved under subsection (b).

(II) FAILURE TO OBTAIN TENTATIVE APPROVAL.—The first applicant amends or withdraws the certification for all the patents with respect to which the applicant submitted a certification qualifying the applicant for the 180-day exclusivity period.

‘‘(IV) FAILURE TO OBTAIN TENTATIVE APPROVAL.—The first applicant fails to obtain tentative approval after the date on which the application is filed.

‘‘(V) AGREEMENT WITH ANOTHER APPLICANT, THE LISTED DRUG APPLICATION HOLDER, OR A PATENT OWNER.—The first applicant enters into an agreement with another applicant under this subsection for the drug, the holder of the application for the listed drug, or an owner of the patent that is the subject of the certification under paragraph (2)(A)(iv), the Federal Trade Commission, or the Attorney General on behalf of the United States in a court (other than a petition to the Supreme Court for a writ of certiorari) has been or can be taken that the patent is invalid or not infringed.

‘‘(VI) EXPIRATION OF ALL PATENTS.—All of the patents with respect to which the application for the listed drug is made effective under subparagraph (B)(iii) have expired.

‘‘(VII) FORFEITURE.—The 180-day exclusivity period described in subparagraph (B)(iv) shall be forfeited by a first applicant if a forfeiture event occurs with respect to that first applicant.

‘‘(IX) SUBSEQUENT APPLICANT.—If all first applicants forfeit the 180-day exclusivity period under clause (ii),

‘‘(i) approval of any application containing a certification qualifying the first applicant for the 180-day exclusivity period under subparagraph (B)(iv) shall be made effective in accordance with paragraph (B)(iii); and

‘‘(ii) no applicant shall be eligible for a 180-day exclusivity period under section 505(j)(2)(A)(vii)(IV).

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the amendment made by subsection (a) applies to an application filed after the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) BY ADDING—at the end of section 505A of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 355a) the following:

‘‘SUBTITLE B—Federal Trade Commission Review

SEC. 1114. CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.

Section 505A of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 355a) is amended—

(1) in subsections (b)(1)(A)(ii) and (c)(1)(A)(ii), by striking ‘‘(j)(5)(D)’’ each place it appears and inserting ‘‘(j)(5)(F)’’; (2) in subsections (b)(1)(A)(ii) and (c)(1)(A)(ii), by striking ‘‘(j)(5)(D)’’ each place it appears and inserting ‘‘(j)(5)(F)’’; (3) in subsections (e) and (I), by striking ‘‘(j)(5)(I)(D)’’ each place it appears and inserting ‘‘(j)(5)(I)(F)’’; and

SEC. 1113. BIOAVAILABILITY AND BIOEQUIVALENCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 505(j) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 355(j)) is amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (B)(v) and inserting the following:

‘‘(B) In this paragraph—

‘‘(i) the term ‘generic drug applicant’ means a person asserting the following:

‘‘(II) the term ‘substantially complete application’ means the Federal Trade Commission.

‘‘(III) the term ‘safety and therapeutic equivalence’ means the Federal Trade Commission.

‘‘(IV) the term ‘bioavailability and bioequivalence’ means the Federal Trade Commission.

‘‘(2) by adding at the end the following:

‘‘(C) For a drug that is not intended to be absorbed into the bloodstream, the Secretary may establish scientifically valid methods to show bioequivalence if the alternative methods are expected to detect a significant difference between the drug and the listed drug in safety and therapeutic effect.

(b) EFFECT OF AMENDMENT.—The amendment made by subsection (a) does not alter the standards for approval of drugs under section 505(j) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 355(j)).

SEC. 1114. CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.

Section 505A of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 355a) is amended—

(1) in subsections (b)(1)(A)(i) and (c)(1)(A)(i), by striking ‘‘(j)(5)(D)’’ each place it appears and inserting ‘‘(j)(5)(F)’’; (2) in subsections (b)(1)(A)(ii) and (c)(1)(A)(ii), by striking ‘‘(j)(5)(D)’’ each place it appears and inserting ‘‘(j)(5)(F)’’; (3) in subsections (e) and (I), by striking ‘‘(j)(5)(I)(D)’’ each place it appears and inserting ‘‘(j)(5)(I)(F)’’; and

SEC. 1114. CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.

Subtitle B—Federal Trade Commission Review
(7) LISTED DRUG.—The term ‘listed drug’ means a brand name drug that is listed under section 505(j)(7) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act.

SEC. 1119. PHARMACIST-GENERATED AGREEMENTS.

(a) AGREEMENT WITH BRAND NAME DRUG COMPANY.—

(1) REQUIREMENT.—A generic drug applicant that has submitted an ANDA containing a certification under section 505(j)(2)(B) and a brand name drug company that enters into an agreement described in this paragraph shall file each agreement in accordance with subsection (c).

(2) AGREEMENT.—Any filing required under section 1112 shall be filed with the Commission not later than 30 business days after the date the agreements are executed.

(b) AGREEMENT WITH ANOTHER GENERIC DRUG APPLICANT.—

(1) REQUIREMENT.—A generic drug applicant that has submitted an ANDA containing a certification under section 505(j)(2)(A)(iv) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act and a brand name drug company that enters into an agreement described in this paragraph shall file each agreement in accordance with subsection (c).

(2) AGREEMENT.—Any filing required under section 1112 shall be filed with the Commission not later than 30 business days after the date the agreements are executed.

(c) FILING.—Any filing required under section 1112 shall be filed in accordance with this subsection.

Any failure of the Commission to take action necessary and appropriate to carry out the purposes of this subsection—

(1) is excused if the failure is due to circumstances beyond the control of the Commission;

(2) may exempt classes of persons or agreements from the requirements of this subsection;

(3) may define the terms used in this subsection;

(4) may determine that an agreement is unnecessary or appropriate to carry out the purposes of this subsection;

(5) may define the terms used in this subsection;

(6) may exempt classes of persons or agreements from the requirements of this subsection; and

(7) may prescribe such other rules as are necessary or appropriate to carry out the purposes of this subsection.

SEC. 1120. RULEMAKING.

The Commission, by rule in accordance with section 553 of title 5, United States Code, consistent with the purposes of this title—

(1) may define the terms used in this subsection;

(2) may exempt classes of persons or agreements from the requirements of this subsection; and

(3) may prescribe such other rules as are necessary or appropriate to carry out the purposes of this subsection.

SEC. 1122. IMPORTATION OF PRESCRIPTION DRUGS.

(a) IMPORTER.—The term ‘importer’ means a person licensed by a State to practice pharmacy.

(b) PHARMACIST.—The term ‘pharmacist’ means a person licensed by a State to practice pharmacy, including the dispensing and selling of prescription drugs.

(c) PRESCRIPTION DRUG.—The term ‘prescription drug’ means a drug subject to section 503(b)(1) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act.

(d) Certification.—The Commissioner shall promulgate regulations to ensure that each prescription drug imported under the regulations complies with section 505, except as otherwise provided.

(e) Subsections (d)(1) and (e); (2) require that each prescription drug imported under the regulations comply with sections 502 and 505.

(f) REQUIREMENT.—The Secretary shall—

(1) require that only prescription drugs which have not left the possession of the first Canadian recipient of such prescription drugs after receipt from the manufacturer of such prescription drugs be eligible for importation into the United States under this section;

(2) require, if determined appropriate by the Secretary, that all prescription drugs imported from Canada under this section by domestic pharmacists and wholesalers be eligible for importation into the United States through ports of entry designated by the Secretary for purposes of this section;

(3) require that any prescription drug from Canada imported by a domestic pharmacist or a wholesaler under this section contain a statement describing the end-user of such drug that such drug has been imported from a foreign seller other than a manufacturer;

(4) require that any prescription drugs which have not left the possession of the first Canadian recipient of such prescription drugs after receipt from the manufacturer of such prescription drugs be eligible for importation into the United States under this section;

(5) require, if determined appropriate by the Secretary, that all prescription drugs imported from Canada under this section by domestic pharmacists and wholesalers be eligible for importation into the United States through ports of entry designated by the Secretary for purposes of this section;

(6) require, if determined appropriate by the Secretary, that all prescription drugs imported from Canada under this section by domestic pharmacists and wholesalers be eligible for importation into the United States through ports of entry designated by the Secretary for purposes of this section;

(7) contain any additional provisions determined by the Secretary to be appropriate to the public health; and

(8) contain any additional provisions determined by the Secretary to be appropriate...
to facilitate the importation of prescription drugs that do not jeopardize the public health.

(3) INFORMATION AND RECORDS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The regulations under subsection (b) shall require an importer of a prescription drug under subsection (b) to submit to the Secretary the following information and documentation:

(1) The name and quantity of the active ingredient of the prescription drug;

(2) A description of the dosage form of the prescription drug;

(3) The date on which the prescription drug is shipped;

(4) The point of origin and destination of the prescription drug;

(5) The price paid and the price charged by the importer for the prescription drug;

(6) Documentation from the foreign seller specifying—

(i) the original source of the prescription drug; and

(ii) the quantity of each lot of the prescription drug originally received by the seller from that source;

(7) The lot or control number assigned to the prescription drug by the manufacturer of the prescription drug;

(8) The name, address, telephone number, and professional license number (if any) of the importer;

(9) Documentation demonstrating that the prescription drug was received by the recipient from the manufacturer and subsequently shipped by the first foreign recipient to the importer;

(10) Documentation of the quantity of each lot of the prescription drug received by the first foreign recipient demonstrating that the quantity was received by the first foreign recipient;

(11) Documentation of each lot of the prescription drug in the shipment was statistically sampled and tested for authenticity and degradation;

(K) Certification from the importer or manufacturer of the prescription drug that the prescription drug—

(i) is approved for marketing in the United States and is not adulterated or misbranded;

(ii) meets all labeling requirements under this Act;

(L) Laboratory records, including complete data derived from all tests necessary to ensure that the prescription drug is in compliance with established specifications and standards;

(M) Documentation demonstrating that the testing required by subparagraphs (j) and (l) was conducted at a qualified laboratory.

(N) Any other information that the Secretary determines to be necessary to ensure the protection of the public health.

(2) MAINTENANCE BY THE SECRETARY.—The Secretary shall maintain information and documentation submitted under paragraph (1) for such period of time as the Secretary determines to be necessary.

(e) TESTING.—The regulations under subsection (b) shall require an importer of a prescription drug under subsection (b) to submit to the Secretary the following information and documentation submitted under paragraph (1) for such period of time as the Secretary determines to be necessary:

(1) that testing described in subparagraphs (j) and (l) of subsection (d)(1) be conducted by the importer or by the manufacturer of the prescription drug at a qualified laboratory;

(2) that tests are conducted by the importer;

(i) that information needed to—

(1) authenticate the prescription drug being tested; and

(ii) confirm that the labeling of the prescription drug complies with labeling requirements under this Act;

(III) be in strict confidence and used only for purposes of testing under this section; and

(III) may include such additional provisions as the Secretary determines to be appropriate to provide for the protection of trade secrets and confidentiality information that is privileged or confidential.

(f) REGISTRATION OF FOREIGN SELLERS.—Any establishment in Canada engaged in the distribution of a prescription drug that is imported or offered for importation into the United States shall register with the Secretary the name and place of business of the establishment and the name of the United States agent for the establishment.

(g) SUSPENSION OF IMPORTATION.—The Secretary shall require that importations of a specific prescription drug or importations by a specific importer under subsection (b) be immediately suspended on discovery of a pattern of importation of that specific prescription drug or by that specific importer of drugs that are counterfeit or are violative of any requirement under this Act, until an inspection by the Secretary demonstrates to the Congress that the public is adequately protected from counterfeit and violative prescription drugs being imported under subsection (b).

(h) APPROVED LABELING.—The manufacturer of a prescription drug shall provide an importer written authorization for the importer to use that specific prescription drug or for the drug to a charitable or humanitarian organization (including the United Nations and affiliates) or to a government of a foreign country.

(H) Waiver Authority for Importation by Individuals.—The Secretary may, for drug or devices, under such conditions as the Secretary determines to be appropriate. Such conditions shall include conditions that such drug or device be—

(1) in the possession of an individual when the individual enters the United States;

(2) imported from a licensed Canadian pharmacy, grant to individuals, by regulation or on a case-by-case basis, a waiver permitting the importation of a prescription drug or device or class of prescription drugs or devices, under such conditions as the Secretary determines to be appropriate. Such conditions shall include conditions that such drug or device be—

(i) that testing described in subparagraphs (j) and (l) of subsection (d)(1) was conducted by the importer or by the manufacturer of the prescription drug at a qualified laboratory;

(ii) that tests are conducted by the importer;

(iii) that information needed to—

(1) authenticate the prescription drug being tested; and

(2) confirm that the labeling of the prescription drug complies with labeling requirements under this Act;

(b) by the specific importer of drugs that are counterfeit or are violative of any requirement under this Act, until an inspection by the Secretary demonstrates to the Congress that the public is adequately protected from counterfeit and violative prescription drugs being imported under subsection (b).

(i) STUDY.—The Secretary shall request that the Institute of Medicine of the National Academy of Sciences conduct a study of—

(A) the importation of prescription drugs made under the regulations under subsection (b); and

(B) information and documentation submitted under subsection (b).

(ii) REQUIREMENTS.—In conducting the study, the Institute of Medicine shall—

(1) evaluate the compliance of importers with the regulations under subsection (b);

(2) compare the number of shipments under the regulations under subsection (b) during the study period that are determined to be counterfeit, misbranded, adulterated, and compare that number with the number of shipments made during the study period within the United States that are determined to be counterfeit, misbranded, or adulterated; and

(3) consult with the Secretary to evaluate the effect of importations under the regulations under subsection (b) on trade and patent rights under Federal law.

(B) REPORT.—Not later than 2 years after the effective date of the regulations under subsection (b), the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to Congress a report describing the findings of the study under subparagraph (A).

(i) BY THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL.—

(A) STUDY.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study to determine the effect of this section on the price of prescription drugs sold to consumers at retail.

(B) REPORT.—Not later than 18 months after the effective date of the regulations under subsection (b), the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to Congress a report describing the findings of the study under paragraph (A).

(ii) CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section—

(p) authorize of Appropriations.—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out this section.

(q) CONDITIONS.—This section shall become effective only if the Secretary determines that the implementation of this section will—

(1) pose no additional risk to the public's health and safety; and

(2) result in a significant reduction in the cost of prescription drugs to the American consumer.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—The Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act is amended—

(1) in section 301(aa) (21 U.S.C. 331(aa)), by striking "covered product pursuant to section 804" and inserting "prescription drug in violation of section 804"; and

(2) in section 303(a)(6) (21 U.S.C. 333(a)(6), by striking "covered product pursuant to section 804(a) and inserting "prescription drug under section 804(b)".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. After 3 hours of debate on the bill, it shall be in order to consider the amendment printed in House Report 108–181, if offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. Rangel) or his designee, which shall be deemed read, and shall be debatable for 1 hour, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and the opponent.

The gentleman from California (Mr. Thomas), the gentleman from New York (Mr. Rangel), the gentleman
from Louisiana (Mr. Tauzin), and the
gentleman from Michigan (Mr. Dingell) each will control 45 minutes of
debate on the bill.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman
from California (Mr. Thomas).

Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such
time as I may consume.

As we begin the 3 hours of debate on
the primary bill and an additional
hour on the substitute, I do want to indicate
that this day, in my opinion, has been
too long in coming.

I want to thank President Bush for
his position during the campaign that
Medicare needed to be modernized and
we were overdue for putting prescrip-
tion drugs in Medicare.

Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such
time as I may consume.

I believe he has continued to be firm
in his resolve that both the House, and
the Senate now for the first time, pass
legislation so that we can confer a
common bill and send it to him for his
signature.

I also want to thank the Speaker of
the House. The gentleman from Illinois
(Mr. Hastert) was involved in these
discussions and discussions to our becoming
the majority and, of course, prior to becom-
ing Speaker. If you examine H.R. 1,
you will find that the Speaker has been
willing to be the lead author. I think it
is entirely proper and appropriate that
the Speaker of the House lead the
House in the most fundamental and
important change in Medicare
since its inception.

I especially want to thank my col-
league and friend and chairman of the
Committee on Energy and Commerce,
the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. Tauzin).
In this institution, where jur-
sdictions are guarded with a pretty
vicious willingness to have turf wars
whenever necessary to hang on to your
jurisdiction, the working relationship
with his and my shared jurisdiction of the
Committee on Energy and Commerce and
the Committee on Ways and Means
has been a very pleasant experience,
and the working relationship between
the staff, of which I will have more to
say a little bit later, could not have
been better.

And, frankly, the product we have be-
fore us, although the gentleman from
Louisiana (Mr. Tauzin) joined me in
the initial sponsorship of legislation,
we could not have gotten it through
both Senate and House and such
in the Committee on Rules to
present to you here today as H.R. 1
without complete and open and very
comradely behavior between the chair-
man of the Committee on Energy and
Commerce and the Committee, and I
thank him for that.

I especially thank the gentleman
from Connecticut (Mrs. Johnson), who
is the chairman of the Subcommittee
on Health of the Committee on Ways
and Means. The members of that com-
mittee have been very, very helpful in
holding the hearings and continuing to
shape this legislation. This bill, as it
rightly should be, is the best piece of
legislation that we have offered this
House, notwithstanding the fact that
twice previously we have passed Medi-
care modernization with prescription
drugs.

And let me say that I do want to sin-
gle out two members of the Committee
on Ways and Means, the gentleman
from Iowa (Mr. Nussle), who also hap-
pens to be the chairman of the Com-
mittee on the Budget, and the gen-
tleman from North Dakota (Mr. Pom-
roy), who offered the bipartisan amend-
ment which was very sig-
ificant in helping us redress the fail-
ure to provide those Americans es-
specially in middle America but in prin-
cipally rural areas with a fair and equi-
itable Medicare program.

Mr. Speaker, I do want to thank
myself such time as I may consume.

In my time.

I reserve the balance of
my time.
ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Although it is permissible to refer to a Senator as the sponsor of legislation, other personal references are not permitted.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. KENNEDY).

(Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island) asked and was given permission to re-state and re-phrase his remarks.)

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to state for the record that the Senator from Massachusetts referred to is my father, and I rise in opposition to H.R. 1.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the Republican prescription drug bill.

Our seniors know that Democrats have worked to provide them with universal, affordable, and reliable drug coverage.

And they know that this bill is just another Republican attempt to dismantle Medicare.

This bill won't help seniors . . . in fact, there is no guaranteed backstop to insure that there will be drug coverage in their area. Indeed, seniors may end up without any drug coverage . . . or forced into an HMO that they do not want to be in.

And the problems with the bill today will only increase in 2010, when premium support and competitive bidding kicks in.

Republicans divide this issue between helping our Nation's elderly now or helping our young in the future, but we can help both.

James, a Boy Scout from Lincoln, Rhode Island, wrote to me because he is worried about his two grandmothers who cannot afford their medications.

I hope he doesn't grow up only to realize that we passed a bill in Congress that actually made it worse for his loved ones.

We should not disappoint James, his family, or the forty million Medicare beneficiaries in this Nation.

Vote "no" on H.R. 1.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I think this is one of those days that we will never forget as legislators. This is one of those days that I think as legislators we will never forget. And even though we have some people who have not studied the bill that are so anxious to believe that they are going to get prescription drug relief, I think at the end of the day that they might be able to see that this is the first step that has been specifically designed not to reform the Medicare system as we know it but to dissolve it.

There are some people who are honest enough, at least outside of this hallway, to admit that that is exactly what they would want to do, to dissolve the Medicare. Many of the people on the other side of the aisle, and perhaps a handful on our side, believe that health care should not be an entitlement, Social Security should not be an entitlement; that the free marketplace should be able to work its will; that government should not be involved in providing these type of services.

Ultimately, I do believe that when the bill is studied and they see that the transfer of the ability to determine how much prescription drugs will cost, which prescriptions would be filled, what is the recipient entitled to, when does the bill lock into place, and at the year 2010 what do they do with the vouchers, and they go into Medicare, all of these things, I think, will be answered at some time, but I really hope that they are answered today.

We have many people that have worked hard on this bill; certainly the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. Dingell) blockaded for health care for decades; the gentleman from California (Mr. Stark), who will be handling the remainder of this bill, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. Pallone), the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Brown), and so many others. But as I have said so many times publicly, at some point in time people will be asking, when they were moving to dissolve Medicare, where were you and what were you doing?

I think, as we vote in the past, that people will remember this vote. And those of us who oppose this piece of legislation will be giving our colleagues an opportunity on voting for legislation that provides all of the coverage that has been requested from AARP, and while parts of the letter was read, I think it is safe to say that the objections that were raised to the bill or the questions that they had hoped that would be changed, that that is handled in.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to allocate the remainder of my time to the gentleman from California (Mr. Stark), with the understanding that he be permitted to allocate the rest of the remaining time.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. Foley), a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding me this time, and to both chairmen who have brought this bill to the floor, I congratulate them for this landmark legislation.

During the rule debate, it was a little depressing to me to hear so many people refer to the fact that our seniors would not not be able to figure these programs out. These people we are talking about survived the Depression, they fought in World War II and Korea, they taught us how to read and write, they taught us how to ride our bikes and drive our cars. They are our parents. They are smart enough to figure this out.

I come from a district in Florida, the fifth largest population of Medicare recipients in the Nation, the fifth largest Medicare recipieent champion in the Nation. When I go to town hall meetings, they do not ask for anything free. They want a break. They want a discount. They want an opportunity to shop. They want freedom in the marketplace. But they want security to know they will not go broke. This bill provides that.

The bill provides for a discount card that I helped author, along with Senator Breaux and many others, and it will give Medicare recipients in the Nation, the fifth largest group of recipients in the Nation, the right to buy prescription drugs at lower prices. Real reforms in Medicare allowing generics, something I have heard about on this floor repeatedly from the other side of the aisle. We have to get generics to the market place sooner, faster, quicker, cheaper. That is in this bill.

This bill provides for increased rural funding for hospitals, which is an incredibly important thing for people in my community and rural communities like Glades, Okeechobee, Hendry, and Highlands County. These are Medicare reforms that will save billions of dollars.
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Yes, this is an historic night, not one to be celebrating fear and animosity or negative pessimism about our seniors, but rejoicing in the fact that we are helping them provide for themselves and their families.

Yes, there is a phenomenal opportunity tonight to pass a bill that will help seniors in my community. And the instructions they gave me when I first ran for office and have continued to give me is do not make it so we do not make it cheap, do not make it for political purposes, make it so it works. This bill works, and I applaud the leadership for giving us a chance to make history tonight on the floor of the House.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to know where to begin to warn the seniors in this country about this sham of a bill as the beginning of the destruction of Medicare, as the Republicans have wanted to do for a number of years. There is no question that this is a major move toward privatizing Medicare. By the calculations that we have from the last feeble attempt to do this, of course Health and Human Services refuses to give us the most recent actuarial computations, but using the last ones, the Medicare premium for B in this drug benefit would rise to $342 a month if the premium could hold at $32.
The Akron Beacon Journal says that while the Medicare reform bills would address the lack of drug coverage in Medicare, beneficiaries might be “no better off with the benefit than they are at present because “on the key issues of affordability, the structure of premiums, and copayments, both versions follow an elaborate path to disappointment.” The list goes on.

In North Carolina, the Raleigh News Observer says the bill’s actual benefit does not outweigh the drawbacks of its so-called reforms. The Roanoke Times and World News says even if the drug bill passes, seniors still will have to fear the possibility they will face crushing drug bills.

In Kansas, the Windfield Courier says the doughnut hole “hurts many seniors when they need the help the most.” “The majority of Republicans are at risk of passing a Medicare bill that looks, walks and talks like a political campaign creature.”

Washington State, the Seattle Post-Intelligencer says what Congress finally sends to the White House will surely be a disappointment. The Oregonian says it is difficult to see the congressional proposals for Medicare drug coverage as much more than a big letdown. They are thin in coverage and convoluted in delivery.

Mr. Speaker, I think we can sum this all up, people will say this is drug coverage for old folks. The truth is this bill is nothing but political coverage for the Republicans.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, Members will find periodically during this 3-hour debate that we will take a very short segment of time to make sure that when an outlandish, outrageous, untrue statement has been made, we will correct the record immediately.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. Johnson), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Health for the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mrs. J. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, this bill does not allow the IRS to share your income information with insurance companies. The bill very clearly states that the privacy of your information, and there are criminal and civil penalties for violating those provisions. Violators can go to jail.

It is true that for 5 percent of the seniors, they will have a higher threshold for catastrophic coverage. I personally do not believe that someone with a $200,000 income living in a gated community should have exactly the same subsidy as someone struggling along on $25,000 or $30,000 of income. I think that is a strength of this bill. But if someone does not want the government to tell you what your catastrophic threshold is, you can opt out and just take the highest threshold. That is your right. But only 5 percent will fall above the threshold, and we think that is progressive. We think we need to target this benefit at those who need it the most, and that is what we do.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CRANE), chairman of the Subcommittee on Health, a long time member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

 Monsieur CRANE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1, the Medicare Prescription Drug and Modernization Act of 2003. As a member of the Committee on Ways and Means’ Subcommittee on Health, I can say with confidence that this bill is a fair and balanced approach towards providing millions of America’s seniors with prescription drug coverage.

Congress is long overdue in helping our seniors with the skyrocketing costs of their prescription medication. Seniors are struggling and we need to help them. But we cannot ignore that the current program without an expensive drug benefit was financially unstable. The Medicare program is already struggling to provide a finite number of health services to nearly 41 million elderly and disabled. It is imperative that this House takes action before the retirement of the baby boom generation, which will add another 36 million beneficiaries to the Medicare roll. Simply adding a new drug benefit is not the answer.

I support H.R. 1 because it includes a number of reforms that will ensure the long-term fiscal integrity of Medicare through modernization. This legislation gives seniors the same range of private health insurance plans available to Members of Congress and other Federal employees. If seniors do not want to enroll in a private plan, they have the option of staying in traditional fee-for-service.

The time has come for Congress to work together to move past political rhetoric and provide prescription drug coverage for seniors. More importantly, it is time for institute reforms to ensure that future generations will have the security of knowing that Medicare will be there when they need it. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support H.R. 1.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MATSUI), a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I have to first of all say that I am extremely disappointed that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have given this bill before us. It is a shame because if they would have thought through the matter better and instead of bringing up those tax cuts, particularly the dividend tax cut and
the capital gains tax cut, we could have gotten a bill on the floor that all Americans could be proud of, and every senior citizen in this country would not only be proud of, but would have an adequate benefit.

I think this bill is a sham and I think instead of covering senior citizens, what we are doing is giving my Republican colleagues cover, political cover that eventually the senior citizens will lift and begin to understand what this bill is really all about. I guarantee Members of this Body, if they would like to see Medicare, this bill will lift the Medicare premiums, in the form of copayments. They have to have $670 that they have to pay out in the form of monthly premiums, in the form of copayments.

When we think about it for a minute, this bill does not do much at all. If a senior citizen has $5,000 worth of prescription drug coverage in any given year, the senior citizen will have to pay $4,000 immediately, $4,000 of the first $5,000 of coverage before they can even get the federal government benefit. They have to have $670 that they have to pay out in the form of monthly premiums, in the form of copayments.

And so this bill is not a good bill for senior citizens.

In addition to that, this bill will ultimately in the next 5 years begin the erosion of Medicare as we know it. Newt Gingrich had said when he became Speaker of the House a few years ago that he wanted to see Medicare wither on the vine. We had the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) just the other day say on national television, "Those who say that the bill would end Medicare as we know it, our answer is, 'We certainly hope so.'" Because what they really want to do is privatize Medicare, make it so that insurance companies could increase premiums to whatever they want to do and ensure the healthy seniors benefit, so that the chronically ill will ultimately wither on the vine.

This system that is being put forward today is one that will in fact do major damage to the Medicare system in America. Why did we have Medicare in 1964? To provide a seamless transition for beneficiaries and States and that is exactly what we are going to have is going back to 1964 with this legislation. That is their intent, because they want to see Medicare wither on the vine.

This bill is a bad bill and we need to vote, therefore it had the American he understands exactly what my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are attempting to do.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This is the fruit of the American he understands exactly what my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are attempting to do.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This is the fruit of the American he understands exactly what my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are attempting to do.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This is the fruit of the American he understands exactly what my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are attempting to do.
next. It could change from year to year.

From the very beginning, Republicans have wanted to use prescription drugs as leverage to end Medicare. The President said earlier to seniors, we will be asking for Medicare prescription drug help depending on whether you leave Medicare and join an HMO. And now what this Republican bill is doing is using a very inferior drug insurance plan in 2006, not until then, to make everything except HMOs unaffordable for seniors. The chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, Mr. Thomas, says just a few days ago, "Old-fashioned Medicare isn't very good," and I quote his words. What Republicans call old-fashioned Medicare is the system of guaranteed benefits, set premiums and deductibles and access to doctors and hospitals that have served seniors so well since 1965. Republicans want to end all that, but current and future Medicare beneficiaries do not. And we Democrats intend to keep fighting for them. In 2010, a senior that wants to be in the Medicare program will be in the Medicare program exactly as they are now. They will be in that Medicare program and have that choice of the Medicare program in 2010, in 2011, in 2012, in 2013. They will never receive a voucher. That is not in this legislation. It is used rhetorically to scare seniors. I want to assure the seniors that this bill represents the most dramatic expansion of benefits under Medicare since the program was founded, not only prescription drugs but additional preventive benefits and a whole system to support seniors with chronic illness.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN). The gentleman from Maryland understands that with proponents like Thomas and Johnson, the seniors do not need any scare from us.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, I oppose the passage of this bill. The passage of this bill will make it much more difficult for Congress to enact a meaningful prescription drug benefit for our Nation's seniors. Let me give you five reasons why.

Reason number one. There is no guaranteed benefit in this bill. Unlike seeing a doctor or going to a hospital, we cannot tell our seniors that their prescription drugs will be covered. It will be different in different parts of the country. Mr. Speaker, I tried to correct that by offering an amendment in the Committee on Ways and Means, and it was rejected by the Republicans. I tried to give this body an opportunity to vote on it, but the Committee on Rules would not make that amendment in order.

Reason number two. We are set on a course to privatize Medicare. Only private insurance can participate in the prescription drug coverage. Private insurance only has to offer a 1-year commitment. Mr. Speaker, my citizens of Maryland remember when we had Medicare+Choice; 100,000 Marylanders lost their coverage when all eight HMOs left Maryland. It is irresponsible to claim that private insurance companies are eager to return to a market that they have abandoned in the past.

Reason number three. This bill will jeopardize coverage for seniors who have good private retiree prescription drug coverage. The Congressional Budget Office estimated that 30 percent of our seniors who currently have their own private coverage for prescription drugs through their prior employment will lose those benefits as a result of the enactment of this legislation.

Reason number four. We are missing an opportunity to bring down drug prices. The legislation specifically prohibits our government from using the purchasing power of 40 million beneficiaries to negotiate drug prices just like the Canadians do.

Reason number five. The benefits are inadequate. The Republicans project that this bill will provide for a $35 a month premium, $250 deductible, then some help up to $2,000, but then our seniors are on their own for the next $2,900. Our seniors are expected to pay a $35-a-month premium when they are not entitled to any benefit for a good part of the year. I think that is unrealistic.

My Republican friends say, well, you only have $400 billion. We offered alternatives within $400 billion that would provide real benefits. I offered a substitute that said, look, if you cannot afford all drugs, let us at least cover drugs for those illnesses such as high blood pressure and coronary artery disease and diabetes and severe depression. But, no, the Committee on Rules would not allow this body to decide whether that would be a better package to the seniors.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot support a bill that provides no guaranteed benefit, relies solely on the whim of private insurance companies, causes harm to seniors who currently have adequate prescription drug coverage, will not do enough to bring down the cost of prescription drugs, and provides inadequate benefits. Therefore, I will vote "no" on the Republican bill.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

You know, it just kind of makes you wonder what the Democrats did for 30 years when they were the majority, because, you know, when Republicans became the majority in 1995, there was literally no prevention and wellness in Medicare. We are the ones that are supposed to be destroying Medicare? We are the ones that added diabetes. We are the ones that added prostate and colorectal screening. We are the ones that added the mammography. In fact, in this bill that they continue to speak against, we provide for the first time every new beneficiary should have a physical.

I want to underscore that. Every new beneficiary should have a physical. In addition to that, we believe that cholesterol screening has now been advanced, and it should be provided as well.

I find it amazing that they go back to the same old scare statements.

Read the bill. It is an enhanced and an improved Medicare. What in the world were you doing for 30 years? The fact of the matter is you did not have a competent challenger.

What we have done is provide real change, and they are afraid those old frayed bumper stickers will not work anymore.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Ms. DUNN), a very valued member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Ms. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, for one am very proud that in his State of the Union address directed the Congress to put together a program that will cost about $400 billion to provide prescription drugs for seniors because I think it is time to keep our promise to the people we represent and provide a comprehensive and voluntary prescription drug benefit for all seniors.

We have all heard stories of seniors paying too much for prescription drugs. When this problem is acute among low-income seniors, especially for women who comprise half of Medicare beneficiaries with annual incomes below 150 percent of the poverty level. In this bill we help seniors on fixed incomes and those with high drug costs. A woman, for example, with an income of less than $14,400 today, which is 150 percent of poverty, will receive assistance from the Federal Government for prescription drugs. While all seniors will benefit, nearly 11 million or 34 percent of Medicare beneficiaries will qualify for additional assistance when this bill is fully implemented.

Improving Medicare is not only about providing a drug benefit, but it is also about giving seniors access to doctors, hospitals, Medicare HMOs, and other services they need. To ensure access to doctors, we address the low reimbursements that they are receiving. We also increase funding for rural hospitals so that seniors can get the health care they need right in their community.

For Medicare HMOs, this bill requires Medicare to accurately account for...
military retirees in the formula and that means higher Medicare-Choice reimbursements in areas with military facilities. Strengthening Medicare also means improving the quality of life for every senior. For this reason I am very happy that we were able to deal with rheumatoid arthritis and other chronic diseases. This bill provides seniors immediate access to self-injectable biologics. Besides providing the choice of which drug works best for rheumatoid arthritis, these self-injectable treatments will allow seniors to receive treatments right in their homes instead of going to the hospital or to a physician's office and will take the burden off those hospitals, clinics and doctors. This is a real prescription drug plan, Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that providing to 25 percent in drug discounts for manufacturers. It covers seniors to participate in the drug program, and it protects those with very high drug costs. It strengthens Medicare's future without raising the benefit that seniors enjoy today. I ask my colleagues to support a real prescription drug by passing this legislation.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. McDermott), a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, who understands that seniors are going to have to pay 4,000 bucks for the first $5,000 of drugs regardless.

Mr. McDermott. Mr. Speaker, well the rubber stamp Congress is ready tonight. The drug companies, after they contributed and got the President elected, gave him this bill, and they said this is what we want. The President brought it up here. We are rubber stamping this here. Can we believe that the Senate, excuse me, in another part of this building they are considering something like 400 amendments, but we cannot have one because when you are using a rubber stamp, you cannot have one single amendment in here. Nothing can be improved in this bill. Can you believe it? It is like the Ten Commandments. It is perfect. It came down from God or somewhere, or the White House.

This bill was put together by drug companies, 10 of them. They had $38 billion in profit last year. That is 50 percent of the profit of the Fortune 500. If the Members think they did not have an impact on this bill, why do they want to privatize? Why do they want to give no guaranteed benefit? Why do they want to have all openness in the world? And why do they put the one line in there that says that the Secretary cannot negotiate on behalf of 40 million people, some of them very poor people, and pick them all up broken into little different pieces so they can divide and conquer. This little agency will get so much. But a little bit bigger one, we will give them a little bit higher benefit. They are going to divide and conquer the American people. This is a sham.

In Canada they get their price reduced very simply by saying let us take the average of the G-7. The United States is way up here and Canada is way down there. Why could we not pass a little amendment in here that said let us give the average of the G-7? I do not know. In every State everybody goes across the border to buy stuff across the border. They do it in Vermont. They do it in New Hampshire. They do it in New York State. Why? Because everybody knows the Canadians have got a better deal than we, and he is going to give the tax cuts and the child never left behind, and he is going to give this stuff, and every one of those is phony. The child never left behind? He puts a budget out here $17 billion short to fund it, and the people are going to figure it out.

Counting on believing that the American people are stupid is not a good political way to go. Vote against this bill because the rubber stamp is wrong.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. Shaw), a valued member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. Shaw. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding me this time.

This is probably, I think without question, one of the most important sessions that this Congress has had regarding Medicare since its inception. We have heard a lot of argument about old fashioned Medicare and new Medicare-Choice, but it is good to know, both political parties understand that medical treatment has changed in the last 40 years since Medicare first came on line. We know that. Drugs are more important to keep the seniors out of hospitals, to keep them mobile, to keep their quality of life moving. So this is a very important thing, and it is important that we put this in the Medicare law. And it is very important that we make it where the seniors can afford it.

Florida is one of the most heavily used Medicare congressional districts in the country. I have seen on more than one occasion, while standing in line waiting for a prescription to be filled, somebody going up. I have a very vivid memory of the last one I saw, this elderly lady coming up and finding out what her prescription drugs was going to cost and looking at this bottle and saying, God, why am I paying that bottle back. She was low income. This bill will take care of her. She will be taken care of under this bill, and she will not have to give that bottle back because she needs it. These are prescription medicines, these are what they are suffering from. Obviously we can wean sweeten the pie by increasing the expenditures, but we heard tonight one of the Members from the other side was saying that we are letting it wither on the vine. We are putting $400 billion in Medicare. We are putting some cost containments in there that is going to make it a better deal. The price of drugs because of the Republican bill will come down, and the people that need it most, the heavy users and the low income, will be taken care of.

This is a very good bill. It is one that the Congress should definitely, definitely pass. H.R. 1, its time has come and gone. This bill move forward. I compliment the chairman and all of those who did this very complex bill and put it together. It is a good bill and it is one this Congress should pass.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. Kleczka), a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, who, unlike the authors of this bill, did not spend his entire life in the public trough but actually worked in private enterprise, so he understands what privatization is.

Mr. Kleczka. Mr. Speaker, I worked for an insurance company before I was elected to the legislature.

So with that as an opening, Mr. Speaker, let me say to the body that in my view this is the beginning of the end of the Medicare program. For 38 years Medicare has provided seniors with quality health care, a defined benefit, and whether one lived in California, Alaska, Florida, or Wisconsin, the premium was the same, they knew what the benefit was, and they knew what the services were, and it has worked.

So there are those in this House who say there has been a change in the way we deliver medicine today, and that is called drug therapy. Let us add that coverage to the Medicare program and we can use the purchasing power of the Federal Government to get the best deal on drugs for everyone. It is important that
drug profits of their friends, the drug companies. But know full well, Mr. Speaker, we do it for the VA and it works and it works well.

So instead of doing a benefit connected to the Medicare program, what we are doing is going to send our seniors out to the private insurance market, we are going to tell them go shop for a drug-only policy. The policy that is being offered in this bill has one big problem, and that is once one spends $2,000 on drugs in any one year coverage lapses until their expenditures total $4,900. Know full well during that period they are paying 100 percent of their drug cost. Their premiums go on. They are paying premiums and getting no benefit. There is something wrong with that system, and that is why this bill is very bad in that respect.

The other problem with the bill is that we had this program for a couple years now called Medicare+Choice, and we are going to show those seniors that the plan that they did not want them 35 years ago wants them now. They are holding their arms open. We want the seniors because we know they have a lot of drug costs and a lot of health care costs. So the Committee on Ways and Means and this Congress go along with this Medicare+Choice. What is it, is a private insurance company selling policies to seniors. Milwaukee, where I come from, has four of these companies and they were peddling these policies and offering the sun and the moon and all of a sudden bingo, three of them go belly up, the seniors have to scurry to get back into some type of Medicare program, and today we have one left. One left.

And the reimbursement for that one Medicare+Choice program is 110 percent of the Medicare rate. So clearly, we are not saving a heck of a lot of money with that system, and that is why this Medicare+Choice program is 110 percent of the Medicare rate. So clearly, when we are not saving a heck of a lot of money with that system, and that is why this Medicare+Choice program is 110 percent of the Medicare rate. So clearly, it is supposed to look and smell better; but, my friends, it is the same type of Medicare program, and today we have one left. One left.

Let me tell my colleagues a story, and I believe before I give my colleagues the punch line, they will know the story. We had no government negotiating of the price. And as is typically the case, currently, in law, in the Medicare program, it is called “best price.” That is where government determines how much the drug is going to cost. It is going to be the best price.

When we looked at ways to change Medicare, we looked at the “best price” concept. Guess what? We sat down with the Health Care Policy Office and we said, what would happen if we did not use best price? They sat down and calculated and they said, you know, if you actually had competition for the drugs, instead of putting in the government phony floor of “best price” they are paying $13 billion. Do you see how absurd it is when my colleagues know why do we not have government negotiating the price? It would cost us tens of billions of dollars over a real negotiation on drugs. Yet, here we are, hearing the same old same old: I am going to vote “no” because we do not have government dictating the price. That is what has gotten us into the problem in the first place.

Mr. Speaker, it is my real pleasure to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER), a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. WELLER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, tonight we hear some partisan political rhetoric, particularly from the other side of the aisle, who began this process by announcing they were going to oppose the bill. It does not matter what is in it; they are going to oppose it.

So I think the important question that we really should ask is: What does this mean, this modernization of Medicare? What does it mean that we are modernizing Medicare for the 21st century? What does it mean that we are investing $400 billion in modernizing Medicare with prescription drugs?

When I think of prescription drug coverage, I think of the seniors who I have met over the 9 years I have had the privilege of serving in this body. They are men and women who I have talked with in their homes who sit there and they sit in that easy chair and right next to their chair, they have that tray, a tray full of pill bottles, and they talked and shared with me the choices they have had to make, whether or not they go to the drugstore, the grocery store that particular week because of the expenses they are facing because of rising prescription drug costs.

Well, those are the people that are the primary beneficiaries of this legislation. Because we have a plan before us that helps those who are truly needy, low-income, by ensuring they pay no premiums; and for others, they pay a pretty affordable premium. This plan would cost a senior about $35 a month, $1 a day. Think about that. A dollar a day for a senior participating in this plan. And if you qualify for Medicare today and you are going to be eligible tomorrow, you qualify and are able to take advantage of this new prescription drug plan. But for a dollar a day, it is projected you could save anywhere from 30 to 70 percent of your prescription drug costs.

Think about that. When you think of that elderly man or woman who you have had the opportunity to talk with in their home and sit there while they are holding the pill bottles, and they are home-bound, they have that tray of pill bottles, and they are, frankly, very concerned because they cannot do much else, other than buy their drugs and hopefully get to the grocery store, they are going to really benefit from the plan. It is affordable. It is available for all seniors.

We also give seniors choices. It is affordable, a dollar a day, $35 a month; it provides real savings, 30 to 70 percent that is projected by nonpartisan analysts who look at this and say, what does it really mean, is the question they ask. To qualify for Medicare, you qualify for this program, and you are going to have choice. You do not have to pick the one-size-fits-all that some members on the other side of the aisle want to have and say, seniors, you only get one choice, and we are going to tell you what it is.

Mr. Speaker, we are going to give seniors more than one choice so they can find a plan that best fits them. Think about that. That is what this really means. We are helping seniors who need help with their prescription drug costs. We are modernizing Medicare for the 21st century. We have a plan that is almost 50 years old that has not changed. We are going to modernize it. The most important choice that seniors face today is, of course, the availability and affordability of prescription drug costs.

Mr. Speaker, this is a commonsense plan. It deserves bipartisan support. I hope my friends on the other side of the aisle will do the right thing. I recognize that they set out today with a decision to oppose the bill, regardless of what is in it. We are going to work together. Let us provide a bipartisan vote to provide prescription drug coverage that will help every senior in America.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, because I do not intend to let unsubstantiated remarks go unchallenged either. We do not oppose this bill because of what is in it, because there is nothing in it. There are no benefits in it. There is nothing in the bill except to spend money to get private insurance companies, if they decide to offer it, to provide coverage. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS), who recognizes that.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, here we are once again debating Medicare. Thirty-eight years ago, the Republicans did not like Medicare, and they do not like it now. In 1965, 88 percent of Republicans voted against Medicare. And here they are, once again, trying to privatize prescription drug coverage for seniors, just like they tried to privatize Medicare.

This is just another scheme by the Republicans to entice older voters. Not
last week, not last year, but just yes-
terday, the gentleman from California
(Mr. THOMAS), the Republican chair-
man of the Committee on Ways and
Means, made it crystal clear when he
said, "To those who say that the bill
would end Medicare, we know the an-
swer is: We hope so." He went on to
say, "Old-fashioned Medicare is not
very good." Tell my mother. Tell your
mother that old-fashioned Medicare is
not good. Tell your grandmother, tell
your mother, tell your parents that old-fashioned
Medicare was not good. It was good in
1965. It was good yesterday. It was good
then, and it is still good right now. We
do not need to destroy Medicare. We
need to save and strengthen Medicare.
Mr. Speaker, this bill is just another
Republican scheme to deceive our sen-
iors, to deceive our elderly. That is not
right. That is not fair. I want my Re-
publican colleagues to tell the Amer-
ican people the truth. We must tell our
seniors that the Republican bill does
not offer our seniors the basic right to
affordable prescription drugs. We must
and we will tell the American people
that the Republicans want to privatize
Medicare.
We must tell the American people
the truth. This is no time to play par-
tisan politics with the lives of our sen-
iors.
The clock is running. Time is run-
ing out. My Republican colleagues,
you still have time to do the right
thing. Do not turn your back on our
seniors, on the elderly. This is a matter
of life and death.
I beg, I plead with my colleagues to
vote against the Republican bill, not
just for our parents, our grandparents,
our children, but also for generations
yet unborn. Old-fashioned Medicare
was like a bridge over troubled waters.
It was reliable. It was dependable then,
and it is still dependable.
Ask the seniors, ask the old people
who live on fixed incomes in our cities
and rural areas. I say to my Republican
colleagues, follow the dictates of your
conscience, not a moral obloquy, a mis-
taken policy, a mission, and a mandate to up-
hold the legislation of 1965 when Ly-
don J. Johnson signed the Medicare bill.
I urge my colleagues to vote against
this unreliable bill.
Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield
myself such time as I may consume.
Mr. Speaker, I will tell my friend
from Georgia, we do not intend to turn
our backs on seniors. Indeed, we intend
to reach out our hand. If someone
wants us to turn our back on seniors.
Indeed, we intend to reach out our
hand. If someone wants to stay in yester-
day’s Medicare, they can tomorrow. We
want to make sure of that, because in 1965 and yester-
day, there were no drugs, there was no
disease, there was no preventive care, there was no
drug. I say to my Republican colleagues,
the gentleman from California (Mr. STARK) for yield-
ing me time.
Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Mr.
Speaker, let me thank the gentleman
from California (Mr. STARK) for yield-
ing me time.
Only in this Chamber over the last
few months could we have written $2
trillion out of our tax system irrespon-
sibly over the next decade and then say
that the cost of Medicare is
unsustainable. Only in this Chamber
could we have this debate from a polit-
ical party who says, let us not take a
truncated quotation. Let us not take a
truncated quotation. Let us not take a
tactic. But you know what? You
cannot truncate history.
When I came to this House 15 years
ago, the Republican leader in the Sen-
ate, Bob Dole, had voted against the es-

tablishment of Medicare. The Repub-
lican leader in this House, Bob Michel,
incredible human being, had voted
against the establishment of Medicare.
And they say, do not use these quotes
because they are not true. They are not
for real.
Speaker Gingrich said, in time we
would let Medicare wither on the vine.
The third-ranking Republican in the
United States in the other body down
the hallway, said recently, I believe the
standard benefit, the traditional Medicare program, has to be phased out. And they say, but trust us on Medicare. Do not be skeptical of our intentions. We have come to love Medicare.

There is not anybody on that side of the aisle that thinks that, and there certainly is not anybody on this side of the aisle that believes that tonight as well. And then they argue, well, we have improved Medicare. Think of what we might have done without those tax cuts over the last 2 years.

A predictable, carefully defined benefit would have been in place for Medicare recipients. It is the closest thing, Medicare, that this Nation has ever had to universal health care. It is an extraordinary achievement for those who turn 65 years old, and they refer to it as old-fashioned Medicare and we are to trust them. But let us talk about Medicare+Choice where I live in Massachusetts, the private sector's answer to the public sector.

Well, they are all gone and the ones that are not gone have jacked premiums through the roof. They do not want to take care of the most vulnerable and whether we have a debate about government tonight and its role or not, that in the end is what government does. It takes care of those who are outside the mainstream of this economic life. Not the top 1 percent of the wage earners in this country, not those who benefit from the raw deal on an estate tax. It is government that does that.

Medicare is a legacy and an amendment to the Social Security program, the greatest achievement domestically in this Nation's history. And that amendment in Medicare is a greatchild and a success of a determined Congress and an enlightened President, Lyndon B. Johnson. Tonight let us stand with history, stand with Roosevelt and stand with Lyndon B. Johnson on what Medicare has done and is doing for the achievement that that does that.
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prejudice the Committee on Government Re-
form's jurisdictional interest and preroga-
tives on these provisions or any other simi-
lar legislation and will not be considered as
preceeding for consideration of matters of ju-
risdictional interest to my Committee in the
future. Furthermore, should these provisions
or similar provisions be considered in a con-
ference with the Senate, I would expect Mem-
ers of the Committee on Government Re-
form be appointed as outside conferees on
these provisions.

I find it appropriate to ask that you include a
copy of our exchange of letters on this mat-
ter in the Congressional Record during House
debate of the bill. If you have ques-
tions with the Senate, I would be pleased to
discuss them with you. I thank you for your
consideration.

Sincerely,

TOM DAVIS,
Chairman.

I also include for the RECORD a quote:

Some of our friends on the other side of the
aisle are saying that if this bill becomes law,
it will be the end of Medicare as we know it.
Our answer to that is, we certainly hope so.
Why should seniors be the last group that
cares retail prices for drugs? Old-fashioned
Medicare is broken. Our answer to that is:
You're going to hear scare tactics . . . but seniors
with extremely high drug costs, when this be-
comes law, will save more than 60 percent of
current drug change, real savings, making Medicare a real day-to-day benefit.

Bill Thomas, Chairman, Committee on Ways
and Means.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask
unanimous consent to place in the RECOR
d the report from NBC news corres-
pondent Norah O'Donnell entitled
"Prescription Drug Benefit Imminent"
from yesterday's MSNBC.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there
objection to the request of the gen-
tleman from California?

There was no objection.

PRESCRIPTION DRUG BENEFIT IMMINENT
(By Norah O'Donnell)

After years of promising a prescription
drug benefit for seniors, Congress is on the
verge of a breakthrough.
This week, the House and Senate are ex-
pected to pass bills that for the first time will allow seniors to sign up for a prescription
drug plan in which the government will pay their drug costs.

Policy and political consequences are
enormous.
Congress had agreed to spend $400 billion,
which in effect means the biggest expansion of Medicare since its creation nearly four
decades ago. Critics charge that the bill's passage is the largest expansion of a federal
entitlement since Lyndon Johnson's Great
Society, with huge costs to American tax-
payers when the Baby Boomers enter the
Medicare system.

Passions surrounding the Medicare reform
bill are reaching a crescendo heading into
votes in both the House and the Senate by
the end of this week, perhaps as early as
Thursday.

'To those who say that (the bill) would end
Medicare as we know it, our answer is: We
certainly do not mean to end Medicare. We just mean to expand it,' said Rep.
Bill Thomas (R-Calif.), chairman of the
House Ways and Means Committee.

'The bill is about to become law, and even
those who worry about its political cost will
cannot stop it,' he said.

Health and Human Services Secretary
Tommy Thompson appeared with Thomas
and other GOP leaders Wednesday morning
to release figures that purport to show what
seniors would save on some popular drugs.

For example, Thompson said that seniors
now paying $806 a year for Zovirax, a drug
of Lipitor, would save $343 a year.

Under the system, he projects that the cost
would come down to $96.92. Seniors would
have to pay only 20% as co-pay ($17.38).

But House Minority Leader Nancy Pelosi
and other House Democrats fought back.

"This is a plan that has been hiding behind
the Health and Human Services act," she
told reporters. "The estate plan would have only a
dollar a year. 'It's only a start. And I'm not convinced it's going to go very far,' " she said.

Roussous is one of an estimated 10 million
seniors who will fall into a benefit gap, be-
cause, under the Senate plan, the govern-
ment will pay for half of drug costs up to
$4,500. But, there's a huge gap for the next
$1,300 where the beneficiary must pay for all
of their drug costs.

Catastrophic coverage does not kick in
until one's drug costs exceed $5,800. Then the
government will pay 90 percent of drug cost
over that amount.

"I think, the gap—are people are re-
taining to pay for the drug themselves—I
can't imagine that working," said Roussous.
"Because those are the people who actually
need to have the help."

Still, the AARP will not use its political
might to block the plan. "This year, something
in prescription drugs is better than
nothing," said Roussous.

The bulk of the proposed assistance in the
prescription drug plan would not be enacted
until 2006. Until then, seniors will receive a
discount card that will provide them with 10
to 15 percent off their drug costs. Low-in-
come seniors will get an additional 5 percent.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield
to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE),
the chair of the Committee on Budget.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank
the gentleman for yielding me time and for
his partnership and hard work on this
bill.

The Democrats are living in 1965.
Boy, we have heard a lot about that
year. We have heard about Bob Dole
and Lyndon Baines Johnson. Well, that
year, 1965, is great but it is not 1965. Medicare is
going bankrupt. Tax cuts did not cause
that. Health care costs are out of con-
trol. The reimbursement system under
Medicare is broken and it is not paying
the bills. Hospitals are closing. Doctors
are leaving rural areas or not taking
Medicare patients at all. Cost shifting
is running rampant onto the private
pay side, and as a result, problems are
running rampant within our health care
system.

Benefits have not improved. We do not
have drugs. We do not have preven-
tion. We do not have disease manage-
ment. We have a sick care system, and
the Democrats have done nothing about
it for the past 30 years since they
did pass Medicare in 1965.

Doing nothing tonight is not an op-
tion, and that is why in the budget we
put $400 billion to improve Medicare,
increasing Medicare by $400 billion, hardly withering on anybody's vine, because doing nothing is not an option. Tonight, H.R. 1 is the choice. It modernizes Medicare, saves it from bankruptcy, controls costs, modernizes benefits, fixes the Medicaid and other rural reimbursement problems, keeps these hospitals open and viable so that they can pay the bills as a result of amendments that have been passed in both the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

Quality health care will be available in rural areas on into the future as a result of what we have done tonight. Inaction is not an option.

But there is one other choice. The Democrats will offer a $1 trillion Medicare drug benefit tonight; one that CBO says costs $1 trillion. Guess what? That not only busts the Republican budget, but it busts the Democratic budget and it busts both of our budgets combined. Do not bankrupt Medicare. Save it by passing H.R. 1.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES), a member of the Committee on Ways and Means who understands that the Republican bill does not extend the life of the Medicare Trust Fund at all. In fact, it probably reduces it some.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I will begin with a quote. "Seniors face a confusing hodgepodge of co-payments and deductibles in Medicare. The system is irrational and difficult to navigate. Simplifying and modernizing cost sharing will make coverage easier to understand and will strengthen the Medicare program over the long term. I believe we can better design both Medicare and Medicaid so that seniors and people with disabilities get the most of the health care dollars they spend."

That is a quote from a Republican colleague. But let me report from Howard Brown, 77 years old, from Cleveland, Ohio. He complained about the complexity of the program that will involve choosing a plan, tracking out-of-pocket expenses, and knowing when the coverage kicks in, lapses and then resumes in severe cases, all according to a sliding scale of benefit.

Mr. Brown said, "I am too old to try to figure all this out. Make it simple. Make it plain so I can understand it." The people in the United States, the seniors who are on Medicare, want a defined benefit giving them an entitlement and a guarantee. They want it to be affordable with reasonable premiums and deductibles. They want it to be designed to significantly reduce the price of their prescriptions, and they demand a meaningful Medicare prescription drug bill that provides absolutely no gaps and no separate privatized ambulance.

But we have not heard any Republican get up tonight and define what the gap is. They have not explained to seniors across this country that there will be a gap in coverage, and it will not be Medicare improved for prescription drugs. Truly, 35 years ago we did not think about prescriptions as being part of Medicare. It was not a part of Medicare today, and our seniors do not want to wait till 2006 and then find out that after paying premiums all year that they do not get any coverage in this gap of coverage. Explain the gap.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds. If the gentlewoman would go to page 260, line 19, from the legislation before us now, I quote, "Nothing in this part or the amendments made by this part shall be construed as changing the entitlement to the benefits, fixes the Iowa and other rural care experiment on our Nation's seniors across this country that there will be a gap in coverage, and it will not be Medicare improved for prescription drugs. Truly, 35 years ago we did not think about prescriptions as being part of Medicare. It was not a part of Medicare today, and our seniors do not want to wait till 2006 and then find out that after paying premiums all year that they do not get any coverage in this gap of coverage. Explain the gap.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, if the Chairman could explain the gap, but obviously he cannot. So I am happy to extend my remarks, and include extra.

Mr. Speaker, let me just say this. That is what we are faced with today, and that is what the American people need to understand, and that is what the Democratic Party is doing in here today, to pull these covers off. We are talking about people who cannot afford it. Medicare was designed to help people, to help the least of us, to help those senior citizens who cannot afford the medicine. Government is there for something. They do not want it privatized.

Mr. Speaker, let me just say this from one of my constituents, and I would read this note. He said, "I am a 74-year-old retired senior on Medicare and this Medicare drug prescription plan is just a stone's throw away from privatization of Medicare. That should not be allowed to happen." Let us not let it happen.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE SCOTT: I'm a 74-year-old retired senior that's on Medicare at home recovering from a massive heart attack and bladder infection so I am very concerned about the course of action Congress is presently taking on the Medicare Drug Prescrip


Representative DAVID SCOTT, JONESBORO, GA.
When the news first came out that Congress was finally going to add prescription drugs to Medicare in order to provide financial relief for seniors that are paying way too much for their prescription versus their meager yearly income from Social Security and if they have one, their pension fund and any life savings they may have. At that time I heard very little. It is said that if such a plan Medicare beneficiaries would be given a choice if they needed and wanted their prescription drugs covered by Medicare. They had to do is sign up for it and pay whatever the cost of the plan covers. For the rest of us who are happy staying with Medicare and our present secondary insurance plan that provides better prescription drug coverage at a lower cost would not have to participate in any Medicare prescription drug plan.

Seniors that don’t have prescription drug coverage should be covered by this plan as a matter of choice, however; I feel it is unfair for Congress to make it a mandatory requirement for all seniors to pay for this plan which would override their own secondary insurance plan for their prescription drug plan. It just isn’t fair, they should have the choice to give up our plan and end up paying far more than what we are presently paying? I’m sure if all seniors were aware of what really is going on they would want to make it a matter of choice also.

Representative Scott please give us Medicare beneficiaries a choice to join or not to join in prescription drug coverage. Even though I’m not in your district I’m asking you to please support us seniors by making sure this choice provision will go on the floor of the final bill that is sent to President Bush. If this choice does not become part of this Medicare Drug Prescription plan it is just a stone's throw away from the privatization. That the Republicans want that should not be allowed to happen. Please remember when you vote whatever the outcome is on this plan it will affect all America nation wide and in some way or other I’m sure it will have some sort of a bearing on the outcome of the 2004 elections.

May God Bless you and may God Bless America.

Sincerely yours,
RICHARD MCGRAW.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WEXLER).

Mr. WEXLER. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to represent the oldest district in this country, and I thought it was important to hear from some of those seniors who fought in World War II and Korea and who rebuilt this country after the depression.

Mr. and Mrs. Robert Moore of Lantana, Florida: “Why do we worry about tax cuts for the rich while so many older folks have to choose between paying for prescription drugs and staying alive?”

Speaking directly to the Republican plan, Mr. Arthur Taumble of Delray Beach, Florida: “I prefer nothing instead of a botched up Republican plan.”

Mrs. Elaine Schwartz from Boynton Beach: “It is very disappointing to me that I live in this wonderful country and senior citizens who have contributed for so many years supporting this country have been forgotten.”

Mrs. that Cortz has got it right, forgotten benefits. Drug benefits for seniors, forgotten; lower drug costs for seniors, forgotten by the Republican plan. American seniors by the Republican plan, forgotten.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY). Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), the majority leader, has stated that the Democratic strategy on his Medicare bill is obstruction, obstruction, obstruction; but when the best that the GOP can do is create a plan that destroys Medicare, we should all rise in opposition.

I want to point out that the Republicans blocked every attempt at a Democratic substitute, sound proposals that would protect Medicare and provide comprehensive coverage for all seniors, regardless of the size of their bank accounts. The AARP, a trusted voice on this subject, says the Republican plan is not good public policy because it has too many coverage gaps.

Why do the Republicans oppose better plans without gaps for seniors? Well, the gentleman from Iowa says one of the plans is too expensive. It was not too expensive for them to pass the largest tax cut in American history, only to create the largest deficit this country has ever seen. Just when it comes to providing our seniors with the most basic ability to protect their health the cost is too high.

It does seem to me to be a simple matter of priorities. So does it instead of obstruct the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) and the Republican’s plan to destroy Medicare? Absolutely.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I did not want this historic debate to leave without my words in opposition to a plan that does nothing to serve the needs of seniors in America. The reason? Because I am proud that President Lyndon Baines Johnson in 1965 extended the lives of American senior citizens, but today we have a plan that will be shoved through on this floor that denies the prescription drug benefit. Lower prices are denied. Full coverage is denied. Choice of drugs is denied because when a sick senior citizen gets to a certain amount of their prescription drug benefit, then they drop through the doughnut hole; and if they survive, if they live through the gap between when they start paying for it, then they may be able to hit again when the amount of the prescriptions go up to $5,000.

The doughnut and privatization are two items in this particular legislation that I will stand against, and again, Medicare denied, real Medicare benefits denied; full coverage denied, choice of drugs denied. This is a historic debate. Vote “no” and stand on the side of saving lives of America’s senior citizens.

Mr. Speaker, when we look at the health care system for our seniors in the United States today, we see good news and bad news. The bad news is that drug costs are outrageously high. The good news is that Medicare is an effective and efficient program that is working well for our seniors, and that seniors would be better off if those who disagree with these two facts: that drug costs are too high and need to be brought down, and that Medicare is a good program that needs to be protected.

That means to me that the Prescription Drugs Bill that the Republicans are showing through Congress today without opportunity for amendment or time for debate, is preserving the bad—the high cost of drugs—and is dismantling the good—Medicare.

We Democrats have been fighting for years for a Medicare prescription drug program that is (1) affordable; (2) available to all seniors and Medicare beneficiaries with disabilities; (3) offers meaningful benefits; and (4) is available in the Medicare program—the tried and true program seniors trust.

And now it seems that we have the political momentum to make a good prescription drug benefit a reality. The President says he wants it. Both parties, both sides of Capitol—everyone has declared their commitment to getting affordable prescription drugs to our nation. So why is it that the only Medicare prescription drug “plan” the Republicans have to offer is a terrible bill with full of holes, and gifts to the HMOs, and protections for pharmaceutical companies. Every time we get a chance to take a closer look at the Republican prescription plan, it becomes more obvious that it is just another piece of the Republican machine that is trying to dismantle Medicare and turn our federal commitment to our nation’s seniors, over to HMOs and the private insurance industry.

The Republican plan would be run by HMOs, not Medicare. HMOs would design the new prescription drug plans, decide what to charge, and even decide which drugs seniors would get. Plus, HMOs would only have to promise to stay in the program for one year. That means that seniors might have to change plans, change doctors, change pharmacies, and even change the drugs they take every twelve months. Medicare expert Marilyn Moon told the Senate Finance Committee on Friday that “There will be a lot of confused and angry consumers in line at their local pharmacies in the fall,” if the Republican approach is not changed. She’s right.

The Republican plan provides poor benefits, and has a giant gap in coverage. Under the House Republican plan, many seniors would be forced to pay higher drug costs—higher costs that they don’t receive benefits. Reportedly, under the House GOP plan, Medicare beneficiaries have a high $250 deductible. After they reach that deductible, they would then be required to pay a portion of their first $2,000 in drug costs—that is a fairly normal system. But, after a senior’s costs hit $2,000 for a year—that is when it becomes obvious just how bad this plan is. Once a senior’s drug costs hit $2,000, the Republican plan cuts them off. Even though they must continue to pay premiums, they get no assistance in paying their drug costs until they reach the $2,000 limit. Let me say that again. It seems so crazy, it is almost unbelievable. The sickest of our seniors, the ones on the most medications—once their
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costs reach the $2000 mark—they fall into the Republican gap. They are left to pay the next $3000 out of their own pockets, while continuing to pay premiums. Almost half of seniors would be affected by this gap in coverage. They will be outraged, and our offices will be hearing about it. And already we are hearing that 4 out of 5 seniors, the people we are trying to help, are against this plan.

I have attended hundreds of health care briefings, and have read everything I can get my hands on, on the subject of improving Medicare and getting health insurance to the American people. And I have never heard anyone say that a hallmark of a smart health insurance program is to have a giant gap in coverage for those who need help the most. Why would our Republican colleagues put in this ditch in the road to health for seniors? Because they wasted all of our nation's hard earned money, on massive tax breaks for the rich, and an unnecessary war.

So now they have placed an arbitrary budget cap on vital programs, pushed by President Bush, in order to compensate for the irresponsible Republicans who jammed through this Congress and last Congress. The way they are dealing with the mess that they have made is by throwing bad policy after bad policy. To remain within their own arbitrary budget cap, they are pitching a bill that will provide a catastrophic benefit to the majority of seniors.

If the Republicans wanted to save money, they could have put in a provision that I and many Democrats have pushed for—and that is to allow the Secretary of the HHS to negotiate with the pharmaceutical companies to get fairer prices for the American people. I believe that the American pharmaceuticals industry is the best in the world. They make good products that benefit the world. But Americans are now paying double the cost for drugs than their counterparts in other rich nations such as German, Canada, Great Britain, or Japan. I am glad our companies are making money. But as we enact a prescription drug benefit under Medicare, access to drugs will rise—and drug company profits will rise as well. It is only fair that the Secretary have the power to negotiate a good price for American consumers, to make sure we get the best returns possible on our federal investment.

Not only did the Republicans not put in a provision to allow such negotiations, they went out of their way to forbid the Secretary from trying to get better prices for Americans. Why? Because they value the profits of their corporate sponsors at Pharma, more than they do the well-being of our nation's seniors. American consumers are now subsidizing the drug-costs of the rest of the world. The Canadians, the Australians, the Japanese—the nations of the world—still pay half of what we pay for drugs. We need to bring leaders in the Pharmaceutical companies to the table. They want to sell their products to more Americans, and we want more Americans to have access to their products. Surely, the Secretary should be able work with the industry to negotiate a compromise that serves all Americans well.

Similarly, the Republican plan's design wastes billions in kickbacks for HMOs—instead of using that money to bring down the premiums and out-of-pocket costs that seniors and the disabled are forced to pay. The Republican plan is to privatize Medicare starting in 2010. The whole reason that Medicare was developed in the first place, was that private industry would not rise to the challenge of taking care of our nation's seniors the way they deserve.

The Republican plan is a risky scheme only an HMO could love. The Bush Administration's own new called traditional Medicare "dumb" and "a disaster," highlighting Republicans' disdain for a program that Democrats have been fighting for since 1965. While Democrats have worked to modernize Medicare with prescription drugs, previous Secretary of Health and Human Services Kathleen Sebelius is on a riskier course even the Wall Street Journal calls a business and social "experiment."

The Republican plan destroys Employer Retiree Coverage. The Congressional Budget Office has concluded that about one third of private employers will drop their retiree drug coverage under a proposal like the one being contemplated. In order to lower its cost, the House Republican plan stipulates that any dollar an employer pays for an employee's drug coverage will be counted against the employee's $3,700 out-of-pocket catastrophic cap. This would therefore disadvantage seniors with employer retiree coverage because it would be almost impossible for them to ever reach the $3,700 catastrophic cap, over which Medicare would pay 100 percent of their drug costs. The practical effect of this is that employers will stop offering retiree coverage. That is a step in the wrong direction.

We can do better. The House Democrats' legislation, that I am proud cosponsor of, is designed to help seniors and people with disabilities, not HMOs and the pharmaceutical industry. Under the Democratic proposal, the new Medicare prescription drug program would be affordable for seniors and Americans with disabilities and available to all no matter where they lived. It offers a meaningful benefit with a guaranteed low premium; and would be available as a new "Medicare Part D" within the traditional Medicare program that seniors know and trust.

I am committed to getting seniors the prescription medications that their doctors deem they need. I want to work with our Colleagues on the other side of the aisle, and the Administration to make that happen. But unless I see a plan without a consistent benefit—with some smart cost-controls—and some protections for Medicare, an excellent program for Americans, I cannot support this Republican drug scheme.

This bill is a sham. Our seniors have been looking forward to getting relief from the high cost of drugs. They will be waiting with anticipation until after the next elections, when this bill conveniently kicks in. When it does, they will be furious. Let's do better.

Mr. Speaker, I yield my time to the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would remind the gentleman from California (Mr. Stark) that he has 30 seconds remaining.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself this time and will use it to sum up because that is about all the time it will take to explain what is in the Republican bill, which is nothing. It privatizes Medicare, and it promises a benefit as good as we Members of Congress get, and it does not get a third of the way there.

It is a hoax. It is phony. It is a fig leaf. It only gives coverage to the Republicans because there is nothing, absolutely nothing in this bill that requires anybody to provide a drug benefit to the seniors, and perhaps they will give the Republicans enough campaign money or promises and favors of other sorts to get them to change this legislation; but all those favors will not do it, nothing will do it. We are not giving the seniors anything but a hoax.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for the gentleman from California (Mr. Stark) has expired.

The gentleman from California (Mr. Thomas) has 4 1/2 minutes remaining.

Mr. Thomas. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remaining time to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mrs. Johnson), to close for our side, to continue to talk about the bill that for the first time in the history of Medicare provides low-income help, and she is the chairwoman of the Subcommittee on Health of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mrs. Johnson of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Today, is an historic day for America's seniors. Congress is about to fulfill the promise and the potential of Medicare, which has been one of our greatest success stories in our history; but when Medicare was created in 1965, prescription drugs were few and far between. Instead, painful and invasive treatments were standard treatment; but now, with the health security of our seniors tied directly to medicines, medicines that extend life and restore hope, we must add prescription drugs to Medicare for all our seniors.

A Medicare program without a drug benefit is a false promise in the 21st century. I am proud to stand here on this House floor and bring prescription drugs to Medicare for all of our seniors and a benefit that is simple, generous, and affordable.

It is simple because it pays 80 percent of the first $2,000 of drug costs; and it guarantees the peace of mind of our seniors, protecting them against catastrophic drug costs, covering all costs above $3,500.

It is generous because the average senior spends $1,200 on prescription drugs every year. Yet in this bill we cover 80 percent of the cost up to $2,000.

It is fair because it helps the low-income seniors more than any other group. It not only helps the very poor, below 150 percent of poverty, but for the first time, by allowing State subsidies to help seniors toward that threshold of catastrophic coverage, we help the next income group to have the security that seniors depend on in their retirement.

In addition, there is fairness at both ends of this bill. Should someone with a $200,000 income have the same level of catastrophic protection as a low-income senior? Of course not.

But modernizing Medicare cannot be just about prescription drugs, as important as prescription drugs are. It
must also be about addressing the most crippling threat to our seniors’ well-being and their retirement. It must address chronic illness.

Current Medicare is an old-fashioned illness treatment program. This bill will provide seniors with chronic illnesses a chance to have truly progressive care, whose goal is to prevent the progression of chronic illness. Our goal must be to be sure that if you have diabetes, you do not end up on dialysis.

Disease management is the new frontier in medicine. It will slow, interrupt or reverse disease. It requires more sophisticated technology. It requires greater patient involvement in their own care. But it results in higher quality health care and much improved quality of life and lower costs for hospital care, emergency room care, and doctors’ visits.

Mr. Speaker, this bill will bring the cutting edge of medical science and modern technology to the service of our seniors and disabled veterans. With over half of our seniors suffering from five or more illnesses and using 80 percent of Medicare’s resources, we must bring chronic disease management to the service of our seniors. And no bill to this point has ever done that. So I am proud to say that this bill brings both prescription drugs and preventive health care programs to Medicare and will provide unprecedented vitality to our Medicare program.

In conclusion, let me remind us all that this bill will revitalize our Medicare Choice plans and provide that reliable high-quality care year after year that seniors depend on, a more holistic integrated care than fee-for-service can provide. So I ask my colleagues tonight to support whole-heartedly and enthusiastically H.R. 1.

In this bill this year, we do a number of other things. We address the concerns of many of our health care providers in terms of their lack of proper reimbursement. When there is only one store in town, generally you get bad products and bad services and often bad attitudes. No matter what store it is, no matter who runs it, when more than one store is available, when we have choice, whether it is choice between a government-run store or a privately-run store, all of a sudden prices become better, products become better, attitudes become better, and service becomes better.

We know that Medicare is described by so many members of the Committee on Ways and Means as being in deep trouble. We know it is on a path toward insolvency. And Medicare, a system by which so many citizens have depended on for years for their health care, is absent this vital asset of prescription drug coverage. So we began our efforts to make sure we could add this coverage to the bill. We have been doing that for the last several Congresses, and every year we battle over what is the right number to fund this program and how best to fund it.

I want to point out that we owe a great debt of gratitude to the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, Mr. THOMAS, of Iowa, who has personally given to this effort and the way in which he has worked with members of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, so many long hours, to accomplish this bill.

It is important also that I highlight, while not acknowledging all the staff who contributed so many hours, the head of our health care staff of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, Mr. Pat Morrissey, who has done Herculean work once again on behalf of this effort. And I want to thank, again, Mr. Ed Grossman, who is a legend in the Legislative Counsel’s office, in terms of his contribution to this entire body and the work we do in preparing legislation for the floor.

There is another reason for this effort in health care would be dedicated to a theme of patients first; the idea that everything we did should be designed to make sure that patients in America continue to have the best health care delivery system in our country and, importantly in this area, that seniors get something they desperately need; and that is prescription drugs.
feet, will not necessarily have to go insolvent. It will have a chance to be one of the options that seniors wish to choose for a long time in the future. These benefits are going to benefit all Americans. I know there is some talk in the Administration that the plan has coverage and then there is a donut hole and there is coverage again for catastrophic coverage. The discounts provided to seniors in this bill will be available at all stages of prescription drug use and at all stages of prescription drug use and purchase throughout the bill. Seniors will see lower drug expenses in this bill. CBO estimates, in many cases, by as much as 50 to 70 percent. All seniors will benefit.

And the seniors who live below 135 percent of poverty, and there are thousands and millions of those seniors living across America, this bill provides a 100 percent subsidy, 100 percent coverage for the drugs they are going to need under this prescription drug plan. And that is a pretty good effort and that is a pretty good reform of our system.

Indeed, we are also going to do some interesting things. We are concerned about the high prices of drugs. And like the Senate, we include reforms in the Hatch-Waxman laws that will speed the approval of generic drugs into the marketplace. And we reformed that awful, that the Medicare system uses with phony wholesale prices that force seniors to pay 20 percent of phony prices whenever they suffer cancer and have to endure cancer therapies and urinary tract infections and inspire therapies. In short, we are going to lower the cost of drugs to America across the board, and we are going to increase the availability of drug coverage for every senior in this country and build new options for seniors to choose from. That is a pretty good package.

I want to again congratulate all who worked on it and all in the two committees who contributed so much to it. In the House Committee on Energy and Commerce we had 65 amendments. I think 29 recorded votes, over 22½ hours of debate again this year. Are we ready for this vote tonight? You bet we are. Are seniors ready for the debate to end? You bet they are. Are seniors ready for us to really do it this year? You know it. Are seniors ready for this House, the Senate, and the President to come together and actually sign a law that gives them these benefits, instead of just debating the issue? You know that is true.

This is a historic moment, and this is our time to get it done.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. Dingell) is recognized for 45 minutes.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, three things: One, this is a bad bill. Two, it is not the Senate bill. And, three, it destroys Medicare as we now know it.

And if you do not believe it, take the words of my good friend, the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, who says, “To those who say this bill would end Medicare as we know it. Our answer is, we certainly hope so. Old-fashioned Medicare is very good.”

Well, it is a safety net that has preserved and protected the health and the well-being of Americans for 38 years. It has been a fabulous system for the protection of the health and the welfare of the people. This thought echoes the words of Speaker Gingrich, who wanted Medicare to wither on the vine.

Well, it is a fraud upon the American people. It provides very little for most people who are looking for the benefit of receiving prescription pharmaceuticals. What it does is it subsidizes the insurance companies. It does not control prices. It does not stimulate competition. It does not provide for prescription pharmaceuticals for the benefit of their subscribers. Indeed, most insurance companies have said they do not want to participate in the pharmaceutical-only care benefit that would be offered by this legislation. So they set up this wonderful situation where there will be enormous boundless subsidies for try to induce somebody to come in and set up HMOs which will serve the people in the area or provide prescription pharmaceuticals for the benefit of their subscribers. Indeed, most insurance companies have said they do not want to participate in the pharmaceutical-only care benefit that would be offered by this legislation.

The Democrats have a simple, easy-to-understand piece of legislation, one which builds upon the practices which we have used in Medicare with such great success and so efficiently for so long. So to see that the people get the benefit on the payments of a modest sum and a modest deductible and then they get their benefits. No donut hole during which they do not gain benefits. And I would note that, by an interesting coincidence, the people under this wonderful Republican bill will pay a lot more than they will get out of this legislation. It is a piece of legislation which can best and most kindly be defined as a fraud upon a group of people who have high hopes that their Congress is going to take care of them.

Mr. Speaker, less than 2 weeks ago, the House Republicans divorced themselves from the Senate bipartisan legislation and unveiled their lengthy and complicated proposal to make sweeping changes in Medicare. After taking months to develop more than 300 pages of fine print in secret consultation with corporate America, the House Republicans rammed the bill through committees last week and are ramming it through the House today under a rule developed in the wee hours this morning. The Speaker said yesterday, “[t]o those who say that [the bill] would end Medicare as we know it, our answer is: We certainly hope so. * * * Old fashioned Medicare isn’t very good.” And a Republican Senate leader was quoted last month as saying that “I believe the standard benefit, the traditional Medicare program, is due to be phased out.” Speaker Gingrich’s 1995 prediction that traditional Medicare would “wither on the vine.” The list goes on. Former Majority Leader Dick Armey said, also in 1995, that Medicare was “a program I would have no part of in a free world.”

Most recently, the Bush administration official in charge of Medicare, Tom Scully, 2 months ago called Medicare an “unbelievable disaster” and a “dumb system.” And, of course, I was here in 1965 to witness the overwhelming majority of Republicans vote for the motion to recommit the legislation that created Medicare.

How will seniors react when told they will be forced to pay more to see their family doctor, or accept whatever doctors and benefits a private plan chooses to give them? How will seniors react when traditional fee-for-service Medicare is no longer a trusted safety net? How will seniors react when given a voucher and told to fend for themselves in the insurance marketplace—the same marketplace that failed them before Medicare? They should, and will, be outraged.

Seniors will also be angry when they learn that the Republican drug benefit helps insurance companies more than them. Democrats propose a true benefit provided under Medicare, with set premiums and benefits. Republicans propose payments to insurers to offer uncertain benefits, with uncertain premiums. The only certainty in the Republican plan is a huge coverage gap, when seniors will continue to pay premiums after substantial out-of-pocket expenses, and yet receive no benefit. And drug costs will continue to rise, because the Republicans prevent bargaining by Medicare to make prescription drugs more affordable to seniors.

Other nasty surprises will hurt seniors as well. Cuts in payments to hospital, when many are closing down. Inadequate payments to doctors, when seniors’ access already is jeopardized. Increasing seniors’ costs by $8.3 billion for their Part B coverage. These are shortsighted acts of extraordinary callousness.

I urge my colleagues to reject this dangerous Republican plan. Our senior citizens deserve better than to be guinea pigs for risky ideological experimentation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.
Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Health.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1, and I urge my colleagues to lend their support to this very important bill. We have before us a historic opportunity to provide our constituents with a meaningful prescription drug benefit that our Nation can afford. While the bill before us certainly is not perfect, it targets the $400 billion available under our budget resolution towards areas where it can do the most good.

Our bill provides a great deal of assistance to our lower-income seniors for whom we waive a deductible and coinsurance requirements. These seniors, those with incomes below 150 percent of the poverty level, which in 2002 was $13,250 for an individual and $17,950 for a married couple, will only be responsible for a small copayment per prescription.

In addition, the bill targets the prescription drug benefit towards where the need is greatest. Beneficiaries are only responsible for 20 percent of their drug costs between a $250 deductible and a $2,000 initial coverage limit. When we consider that the 2003 median drug costs for Medicare beneficiaries are estimated to be $1,300, it is clear that our bill provides a very good, up-front benefit.

Finally, the bill ensures that seniors will have the peace of mind of knowing that their annual drug costs will be capped at no more than $3,500 out of pocket. While that number does rise for some wealthier seniors, I would note that 95 percent of seniors will qualify for the $3,500 figure. Our bill makes other improvements to the Medicare program, and includes some Medicare payment modifications to ensure that beneficiaries will still have access to high-quality health care.

I would like to close by noting my great disappointment with my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, who for 30 years when they controlled this House did not do a thing for Medicare. I had to sit through a 3-day mark-up where my intentions and those of my colleagues were constantly questioned. Republicans were often accused of not being willing to commit adequate resources to a Medicare prescription drug benefit. I find that odd since in 2001, 2 years ago, the Democratic substitute to the budget resolution included only $330 billion for a new drug benefit.

Republicans added $70 billion to that number only 2 years later, and still our colleagues accuse us of under-funding that benefit.

Mr. Speaker, all this tells me is that most Democrats only care about engaging in a reckless bidding war with Republicans about developing a reasonable, affordable benefit. H.R. 1 is a good bill, and its passage today will move us one step closer to a law which will provide real help to tens of millions of Medicare beneficiaries.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Health.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, for years Republicans have tried to frighten seniors by telling them that Medicare was going broke. The media in this country scolded the Republicans for their Mediscare tactics. Well tonight, Republicans once again are trying to scare seniors away from using Medicare tactics to a new level, and that is scam.

Mediscam number one: my Republican colleagues tout H.R. 1 as the largest expansion of Medicare since the program's inception calling their plan generous. But under H.R. 1, seniors will be required to pay $4,000 out of pocket to receive $5,000 in benefits. That is not generous; that is not even insurance.

Mediscam number two: my Republican colleagues say H.R. 1 gives seniors coverage it never had. It is an expansion of the failed Medicare+Choice program which has dropped coverage for 2 million seniors outright. H.R. 1 is not coverage you can trust; H.R. 1 is coverage that cashes the check, then leaves seniors hanging.

Mediscam number three: my Republican colleagues say H.R. 1 gives seniors coverage it never had. It is an expansion of the old, failed Medicare+Choice program which has dropped coverage for 2 million seniors outright. H.R. 1 is not coverage you can trust; H.R. 1 is coverage that cashes the check, then leaves seniors hanging.

Mediscam number four: my Republican colleagues say H.R. 1 will enhance the security of America's retirees, but the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office says about one-third of employers will drop their retiree benefits if H.R. 1 becomes law. In other words, H.R. 1 will force seniors out of the drug coverage they now have. It will force seniors out of the drug coverage they now have.

Mediscam number five: my Republican colleagues say H.R. 1 will bring prices down through the magic of competition. How could that be? The drug industry wrote this legislation; the insurance industry wrote this legislation. Then they say we should pass this out of pocket. They want higher prices, and that is why my Republican colleagues took out any reference to the Secretary of Health and Human Services to lower drug prices. In fact, the drug companies gave $85 million to my Republican friends for their re-election in 2002 and tens of millions of dollars to President Bush.

Mediscam number six: my Republican colleagues say forcing seniors into private health insurance will reduce Medicare care costs because private plans are more efficient. My Republican friends know that private insurance plans actually operate less efficiently than Medicare with administration costs five times higher than Medicare.

Mr. Speaker, it is irresponsible to spend tax dollars bribing HMOs. It is irresponsible to provoke employers into dropping retiree health coverage. Vote "no" on H.R. 1.

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, the Mediscam bill that the gentleman just described is patterned after H.R. 1495, authored by the gentleman from California (Mr. STARK), the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL), the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN), and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) just a few sessions ago in the 106th Congress. It provided a $220 deductible, 20 percent cost share up to $1,700, a doughnut hole with a $3,000 catastrophic coverage, and no defined premium. Does that sound familiar? The bill we wrote today is patterned after a bill written by my friends on the other side of the aisle back then, and they complain today that it is Mediscam.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Commerce, Trade, and Consumer Protection.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, we have heard from the Democrats that this is a plan that will not work and is a fraud. We had 2 days of hearing, and I never heard a plan from the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) or the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN). We had 64 amendments.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). Will the gentleman yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I do not yield.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) controls the time.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, what we have here is a plan that the Republicans have been on their knees trying to come up with to try and solve this problem. It is voluntary. It brings choice, everything that the Federal government health benefit plan has, the same program that all these folks have.

Joshua Hammond wrote a book called "The 7 Cultural Forces," which defines who we are as Americans; and one of those cultural forces is we are ready, fire, aim. That is, sometimes we do not get it perfect. We do the best we can, and that has been our history for 230 years. Is this bill perfect? No. In fact, the people on this side will argue back and forth, but all of us know this bill is not perfect. However, we have carefully balanced the needs and resources from home health to physical therapy.
This bill contains the long-overdue addition of a prescription drug benefit. Our seniors and disabled beneficiaries have waited many years, particularly true in Florida; and I am pleased to be part of the solution and part of that markup over the 2 days.

Now the folks on this side of the aisle say they have a bill. Their bill is for $1 trillion. Ours meets the budget demands of $400 billion. If we could spend all we want in the world, that would be the Democrats.

But at long last Medicare beneficiaries will have available the same options that the President of the United States has, the Senate and the House and the staff here in Congress, a choice to choose the plan that best meets their needs.

Mr. Speaker, I am very happy that part of this plan that we have here has a demonstration project in consumer-directed care. That will provide an objective, such as folks with diabetes. It is analogous to the successful consumer-directed care demonstration and evaluation projects, known as Cash and Counseling, in Medicaid in Florida, Arkansas, and New Jersey. But consumer-directed care has been another part of this plan that is part of the American Postal Workers Union. It has a consumer-directed option. So what we have with Medicaid, we are going to have with Medicare. I am glad that is part of the solution we have.

So I would conclude by saying to my colleagues who are wondering what to do on this side of the aisle, come along with us. It is a start. It is not perfect. We can work with the Senate, the House conference on it, and improve it. In fact, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. Tauzin) in the markup amended the bill with a GAO study of the impact of this new cost regime. It is my hope that this will provide an objective, balanced approach and give us a proper understanding of how much this whole thing is going to cost. I commend the chairman every step of the way trying to be balanced, listening to the Democrats' amendments, many of which were accepted, many we defeated.

Mr. Speaker, thank you for bringing up this package of Medicare additions, updates and reforms here to the Floor today. There is much here to applaud. We have carefully balanced the needs and resources varying from home health to the physical therapy cap. Most significantly, this bill contains the long-overdue addition of a prescription drug benefit to Medicare. Our seniors and disabled beneficiaries have waited many years now, and I am pleased to be part of the solution. At long last, Medicare’s beneficiaries will have available to them the same options that we, and the Senators, and all of our staff and employees have; a choice of selections from which to choose that best meets their needs. Leading off with “choice,” I am pleased that my provision for a voluntary, small-scale, controlled demonstration project in consumer-directed care for Medicare beneficiaries with chronic conditions, my particular interest is diabetes, is included in H.R. 1 as Section 736.

This would be an analog to the successful Consumer-Directed Care Demonstration and Evaluation Projects, known nationally as “Cash and Counseling,” in Medicaid in Florida, Arkansas, and New Jersey. The Energy and Commerce Committee held a hearing June 5 on Consumer-Directed Care, and every single Member praised that demonstration’s progress, but many cautioned not to rush to implementation. I agree. To that end, at markup I agreed to language from my friend, the ranking Member of the Committee, the gentleman of Michigan, Mr. Dingell, tightening some boundaries for the demonstration project. The Consumer-Directed Care demonstration in fact is an experiment in allowing for participating Medicare beneficiaries to cash out the value of certain services. They then, with the assistance of a designated “counselor” of their choosing, and government-provided fiscal intermediary, would have some flexibility in making decisions directing care for their condition.

Furthermore, Consumer-Directed Care type models are now offered in major health plans in the private sector: in 2003, the American Postal Workers Union (APWU-AFL-CIO) are the very first group with first Consumer-Directed Care plan available to them. Do our Medicare beneficiaries deserve any less choice?

At the June 5 hearing, the National Director of Cash and Counseling, Dr. Kevin Mahoney, outlined that there are generally three characteristics of a condition that make it a good fit for the consumer-directed care model. Disabilities fit these three, and I believe diabetes does, too: (1) It is chronic, and one of the most self-managed diseases; (2) It follows a relatively predictable course of treatment; and (3) there is room for choice, in tailoring a treatment plan to the individual.

I remind my colleagues that under the Medicare demonstration, success has been in the high 90 percent, no adverse health outcomes have increased (measures that have improved), and fraud has been virtually zero.

From that, I must turn to other provisions of the bill. I do not stand here without some reservations. For example, the reform of reimbursement for oncologists. No one, no Member, no oncologist, and no patient wishes for the accounting mismatch of Average Wholesale Price (AWP), to perpetuate, and we should never let dialogue about AWP degrade into accusations about gaming the system. It is a true the bill provides patient over-payment on Medicare-covered drugs, while concurrently increasing the practice expense reimbursement to appropriate levels that reflect their costs. But my understanding is that this is still a net decrease for the practice. I ask that the negotiations continue in good faith.

In Energy and Commerce, Chairman Dingell amended the bill with a GAO study of the impact of this new cost regime, and it is my hope that this will provide an objective, accepted arbiter on true proper costs of administering total community-based cancer care.

Further, I harbor a concern that this bill will not become a runaway money train. We have budgeted $400 billion over 10 years: that is a ceiling, or a floor? It is a logical modernization to add prescription drug coverage to the Medicare program; none of us would choose a health plan in FEHBP (Federal Employee Health Benefits Program) that lacked drug coverage. And, through economies of scale, both the traditional fee-for-service program and the participating private sector plans will have the purchasing power to contain costs. However, there always runs the risk of this exploding beyond our control. We have a responsibility for the fiscal health of this nation, and it is essential that proper cost containment is addressed in advance, as I understand the Speaker has assured.

Mr. Tauzin, Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, just to correct the record, the Democrats did offer a substitute plan in our committee which was defeated, and I think it is pretty close to the substitute plan we will see later tonight.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 seconds to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. Stearns).

Mr. Stearns. Mr. Speaker, if the Democrats' plan is for $1 trillion and our is for $400 billion, we cannot say they offered a plan that met the budget requirements. I would like to ask the Democrats tonight: Do you have a plan that is under $400 billion like the Republicans? Mr. Dingell. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. Deutch).

Mr. Deutch. Mr. Speaker, the House bill in front of us, as the ranking Democrat of our full committee has ably quoted the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means in his own words: "To those who say the bill would end Medicare as we know it, the answer is we certainly hope so." This bill is a nonstarter. The Republicans in the Senate oppose it. It will not happen. It destroys Medicare, I am going to take my 2 minutes and even talk about that.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to talk about the disingenuous nature of the proposal that the Republicans are fostering this proposal. It does not mean they are stupid. They are purchasing drugs in Canada where they are purchasing drugs in Canada where the benefits of purchasing drugs in Canada far exceed any proposal the Republicans have made. I just because people are old, just because they are sick does not mean they are stupid. They are going to continue to purchase them. So this bill for most seniors, for probably over 95 percent of the seniors in America, does absolutely nothing.
What it does is even worse, though.
In a Congress, in a country, in a society that is facing the largest budget deficits in the history of the world, we take $400 billion out of working Americans, give it to seniors, but effectively take $400 billion out of working Americans. We flush it down the toilet and we get absolutely nothing from my Republican colleagues' proposal.

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Speaker, I first want to take 15 seconds, if I may, to point out that the bill that does now contain the drug reimportation provisions similar to the Senate provisions and adds language directing the FDA to conduct rulemaking to make sure that there is safe packaging, to make sure when we do get drugs under and through the program, that they are safe and effective.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GREENWOOD), distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, our grand inquisitor.

(Mr. GREENWOOD asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GREENWOOD. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, my parents, my mother and father, are 81 years of age, alive and well and I would like to dedicate all the work that I have put into this bill to them and I know it will benefit them immensely. My father used to say when I was a young lad, "Jim, there are three kinds of people in this world. There are shirkers, there are workers and then there are jerkers. The shirkers are the ones that all the time put on their sleeves and get the job done. The workers are the people who just don't do anything. They don't contribute. They don't help. The workers are the people who roll up their sleeves and get the job done. The jerkers are the ones that all the time the workers are working they keep tugging at them, pulling at them, jerking them around trying to interfere with the work." I would submit that the Democratic Party, in all due respect, between 1965 and 1994, when they lost control of the House, were shirkers when it came to the issue of a prescription drug benefit, for they did nothing. They did not provide a big plan, a little plan, a medium-sized plan, they did not provide a plan of any kind. They did nothing. We have been the worker party. We have passed a prescription drug bill in this House year after year since we have had control. That is hard to do. That is hard to do because mature legislators have to figure out how to strike a balance.

We have people in this House who do not want to vote for this bill. They do not want to vote for this bill because they think it is too liberal. They think it is too liberal. They think it is big government entitlement program that will bankrupt the country. They are against it because it is too liberal. There are a whole lot of people in this House who cannot vote for this and will not vote for it because it is too conservative; it does not spend enough money; it is not big government enough; it uses private sector factors, influences to curb prices. If you want to get your prescription drug benefit you need to provide a prescription drug benefit to the elderly and the disabled in this country, you have to work very hard with very complex issues and strike a political balance down the center through the eye of the needle to get the job done, and that is what the House of Representatives stands for. That is what it results from.

Now we have got the jerkers. We are trying to get this carefully balanced, incredibly complicated piece of work that our staff on both sides of the aisle have labored over for years to get done, want to try to move it through the House today, get it over to Senate, we have got some bipartisan support here, we have got some bipartisan support in the Senate, and we are going to get it done. And at the end of the day when the little old ladies and the little old men in my district and your districts who have been writing us letters and saying, with tears rolling down their cheeks, and we are going to get those letters for years and years. And when this year is over and when we stand with the President of the United States and he signs these bills, we will say to the little old men and the little old ladies and the disabled people of all ages in our district, we got the job done, when nobody else could or anybody else would. Whether the shirkers did not do their job or the jerkers tried to get in the way, the workers will get the job done and this will be an historic year for the Medicare program of this United States.

I am proud of everyone on either side of the aisle who actually rolled up their sleeves and contributed to the product.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. ESHOO).

Ms. ESHOO. I thank the distinguished ranking member of the committee for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, for those that are listening in this evening, besides the vote that some Members of Congress have had to take on going to war, I consider this the most important vote in the House of Representatives. Tonight we debate a bill where there is only one thing that the two parties agree on, and that is that our seniors deserve prescription drug coverage.

For 38 years, there has been a gold standard for the prescription drug bills to provide a prescription drug benefit to the elderly and it was named Medicare. How dare my colleagues on this side of the aisle say that the Democrats have not done a damn thing. I regret those words in the Record. We love Medicare. We put it on the books, and we have defended it ever since then. And we want a policy in Medicare that is ennobling and recognizes what senior citizens are.

The advertisers are very busy, but beware. Beware of the advertising. Read the bill. If your insurance salesman comes to you, the first thing you say is, how much is this going to cost a month? Read the bill. There is no premium cost in the bill. It says the choices, there will be the choice of insurance companies but not choices of doctors.

By 2010, every senior citizen that is listening in, you will be forced, you will be mandated to go into a private insurance program. That is what our friends have written.

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from the State of Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE).

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Speaker, rural health care is struggling. The hospitals are closing and many doctors are leaving. If you are in a small community and the doctor leaves or the hospital closes, the whole community begins to suffer. H.R. 1 addresses our troubles that we see currently in rural health care. Number one, it lowers the labor share of the wage index for rural hospitals. It allows us to be more competitive with urban areas in terms of wages and scale.

Number two, H.R. 1 increases Medicare reimbursement for rural doctors. Sixty percent of the patient load in my district and many other rural districts are Medicare patients. Doctors simply cannot afford to treat Medicare patient loads of this size because on many Medicare patients they lose money. As a result, they cut back Medicare patients or sometimes leave the area.

Thirdly, H.R. 1 provides a full and permanent equalization of Medicare payments to rural hospitals. An appendectomy is not cheaper in a small hospital than in a large urban hospital. In some cases it is actually more expensive. Also, H.R. 1 provides additional home health care payments and provides provision for rural ambulance.

Mr. Speaker, the reason I want to come to the floor tonight is simply to thank the gentleman from Louisiana for all that he has done for rural health care. This is obviously a matter that I am concerned, the most important part of the bill. I would also like to say I represent a rural area. Many retirees in my area live on fixed incomes. Most of these people are making 15, $20,000 a year. Most of them are spending 30, 40, 50 percent of their income on prescription drugs. And so the number one concern that I see in rural America is the prescription drug bill. This bill offers considerable help to these people.

Again, I would like to thank the gentleman from Louisiana, the gentlewoman from California (Mr. THOMAS) and also the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSELE). I urge the passage of H.R. 1.
Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. Engel).

Mr. ENGEL. I thank my friend for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the Republicans. This bill is a cruel hoax perpetrated on America's seniors. This bill is not about helping seniors. It is all about privatizing Medicare. This is not the Senate bill. This bill is a wolf in sheep's clothing. It purports to help seniors. All it does is create a goal that many people on the other side of the aisle have wanted for years, the privatization of Medicare. This bill drains the lifeblood out of the Medicare program and the Medicare promise we made to seniors 38 years ago when Medicare was created.

I wish this Congress could have come together for an historic moment that would finally provide seniors with the type of prescription drug coverage they need and deserve. Unfortunately, we are doing a disservice to our seniors by shortchanging them with a woefully inadequate drug benefit. Why is it inadequate? Let us face it, there is not enough money in this bill because my friends on the other side of the aisle have, in government parlance, made huge tax cuts, huge tax cuts to benefit the rich, huge tax cuts which make it impossible to help entitlement programs like Medicare. When the leaders over there said they wanted Medicare to work, they were speaking the truth and that is what is happening today. With the enactment of this bill, Medicare is withering on the vine.

When I came to Congress 15 years ago, my goal was to provide meaningful prescription drug benefits. My bill and others, 1045, would keep the promise of Medicare, which was created to prevent seniors from having their life savings ravaged by health care costs. Today, considering no such thing. The legislation before us is not a promise kept to seniors, it is a promise kept to HMOs and insurance companies. This is not the Senate bill. The Senate bill was a starting point to improve upon. This bill bankrupts Medicare, privatizes it by the year 2010. American seniors will not have Medicare as they know it by 2010. Again, when you have tax cuts for the rich and you do it to help your rich friends and you want to strangle social programs and entitlement programs, you do not have an adequate bill.

This bill should be rejected.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mr. Wynn).

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I rise in strong opposition to the Republican plan. This Medicare reform plan is woefully inadequate. Everyone agrees this bill, a prescription drug plan would cost between $600 and $800 billion. This plan only provides $400 billion. Why? My Republican colleagues will say, well, this is because that's all we can afford. The truth of the matter is that is all we can afford because of their big tax cuts. But keep in mind, you did not get a big tax cut. The wealthy got a big tax cut. Mr. and Mrs. Average American got cuts in service, cuts in benefits and cuts in quality.

What we are witnessing here is an attempt by the Republicans to do prescription drug coverage on the cheap.

There are three problems with this. First, in their plan, there are no guaranteed drug benefits. The private insurance companies are going to say it is not going to be available to you, not your needs. So that if your drugs are not covered, then you have to pay the full price. This is no prescription drug benefit. Second, there are no fixed premiums. You hear the Republicans tell you, well, it's going to be $35 a month. Wait a minute. $35 a month is nowhere in their bill. These premiums could rise to as much as $85 a month. You will drive seniors into bankruptcy with that.

The third problem with this plan is the hole in the doughnut, the gap. Under the Republican plan, this plan they are talking about tonight, after the first $2,000 of prescription drug costs, you have to pay the rest up to $5,000. That is a gap of $3,000. Again, that would drive seniors into bankruptcy. The neediest, sickest seniors do not get the benefits when they need it, the consequence of doing prescription drug coverage on the cheap. Forty-eight percent of Medicare beneficiaries will fall into this gap. This is not a true prescription drug plan.

Second, this bill contains something called Medicare reform. That is another name for privatizing and destroying Medicare as we know it. Plans will have to compete. Medicare will compete against private plans and our seniors will be forced out of a plan that they have come to trust. This plan will not work, will not provide the benefits as a safety net for our seniors. I urge its rejection.

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 seconds to ask a question. If this plan funded at $400 billion is prescription drugs on the cheap, what do you call the $330 billion that was allotted by the Democratic budget for the year 2002?

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. Burr), the distinguished vice chairman of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

Mr. BURR. Mr. Speaker, I asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. BURR. Mr. Speaker, I am here tonight to thank the chairman of the Committee on Energy and Commerce and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL), ranking member, our colleagues on the House Committee on Ways and Means, the leadership of the House for having the foresight to move forward with legislation to recognize that there is a problem in America, a problem that we have ignored for a decade, the need to add a prescription drug plan. I did not come here to argue with anybody, I came here because I believe we can do better. I believe we can do better than the bill we have proposed. I believe we can do better than the substitute that is offered.

America understands why we have not solved this because all they need to do is listen to us. We talk about each other's bills in a way that works out the things that we think are bad. We forget that we are talking about a population that has nothing. I wish we could have started with something smaller, but something that was targeted to people who are faced with the decision every day of do I buy drugs or do I buy food? But we have been convinced by this town that our only action has to be something comprehensive, something that includes everybody, something that INCLUDES everybody. I know a lot of middle income and those who have an income of $1 million a year. We have not excluded anybody. We will not exclude them over here and we will not exclude them over here, because there are associations and groups that represent seniors, and they have never met those seniors, but we have.

Mr. Speaker, we owe our constituents more than to sit on this floor and tear up each other's legislation. We have to be for something. To get up here and debate that we are against this and we are against that and it is bad, it is inadequate is only a suggestion that we are not good enough to serve here, that they ought to look for replacements. I would challenge all of us.

I do not know what the outcome of tonight would be. I will vote no on both proposals that come up. I do not suggest on either side of the aisle that we do that.

Mr. Speaker, we owe our constituents more than to sit on this floor and tear up each other's legislation. We have to be for something. To get up here and debate that we are against this and we are against that and it is bad, it is inadequate is only a suggestion that we are not good enough to serve here, that they ought to look for replacements. I would challenge all of us.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. Green).

Mr. GREEN of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, following the gentleman from North Carolina, my good friend, it is frustrating because I feel the same thing, that we were given a plan and even though we spent 3 days and a long night debating it in a committee we did not really get to the legislation. What we really had a plan given to us and it was either take it or leave it. But this is the most important issue that we will consider this year not only for our constituents but for our colleagues and my colleagues feel that we should support any legislation because it is a step in the right direction or maybe it is like the Senate bill.
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This is not the Senate bill. The Senate has a better idea. It is not as good as I would like, but it is better than what we have on the floor today.

This legislation would require Medicare to move to a competitive program by 2010. A lot of different terms are used to describe the model in this bill, whether it is called defined contribution, voucher, premium support, or something else, but it abolishes Medicare as we know it. The bottom line is it is the Republican Medicare bill.

There is language in the Senate bill which makes it possible for seniors with higher drug costs, they will fall into this doughnut hole. Once a little over $3,000 a year up to a little over $5,000, they fall in this hole.

I talked to a senior this evening who has $3,000 a month in prescription drug cost. They will still pay their $35 plus a month, but they will not get one dime of benefits because they will be in this doughnut hole.

The ultimate anti-competitive part is that the Secretary can negotiate lower drug costs. The VA does it, Medicare does it, private insurance does it, but we are prohibiting in this bill the Secretary of Health and Human Services to reduce costs for our seniors. That is why it is outrageous.

The substitute, on the other hand, is the kind of benefit that seniors support. It is affordable, comprehensive, and will actually help our most vulnerable seniors.

There is language in the Senate bill which would drive seniors out of Medicare and into the arms of private insurers. The GOP pretends that it is merely extending Medicare, but in fact the bill is the most dangerous attempt yet to dismantle the most popular health care program in history.

The Republicans fought the adoption of Medicare in 1965. Their majority leader said that Medicare should not exist in a free society. Yesterday the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, the architect of this bill, said on television, and the Members can read it here, “To those who say that [the bill] would end Medicare as we know it, our answer is we certainly hope so.”

This bill would drive seniors out of Medicare and into the arms of private insurers. There is no guaranteed monthly premium. There is no defined benefit for seniors. There is no guaranteed access to drugs seniors must have. The Members are guaranteed in this bill is that it would leave a huge gap in coverage.

Seniors would pay a $250 deductible, $420 a year in premiums, and all costs between $2,000 and $5,100 in drug expenses. That is $3,100 left to seniors to pay. This bill even prohibits the government from negotiating lower drug prices for seniors.

In contrast, the Democratic substitute offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Ms. McCarthy)
Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) would provide a prescription drug benefit that guarantees affordable, universal, and voluntary Medicare coverage for prescription drugs. There are no gaps in coverage. Seniors would not have to give up Medicare to get this benefit. Seniors would need to pay a $25 a month, $100 deductible, and then 20 percent coinsurance. Their out-of-pocket expenses would be limited to $2,000 a year. That is 1,100 under the gap that exists in the Republican bill. The Republican plan also does not give the Secretary of Health and Human Services the authority to negotiate prices. Our bill does. I would ask the Members to vote for this substitute which guarantees prescription drug coverage for seniors.

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I am always happy to accommodate the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. TAUZIN), my dear friend, even when he is pushing an outrageous piece of legislation under an appallingly constrictive rule. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 1/2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), and I ask the chairman of the Committee on Energy and Commerce to listen closely.

Mr. MARKEY. Watch out, Grandma. Watch out, Grandpa. The GOP is selling snake oil off the back of a wagon, and, boy, do they have a prescription for you.

Mr. Speaker, every senior citizen gets a bottle with three bitter pills. Bitter pill number one is a lethal dose of privatization poison. The Republicans are diverting Medicare funds into private drug plans with no maximum premiums, no guaranteed coverage, and a cynical drive to destroy the Medicare program.

Bitter pill number two is a dose of crushing costs. Incredibly the Republican bill injects $400 billion into Medicare but spends it in such a tangled, convoluted, copay-riddled, incomprehensible, doughnut-hole-hollowed maze of bureaucratic and regulatory walls that the plan would not prevent the cost of prescription drugs from continuing to soar, that Grandma is actually going to spend more under this proposal than if we had just left well enough alone.

Bitter pill number three is a privacy piracy pill in the form of income tax forms. The Republicans require seniors to hand over to corporations sensitive personal information from income tax returns and the most intimate details of their medical care as a condition of qualifying for any catastrophic coverage. This information will be used by insurance companies against senior citizens to market schemes intended to cherry-pick the most desirable recruits into private plans, further weakening the foundation of Medicare for the seniors who need it most.

This is a black day for Medicare. Mr. Speaker, GOP used to stand for Grand Old Party. Now it stands for Forget Old People.

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Speaker, now that we have heard from the doctor of showmanship, we are going to hear from a real OB-GYN doctor.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 1/2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY). (Mr. GINGREY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Louisiana for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, as a physician Member of this body, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1, the Medicare Prescription Drug and Modernization Act of 2003. I do not take lightly voting for a Federal program that expenses $400 billion of the taxpayers' money. Being responsible with that money is a burden that I take very seriously. As appropriators of the people's revenue, we must assure that each dollar is spent wisely. That is a high hurdle, but I believe the Medicare Modernization Act clears that hurdle.

This act is an investment that brings Medicare into the 21st century. We will save money as we expand the focus of Medicare spending to include preventive care. Seniors will take the right drugs at the right time are more likely to stay healthy; and they are less likely to need expensive, prolonged hospitalizations, painful and complicated surgical procedures and, sometimes, extended nursing home stays. For that reason, I do not think that this program will really cost $400 billion over 10 years. It will only cost that much if it does not work.

My experience as a physician for more than 28 years teaches that a prescription drug program for preventive care will pay dividends and increase health and a better quality of life. It is true what they say: an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure. And it is a lot less expensive.

This Congress has a great opportunity to expand the coverage for seniors, particularly our needy seniors, while, at the same time, strengthening the system so that it will be around to serve the baby boom generation as it moves into retirement. We will serve tomorrow's seniors as we are serving today's.

Some of our friends on the other side of the aisle insisted today that this bill costs $1 trillion, threatening to slam the entire Medicare system onto the rocks of financial insolvency. It was absurd.

The plan that we will vote on tonight provides a good, strong benefit for our seniors; but just as important, it provides a sustainable benefit that will be there for future generations of seniors. I encourage my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to bring Medicare into the 21st century. Vote for the Medicare Prescription Drug and Modernization Act tonight and deliver on your promise to our beloved seniors.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STRICKLAND).

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to point out to my friend, the gentleman who just spoke, my understanding is that he voted recently to give $800 billion to about 200,000 people. Surely to God that is not an investment that is good for our 40 million senior citizens.

Make no mistake about it. This bill will provide no stable, affordable prescription drug benefit for our seniors, but I will tell my colleagues what it will do. It will ultimately destroy Medicare's social insurance structure, a structure that has provided successful services to our seniors since 1965.

Let me give a clear example of how this bill will fail. The Republicans claim that premiums offered by the private plans will be about $35 a month. But there is no provision in this bill that will guarantee a $35 monthly premium or even a range of premiums near $35. Despite what we have heard, there is nothing in this bill to keep the private plans from charging any premium they choose to charge.

Now, in fact, Nevada is the only place this model has been tried; and in Nevada, the premiums were $85 a month. Furthermore, premiums will be different from State to State, from county to county, even from ZIP code to ZIP code.

Finally, private plans will be able to increase their premiums each year without any regulation, leaving seniors subject to the possibility of wildly fluctuating premiums.

I offered a simple amendment in the Committee on Energy and Commerce last week that would have corrected this problem and guaranteed seniors a $35 monthly premium, regardless of which drug plan they chose to enroll in or where they live. Every single Republican voted against this amendment. Last night, I asked the Committee on Rules. On a party line vote, they denied me the right to offer this amendment.

Republicans continue to say their bill will cost $35 a month. It is not true. They ought to stop saying it.

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Speaker, what is absolutely true is that 259,000 citizens of Nevada will be given free coverage under this bill because they live under 135 percent of poverty.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Rockwall, Texas (Mr. HALL), a Democrat and my dear friend.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill because I am for a bill. I want to see a bill passed. I want a bill that can pass this House. I want a bill that can get to the conference committee. I want a bill that we can consider along with the Senate bill and get
the best of both bills for the best people of this country.

Almost 40 years ago when I was in the Texas senate, Members of this Congress came to Texas, came to the Texas house and the senate, totting two great things that they were going to introduce and pass. They named them Medicare and Medicaid. And they said by 1990, Medicare could cost $9 billion a year. And as I remember, they said Medicaid could cost almost $1 billion a year. So that we really needed to monitor the program closely or the costs could double.

Well, my colleagues know what has happened to the cost, what has happened to Medicare and Medicaid. There is an awful lot to do, and we need to be doing it.

There is no doubt that Medicare has helped millions of seniors escape dire poverty and live fuller lives. There is also no doubt that medical costs have far outstripped inflation due to a number of factors, including expansion of benefits, increased use, and coverage of the disabled population. Our seniors are staring into their pocketbooks to find a program they need for their care. We desperately need to do something to save a great program for people in their golden years.

Mr. Speaker, Medicare needs to be modernized to include a meaningful provision for drug coverage. In my lifetime, we have seen how prescription drugs have greatly improved and extended the lives of Americans. We have also seen how the cost of those life-providing drugs can trouble families every day. Unfortunately, Congress has almost been timid in seeking parity between the prices drug companies have charged domestic dispensers compared to the nondomestic dispensers just across our border.

While American drug companies need added alliance for research and development, and I am willing to give them that, for 10 key drugs for seniors, Americans pay an average of 150 percent over the price these drugs sell in Japan. This is unacceptable. I do not like price controls. The marketplace provides the competition necessary to deliver the best price for the people in need. We have to lower the cost of prescription drugs, and my hope is that we can all work together, including drug companies, to come up with new, better, and more creative ways to achieve affordable prescription drugs.

As we introduce new competition among providers for services, we should consider provisions that respect the choices available to current Medicare beneficiaries. These seniors and the disabled have paid for and have come to depend on the Medicare system and the safety net that it provides them, and they should be able to retain their current plans if they continue to be pleased with them. The Senate improved upon this provision, and I hope that is included in the final bill.

The Senate and the House bills have good provisions to achieve our goal.

Like many people, I am not completely satisfied with this bill, but I am very hopeful that we can pass a bill.

I am particularly pleased that we are introducing long-overdue Medicare reforms that will bring health care into the 21st century; name them prescription drug benefit and significant improvements to guarantee healthy years for our Medicare population.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS).

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my distinguished ranking member for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, the Medicare bill before us is not a good bill. The coverage it provides is unreliable and insufficient. After a senior has spent $2,000 in medications, they get no more help until they have spent another $9,000 out of pocket without help and while continuing to pay premiums. And that is only if a private plan chooses to come into their area. This bill turns Medicare into a voucher, handing it over to the insurance companies and forcing seniors to pay more. It reneges on a promise made to America’s seniors by ending Medicare as they know it.

In addition, the bill before us cuts cancer care by hundreds of millions of dollars, jeopardizing access to cancer care for seniors who face this dreaded diagnosis. If this bill passes, many cancer centers will close. Others will curtail their services, admit fewer patients, and lay off oncology nurses and critical support staff. This bill is supposed to make it easier for patients to get health care, but it will actually make it harder for cancer patients to get the care they need.

It is true that Medicare beneficiaries are paying too much for their oncology medications. We all agree we must fix this. But Medicare also pays too little for essential oncology services, and so the overpayment for oncology drugs has been used to pay for treatments oncologists provide to cancer patients. We must fix both problems. But this bill will cut hundreds of millions of dollars from cancer care. And it still risks the lives of cancer patients.

We will all go home after passing a Medicare bill, and we will face our constituents. I, for one, do not want to see the cancer patients in my district that Congress has decided to curtail their treatment and endanger their care.

We can do better. We must. I urge my colleagues to vote against this bill.

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 seconds. I want to point out our bill provides 430 million new dollars to oncologists in America, twice what provided to any other specialist for nonpractice expenses, twice as much as any other specialist.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Energy of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

Mr. BARTON of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Speaker, first, I want to commend my chairman, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. THOMAS), for his hard work and effort, and I want to thank him for allowing the reform group that I have been a part of in his committee the opportunity to present an alternative and to try to make that a part of the package I really appreciate that.

I would say to my friends on the Democratic side of the aisle, as they have talked about privatizing Medicare, that the first thing that we need to do is preserve what’s there. I would point out that if we do nothing to the existing Medicare program, the projections are that within the next 5 to 10 years, there will be no Medicare, because doctors and hospitals will opt out of the system because they are not able to be reimbursed adequately for the services they are providing.

So the first thing that we need to do is to preserve the current Medicare system. The bill that the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON) and so the other reforms.

The second thing I would like to point out is that we understand that seniors need a prescription drug benefit.

And my reform group was able to get into this bill a transition program that if this bill becomes law within 90 days of enactment, 17 million seniors in this country will begin to get a prescription drug benefit immediately. They will get a prescription drug card, and if they are low income those drug cards will have $800 of benefits on them; and if they are moderate income, they will have $500 and if they are upper income, they will have $100. Their families and employers can add money to those cards, up to $5,000, and within 90 days of enactment there will be a prescription drug benefit. Not 3 years from now, not 4 years from now, but within 90 days. And this drug benefit will not require a deductible, and it will not require any paperwork. It will not have any doughnuts.
It will require a modest co-pay, but then you get your prescription drugs plus any discounts that the prescription drug benefit card allows you. And I think that is important that we as a country say to our senior citizens, not that we want to get old people but that we want to do it with our parents and our grandparents a break. We want to give them a benefit and we want to do it sooner rather than later.

I think the most important thing about this bill is that there is an acknowledgement, a guarantee that there will be a benefit, there will be a prescription drug benefit.

Now, we can debate and we will debate whether it is adequate or it needs to be more generous or whether it needs to be more universal or whether it needs to be more targeted to the people that need it the most, but the important step is we are giving the benefit, we are adding the benefit and we are doing it now. And our transition program works within 90 days of enactment, no later than September of 2004. So I will vote for this bill and hope we can perfect it as we go through the process.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DOYLE).

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I represent Allegheny County, Pennsylvania, the second oldest county in the country, and this is indeed a sad day for seniors in Allegheny County because instead of providing our seniors with an affordable prescription drug plan under Medicare, instead, tonight we will give seniors a Medicare-Choice style drug plan.

Now, we all remember in Pennsylvania what Medicare-Choice is. That is the HMOs trying to provide Medicare, the same companies that left hundreds of thousands of Pennsylvanians high and dry, not only in my State but all across this country, when they pulled out of their plans.

This plan is nothing more than a huge subsidy to drug companies and will eventually lead to the privatization of Medicare. Do not just take our word for it. The AARP, which represents more senior citizens than any other organization in this country, says, The provisions that would establish a premium support structure beginning in 2010 could destabilize the traditional Medicare program and lead to much higher costs for beneficiaries.

Rather than expand choice, this provision could limit choice by leading to a substantially higher cost for beneficiaries who want to stay in the traditional Medicare program. Therefore, choose not to enroll in private plans should not be put at a financial disadvantage.

The other part of this plan that I just find unbelievable right here in title VIII, section 801 is we prohibit the administration of the program from negotiating better prices from the drug companies on behalf of taxpayers. We are going to spend $400 billion of taxpayers' money, and we always hear from our friends, let us run government like a business. Well, what business does not negotiate for more favorable prices? But not this plan.

Our government is prohibited from negotiating lower prices on behalf of senior citizens. Match seniors in Pittsburg get on buses every month and drive to Canada to buy their drugs, because they cannot afford them in this country, for half the price of what they have to pay for in the United States. They have an opportunity to take the buying power of all these senior citizens and negotiate more favorable prices from the drug companies, this bill specifically prohibits us from doing that.

Mr. Speaker, this is a bad bill. We should vote it down.

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BURNS).

Mr. BURNS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the chairman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, we have a bill before us tonight that will improve and it will preserve Medicare. This bill will congratulate the pharmaceutical companies and fundamental health care they so desperately need but provide something more. It provides something that my constituents want and need in affordable prescription drug plan for all Americans and seniors.

Mr. Speaker, I am a co-sponsor of H.R. 1 for one simple reason: Because seniors in my home State of Georgia must have an improved Medicare system. They must have prescription drug coverage. They do not want excuses. They want action. They want it now. The time for stale ideas and old systems and gimmicky are over.

H.R. 1 is legislation we can support because it preserves a system our seniors know and love, while it addresses the issues of coverage and solvency of a program for baby boom generations. Make no mistake, we are far from finished in our efforts to fix our Nation's health care challenges, but this is the first step into a new world of advanced health care. Through H.R. 1, seniors in Georgia can decide the coverage plan that best fits their needs. Seniors in Georgia will be able to decide which prescription drug plan through Medicare is the best option.

For those who have good coverage and pay exorbitant prices for their drugs out of their own pocket, these benefits are real. We are providing them with real savings and real choices.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for Congress to step up to the plate and ensure Medicare's future for all Americans.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN).

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, the Republican prescription drug bill transforms Medicare intoMaybe care. Depending on where you live, maybe you get your traditional Medicare and maybe you do not. Depending on what plan you have, maybe you keep your doctor or maybe you do not. Depending on what year it is, maybe you keep a good package of benefits or maybe you pay very high prices for a low, low package of benefits.

And the Republicans are here tonight saying choices, choices, choices. We are giving America's seniors choices. Well, what kind of choice are they giving America's seniors? Well, not a choice of doctors and not a choice of hospitals. What they are saying is we are going to give you a choice of insurance plans. Well, no one in my State of Maine has ever come up to me and said, You know what I really want is choice. I want a choice of doctors or hospitals, I want to see different brochures, different insurance brochures. Please have some insurance agents call me and talk about their different plans.

What is happening in Maine, in the private sector with this wonderful competition for the employed market is every year 20 percent increases, 30 percent increases, higher payments, lower benefits. That is what and choice and what the Republicans are saying is that is what America's seniors need. It is unbelievable. Every senior I talk to says we want lower prices. Please give us lower prices. We are being gouged from Canada. We are taking buses to Canada, and this bill prevents the administrator from negotiating lower prices for America's seniors.

This bill is never likely to work in my opinion, but if it did, you ought to follow the money. Who gains from this bill? The insurance companies will make millions, hundreds of millions of dollars. The pharmaceutical industry will be able to keep charging the highest prices in the world. America's seniors? Well, not a choice of anything. You follow the money to the insurance companies and the pharmaceutical industry and you can tell who wins under this bill.

This bill is a nightmare for America's seniors. Reject this bill and support the Democratic substitute.

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Speaker, how much time remains on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). The gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. TAUZIN) has 8 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) has 14 1/2 minutes remaining.

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. JOHNN). (Mr. JOHN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JOHNN. Mr. Speaker, I thank you for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support a drug benefit in Medicare. And in some respects the Bush administration's failure to act has not been that long ago, just a few short years, that the Republicans wanted to take a privatized outside-of-Medicare, a drug benefit. But
now all of the debate is about it being a part of Medicare. So in that aspect, I think that we have won as Democrats. But I do believe that what they have done with this bill is continue to try to privatize Medicare and the benefits that are available to seniors.

An entire generation of baby boomers are upon us, Mr. Speaker, and in just a few years away we are going to have to deal with this. Unfortunately, this bill falls short of what our seniors deserve as it has holes in it that the Republicans are trying to close.

Perhaps the $174 billion bill that we passed just prior to this debate could have been used for the doughnut to be plugged. Efforts to fix this problem were denied us through the amendment process in this body on this debate. I offered amendments to try to bring some certainty with 2 years for our seniors to try to provide our rural ambulance services, our rural home health care and our rural doctors a fair reimbursement of our health care.

In particular, I believe this bill falls short in addressing the needs of rural seniors and rural Americans. In fact, our previous experience should tell us that it has not worked. It is not profitable to offer plans to seniors in rural areas. In southwest Louisiana we have no Medicare+Choice plans.

I urge Members to vote against this, and I urge the other side to work, as the Senate did, in a bipartisan fashion to fashion a bill that our seniors can use.

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. Davis).

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, one of the things that Democrats and Republicans ought to be able to agree upon tonight is that we owe our seniors truthfulness. We should be very clear and honest with them and ourselves as to exactly what is happening. Our failure to do so is a cardinal sin because it is ultimately to disrespect our seniors.

This bill offered by the House Republicans is based on a remarkable fixation with private insurance companies. Private insurance companies throughout the country in Washington have said once again they do not want the money that is being offered under this bill to write these private insurance plans.

The distinguished chairman of the committee's response to that is we will subsidize 99 percent of this cost as necessary to get private insurance companies to sell this benefit. How often in Washington, D.C. do you hear somebody turn down that type of money the government is offering them? Something is wrong with this plan.

I salute the Republicans on the committee who acknowledge they were concerned about whether private insurance companies would offer this benefit to seniors. Some of them are going to vote against the bill tonight based on that concern. A number of Democrats have said to those Republicans and others, we will work with you on a bill that fits within our budget constraints but let us have a traditional Medicare benefit that provides drug coverage.

What does this bill do? It does not set any maximum premium. It does not set any maximum deductible. It has a doughnut that almost 50 percent of seniors will experience after they have spent $2,000 on drug costs. During that time period they will be forced to pay a premium for basically nothing. I would like to bring a chart up here to also show you just how complicated this plan will be that is being foisted on seniors. This represents a relatively detailed description of what this bill attempts to do.

Would somebody on the majority please explain to me how this bill works and how any senior at home, Democrat, Republican or Independent, is expected to understand how to use this drug benefit?

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for 2 additional hours to explain the chart.

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

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

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

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. Whitfield), a distinguished member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, tonight is the culmination of 4 or 5 years of debate of a prescription drug benefit for our senior citizens here in America. I hear a lot of the criticism and I have heard it all day today about private insurance companies being involved in this program that we are submitting tonight. Yet, I would remind those on the other side of the aisle that private insurance companies and Medicare as it exists today and has been for some time because it is the private companies that are responsible for the reimbursement of our health care.

So private companies are already very much involved in our Medicare system today.

I would also say, what benefit are seniors going to get from this program? First of all, if they are 135 percent of the poverty level and below, and I can tell my colleagues, in my district that is about 60 percent of them, they are not going to have to pay anything. The private insurance companies will cover their premium for them. The only thing that they will have to pay is a $2 small copay for a generic drug and a $5 copay for a name-brand drug. What is wrong with a program that provides free medicines for seniors who today cannot get them?

I would also say that in addition to that tremendous benefit, and we provide catastrophic coverage for them as well, but in addition to that tremendous benefit, we have a rural health package in this bill that is going to help rural America, rural health providers. It is going to provide $27 billion over the next 10 years for our doctors, and this is the disproportionate share payment for our rural hospitals, children's hospitals around the country, urban hospitals that treat our citizens on Medicaid, our hospitals over the next 10 years are going to get $3.6 billion for those who treat the needy.

This is a program that we should all be supporting, and certainly we should not support the Democratic substitute.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Ms. Solis).

(Ms. Solis asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank our ranking member for yielding me the time.

I rise tonight in opposition to this bill. We have heard a lot tonight about how this bill is going to help our seniors from the other side of the aisle. Well, I want to talk about the seniors that are present in my hometown in the San Gabriel Valley in East Los Angeles, California.

In my congressional district, I represent nearly 6,000, 6,000 seniors in poverty, making less than $11,000 a year. For them the cost of prescription drugs is so overwhelming that they often have to forgo between paying their medicine or having a meal or paying a phone bill. That is what it means to seniors in my district.

This is a choice that no senior citizen should have to make. Yet the Republican bill does nothing to reduce the cost of prescription drugs. It does not allow us to use the purchasing power of Medicare beneficiaries to negotiate lower drug prices, it is just like we do for the Veterans Administration.

So what do we tell Grandma, living alone on a fixed income who cannot afford her medicine? Sorry, but Medicare has a new drug benefit, but it is not for you? Sorry, but Medicare is raising Part B deductibles by eight times as much as our Social Security cost-of-living increase?

Only the Democratic alternative that we will debate later on tonight will do what I think my constituents want to hear, and it will provide them with the guaranteed, affordable, easy-to-use drug benefit that is part of Medicare.

Let us be clear tonight. For our seniors, for our grandparents, our uncles, our fathers and our mothers, there is only one thing to talk about tonight and it is about medicine. This should not be about privatization or insurance companies or anything else. Let us give our senior citizens the help they need to pay for their medicines.

Let us oppose this proposal being put forward tonight by the Republicans and support the Democratic prescription drug bill.
Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Speaker, how much time remains on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). The gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. TAUZIN) has 6 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) has 8½ minutes remaining.

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BERRY).

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Michigan for yielding me the time, and I appreciate his leadership on this and all other matters before this House.

Mr. Speaker, one thing we understand is the Republicans are in the majority. They are in charge. You can do whatever you want to do. You have got the chance to do it. You have got the chance to go to the House. Now, you may talk more trash than a $3 radio, but you are in charge.

The difference in these two plans is very simple. The Democrats would offer you the best plan, the best price, and very few restrictions. On the other hand, will allow the pharmaceutical companies, by law, statutory, to continue to rob our senior citizens. Never before in the history of our nation has Congress been presented with an opportunity to cheat and continue to rob our senior citizens. Never before in the history of the United States has this Congress given us an opportunity to cheat our senior citizens. Never before have they been presented with an opportunity to cheat and continue to rob our senior citizens. Never before have they been presented with an opportunity to cheat and continue to rob our senior citizens. Never before have they been presented with an opportunity to cheat and continue to rob our senior citizens.

Tonight, the House of Representatives will take a bold step to improve the lives of senior citizens. Not only will seniors have greater access to prescription drugs, but built-in reforms will hold down the cost of these medications.

In a report released today by Secretary Tommy Thompson, seniors will save substantially through upfront drug discounts under the House plan. The Medicare actuary estimates seniors will see an immediate savings of 25 percent off their current prescription drug costs.

On the other side of the aisle, those who were wearing the arm bands earlier today, where were those arm bands in 1998 and 1999? Where were those arm bands when that administration refused to even open the book and look at the Medicare commission, bipartisan commission?

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Ms. KILPATRICK).

(Ms. KILPATRICK asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for yielding me the time, and certainly I want to acknowledge the great leadership of our chairman and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON), as well, who proposed the prescription drug benefit that this House passed this year.

I rise tonight to support H.R. 1, the Medicare Prescription Drug and Modernization Act of 2003. What most people want in America, including seniors, is to contain the high costs of prescription drugs. This bill prohibits the Secretary of Health and Human Services from negotiating lower prices for prescription drugs. It is a farce, and on its own it is enough to say vote "no" on this bill. What a sham for the seniors who built this country.

This bill will destroy the retirement benefits that companies in my district like General Motors, like DaimlerChrysler, have been providing to their retirees. This plan is a disincentive for them to keep giving that. Vote "no" on this plan. It is unfortunate I do not have any more time. Vote "no." Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my disappointment and opposition to H.R. 1. We, in Congress, over the last few years, have repeatedly pledged to provide seniors with the prescription drug coverage they so desperately need—and deserve. My Republican colleagues have touted this day as a "historical day." Unfortunately, for Democrats, who spend their meaningful comprehensive drug plan under Medicare, this day is not a "historical day" in the positive sense but a day when we failed on our promise to come through for our seniors. What this bill does do is afford the Republicans the ability to say to seniors, "We kept our pledge." Unfortunately, their rhetoric does not match up to the emptiness that will be felt in our seniors' pocketbooks. Nor does it match up in providing seniors with real choice and a meaningful, comprehensive prescription drug program.

The GOP Prescription Drug Plan is a flawed plan, period. It would put the power in the hands of private insurers—those same insurers who have abandoned seniors in providing essential health care services in the past. Why our Republican colleagues want to give even more power to HMOs and private insurers is a question I cannot answer. However, the consequences of such actions will be felt by the most vulnerable in our society.

The majority of seniors across our nation live on fixed monthly incomes. With so many seniors today living longer, this also means that they need to save as much money as they can to ensure their survival over the years. They cannot afford to pay exorbitant costs for their drugs. Moreover, seniors need security. What they do not need is to be forced into private managed care plans that are able to opt-out of coverage for seniors at their free will. Seniors deserve better—they deserve a universal, comprehensive, affordable, and meaningful drug plan under Medicare.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my disappointment and opposition to H.R. 1. We, in Congress, over the last few years, have repeatedly pledged to provide seniors with the prescription drug coverage they so desperately need—and deserve. My Republican colleagues have touted this day as a "historical day." Unfortunately, for Democrats, who spend their meaningful comprehensive drug plan under Medicare, this day is not a "historical day" in the positive sense but a day when we failed on our promise to come through for our seniors. What this bill does do is afford the Republicans the ability to say to seniors, "We kept our pledge." Unfortunately, their rhetoric does not match up to the emptiness that will be felt in our seniors' pocketbooks. Nor does it match up in providing seniors with real choice and a meaningful, comprehensive prescription drug program.

The House Republican prescription drug bill is even worse than the one considered by Congress last year and goes much further in privatizing Medicare. Seniors would need to use private insurance companies for drug coverage and these private insurance companies and managed care plans would design the new prescription drug plans. These insurance plans would also need to commit to the program for only one year. What does this mean? It means that seniors can be dropped from their plan year-to-year. They would have to purchase a new prescription drug plan. These insurance plans would kick seniors out of private managed care plans that are able to opt-out of coverage for seniors at their free will. Seniors deserve better—they deserve a universal, comprehensive, affordable, and meaningful drug plan under Medicare.

The House Republican prescription drug bill is even worse than the one considered by Congress last year and goes much further in privatizing Medicare. Seniors would need to use private insurance companies for drug coverage and these private insurance companies and managed care plans would design the new prescription drug plans. These insurance plans would also need to commit to the program for only one year. What does this mean? It means that seniors can be dropped from their plan year-to-year. They would have to purchase a new prescription drug plan. These insurance plans would kick seniors out of private managed care plans that are able to opt-out of coverage for seniors at their free will. Seniors deserve better—they deserve a universal, comprehensive, affordable, and meaningful drug plan under Medicare.
them with the security and stability they need. Seniors do not want to be forced into an HMO. In fact, 72 percent of seniors polled say they do not want to be forced into getting coverage through an HMO. We need to listen to those we are trying to serve.

The GOP plan receives an "F" on the affordability scale. Under their plan, seniors would be required to pay high premiums even if they are not receiving coverage. The Republican plan would deny assistance to those seniors with drug costs between $2,000 and $4,900. Nearly half of Medicare beneficiaries would fall into the "coverage gap" every year; however, they would still be expected to pay the monthly premium. Seniors would be asked to continue paying for a service they are not receiving—a service that does not honor seniors with meaningful support in the first place.

Another glitch in the Republican bill is its inability to deal with the underlying problem—the rising costs of prescription drugs. Seniors want help in curbing the increasing costs of prescription drugs. In fact, seniors prefer cost control measures by a vote of two to one. While we can't do much in purchasing their medicines, they also want solutions in curbing the rising costs. The Republican bill does not do this. It neglects to include an important provision supported by Democrats to provide the Secretary of Health and Human Services with the authority to negotiate for lower prices for the Veterans' Administration has included. Including cost-control provisions is the right and reasonable thing to do; however, our Republican friends do not see the benefit of this. How unfortunate.

The Democratic Substitute, which I proudly support, is the coverage that will fulfill our pledge to seniors. It provides them with real assistance within Medicare and includes provisions to curb the high cost of prescription drugs. Seniors do not need to worry about paying more in the future if they decide to stay in the traditional Medicare program. They do need to worry about this with the Republican bill, since the "competitive bidding" provision would force seniors to pay more for their prescription drugs than they do now. Seniors want a plan that is straight up, no-nonsense, and one that provides, that we provided, all of our seniors with meaningful support in the first place.

I want to do right by the seniors in my district and for seniors across the nation who are struggling to pay for the prescription drugs they need to live fulfilling and healthy lives. H.R. 1 was constructed with the interests of pharmaceutical companies and private insurance companies at heart. The voice of seniors was nothing but a faint echo in the rooms where this bill was constructed and their best interests have been left in the dust. For these reasons, I vote against passage of H.R. 1. We need to safeguard our nation's seniors, not their profits.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL).

(Mr. PASCRELL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I really suggest that the other side go to see the movie. It is an old movie, "Thelma and Louise." Thelma turns to Louise and says, "Do not settle, Louise."

You have settled. You blew it. In fact, the seniors already are angry. The plan does not even go into effect until 2006. Why are they angry? They are angry because this is a question of values. Just when you need it most, the plan ends.

The second reason why they are angry is you are going to force them into HMOs. Look what happened in New Jersey on Medicare+Choice. Now you are going to call it Medicare plus advantage. Bill Sartore would have a picnic on this. This is a joke and a sham, and you know it. Look at that record that you have provided, that we provided, all of us in the State of New Jersey, where they lost 100,000 people. What are we going to do, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania said just a few moments ago, is subsidize insurance plans. That is what we are going to do.

The third reason why they are ticked off is that there is no control over prices. Boy, are they angry. You blew it.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS).

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, last night we debated the Homeland Security appropriations bill. The Republicans made excuses about not spending enough money to truly secure our homeland. Tonight, the Republicans are cryin' like babies and claimed we do not have enough money to fund credible prescription drug coverage for our seniors.

This bill provides no coverage when a senior's prescription drug costs are between $2,000 and $4,900 a year. This huge coverage gap affects 47 percent of Medicare beneficiaries. This bill provides no coverage when a senior's prescription drug costs are between $2,000 and $4,900 a year. This huge coverage gap affects 47 percent of Medicare beneficiaries.

This bill is also a giveaway to pharmaceutical companies, as it prohibits the Secretary of Health and Human Services from negotiating lower drug prices. The primary beneficiaries of this bill are not the beneficiaries of Medicare. They are the wealthy special interests and the pharmaceutical industry. This is a giveaway to the insurance industry that give huge campaign contributions to the Republicans.

Mr. Speaker, the Republicans have given huge tax cuts to the wealthy, promised the Iraqis a universal health care plan. They are spending millions attempting to buy the loyalty of war lords in Afghanistan, and the President just gave Musharraf $3 billion. Seniors, call your Republican Members and ask them why they do not take care of the seniors of this country.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. Ross).

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL), the ranking member, for yielding me the time.

As the owner of a small-town family pharmacy, I got sick and tired of seeing seniors who could not afford their medicine or could not afford to take it properly. That is why back in 2000 I decided to run for the United States House of Representatives.

But tonight, what we are debating is nothing more than a false promise for our seniors. Seniors need an accountant to figure out this plan.

I put a calculator to it, and here is what the Republican national leadership plan offers our seniors. Seniors will pay the first $2,520 of the first $3,500 of the first $3,500 worth of medicine they need every year. Now, let us contrast that with a moment to a health care plan provided for Members of Congress, those who wrote this plan. Guess what they pay? Seven hundred dollars of the first $3,500 worth of medicine.

They want to provide seniors with little help while continuing to take care of Members of Congress. It is simply wrong. This is not a seniors bill, this is a bill written by the big drug manufacturers for one reason only. To privatize Medicare. To privatize Medicare and claim that Medicare cannot command discounts.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I would inform the gentleman from Louisiana at this time that I have one speaker remaining.

Mr. TAUSIN. Mr. Speaker, who has the floor to close?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). The gentleman from Louisiana has the right to close.

Mr. TAUSIN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time and the right to close.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the minority leader, to close.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Michigan for yielding me the time and for his tremendous leadership. He has been fighting this fight for America's seniors for access to quality health care for all Americans and an affordable prescription drug benefit for America's seniors. We are all in your debt.

Mr. Speaker, today is a sad day for America's seniors. Another sad day, late at night in the Chamber of the House of Representatives, where the budget priorities of our country should be debated to their fullest extent, but where the limitation on time is placed so that the American people can never really get the full story. This prescription drug benefit bill discussion is an historic occasion for our country because it does indeed, it does indeed give us the opportunity to expand Medicare to provide a guaranteed affordable defined benefit for our seniors. The Senate has taken up the bill for the past 2 weeks. They have considered 30 amendments to the bill. Thirty amendments. The House is considering the bill this evening with no opportunity for amendment.

I do want to commend the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) and the
gentleman from New York (Mr. Rangel), the ranking member on the Committee on Ways and Means, for the proposal that they will be putting forth tonight, which is a real prescription drug benefit for seniors. I commend the gentleman from California (Mr. Dooley) for his limited opportunity but great product that he put forth on the previous question on the rule earlier. Another excellent proposal. And I commend the Blue Dogs, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. Berry), for their hard work on our motion to recommit, which we hope will be dealt with tonight.

Any one of these would be far superior to the proposal that is being put forth by the Republicans today. Why it is so sad is because we are supposed to honor our parents. Our senior citizens built our country. They raised our families, the backbone of America. They fought our wars. Some of them are part of the greatest generation. Some of them lived through the New Deal, many of them the Fair Deal, and tonight they are getting a raw deal. What makes it so sad is that we had the opportunity to do it right, and one of those opportunities we will hear about next, the Dingell-Rangel/Rangel-Dingell Democratic proposal, of which we are very proud.

Nearly 40 years ago, when Medicare came into existence, it came at a time when many, many seniors had no access to health care, and not every senior in America has access to quality health care. At the time, there was no prescription drug benefit included in the package. That was unfortunate. Today, it is imperative that we have a prescription drug benefit in the package. The advances to science have been so miraculous. Seniors today, if they have a prescription drug benefit, would be able to self-administer drugs, which would not only be an adjunct to physician or hospital care but be a supplement for it. It would be a substitute for it.

So think of what it means to the quality of life for our seniors in order for them to have that independence and to be able to know that it is guaranteed, defined, and dependable. Think of what it means to the taxpayer in the reduction of cost in medical services to seniors because they can have access to prescription drug benefits. That is what makes this such a tragedy. It makes it such a tragedy.

So tonight, instead of honoring our parents and our seniors, we are foisting a hoax upon them, at least the Republicans are. And a cruel hoax it is in deed. In doing so, the Republicans insult the intelligence, they insult the intelligence of America’s seniors. Many of you are blessed to still have your parents with you, and some of us are even bordering on being seniors ourselves, but any of you who have your parents or dear relatives who are older know that they are into stats. They know their statistics. They know their blood count, they know their blood pressure, they know their bank account balance, they know the cost of everything, many of them, because many of them are on fixed incomes and the slightest change has an impact on their economic security.

So I want those seniors who are so sensitive to changes in cost to take a look at this chart, which was in the New York Times this morning, and it says, “Under House GOP Bill Seniors’ Out-of-pocket Drug Costs Remain Staggering.” Remains staggering. The average cost that seniors will pay in prescription drug costs in 2006 is reported to be $3,155. So let us take the $3,000 line for the Republican hoax on seniors. If the beneficiary’s annual drug costs are $3,000, seniors out there, if you are paying about $3,000, under the House bill your deductible will be $250. Your premium will be $420. The share of initial coverage is $350. Gap in coverage, here is where you fall into the gap, $1,000.

So of that $3,000 worth of drug cost, you, America’s seniors, will be paying $2,020 out of pocket. Where is the benefit? And this is the best case scenario. These prices that you see here are suggestions to the HMOs. The prices could be much more, and your out-of-pocket cost could be much more.

I do not know how many of you think the hole is the most delicious part of the donut, but seniors, when they fall into this donut hole where they get no coverage, they still pay the premium. They are paying a premium for something that is not there. It is not there. And of course, if they pay $4,500 in drug costs, they are paying $3,520 out of pocket. A cruel hoax on America’s seniors. And they call that modernization. I call it humiliation. I call that insulting the intelligence of America’s seniors.

It was interesting, in this same article today one senior who was quoted on the record. He said, “How do you think anybody in Washington, D.C. has any idea what people on a limited income have to do to live?” Clearly, the Republicans do not. They are just too busy giving the biggest tax breaks to the highest-end people in our country. They are just too busy giving those tax breaks that they cannot write a decent prescription drug benefit for seniors.

In fact, I might add seniors and children. Where, oh where did the child tax credit go in all of this, as we adjourn tomorrow? Tax cuts instead of child tax credits. Tax cuts instead of prescription drug benefits. At the beginning of life; toward the end of life. It is a cruel hoax.

And so, my colleagues, no matter what the Republicans tell you about their bill, the euphemism that it is a modernization of Medicare is really a laugh. It is an elimination of Medicare. Because no matter what they tell you, the facts are these: The Republicans do not provide a guaranteed defined benefit for seniors. The Republican bill does not reduce the high cost of prescription drugs.

Indeed, the hardest to explain to anyone is that the bill prohibits the Secretary of Health and Human Services from negotiating for best prices. I repeat: Not only does the bill not bring down the cost of drugs, it prohibits the Secretary of HHS from negotiating for the best prices. Every business in America, indeed the VA, does that. Volume gives you leverage; gives you opportunity. Except in this bill it is prohibited.

And at this point I want to say that the proposal put forth by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. Dingell) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. Rangel), the cost of it would be cut in half, cut in half, if the Secretary had the authority, which our bill calls for, and indeed took that responsibility to negotiate for best prices.

What the bill does also, instead of modernizing Medicare, is to unravel not only Medicare, and I hope seniors are listening, not only the prescription drug benefit, but part A and part B along with the prescription drug benefit, forcing seniors to compete and pay more to stay in Medicare, the Medicare they know and trust. I repeat: When this bill, in 2010, comes to fruition, seniors will have to pay more to stay in Medicare for part A, part B, and prescription drug benefits.

And this is really a sad one in their bill. The employer piece. The employer piece. There are many businesses in America who honor their responsibility to their retirees. The CBO, the Congressional Budget Office, estimates that under the Republican bill one-third of all retirees who get their benefits from their employers will lose their coverage. Millions of seniors will be worse off.
So that is why I say this is really a tragedy. It is a missed opportunity. It could be so good. It could be bipartisan. It could be what seniors expect and deserve. Democrats have a better idea. The Rangel-Dingell/Dingell-Rangel proposal, the two distinguished gentlemen who have spent a lifetime in public policy promoting access to quality health care, whose credentials are impeccable in this regard, they support Medicare. They have promoting a bill that is worthy of the seniors whom we respect. It is a guaranteed defined benefit under Medicare. It does give the authority to the Secretary to negotiate for best prices. It protects seniors' options in terms of their employers giving them benefits; not making millions of seniors be worse off. America's seniors deserve a benefit that is affordable, with reasonable premiums and deductibles. America's seniors deserve a benefit that is available to all seniors and disabled Americans, including Americans in rural areas.

NOTICE
Incomplete record of House proceedings.
Today's House proceedings will be continued in the next issue of the Record.
The Senate met at 9:15 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. STEVENS).

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Today's prayer will be offered by our guest Chaplain, Rev. Richard A. Lapehn of Milton Presbyterian Church, Rittman, OH.

The guest Chaplain offered the following prayer:

Let us pray:
Triumphant and holy God, ruler of Heaven and Earth, You have given to us the privilege of living in these unprecedented times. We know that our hope is vain when it is placed in humankind. Scripture cries aloud, "As the heavens are higher than the earth, so are My ways higher than your ways, and My thoughts than your thoughts" declares the Lord (Isaiah 55:9). Blessed is the Nation whose God is the Lord.

May we listen for Your voice and learn, hear and obey You amid the competing pressures for our time. Our world will not thrive with pusillanimous leaders, bereft of the courage to speak and act for those things which are just and right in Your eyes. These uncommon days require leaders who will seek out Your vision, soak up Your wisdom, and rely upon Your strength for the rigorous task they face.

May debate be lively and leavened with hope, may conversations uplift and encourage, and may the words spoken in this Chamber bring persistent honor to Your Name. Bless each Senator with Your mercy, Your peace, and Your abiding Spirit. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The PRESIDENT pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, this morning the Senate will immediately resume consideration of S. 1, the prescription drug benefit/Medicare bill. Under the previous agreement, the Senate will begin two back-to-back roll call votes shortly. We were in late last night, and we set those votes to occur the first thing this morning.

The voting schedule will be as follows: The first vote will be in relation to the Harkin amendment No. 991 dealing with demonstration programs. The second vote will be in relation to the Edwards amendment No. 1052 dealing with drug advertising. For the remainder of the day, we will continue to debate and vote on amendments to S. 1.

We have made very good progress over the last 2 weeks on this bill. The Democratic leader and I were just talking, and we still have 50 amendments pending. It is my hope a number of these amendments will be disposed of by voice vote. I know the managers are working along that line. Inevitably, though, we are going to have a very heavy voting schedule today and into this evening. Members should expect roll call votes throughout the day and, if necessary, into the wee hours of the morning on Friday. We will know a little bit later today the pace of these amendments and how they can best be handled.

My intention was to finish this bill before the July 4 recess. I think everybody is working in good faith to do just that. With the cooperation of all Members, and if we are able to continue voting throughout the day and the debate and amendment process, we may be able to pass this legislation this evening.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I have indicated to the majority leader that I intend to work with him today to schedule as many of these votes and to work through the pending amendments.

As he noted, there are approximately 50 pending amendments. It is my hope that our managers might look carefully at many of them and perhaps accept them on voice votes, but those requiring roll calls I hope can be scheduled earlier rather than later throughout the day.

We will work on our side to perhaps offer them en bloc, where we could have a sequence of roll call votes throughout the day, but we certainly will work with the majority leader to see if we can accomplish as much as he has laid out for the schedule, with an expectation that perhaps by the end of this evening we will have completed our work on the bill.

I yield the floor.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

PRESCRIPTION DRUG AND MEDICARE IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2003—Resumed

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the hour of 9:15 a.m. having arrived, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of S. 1, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows: A bill (S. 1) to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to make improvements in the Medicare Program, to provide prescription drug coverage under the Medicare Program, and for other purposes.

Pending:

- This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.
Kerry amendment No. 958, to increase the availability of discounted prescription drugs. 
Lincoln modified amendment No. 934, to ensure coverage for syringes for the administration of insulin, and necessary medical supplies associated with the administration of insulin. 
Lincoln amendment No. 935, to clarify the intent of Congress regarding an exception to the initial residency period for geriatric residency or fellowship programs. 
Lincoln amendment No. 950, to establish a demonstration project for direct access to physical therapy services under the Medicare Program. 
Baucus (for j effords) amendment No. 964, to include coverage for tobacco cessation products. 
Baucus (for j effords) amendment No. 965, to establish a Council for Technology and Innovation. 
Nelson (FL) amendment No. 988, to provide for a study and report on the propagation of concierge care. 
Nelson (FL) amendment No. 996, to provide for an extension of the demonstration for ESRD managed care. 
Baucus (for Harkin) amendment No. 998, to restore reimbursement for total body orthotic management for nonambulatory, severely disabled nursing home residents. 
Baucus (for Cantwell) amendment No. 942, to prohibit an eligible entity offering a Medicare prescription drug plan, a Medicare Advantage organization offering a Medicare Advantage plan, or a Medicare Part B provider or supplier from contracting with a pharmacy benefit manager (PBM) unless the PBM satisfies certain requirements. 
Rockefeller amendment No. 975, to make all Medicare beneficiaries eligible for Medicare prescription drug coverage. 
Akaka amendment No. 990, to expand assistance with coverage for legal immigrants under the Medicaid Program and SCHIP to include citizens of the Freely Associated States. 
Akaka amendment No. 979, to ensure that current prescription drug benefits to Medicare-eligible enrollees in the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program will not be diminished. 
Bingaman amendment No. 973, to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for prescription drug coverage for all Medicare Part B services furnished by certain Indian hospitals and clinics. 
Baucus (for Lautenberg) amendment No. 986, to provide for a limitation on prescription drug coverage available beginning on july 1, 2004. 
Murray amendment No. 990, to make improvements in the Medicare Advantage benchmark determinations. 
Harkin modified amendment No. 991, to establish a demonstration project under the Medicaid Program to encourage the provision of community-based services to individuals with disabilities. 
Dayton amendment No. 960, to require a streamlined review of the Medicaid regulations. 
Dayton amendment No. 977, to require that benefits be made available under Part D on January 1, 2004. 
Baucus (for Bogan) amendment No. 993, to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage of cardiovascular screening tests under the Medicare Program. 
Smith/Bingaman amendment No. 962, to provide reimbursement for federalally qualified health centers participating in Medicare managed care. 
Hutchison amendment No. 1004, to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to freeze the indirect medical education adjustment percentage under the Medicare Program in 2002. 
Sessions amendment No. 1011, to express the sense of the Senate that the Committee on Finance should hold hearings regarding permitting States to provide health benefits to legal immigrants under Medicaid and SCHIP as part of the reauthorization of the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families Program. 
Conrad amendment No. 1019, to provide for coverage of self-injected biologicals under Part B of the Medicare Program until Medicare prescription drug plans are available. 
Conrad amendment No. 1020, to permanently and fully equalize the standardized payment rate beginning in fiscal year 2004. 
Conrad amendment No. 1021, to address Medicare payment inequities. 
Clinton amendment No. 1041, to provide for the development of quality indicators for the priority areas of the Institute of Medicine, for the standardization of quality indicators for Federal agencies, and for the establishment of a demonstration program for the reporting of health care quality data at the community level. 
Clinton amendment No. 953, to provide training to long-term care ombudsmen. 
Clinton amendment No. 954, to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to develop literacy standards for informational materials, particularly drug information. 
Reid (for Boxer) amendment No. 1036, to eliminate the coverage gap for individuals with cancer. 
Reid (for Corzine) amendment No. 1037, to permit Medicare beneficiaries to use federally qualified health centers to fill their prescriptions. 
Reid (for j effords) amendment No. 1038, to improve the critical access hospital program. 
Reid (for Inouye) amendment No. 1039, to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to provide 100 percent reimbursement for medical assistance provided to a Native Hawaiian through a federally qualified health center or a Native Hawaiian health care system. 
Thomas/Lincoln amendment No. 998, to provide for the coverage of marriage and family therapist services and mental health counselor services under Part B of the Medicare Program. 
Edwards/Harkin amendment No. 1052, to strengthen provisions against misleading direct-to-consumer drug advertising. 
Enzi/Lincoln amendment No. 1051, to ensure accessibility to pharmacies and prohibit the tying of contracts. 
Enzi amendment No. 1050, to encourage the availability of Medicare Advantage benefits in medically underserved areas. 
Hagel/Ensign amendment No. 1012, to provide Medicare beneficiaries with an additional choice of Medicare prescription drug plans under Part D that consists of a drug discount card and protection against high out-of-pocket drug costs. 
Hagel amendment No. 1026, to provide Medicare beneficiaries with a discount card that ensures access to privately negotiated discounts on drugs and protection against high out-of-pocket drug costs. 
Baucus (for Feinstein) amendment No. 1060, to provide for an income-related increase in the Part B premium for individuals with income in excess of $75,000 and married couples with income in excess of $150,000. 
Baucus (for Akaka) amendment No. 1061, to provide supplemental coverage under Medicare as a low-income option. 
Hagel amendment No. 1074, to provide for the redistribution of unused reserves of Medicare Part D. 
Baucus/Reid amendment No. 1075, to extend the demonstration project for direct access to physical therapy services under the Medicare Program. 
Baucus (for Cantwell) amendment No. 1076, to provide for the treatment of payments to certain comprehensive care centers. 
Baucus/Lincoln amendment No. 1077, to provide for the redistribution of unused reserves of Medicare Part D. 
Ensling amendment No. 1078, to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the treatment of payments to comprehensive care centers. 
Baucus amendment No. 1079, to provide for the treatment of payments to certain comprehensive care centers. 
Baucus amendment No. 1080, to provide for the treatment of payments to comprehensive care centers. 
Baucus (for Mikulski) amendment No. 1088, to provide for the treatment of payments to certain comprehensive care centers. 
Grassley amendment No. 1089, to provide for the treatment of payments to certain comprehensive care centers. 
Baucus amendment No. 1090, to provide for the treatment of payments to certain comprehensive care centers. 
Baucus (for Mikulski) amendment No. 1091, to extend certain municipal health service demonstration projects. 
Grassley/Baucus amendment No. 1092, to extend certain municipal health service demonstration projects. 
Kyl amendment No. 1093 (to amendment No. 1092) in the nature of a substitute. 

The President pro tempore. There will be 2 minutes equally divided on the amendment. 
Who seeks recognition? The Senator from Iowa. 
Mr. HARKIN. The amendment before us is the one where the money follows the purser. It is $350 million a year for 5 years whereby States can use this money to get out of institutions, out of nursing homes, people with disabilities and get them into community, home-based living. 

Thirteen years ago, this Congress and the President signed a bill called the Americans With Disabilities Act. One of the premises of that was we did not longer wanted to segregate people with disabilities in our society. We wanted to integrate people with disabilities in education, work, travel, jobs, everything. However, under the Medicaid system, it is still segregation. 

Seventy percent of our Medicaid money goes to institutional care, only 30 percent to community-based care. What this amendment says is that for the first time in 13 years, the federal government will pick up the full share of the State so the State can take people out of institutions and put them into community-based living.
This was proposed by President Bush in his budget proposal for next year. It is exactly what the President proposed. 

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. HARKIN. I ask unanimous consent that a letter I received from United Cerebral Palsy and The Arc of the United States in support of this amendment be printed in the RECORD.

Finally, this amendment would help States comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act. As my colleagues in the Senate are well aware, we are nearing the 13th anniversary of the Americans with Disabilities Act and of the Olmstead Supreme Court decision. That decision ruled that needless institutionalization of Americans with disabilities constitutes discrimination under the Americans with Disabilities Act. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this important amendment and to support the freedom of choice for Americans with disabilities.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ARCC AND UCP
PUBLIC POLICY COLLABORATION,

Hon. GORDON SMITH,
U.S. Senate, Russell Senate Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR SMITH: On behalf of United Cerebral Palsy and The Arc of the United States, as you are aware, we are a co-sponsor of Senator HARKIN's Money Follows the Person Amendment pending before the Senate.

This amendment would authorize the 2004 Money Follows the Person Initiative in Medicaid, a part of the President's New Freedom Initiative to integrate people with disabilities into the communities where they live.

This amendment would create a 5-year program to help States move people with disabilities out of institutional settings and into their communities. For example, under this legislation, Oregon's effort to help an individual move out of an institutional care facility into a community home would be 100-percent federally funded for 1 year.

After that first year, the Federal Government would pay its usual rate. Under the provisions of this amendment, states like Oregon can take advantage of $350 million dollars of Federal assistance for 5 years for a total of $1.75 billion.

This amendment is important to the disabled community for many reasons. First, States' efforts to help Americans who have been needlessly placed in institutional settings move into community settings, this amendment will help States increase access to home and community-based support for people with disabilities.

Second, by assisting the movement of people who are not best served by an institution into a community care facility, this amendment gives them the freedom to make choices. Too often, Americans with disabilities are unable to take advantage of opportunities other take for granted—to choose where they want to live, when to visit family and friends, and to be active members of their communities.

Third, this amendment helps honor those veterans whose disabilities resulted from noble and selfless service to this Nation. This morning, I heard from the head of the Oregon Chapter of the Paralyzed Veterans of America. He confided that this amendment would benefit combat disabled veterans in Oregon alone. I would ask unanimous consent that the letter that I received from the Paralyzed Veterans of America in support of this amendment be printed in the RECORD.

I likewise ask unanimous consent that a letter I received from United Cerebral Palsy and The Arc of the United States in support of this amendment be printed in the RECORD.

The Arc is the national organization of and for people with mental retardation and related developmental disabilities and their families. It is dedicated to promoting and improving supports and services for people with mental retardation so that they can live, work, go to school and otherwise be active in their communities. UCP also supports a broad range of research and education efforts on cerebral palsy and related disabilities.

The Arc is the national organization of and for people with mental retardation and related developmental disabilities and their families. It is dedicated to promoting and improving supports and services for people with mental retardation and their families. The Arc also fosters research and education regarding the prevention of mental retardation in infants and children.

We urge all Senators to join you and Senator Harkin to support inclusion of your amendment, S. AMDT. 990, in the Medicare Prescription Drug bill.
States with the costs of paying for community-based attendant and support services. Had I been present for the vote, I would have voted against the motion to table the Harkin amendment and would have voted in favor of its inclusion in the Medicare prescription drug bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized for 1½ minutes.

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, I think what the Senator from Iowa has done is a very worthy thing. The President has focused on this. Part of the President's plan is what the Senator from Iowa has done before. The problem with this is that this is a Medicaid proposal that is under the jurisdiction of the Finance Committee. The Finance Committee would like the opportunity, in the context of looking at the Medicaid program, to work through the structures. A, to have this amendment come to the floor, not having gone through the normal process, I think is inappropriate; B, this is a Medicare bill, not a Medicaid bill.

I say to the Senator from Iowa, I know Senator GRASSLEY has said to me he is willing to work with his colleagues from both sides of this issue. The legislation the Senator from Iowa has put forward has merit and will probably receive bipartisan support, but it does not belong on this bill.

So I ask my colleagues—by the way, it is $1.75 billion. I understand there is an offset, but this is a Medicare bill and we should defeat this amendment.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Colorado be recognized to lay down an amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. President, I ask that the pending amendment be temporarily laid aside.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 1017

Mr. ALLARD. I send amendment No. 1017 to the desk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Colorado (Mr. ALLARD), for himself, Mr. FEINGOLD, Mr. KOHL, and Mr. LEAHY, proposes an amendment numbered 1017.

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore, without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To provide for temporary suspension of OASIS requirement for collection of data on non-Medicare and non-Medicaid patients.)

At the end of title VI, insert the following:

SEC. 1017. TEMPORARY SUSPENSION FOR COLLECTION OF DATA ON NON-MEDICARE AND NON-MEDICAID PATIENTS.

(a) In General.—During the period described in this section, the Secretary shall not require, under section 4602(e) of the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 or otherwise under OASIS, a home health agency to gather or submit information that relates to an individual who is not eligible for benefits under either title XVIII or title XIX of the Social Security Act (such information in this subsection referred to as “non-Medicare/medicaid OASIS information”).

(b) Period of Suspension.—The period described in this subsection—

(1) begins on the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(2) ends on the last day of the 2nd month beginning after the date on which the Secretary has published final regulations regarding the collection and use by the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services of non-Medicare/medicaid OASIS information following the submission of the report required under subsection (c).

(c) Report.—

(1) STUDY.—The Secretary shall conduct a study on how non-Medicare/medicaid OASIS information is and can be used by large home health agencies to improve OASIS data collection and quality assurance.

(A) whether there are unique benefits from the analysis of such information that cannot be derived from other information available to, or collected by, such agencies; and

(B) the value of collecting such information by small home health agencies compared to the administrative burden related to such collection.

(2) REPORT.—The Secretary shall submit to Congress a report on the study conducted under paragraph (1) by not later than 18 months after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(d) Construction.—Nothing in this section shall be construed as preventing home health agencies from collecting non-Medicare/medicaid OASIS information for their own use.

At the end of title VI, insert the following:

SEC. 1018. REQUIREMENT FOR COLLECTION OF DATA ON NON-MEDICARE AND NON-MEDICAID PATIENTS.

(a) In General.—During the period described in this section, the Secretary shall not require, under section 4602(e) of the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 or otherwise under OASIS, a home health agency to gather or submit information that relates to an individual who is not eligible for benefits under either title XVIII or title XIX of the Social Security Act (such information in this section referred to as “non-Medicare/medicaid OASIS information”).

(b) Period of Suspension.—The period described in this subsection—

(1) begins on the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(2) ends on the last day of the 2nd month beginning after the date of which the Secretary has published final regulations regarding the collection and use by the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services of non-Medicare/medicaid OASIS information following the submission of the report required under subsection (c).

(c) Report.—

(1) STUDY.—The Secretary shall conduct a study on how non-Medicare/medicaid OASIS information is and can be used by large home health agencies to improve OASIS data collection and quality assurance.

(A) whether there are unique benefits from the analysis of such information that cannot be derived from other information available to, or collected by, such agencies; and

(B) the value of collecting such information by small home health agencies compared to the administrative burden related to such collection.

In conducting the study the Secretary shall obtain recommendations from quality assessment experts in the use of such information and the necessity of small, as well as large, home health agencies collecting such information.

(2) REPORT.—The Secretary shall submit to Congress a report on the study conducted under paragraph (1) by not later than 18 months after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(d) Construction.—Nothing in this section shall be construed as preventing home health agencies from collecting non-Medicare/medicaid OASIS information for their own use.

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. President, Medicare home health services are suffering from a paper work crisis. Current regulations of the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, CMS, requires that caregivers administer voluminous paperwork to patients when they administer care. These paperwork requirements are too excessive for both patients and caregivers. Caregivers must administer numerous forms including data collection, patient privacy information, a plan of care, advance directives, a visit schedule, a comprehensive assessment, and more.

One of these requirements, called OASIS, or the Outcome and Assessment Information Set, is 94 questions long and takes a few hours to fill out. Before collected, physical therapists, occupational therapists, and nurse practitioners are required to collect this data for no reason.

It is my understanding CMS intends to require the transmission of data for private health patients. But it has been 4 years and they have not done it yet.

In the meantime there are still many problems with OASIS. Until CMS issues the improved regulation, caregivers should be allowed to stop collecting unused data that ends up in the filing cabinets of home health agencies.

The amendment I am offering with Senators FEINGOLD, COLLINS, KOHL, and LEAHY would suspend the CMS requirement of collecting OASIS data for private insurance patients, non-Medicare and non-Medicaid patients, until an outcome by CMS’s two OASIS working groups is reached.

Specifically, OASIS would be suspended until the 2 months immediately after HHS issues its regulations about OASIS. The regulations will be based on the information collected from and the recommendations of CMS’s two working groups that are determining over the course of 3 years ways to improve OASIS data collection and quality assurance.

Our amendment is supported by caregivers in home health who administer OASIS, including physical therapists, nurses, nurse practitioners, occupational therapists, and speech therapists. Congresswoman NANCY JOHNSON, chairwoman of the Oversight Subcommittee of the House Committee on Ways and Means, also strongly supports this amendment. In addition, our language was included in Medicare reform bills in the Senate in the last 2 consecutive years. Further, I commend...
Senator Feingold for introducing legislation last Congress to reform OASIS and I commend Senator Murkowski and Senator Kerry for their work on the MARCIA regulatory reform legislation, which included an OASIS suspension.

My colleagues and I believe OASIS data collection is helpful and should be applied. Even providers and patients, who must comply with the law, believe this. Yet the requirements to collect data should be achievable and inexessive.

I am pleased to offer this amendment and urge my colleagues to support this effort for caregivers and patients.

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the two additional cosponsors be added to the amendment, Senator Kohl and Senator Leahy.

The President pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Pennsylvania.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 981

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, I move to table the Harkin amendment and ask for the yeas and nays.

The President pro tempore. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. REID, I announce that the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. LIEBERMAN) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY) would each vote "nay".

The President pro tempore. Are there any other Senators in the chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 48, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 247 Leg.]

YEAS—50

Alexander
Allard
Allen
Baucus
Bennett
Bond
Breaux
Brownback
Bunning
Burns
Campbell
Chafee
Chambliss
Cochran
Coleman
Collins
Cornyn

NAYS—48

Akaka
Bayh
Biden
Bingaman
Byrd
Cantwell
Carper
Corzine
Daschle
Dodd

Sarbanes
Schumer
Smith
Specter
Stabenow
Wyden

Kerry
Lieberman

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote. Mr. GRASSLEY. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 982

Mr. BAUCUS. Madam President, will the Chair state the regular order?

The President pro tempore. There will be 2 minutes evenly divided before the vote on the next amendment.

Mr. BAUCUS. I thank the Chair.

The President pro tempore. Who yields time?

Mr. BAUCUS. The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. EDWARDS. Madam President, yesterday we voted on the Edwards-Harkin amendment which had two provisions. The first provision dealt with the FDA approval process for "me too" drugs. There were concerns expressed by the Members of the Senate about that provision. Even though I disagreed with those concerns, I don't think it would have slowed down the FDA approval process. Because of those concerns, we have removed those provisions from this amendment.

The amendment we are about to vote on deals only with advertising. It in no way bans advertising. All this amendment does is require that the advertising engaged in by drug companies and pharmaceutical companies be evenhanded. The only thing this amendment requires is that the information be accurate and evenhanded. In other words, you can't have kids dancing in a field as the image on television and in small print at the bottom saying the drug can cause strokes or have other side effects.

We want to make sure the American people in these advertisements get accurate information and which is not misleading. This amendment does exactly that. We have eliminated the provision so many were concerned about yesterday.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment. Let us make sure the American people get true and accurate information in the advertising they are seeing on drugs on television.

The President pro tempore. Who yields time?

Mr. ENZI. Madam President, I rise in opposition to this amendment submitted by my colleague from North Carolina, Senator Edwards. Yesterday, the Senate defeated an amendment offered by my colleague that would have restricted direct-to-consumer advertising of prescription medicines.

This new amendment continues this effort by offering similar advertising provisions to those already defeated.

I have a list of 14 organizations which I ask unanimous consent be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The undersigned organizations are writing in opposition to the amendment offered by Senator Edwards regarding changes to Direct-to-Consumer advertising of pharmaceutical products. This amendment would impose serious restrictions on information which is of considerable value to the millions of patients we represent.

Our organizations are advocates for millions of Americans who suffer from a broad range of illnesses. Early detection and treatment of these illnesses is an important factor in helping those individuals lead longer and healthier lives. Communication, public education and awareness are key components in the outcomes American patients can hope to achieve. Limiting access to credible information is bad healthcare policy and we urge you to oppose the Edwards amendment and any other efforts to deny Americans information.

Respectfully,

The National Alliance for the Mentally Ill.
The National Mental Health Association.
The American Association of Diabetes Educators.
The American Foundation for Urologic Disease.
The American Lung Foundation.
The National Health Council.
The Interamerican College of Physicians and Surgeons.
The Kidney Cancer Association.
The National Headache Foundation.
The National Coalition for Women with Heart Disease.
The National Osteoporosis Foundation.
The American Liver Foundation.
The National Stroke Association.

Mr. ENZI. Madam President, these organizations that are advocates for millions of Americans who suffer from a broad range of illnesses. Early detection and treatment of these illnesses is more communication. Public education and awareness are key components. Advertising is the key component of it.

This amendment would require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to promulgate new rules that would require advertisements to provide information about a drug's effectiveness in comparison to other drugs for "substantially the same condition." In other words, you have to advertise with your competitors as well. The unfortunate effect would be to make the advertisements even more complex, not less, for consumers. It would force ads to drop other information that would be beneficial to consumers.

I ask that you reject the amendment. The President pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. SANTORUM. Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The President pro tempore. There is a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. LIEBERMAN) are necessarily absent.
The amendment (No. 1052) was rejected.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. BAUCUS. I move that lay motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

SEC. 211. ESTABLISHMENT OF ALTERNATIVE PAYMENT AND DELIVERY SYSTEMS FOR PREFERRED PROVIDER ORGANIZATIONS IN HIGHLY COMPETITIVE REGIONS.

(a) Establishment of Alternative Payment System for Preferred Provider Organizations in Highly Competitive Regions—Section 1858 (as added by section 121(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following provisions:

"(l) ALTERNATIVE PAYMENT METHODOLOGY FOR HIGHLY COMPETITIVE REGIONS.—

"(1) ANNUAL DETERMINATION AND DESIGNATION.—

"(A) In general.—

"(i) The Secretary shall designate a preferred provider region as a highly competitive region for one or more fiscal years following the fiscal year in which this subsection is first in effect if the Secretary determines that the Secretary shall—

"(I) take appropriate steps to stay within the applicable amount, including through providing limitations on enrollment; or

"(II) rescind the designation under subparagraph (A) of paragraph (1) pursuant to subparagraph (B)(ii) with respect to a preferred provider region, the Secretary shall provide for an appropriate transition to the payment system applicable under this subsection to the payment system described in the other provisions of this section in that region. Any amount expended by reason of the preceding sentence shall be considered to be part of the total amount expended as a result of the application of this subsection for purposes of applying the limitation under subparagraph (A).

"(B) APPLICATION OF LIMITATION.—If the Secretary determines that the application of this subsection will not cause the total amount that would have been expended under this title during the period if this subsection had not been enacted plus $65,000,000, and

"(C) TRANSITION.—If the Secretary rescinds a designation under subparagraph (A) or (B) of paragraph (1) pursuant to subparagraph (B)(ii) with respect to a preferred provider region, the Secretary shall provide for an appropriate transition to the payment system applicable under this subsection to the payment system described in the other provisions of this section in that region. Any amount expended by reason of the preceding sentence shall be considered to be part of the total amount expended as a result of the application of this subsection for purposes of applying the limitation under subparagraph (A).

"(D) APPLICATION.—Notwithstanding paragraph (1)(B), on or after January 1 of the year in which the fiscal year described in subparagraph (A)(ii) begins, the Secretary may designate appropriate regions under such subparagraph (A)(ii).

"(E) LIMITATION OF JUDICIAL REVIEW.—There shall be no administrative or judicial review under section 1852, section 1878, or otherwise, of designations made under subparagraph (A) or (B) of paragraph (1).

"(F) REPORT.—Not later than April 1 of each year (beginning in 2010), the Secretary shall submit a report to Congress and the Comptroller General of the United States that includes—

"(i) a detailed description of the total amount that would have been expended under this title in the year if this subsection had not been enacted;

"(ii) the projections of the total amount that will be expended as a result of the application of this subsection in the year in which the report is submitted compared to the total amount that would have been expended under this title in the year if this subsection had not been enacted;

"(iii) amounts remaining within the funding limitation specified in paragraph (5); and

"(iv) the steps that the Secretary will take under section 1322(a) to ensure that the application of this subsection will not cause expenditures to exceed...
the applicable amount described in paragraph (a)(A); and

(B) a certification from the Chief Actuary of the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services to the Secretary under clause (ii), (iii), and (iv) of subparagraph (A) that such estimates are reasonable, accurate, and based on generally accepted actuarial principles and methodologies.

(8) BIENIAL GAO REPORTS.—Not later than January 1, 2023, and biennially thereafter, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit a report to the Secretary and Congress on the designation of highly competitive regions under this subsection and the payment system under this subsection within such regions.

Each report shall include—

(i) an evaluation of—

(A) an evaluation of the quality of care provided to beneficiaries enrolled in a Medicare Advantage preferred provider plan in a highly competitive region;

(B) the satisfaction of beneficiaries with benefits under such a plan;

(C) the costs to the Medicare program for payments made to such plans; and

(D) any improvements in the delivery of health care services under such a plan;

(ii) a comparative analysis of the benchmark system applicable under the other provisions of this section and the payment system applicable in highly competitive regions under this subsection; and

(iii) recommendations for such legislation or administrative action as the Comptroller General determines to be appropriate.

(9) REPORT ON BUDGET NEUTRALITY FOR FISCAL YEARS AFTER 2012.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—If the Secretary intends to designate 1 or more regions as highly competitive regions with respect to calendar year 2014 or any subsequent calendar year, the Secretary shall submit a report to Congress indicating such intent no later than April 1 of the calendar year prior to the calendar year in which the applicable designation year begins.

(B) REQUIREMENTS.—A report submitted under subparagraph (A) shall—

(i) specify the steps (if any) that the Secretary will take pursuant to paragraph (B) to ensure that the total amount expended as a result of the application of this subsection during the year in which the applicable designation year begins does not exceed the applicable amount for the year (as defined in paragraph (a)(A)(ii)(I)); and

(ii) contain a certification from the Chief Actuary of the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services that such steps will meet the requirements of paragraph (b) based on an analysis using generally accepted actuarial principles and methodologies.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 1858(c)(3)(A)(i) (as added by section 211(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

‘‘(II) a detailed description of—

(I) the total amount expended under the Medicare fee-for-service program under parts A and B of title XVIII of the Social Security Act (including all amounts expended as a result of the projects under this section) during the previous year compared to the total amount that would have been expended under the original Medicare fee-for-service program in the year if the projects had not been conducted;

(ii) the projections of the total amount expended under the Medicare fee-for-service program under parts A and B of title XVIII of the Social Security Act (including all amounts expended as a result of the projects under this section) during the year in which the report is submitted compared to the total amount that would have been expended under the original Medicare fee-for-service program in the year if the projects had not been conducted;

(iii) amounts remaining within the funding limitation specified in paragraph (2); and

(iv) how the Secretary will change the scope, site, and duration of the projects in subsequent years in order to ensure that the projects described in subparagraphs (A) and (B) of paragraph (2) are not violated.''

(8) BIENIAL GAO REPORTS.—Not later than January 1, 2008, the Secretary shall submit a report to Congress concerning the review given the projects under subparagraph (A) which shall include estimates of the total costs of the demonstrations, including expenditures as a result of the provision of services provided to beneficiaries under the demonstrations that are incidental to the services provided under the demonstration, and all other expenditures under title XVIII of the Social Security Act. The report shall also include a certification from the Chief Actuary of the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services that such estimates are reasonable, accurate, and based on generally accepted actuarial principles and methodologies.

(2) PROJECTS.—Beginning in 2009, the Secretary, based on the empirical review conducted under paragraph (1), shall establish projects under which Medicare beneficiaries receive the enhanced benefits or services provided under the Medicare fee-for-service program under parts A and B of title XVIII of the Social Security Act or as otherwise determined by the Secretary. The purpose of such projects is to evaluate whether the provision of such enhanced benefits or services to such beneficiaries—

(A) improves the quality of care provided to such beneficiaries under the Medicare program;

(B) improves the health care delivery system under the Medicare program; and

(C) results in reduced expenditures under the Medicare program.

(3) ENHANCED BENEFITS OR SERVICES.—For purposes of this section, enhanced benefits or services shall include—

(A) preventive services not otherwise covered under title XVIII of the Social Security Act;

(B) chronic care coordination services;

(C) disease management services; or

(D) other benefits or services that the Secretary determines will improve preventive health care for Medicare beneficiaries, result in improved chronic disease management, and management of high-cost conditions and are consistent with the goals described in subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C) of paragraph (1).

(a) P R OJE C T S AND DURATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsection (e)(2), the projects under this section shall be conducted—

(A) in a region or regions that are comparable (as determined by the Secretary) to the region or regions that are designated as a highly competitive region under subparagraph (A) or (B) of section 1858(c)(3)(A)(i) (as added by section 211(b)) of the Social Security Act, as added by section 231 of this Act; and

(B) during the years that a region or regions are designated as such a highly competitive region.

(2) R ULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—For purposes of paragraph (1), a comparable region does not necessarily mean the identical region.

(A) WAIVER AUTHORITY.—The Secretary shall waive compliance with the requirements of title XVIII of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395 et seq.) only to the extent and for such period as the Secretary determines is necessary to provide for enhanced benefits or services consistent with the projects under this section.

(B) DETERMINATION.—The Secretary shall, after consultation with the appropriate Committees, make the determination described in subparagraph (A) within 30 days of the date on which a certification is submitted under subparagraph (A) and in any region or regions in which a comparable region has been designated.

(2) LIMITATION.—The total amount expended under the Medicare fee-for-service program under parts A and B of title XVIII of the Social Security Act during the period if the projects had not been conducted plus $6,000,000,000; and

(C) REPORT ON BUDGET NEUTRALITY FOR FISCAL YEARS AFTER 2013.—

(i) the total amount expended under the Medicare fee-for-service program under parts A and B of title XVIII of the Social Security Act (including all amounts expended as a result of the projects under this section) during the period if the projects had not been conducted;

(ii) the projections of the total amount expended under the Medicare fee-for-service program under parts A and B of title XVIII of the Social Security Act (including all amounts expended as a result of the projects under this section) during the year in which the report is submitted compared to the total amount that would have been expended under the original Medicare fee-for-service program in the year if the projects had not been conducted;
Mr. BAUCUS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 1054

Mr. BAUCUS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that all pending amendments so that I might call up amendment No. 1054 on behalf of Senator FEINGOLD, with respect to Medicare beneficiaries. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk read the following: The Senate from Montana [Mr. BAUCUS], for Mr. FEINGOLD, proposes an amendment numbered 1054.

Mr. BAUCUS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The amendment is as follows: (Purpose: To establish an Office of the Medicare Beneficiary Advocate) At the end of subtitle D of title I, add the following: SEC. 133. OFFICE OF THE MEDICARE BENEFICIARY ADVOCATE. (a) ESTABLISHMENT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall establish within the Department of Health and Human Services, an Office of the Medicare Beneficiary Advocate (in this section referred to as the "Office"). (b) DUTIES.—The Office shall carry out the following activities: (1) Establishing a toll-free telephone number for Medicare beneficiaries to use to obtain information on the Medicare program, and particularly with respect to the benefits provided under part D of title XVIII of the Social Security Act and the Medicare Prescription Drug plans and Medicare Advantage plans offering such benefits. The Office shall ensure that the telephone number accommodates beneficiaries with disabilities and limited-English proficiency. (2) Establishing an Internet website with easily accessible information regarding Medicare Prescription Drug plans and Medicare Advantage plans and the benefits offered under such plans. The website shall— (A) be updated to reflect changes in services and benefits, including with respect to the plans offered in a region and the associated monthly premiums, benefits offered, formularies, and contact information for such plans, and to ensure that there are no broken links or errors; (B) have printer-friendly, downloadable fact sheets on the Medicare coverage options and benefits; (C) be easy to navigate, with large print and easily recognizable links; and (D) provide links to the websites of the eligible entities participating in part D of title XVIII. (3) Providing regional publications to Medicare beneficiaries that include regional contacts for information, and that inform the beneficiaries of the prescription drug benefit options under title XVIII of the Social Security Act, including with respect to— (A) monthly premiums; (B) formularies; and (C) the services and benefits offered. (4) Conducting outreach to Medicare beneficiaries to inform the beneficiaries of the medicare coverage options and benefits under parts A, B, C, and D of title XVIII of the Social Security Act. (d) Actions relating to the Office.—The funds made available to the Office shall be used— (1) To operate the Office; and (2) To disseminate information and notices, including the following: (A) Information on the availability ofissuement of the Social Security Act.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BAUCUS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be modified with the changes I send to the desk. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has a right to modify her amendment. The amendment is so modified. The amendment (No. 942), as modified is as follows: On page 204, after line 22, insert the following: SEC. 133. PHARMACY BENEFIT MANAGERS TRANSPARENCY REQUIREMENTS. (a) MEDICARE.—Subpart 3 of part D of title XVIII of the Social Security Act (as added by section 101) is amended by adding at the end the following new section: "PHARMACY BENEFIT MANAGERS TRANSPARENCY REQUIREMENTS. "SEC. 13302. (a) PROHIBITION. "(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, an eligible entity offering a Medicare Prescription Drug plan under this part or a Medicare Advantage organization offering a Medicare Advantage plan under part C shall not enter into a contract with any pharmacy benefit manager (as defined by section 101) that is owned by a pharmaceutical manufacturing company.
Ms. CANTWELL. Madam President, I rise today to offer the Cantwell-Lincoln Prescription drug transparency amendment to S. 1, the Senate health care bill. I thank my cosponsor, Senator Lincoln, for working with me on this important amendment that will help protect consumers against high prescription drug prices. This amendment does three things.

First, it requires any PBM complying with subsection (a) to be liable for any administrative or judicial action or proceeding that may be relevant to the application of the Assistant Attorney General.

Second, the disclosure of these financial arrangements to the Department of Justice provides an incentive for PBMs to return as much of the savings as possible to Medicare, which will in turn, help reduce the high cost of prescription drugs.

Finally, it prohibits a pharmaceutical company from owning a pharmacy benefit manager, an inherent conflict of interest.

By requiring transparency, the Cantwell-Lincoln amendment works to prevent collusion on pricing and helps ensure seniors are not paying unnecessarily high prices for their medications.

PBMs have been the target ofnumerous lawsuits filed in recent years by health plans, employers and governments. The allegations in these lawsuits are always the same: overinflated drug prices, price collusion between PBMs and manufacturers, failure of PBMs to share discounts and rebates, and switching patients to more expensive drugs without the consent of the patient or the doctor.

The PBMs have denied wrongdoing and have settled in many cases. Last year, Merck agreed to pay $42.5 million to settle lawsuits over allegations that Medco improperly promoted higher priced Merck drugs when less expensive options from other pharmaceutical companies were available.

In 1998, Merck signed a settlement agreement with the Federal Trade Commission stating that, “Medco has given favorable treatment to Merck drugs.”

This admission is proof that pharmaceutical companies and PBMs have engaged in collusion on drug pricing in the past, extracting excessive profits from people who rely on these drugs. The Cantwell-Lincoln amendment is needed to help prevent price gouging in the future.

Other governments have struggled to keep a close watch on PBM practices. In 2000, one of the big four PBMs, Advanced PCS, was hired by the state of Arkansas to provide coverage for the state's 135,000 employees. A recent audit found that the PBM was overcharging the state for numerous drugs. During one 4-month period, the PBM overcharged the state $479,000 on generic drugs alone.

PBMs executives say that my amendment makes turning a profit impossible. It is true that PBMs are not charities but private companies with a duty to their shareholders to earn a profit.

Let's not forget, however, that these are also private companies charged with providing a Government-funded benefit in the best interests of 40 million senior citizens. These companies also are duty bound to get the most for the Government's $400 billion investment.

Traveling in my home State of Washington, I hear regularly from senior citizens about the high cost of prescription drugs. While seniors in my State, like elsewhere in the country, want a Medicare prescription drug benefit, they also desperately want some relief from high prescription drug prices. They say, “Stop the price gouging. Do something to make sure that prescription drugs are reasonably affordable for everyone.”

PBMs have come to dominate the prescription drug benefit market. Nearly 230 million Americans are served by one of the four largest PBMs.

According to the Centers for Medicaid and Medicare Services, national prescription drug spending increased by 15.7 percent in 2001. Despite promises from pharmacy benefit managers to lower costs, prescription drug prices continue to be the fastest growing sector of health care spending in this country.

Soaring in tandem with prescription drug prices are PBM profits. St. Louis-based Express Scripts—one of the four largest PBMs—provides coverage to 40 million people. The company reported that its net income grew 63 percent last year to $202 million.

One of the big four, Advance PCS, which covers 75 million people, was ranked by Fortune Magazine as the ninth fastest growing company in the nation based on its profits over the past 5 years.

Unfortunately, it has been near-impossible to find out whether PBMs are fairly sharing rebates and other savings with patients or simply using it to boost the bottom line.

Even the General Accounting Office has been unable to find out how rebates are being divided between PBMs and the Federal Employees Health Benefits Plan. A GAO requested by Senate Majority Leader Durbin last year failed to discover if the PBMs were passing along the savings because none of the PBMs financial documents were available for review.

PBMs are also private companies and employee groups that contract with PBMs have resorted to lawsuits to get access to this information.

The Cantwell-Lincoln amendment requires the PBM to disclose to the Department of Justice all financial arrangements that dictate what percentage of rebates and other savings are being passed back to the client.

This disclosure creates a major incentive for PBMs to return as much of the savings as possible to Medicare. This incentive also will help reduce prescription drug prices.

The PBMs have argued that reporting this financial information would kill their ability to continue to negotiate low drug prices. I am a businesswoman, and I understand the need to keep financial agreements confidential. That is why my amendment mandates that the information be handed over to the Department of Justice, where it remains confidential.

Department of Justice oversight also allows for regular review of these financial arrangements to weed out any potential collusion on pricing. This added protection also will help lower drug costs for seniors.

The Cantwell-Lincoln amendment also prohibits PBMs from being owned by pharmaceutical manufacturers. This cross-ownership is problematic because it could allow for pharmaceutical companies to collude with PBMs to favor the manufacturers more expensive drugs over less expensive alternatives.

A report on PBMs by the National Health Law Program points out the concerns raised by close relationships between PBMs and drug manufacturers. Close ties between the two could lead to a lack of drug choice for consumers, with one manufacturer's drugs getting preferential treatment by the PBM.

Actions taken this week by the U.S. attorney in Philadelphia reinforce the
need for greater PBM oversight as outlined in the Cantwell-Lincoln amendment.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that articles from the Washington Post and Wall Street Journal be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The June 26, 2003, edition of the Wall Street Journal contained an article titled "Medco's Mail Order Pharmacy: Behind the Scenes." The article, written by Barbara Martine, discusses a legal complaint filed against Medco Health Solutions Inc. by two former Medco pharmacists, alleging that the company engaged in activities that compromised patient care and cost containment.

The complaint, filed in the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, accuses Medco of using "cheaper, non-pharmacists employees" to handle mail-order prescriptions, resulting in inaccurate or delayed delivery of medications. The lawsuit seeks compensatory and punitive damages on behalf of the plaintiffs and other patients affected by Medco's practices.

The complaint highlights several areas of concern, including:

- Medco's use of non-pharmacists to handle mail-order prescriptions,
- Medco's failure to verify prescriptions before filling them,
- Medco's practice of canceling prescriptions without notifying patients,
- Medco's failure to replace prescription drugs on time,
- Medco's use of "cheaper, non-pharmacists employees" to handle mail-order prescriptions.

The plaintiffs, who are former Medco pharmacists, are seeking damages for the company's alleged violation of the federal False Claims Act.

The complaint is based on information obtained through a whistle-blower suit brought by two former Medco pharmacists, who claim that Medco has systematically been circumventing the proper handling and filling of prescriptions, compromising patient safety and the quality of care.

The lawsuit seeks to hold Medco accountable for its alleged practices, which the plaintiffs believe have resulted in significant harm to patients and the health care system.

The congressional hearing on this issue was scheduled for June 26, 2003, and was to feature testimony from representatives of various stakeholder groups, including industry officials, patient advocates, and government officials.
that may enhance the clout of pharmacy-benefit managers, industry analysts say. The companies are expected to administer government drug spending under some plans, according to tests conducted last year by the National Association of Chain Drug Stores, and to receive a larger share of government reimbursements for prescription drugs.

More than 82 million Americans get prescriptions processed through Medco, according to the company. Medco handles pharmacy visits worth nearly $30 billion a year, including $1.2 billion from Blue Cross/Blue Shield as part of the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program.

George Bradford Hunt and Walter W. Gauger, who both worked as pharmacists in Medco’s Las Vegas processing facility, and Joseph Placentile, a physician, alleged in their complaints that on busy days Medco would cancel or destroy prescriptions to avoid penalties for delays in filling orders. Customers would be told that the prescriptions had never been received, Sheehan said.

The company is also accused of fabricating records and, when the handwriting on prescriptions was unclear or difficult to read, simply guessing at what they said, according to Sheehan. The government’s suit against Medco could ask for damages in the millions of dollars if the court determines that Medco damaged the integrity of the system.

Merck acquired Medco in 1993 at a time when other drugmakers were purchasing pharmacy-benefit managers. By the end of the 1990s, the pharmaceutical manufacturing industry had changed, but Merck had sold their units amid concerns that the drug companies would use the benefit managers to push their own drugs, rather than what was best for clients.

In 1998 Merck signed a settlement agreement with the Federal Trade Commission stating that “Medco has given favorable treatment to Merck and other Merck-affiliated companies.” Last summer, Medco agreed to pay $42.5 million to settle a class-action lawsuit alleging that the company improperly promoted higher priced Merck drugs rather than seeking the best price from alternative pharmaceutical companies. Medco announced it intended to spin off Medco last year, but delayed the initial public offering of shares because of the depressed stock market.

Yesterday’s announcement marks the first significant legal action by a federal agency against a pharmacy benefit manager. Previ- ously, attorneys general of at least 25 states have opened inquiries into Medco to determine whether it has violated state laws, and New York State Attorney General E. S. Spitzer told last Friday that his office was investigating another company, Express Scripts Inc., for allegedly overbilling state health plans.

Shares of Merck closed yesterday at $62.11, down 78 cents, or 1.24 percent.

[From the Washington Post, June 24, 2003]

MEDCO ACCUSED OF FAVORING MERCK DRUGS

(BY DAVID B. CARUSO)

Federal prosecutors on Monday said a company that was supposed to help health plans find low-cost prescription drugs instead pressured doctors to switch patients to medications made by its own, pharmaceutical giant Merck & Co.

U.S. Attorney Patrick Meehan said his office has joined a pair of civil “whistleblower” lawsuits against Medco Health Solutions, accusing the Merck subsidiary of provid- ing false information to the federal government in connection with its contract to manage drug benefits for federal employees. More than 1,000 companies have hired Medco to manage prescription coverage for employee health plans, making it the nation’s largest manager of pharmacy benefits, and the company is supposed to use its bulk-purchasing power to lower drug costs.

But the suits say Merck routinely induced physicians to switch patients to Merck drugs, even if a patient had been doing well on another medication that cost less.

The government also says the company failed to care for doctors to explain prescriptions that were unclear, and fabricated records to make it appear as if calls from pharmacists to physicians had been made.

The three whistleblowers—a New Jersey doctor and two Nevada pharmacists who once worked for Medco—claim the firm also mislabeled their practice of accepting cash rebates from pharmaceutical companies in exchange for promoting their products. The suits claim the payments amount to kickbacks.

Medco spokesman Jeffrey Simek said the charges are “either absolutely untrue, or they reflect years-old isolated issues that were identified and corrected.”

He denied the firm gives preferential treat- ment to Merck, or any other drug company. “Our policy is that we will never make a drug more expensive when it will not result in a benefit for either our clients, or the members of their health plans,” he said. “If we improperly favored any drug by any single company, we would not succeed.”

Several health plans have previously sued Medco, claiming that it improperly accepted $3.56 billion in payments from drug compa- nies in exchange for promoting their products, but Monday’s filing by the U.S. Attorney in Philadelphia is the first such action by a federal prosecutor.

By spinning off Medco, like other pharmacy benefit companies, Merck acknowledges participating in rebate programs. Simek said the company took in $2.5 billion in rebates in 2001. But he said the payments work like coupons and ultimately lower medication costs for clients.

The suits also accuse Medco, of Franklin Lakes, N.J., of shortchanging patients by mailing them fewer than the number of pills they paid for. They say the company tried to avoid penalties for delays in filling mail order orders by destroying prescriptions on days when the order volume was heavy.

Simek said the company investigated the allegations and determined they were iso- lated incidents of customer care. Two employees were fired, he said.

Court filings identified the whistleblowers as Dr. Joseph Placentile, of New Jersey, and George Bradford Hunt and Walter W. Gauger, who were identified as two pharmacists who previously worked for Medco in Las Vegas.

Attorneys general in several states have said they are also investigating whether the company, and other pharmacy benefit firms, broke the law.

Merck has been trying to spin off its Medco business. It canceled a plan in July to offer for the company in July after revealing that it had misstated its revenues by $12 billion in recent years by counting prescription rebates as drug revenues, not Medco revenue. Simek said in May that the firm would be spun off instead to Merck share- holders.

Ms. CANTWELL. Madam President, it was important this that U.S. At- torney Patrick Meehan plans to join a pair of lawsuits filed by three former Medco Health employees. The employ- ees—two pharmacists and a doctor—a- llege that Medco provided misleading information to the government related to a contract to provide drug coverage for Federal employees. The lawsuits accuse Medco of switching patients to more expensive drugs and fabricating records to make it look as if the pre- scriptio changes were made by do- ctors and not by Medco.

These are serious allegations result- ing from an investigation that began in 1999. This is the first such action taken by the government, and there is a strong signal that all is not right with this industry.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous con- sent that letters of support be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the mate- rial is ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONSUMERS UNION,

DEAR SENATOR: As the Senate continues to debate S. 1, the “Prescription Drug and Medicare Improvement Act of 2003,” Consu- mers Union urges you to redouble your ef- forts to improve the legislation so that it better meets the needs of seniors and people with disabilities, many of whom are in dire need of meaningful protection from the devastat- ing impact of spiraling prescription drug costs.

Some of Consumers Union’s most serious concerns about S. 1 are:

The amount set aside in the Congressional budget resolution for a Medicare prescrip- tion drug bill, $400 billion over 10 years, is in- adequate for the task and limits coverage to only generics. This is the first, and possibly last, prescription drug expenditures over this time period.

Prescription drug coverage provided by S. 1 is inadequate, leaving many beneficiaries who lack coverage in 2003 actually paying more out of their own pockets for prescription drugs in 2007, when they have coverage. (For more information, please see our report, Skimpy Benefits and Unchecked Expendi- tures: Medicare Prescription Drug Bills Fail to Offer Adequate Protection for Seniors and People with Disabilities, at www.consumersunion.org).

The bill lacks a standard, uniform benefit, does not guarantee the availability of a pre- scriptio benefit, or otherwise cover prescription drug expenditures, and leaves all beneficiaries uncer- tain about what coverage will be available to them (and uncertain about the premium they will be charged).

While the Senate has approved helpful amendments that would accelerate the intro- duction of generics and possibly provide beneficiaries access to lower-priced drugs from Canada, the bill’s reliance on hundreds of private insurance companies and HMOs raises serious concerns about the possibility of the federal gov- ernment using its purchasing power to nego- tiate deep discounts for consumers. It does too little, therefore, to rein in spiraling pre- scriptio drug expenditures.

The bill creates confusion for Medicare beneficiaries, forcing them to sort out the
need to curb prescription drug expenditures.
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There are several amendments that would

help address some of the problems with S. 1. We

urge you to support amendments that would:

Expand the prescription drug benefits so that

they are comparable to prescription drug

coverage in employer-based health insur-

ance plans.

Rein in prescription drug expenditures through

the use of the federal government’s buying

power to negotiate deep discounts;

Provide for scientific study of the compara-

tive effectiveness of alternative pre-

scription drug benefit designs;

Guarantee that beneficiaries would have access
to a prescription drug benefit through the

Medicare program at a set premium;

Count the contributions made by employ-

ers toward beneficiaries’ out-of-pocket costs;

Maintain a level-playing field so that bene-

ficiaries in PPOs and HMOs are not more gen-

erous than benefits available in traditional

fee-for-service Medicare;

Instruct the National Association of Insur-

ance Commissioners to adjust medigap ben-

efit packages to allow beneficiaries to buy

additional prescription drug coverage;

Increase the transparency of transactions by phar-

maceutical benefit managers;

Cut the time before the prescription drug

benefits begin.

The current debate about a Medicare pre-

scription drug benefit has led seniors and

persons with disabilities to believe that rel-

ief is in sight. In many ways, this bill will be

a big disappointment to beneficiaries

when it is implemented in 2006. We urge you to

amend S. 1 so that it is more effective in

providing meaningful relief to Medicare

beneficiaries while addressing the pressing

need to curb prescription drug expenditures.

Sincerely,

GAIL E. SHEarer,
Director, Health Policy Analysis,
Washington Office.

Hon. MARIA CANTWELL,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR CANTWELL: As you know,
union members and retirees in Washington
are very concerned about the current activi-
ties involving prescription drug benefits for
Medicare seniors. We thought you should
know that we are part of a national delega-
tion of unions that met with Secretary
Thompson to express our opposition to
any PBM-based alternative to our local
pharmacies.

PBM’s own much of the mail order drug

service in this country. For the past 2 years,
we have been warning congressional mem-
bers that a PBM-based benefit would poten-
tially harm many local pharmacies that

serve our communities. Still however, law-
makers almost passed a PBM-based benefit
in the 107th Congress.

Since last year, the reputation of PBMs has
grown worse. Now they are being sued by
a California-based union, AFSCME. Alleg-
edly, four of the largest PBMs have been
pocketing money that is meant for the con-
sumption.

SPEEA urges you and your fellow Senators
to look into this lawsuit before passing any
PBM-based legislation. In this day and age,
transparency must be part of any program
set up by the United States government.

Sincerely,

CHARLES BOFFERDING,
Executive Director.

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF STATE,
COUNTY AND MUNICIPAL EMPLOY-
EES, AFL-CIO,

Hon. MARIA CANTWELL,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR CANTWELL: On behalf of
AFSCME’s 1.4 million members, I am writing
to express my strong support for your amend-
ment to S. 1, the Medicare prescrip-
tion drug bill, that would make certain that
cost savings generated by Pharmacy Benefit
Managers (PBM) on behalf of the Medicare
program are returned to the program. We be-
lieve that this is a critical means of control-
ing costs for this new benefit.

PBMs create most of their cost savings and
their profits by negotiating with drug manu-
facturers to receive favorable rates on a
pharmaceutical company’s drugs in ex-
change for including the drugs on the PBM’s
formulary preferred medicines. This bill
would require that all contracts with PBMs
to provide the Medicare benefit with a pri-

date insurer or the government itself include
language that would allow all savings
negotiated with a pharmacy be passed back
to the government or the private insurer ad-

ministering the benefit on behalf of the
government.

We believe it is crucial that PBMs be re-

quired to disclose the percentage of rebate
they have negotiated with the pharma-
caceutical companies that are passed onto
their clients. Your amendment would do
precisely that—giving some assurance to con-

sumers and the government that the savings
achieved by the PBMs are being shared.

I believe that your amendment goes a long
way toward ensuring that Medicare bene-

ficiaries are the real beneficiaries of the

cost savings produced by contracts with
PBMs, and AFSCME strongly supports its ad-

option.

Sincerely,

CHARLES M. LOVELESS,
Director of Legislation.

DEAR SENATOR CANTWELL: On behalf of
AFSCME’s 1.4 million members, I am writing
to express my strong support for your amend-
ment to S. 1, the Medicare prescrip-
tion drug bill, that would make certain that
cost savings generated by Pharmacy Benefit
Managers (PBM) on behalf of the Medicare
program are returned to the program. We be-
lieve that this is a critical means of control-
ing costs for this new benefit.

PBMs create most of their cost savings and
their profits by negotiating with drug manu-
facturers to receive favorable rates on a
pharmaceutical company’s drugs in ex-
change for including the drugs on the PBM’s
formulary preferred medicines. This bill
would require that all contracts with PBMs
to provide the Medicare benefit with a pri-

date insurer or the government itself include
language that would allow all savings
negotiated with a pharmacy be passed back
to the government or the private insurer ad-

ministering the benefit on behalf of the
government.

We believe it is crucial that PBMs be re-

quired to disclose the percentage of rebate
they have negotiated with the pharma-
caceutical companies that are passed onto
their clients. Your amendment would do
precisely that—giving some assurance to con-

sumers and the government that the savings
achieved by the PBMs are being shared.

I believe that your amendment goes a long
way toward ensuring that Medicare bene-

ficiaries are the real beneficiaries of the

cost savings produced by contracts with
PBMs, and AFSCME strongly supports its ad-

option.

Sincerely,

GAIL E. SHEarer,
Director, Health Policy Analysis,
Washington Office.

Hon. MARIA CANTWELL,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR CANTWELL: Families USA,
the national consumer health advocacy orga-

nization, strongly endorses your amendment
to S. 1 to require that the savings achieved
by the PBMs be shared with beneficiaries.

We believe that your amendment would not
only make PBM savings available to bene-
deficiaries but also ensure that PBMs do not
profit from making patients pay for the
costs of buying brand name drugs. Congress
ought to make sure that PBMs do not benefit
from profiting on patients’ health care.

Sincerely,

RICHARD CARLSON,
President.

Families USA.

WASHINGTON STATE
PHARMACY ASSOCIATION,

Hon. MARIA CANTWELL,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR CANTWELL: The Washington
State Pharmacy Association, representing
pharmacy practitioners from all practice
areas in the State of Washington, strongly
endorses your amendment to ensure that the

savings generated by Pharmacy Benefit
Managers (PBM) on behalf of the Medicare
program are returned to the program.

We believe it is crucial that PBMs be re-

quired to disclose the percentage of rebate
they have negotiated with the pharma-
caceutical companies that are passed onto
their clients. Your amendment would do
precisely that—giving some assurance to con-

sumers and the government that the savings
achieved by the PBMs are being shared.

I believe that your amendment goes a long
way toward ensuring that Medicare bene-

ficiaries are the real beneficiaries of the

cost savings produced by contracts with
PBMs, and AFSCME strongly supports its ad-

option.

Sincerely,

RONALD F. POLLACK,
Executive Director.

WASHINGTON STATE
PHARMACY ASSOCIATION,

Hon. MARIA CANTWELL,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR CANTWELL: The Washington
State Pharmacy Association, representing
pharmacy practitioners from all practice
areas in the State of Washington, strongly
endorses your amendment to ensure that the

savings generated by Pharmacy Benefit
Managers (PBM) on behalf of the Medicare
program are returned to the program.

We believe it is crucial that PBMs be re-

quired to disclose the percentage of rebate
they have negotiated with the pharma-
caceutical companies that are passed onto
their clients. Your amendment would do
precisely that—giving some assurance to con-

sumers and the government that the savings
achieved by the PBMs are being shared.

I believe that your amendment goes a long
way toward ensuring that Medicare bene-

ficiaries are the real beneficiaries of the

cost savings produced by contracts with
PBMs, and AFSCME strongly supports its ad-

option.

Sincerely,

CEO.

RIGHTEOUS BUSINESS,
CEO.
Ms. CANTWELL. Madam President, these groups and others have been trying to call attention to problematic PBM practices. These groups rightly point out that strong consumer protections are needed in any Medicare drug benefit.

The American Association of State, County and Municipal Employees agrees that these protections provide “a critical means of controlling costs.”

A number of coalition of workers representing more than 20 states also are supportive of efforts to monitor PBMs. Many in this coalition currently use PBMs to provide benefits and many of them are wondering why drug costs continue to rise.

There is a balance to be had here, and the Cantwell-Lincoln amendment makes sure the scale is not tipped too far one way. It is a good amendment that will lower prescription drug prices, provide much needed consumer protections and ensure strong government oversight. I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Is the amendment before us now?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is before us.

Mr. GRASSLEY. We have looked at the amendment on this side. It has been modified, and I urge we accept it on a voice vote.

Mr. BAUCUS. We have looked at this amendment. I agree with Senator Grassley. We accept the amendment.

Mr. GRASSLEY. We move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. BAUCUS. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. BAUCUS. We move to lay that motion on the table. The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. BAUCUS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak out of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the Chair. (The remarks of Mr. BYRD are printed in today’s Record under “Morning Business.”)

AMENDMENT NO. 1099

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the pending amendments be temporarily set aside.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. On behalf of the Senator from South Dakota, Senator JOHNSON, I send an amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report as follows:

The assistant legislative clerk read the amendment as follows:

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. Reid], for himself and Mr. COCHRAN, proposes an amendment numbered 1099.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To provide for a 3-year medication therapy management services program under parts A and B of title XVIII of the Social Security Act to eligible beneficiaries.

At the end of subheading I of title I, add the following:

SEC. 111. MEDICATION THERAPY MANAGEMENT ASSESSMENT PROGRAM.

(a) Establishment.—

(1) In general.—The Secretary shall establish an assessment program to contract with qualified pharmacists to provide medication therapy management services to eligible beneficiaries who receive care under the original Medicare fee-for-service program under parts A and B of title XVIII of the Social Security Act to eligible beneficiaries.

(2) Sites.—The Secretary shall designate in geographic areas each containing less than 3 sites, or which have been modified, and I urge we accept it on a voice vote.

Mr. BAUCUS. We have looked at this amendment. I agree with Senator Grassley. We accept the amendment.

Mr. GRASSLEY. We move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. BAUCUS. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. BAUCUS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak out of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the Chair. (The remarks of Mr. BYRD are printed in today’s Record under “Morning Business.”)

AMENDMENT NO. 1099

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the pending amendments be temporarily set aside.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. On behalf of the Senator from South Dakota, Senator JOHNSON, I send an amendment to the desk.

(1) In general.—Subject to paragraph (2), the Secretary shall provide for the transfer from the Federal Supplementary Insurance Trust Fund established under section 1845 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395t) of such funds as are necessary for the costs of carrying out the assessment program under this section.

(2) Budget neutrality.—In conducting the assessment program under this section, the Secretary shall ensure that the aggregate payments made by the Secretary do not exceed the amount which the Secretary would have paid if the assessment program under this section was not implemented.

(3) Waiver authority.—The Secretary may waive such requirements of titles XI and XVIII of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1301 et seq.; 1395 et seq.) as may be necessary for the purpose of carrying out the assessment program under this section.

(g) Availability of data.—During the period in which the assessment program is conducted, the Secretary annually shall make available data regarding:

(1) the geographic areas and sites designated under subsection (a)(2);

(2) the number of eligible beneficiaries participating in the program under subsection (b) and the levels and types medication therapy management services used by such beneficiaries;

(3) the number of qualified pharmacists with contracts under subsection (c), the location of such pharmacists, and the number of eligible beneficiaries served by such pharmacists; and

(4) the types of payment methodologies being tested under subsection (d)(2).

(h) Report.—

(1) In general.—Not later than 6 months after the completion of the assessment program under this section, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a final report summarizing the final outcome of the program and evaluating the results of the program, together with recommendations for such legislation and administrative action as the Secretary determines to be appropriate.

(2) Assessment of payment methodologies.—The final report submitted under paragraph (1) shall include an assessment of the feasibility and appropriateness of the various payment methodologies tested under subsection (d)(2).

(i) Definitions.—In this section:

(1) Medication therapy management services.—The term “medication therapy management services” means services or programs furnished by a qualified pharmacist to an eligible beneficiary, individually or on behalf of a pharmacy provider, which are designed—

(A) to ensure that medications are used appropriately by such individual;

(B) to enhance the individual’s understanding of the appropriate use of medications;

(C) to increase the individual’s compliance with prescription medication regimens;

(D) to reduce the risk of potential adverse events associated with medications; and

(E) to reduce the need for other costly medical services through better management of medication therapy.

(2) Eligible beneficiary.—The term “eligible beneficiary” means an individual who is—

(A) entitled to (or enrolled for) benefits under part A and enrolled for benefits under part B of the original Medicare fee-for-service program under parts A and B of title XVIII of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395 et seq.; 1395f et seq.); or

(B) enrolled with a Medicare+Choice plan, Medicare Advantage plan, or Medicare Part D prescription drug plan.

(Mr. REID. Mr. President, I move to lay this amendment on the table. Without objection, it is so ordered. The remarks of Mr. REID are printed in today’s Record under “Morning Business.”)
(i) the treatment of asthma, diabetes, or chronic cardiovascular disease, including an individual on anticoagulation or lipid reducing medications; or
(ii) any other chronic diseases as the Secretary may specify.

(3) QUALIFIED PHARMACIST.—The term "qualified pharmacist" means an individual who is a pharmacist in standing with the State Board of Pharmacy.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator KENNEDY’s comments I be recognized to offer an amendment to the Boxer amendment. I further ask unanimous consent that this morning the Senate proceed to a vote in relation to the McConnell amendment, to be followed immediately by a vote in relation to the Bingaman amendment numbered 1065, with no second degrees in order to the three above amendments prior to the vote, with 2 minutes equally divided prior to the vote, with 10 minutes equally divided before the first vote.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, it is my understanding that as soon as Senator KENNEDY finishes his speech Senators MCCONNELL and BOXER will be recognized, with the time equally divided, and then we go into the series of votes. Is that right?

Mr. MCCONNELL. That is my understanding.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Massachusetts is recognized.

AMENDMENT NO. 1092

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, we will have a chance to have greater discussion and debate on one of the important amendments that is before the Senate. But I wanted to bring to the attention of our Members as we go through the course of the day the Grassley-Baucus amendment, which has two different parts to it. I would like to address the part of the amendment which I find enormously compelling and which deserves the broad support of all the Members of this body.

This amendment provides equal funding for Medicare and the private plan demonstration plans. That is effectively what will be in the Grassley-Baucus amendment. The Republicans say the private sector can do a better job at providing care for patients who say Medicare can do a better job. This amendment tests both. This amendment improves the coordination of care for seniors with multiple chronic conditions who remain in Medicare.

Republicans have said we need to move seniors into private plans if we want to provide chronic care coordination, disease management, or enhanced preventive services.

I am confident this demonstration program will show Medicare can do an even better job than private plans in providing preventive health services and ensuring care coordination. Care for patients with chronic conditions is especially critical. These patients account for 95 percent of Medicare spending, according to “Care Coordination for People with Chronic Conditions”, an analysis published this year by Johns Hopkins University.

Americans have multiple chronic conditions, and that number is expected to grow to 157 million by the year 2020.

Sixty-two percent of seniors have multiple chronic conditions, but their care is fragmented. For example, a senior citizen may get treatment for her diabetes from one doctor, care for her arthritis from a second doctor and attention for her high blood pressure from a third.

Study after study shows that improving the coordination of care for those with multiple chronic conditions can improve outcomes and reduce costs.

For example, in Laconia, New Hampshire, the Home and Community Based Care program—SOURCE—program improved disease management for seniors with multiple conditions. This program saved an average of $8,100 in health care costs for each senior and decreased admission to nursing homes.

In Georgia, the Service Options Using Research to Enhance Coordination—SOURCE—program improved disease management for 1,600 beneficiaries in 80 counties. The costs of caring for those seniors in the SOURCE program over two years was over $4,000 lower than for those who were not in the program.

My own state of Massachusetts is part of the New England States Consortium, a multi-state effort funded by the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation to study the improvements that can be made in health care through better care coordination.

Expert groups in health care have said that care coordination should be one of the highest priorities for our health care system. For example, in its recent report, Priority Areas for National Action: Transforming Health Care Quality, the Institute of Medicine identified 20 “priority areas” for improving health care.

The Institute of Medicine has carefully examined the issue of care quality. The Institute’s recent report, “Priority Areas for National Action” has a series of recommendations on improving the quality of health care in America: for example, in Amendment 13 of the 20 priority items that have been identified by the Institute of Medicine that will make a significant difference in quality. The amendment will have an important impact in reducing costs by improving care coordination and providing needed preventive services.

A recent study funded by the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation reaches the same conclusion. The study examined the health benefits and costs of health care for seniors in the SOURCE program. The study found that care coordination can reduce costs by $800 per patient.

This amendment will give us an opportunity to take dramatic steps forward in Medicare which will strengthen and improve the quality of health care for our seniors. The amendment will also have a very positive impact in terms of cost reductions.

This amendment also addresses the whole question of prevention which is equally critical to keeping people healthy. Immunizations, managing high blood pressure, cancer screening, and patient education can all have an enormous impact on keeping people healthy and reducing costs. Too often Medicare pays huge amounts to care for people who are sick but fails to invest adequately in preventing illnesses.

We believe that the kinds of quality improvement initiatives included in this amendment will be a major factor for the support for this legislation. Health care quality and its impact on health care costs is an aspect of the health care debate that has not received sufficient attention.

Failure to invest adequately in preventive services is a tragic consequence of the repayment system we now have under the Medicare system. When the original Medicare system was established, we did not have the knowledge, awareness, and understanding of the importance of prevention nearly to the extent we have it today. Preventive care was not reimbursed the way it should be.

With this amendment, we will have the opportunity to provide the kinds of real, effective support for prevention programs they deserve. Increased support for preventive services will mean terms of their blood glucose levels.

Elevated blood glucose is a major concern for patients with diabetes, and preventive services are effective in keeping blood glucose levels down. As we know, diabetes is one of the principal health concerns for our country, and is of particular concern for our seniors.

A decrease of even one percentage point in the blood glucose level of a patient with diabetes can have a profound effect on health. That seemingly small decrease results in a 21 percent drop in the mortality from the complications of diabetes, a 24 percent decrease in renal failure, and a remarkable 43 percent drop in the amputations that so many patients face as a result of this cruel disease. More effective management of blood glucose levels is also effective in keeping patients out of hospitals or nursing homes and thus reducing costs. A reduction in blood glucose levels of just one percent reduces health care costs by $800 per patient.

These kinds of extraordinary improvements in health care quality are what this amendment is all about. We are going to provide some $6 billion nationwide over a 5-year period to give physicians and hospitals the incentive to improve their care, and we are going to challenge the private sector to do it as well.

We believe that the kinds of quality improvement initiatives included in this amendment will be a major factor for the support for this legislation. Health care quality and its impact on health care costs is an aspect of the health care debate that has not received sufficient attention.

Failure to invest adequately in preventive services is a tragic consequence of the repayment system we now have under the Medicare system. When the original Medicare system was established, we did not have the knowledge, awareness, and understanding of the importance of prevention nearly to the extent we have it today. Preventive care was not reimbursed the way it should be.

With this amendment, we will have the opportunity to provide the kinds of real, effective support for prevention programs they deserve. Increased support for preventive services will mean terms of their blood glucose levels.
lower costs and better quality of care for our seniors under Medicare.

As I mentioned, too often we pay huge amounts to care for people who are sick, but fail to invest in keeping people healthy. This amendment gives Medicare the high quality care for the sickest patients. Medicare is a fine program. It has kept our senior citizens secure for 40 years. Today let us make Medicare even better with this amendment.

I will include the selective parts of the studies I referred to previously in the RECORD. I ask unanimous consent that the selective parts be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1).

Mr. Kennedy. Mr. President, as I mentioned, the New England Journal of Medicine—in a major study published focuses on the problem of quality. The study demonstrates that the problem most likely to occur in our health care system is not over-utilization of services, but under-utilization. This point bears repeating. Patients medical care are not receiving the services they need to keep them healthy. 46 percent of patients did not receive the recommended care, while only 11 percent received care that was not recommended and was potentially harmful. That means that four times as many patients did not receive the care they needed as received care they did not need. The problem in our health care system is not overutilization of services, but underutilization.

The problem of not receiving needed care is particularly acute for some of the most serious disorders that affect seniors. The New England Journalarticle states that less than a quarter of patients with diabetes received recommended blood tests. Fewer than two-thirds of patients with high blood pressure received the recommended care. These two diseases alone take an extraordinary toll on the lives of our citizens. Nearly 600,000 seniors die each year from heart disease, and complications of diabetes kill over 50,000 seniors. We could dramatically reduce the serious toll of these diseases—and many others—by improving access to preventive services and enhancing the quality of care.

Modern medicine—and a strong Medicare program—have been effective in allowing seniors to live with chronic conditions that once were fatal. Millions of seniors are alive today because of advances in the treatment of heart disease, diabetes, and other serious illnesses. As a result of this success, however, millions of seniors have multiple chronic conditions which put them at higher risk for illness and hospitalization. The Institute of Medicine reports that only 0.7 percent of seniors with just one chronic condition require hospitalization in any given year. 62 percent of seniors with 4 chronic conditions are hospitalized in a given year. 25 percent of seniors with 10 or more chronic conditions require a hospital stay. Currently, 60 million Americans have multiple chronic conditions, and that number is expected to grow to 157 million over the next two decades.

Improving the coordination of care for those with multiple chronic conditions can markedly improve outcomes. Yet the average Medicare beneficiary sees more than six different doctors in a year. Clearly, we need to do more to see that seniors receive the most appropriate care for all their conditions—not just the one that any particular doctor among these six is treating individually. Study after study cited by the Institute of Medicine indicates that care is inadequately coordinated for patients with some of the most serious diseases.

Our health care system also fails to provide adequate preventive services. Survival rates for many forms of cancer increase dramatically if the disease is detected early—yet far too few patients receive the type of early screening that can literally mean the difference between life and death. For example, early diagnosis of colon cancer can result in a survival rate of 90 percent, but that survival rate drops precipitously if the cancer spreads or grows before it is detected. Early detection not only saves lives—it reduces costs too. Proper screening can save up to $25,000 for every patient who avoids painful and lengthy treatment through early detection of cancer. Despite this compelling evidence of the value of preventive services, only a third of patients receive the recommended form of colorectal cancer screening.

The story is the same with adult immunization. Pneumonia and influenza are the seventh leading cause of death in the United States, and the fifth leading cause of death among seniors. Over a third of seniors with invasive pneumonia will die of the disease. Many cases of these diseases are preventable with a simple immunization—yet one-third to one-half of all seniors do not receive needed immunizations. Coverage rates for high-risk seniors are particularly poor. Tragically, only about a quarter of seniors with chronic disease receive a flu shot.

This very important amendment will address these challenges which the Institute of Medicine, the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, and the New England Journal of Medicine have all commented on as being critical if we are going to strengthen quality and begin to get a greater handle on costs.

I will refer to the part of the amendment dealing with Medicare. I ask unanimous consent to include the section of the bill containing this provision in the RECORD.

Mr. President, as I mentioned, the amendment provides chronic care coordination services, disease management services and other benefits that the Secretary will determine to improve preventive health care for Medicare beneficiaries. These services will improve chronic disease management and management of complex life threatening or high-cost conditions. The amendment will make a real difference in improving the health of millions of seniors.

This is really a historic opportunity. I can say, having been here for some period of time, the idea that you would get $6 billion over 5 years to be able to support prevention and the coordination of care for our seniors—and didn't be the most widely discussed or debated issue I have ever seen or had that chance with this amendment.

I think one of the most important aspects of this legislation is its emphasis on the area of prevention, which is so important, as I have just described. Increased support for preventive health care services will improve and strengthen the quality of health care and also result in savings for the Medicare system. We have seen how these services help the intensely ill and sick patients with some of the most serious disorders. We have seen how these services help the intensely ill and sick patients with some of the most serious disorders. And we will have the evidence—ample evidence—to show that action in this area can make a very important difference to the elderly.

I will let others describe the other part of the amendment dealing with private plans. But we challenge them, after the 5 years in which the resources will be spent—with a GAO study that will report back how the money has been spent—we challenge them to see which will make the greatest difference in terms of quality of care for our senior population and will make a difference in terms of the savings in the Medicare system. There is no question in my mind—no question in my mind—what that GAO report will demonstrate. We have clear documentation and scientific information that talks about the various studies that have been done to date, and also the conclusions that have been reached by thoughtful, nonpartisan groups in this very area.

We welcome the opportunity to show to the American people which system is really going to work effectively. At the end of that period of time, we will have the chance to enhance and improve on that, to make sure the future generations' health care will be strengthened.

Mr. President, in this amendment, which will be before us very soon, will receive overwhelming support because I think it will have a real chance to evaluate the different approaches and see what
is going to be most effective in terms of quality and cost.

**Blood Glucose—Reductions Pay Off**

Longitudinal studies demonstrate that a one percentage point reduction in Hemoglobin A1C (blood glucose) results in: 14% decrease in total inpatient care; 25% decrease in diabetes-related deaths; 14% decrease in myocardial infarction; 12% decrease in strokes; 45% decrease in amputations; 24% decrease in renal failure; and $800 reduction in health care costs.

**Problems with Quality of Care**

The problem with quality that is most likely to occur, is underuse: 46.3 percent of patients did not receive recommended care. With overuse, 11.3 percent of participants received care that was not recommended and was potentially harmful.

**Variations in Quality**

There is substantial variability in the quality-of-care patients receive for the 25 conditions for which at least 100 persons were eligible for analysis. Persons with severe conditions received care at 61 percent of the recommended level. Persons with intermediate conditions were generally not sensitive to the presence or absence of any single indicator of quality.

**Discussion**

Overall, participants received about half of the recommended processes involved in care. These deficits in care have important implications for the health of the American public. For example, only 24 percent of participants were identified as having diabetes, receiving three or more glycosylated hemoglobin tests over a two-year period. This routine monitoring is essential to the assessment of the effectiveness of treatment, to ensuring appropriate responses to poor glycemic control, and to the identification of complications of the disease at an early stage so that serious consequences may be prevented.

In our study, persons with hypertension received 64.7 percent of the recommended care. We have previously demonstrated a link between blood-pressure control and adherence to process-related measures of quality of care for hypertension. Persons whose blood pressure is persistently above normal are at increased risk for disease, stroke, and death. Poor blood-pressure control contributes to more than 68,000 preventable deaths annually.

**Final List of Priority Areas**

The committee’s selection process yielded a final set of 20 priority areas for improvement in health care quality. Improving the delivery of care in any of these areas would enable stakeholders at the national, state, and local levels to begin setting a course for quality health care while addressing unacceptably disparities in care for all Americans. We have made no attempt to rank order the priority areas selected. The first 2 listed—care coordination and self-management—health literacy—are cross-cutting areas in which improvements would benefit a broad array of patients. The 17 that follow represent the continuum of care across the life span and are relevant to preventive care, infectious care, and care of patients with chronic conditions, end-of-life care, and behavioral health, as well as to care for children and adolescents (see boxes ES-1 to ES-6). Finally, the 13 conditions are listed as an "emerging area" that does not at this point satisfy the selection criteria as fully as the other 19 priority areas.

**Recommendation 3**: The committee recommends that DHHS, along with other public and private entities, focus on the following priority areas for transforming health care:

- Care coordination (cross-cutting);
- Self-management/health literacy (cross-cutting);
- Asthma—appropriate treatment for persons with mild/moderate persistent asthma;
- Cancer screening that is evidence-based—focus on colorectal cancer;
- Children with special health care needs;
- Diabetes—focus on appropriate management;
- End of life with advanced organ system failure—focus on congestive heart failure and chronic obstructive pulmonary disease;
- Frailty associated with old age—preventing falls and pressure ulcers, maximizing function, and developing advanced care plans;
- Hypertension—focus on appropriate management of early disease;
- Immunization—children and adults;
- Ischemic heart disease—prevention, reduction of recurring events, and optimization of functional capacity;
- Major depression—screening and treatment;
- Medication management—preventing medication errors and overdose of antibiotics;
- Nosocomial infections—prevention and surveillance;
- Pain control in advanced cancer;
- Pregnancy and childbirth—appropriate prenatal and intrapartum care;
- Severe and persistent mental illness—focus on treatment in the public sector;
- Stroke—early intervention and rehabilitation;
- Tobacco dependence treatment in adults;
- Obesity (emerging area).

**Care Coordination—Rationale for Selection**

Nearly half of the population—125 million Americans—lives with some type of chronic condition. About 60 million live with multiple such conditions. And more than 3 million—2.5 million women and 750,000 men—live with five such conditions (Partnership for Solutions, 2001). For those afflicted by one or more chronic conditions, coordination of care over time and across multiple health care providers is essential. Yet in a survey of over 1,200 physicians conducted in 2001, two-thirds of respondents reported that their training was not adequate to coordinate care for patients with chronic conditions (Partnership for Solutions, 2001).

More than 50 percent of patients with hypertension (Joint National Committee on Prevention, 1997), diabetes (Clark et al., 2000), tobacco addiction (Perez-Stable and Fuentes-Afflick, 1998), hyperlipidemia (McCoy et al., 1995), and heart failure (Ni et al., 1998), chronic atrial fibrillation (Samsa et al., 2000), asthma (Legorreta et al., 2000), and depression (Young et al., 2001) are currently undermanaged. Among the Medicare-eligible population, the average beneficiary sees 6.4 different physicians in a year, 4.6 of those being in the outpatient setting (Anderson, 2002).

**Cancer Screening That Is Evidence-Based—Rationale for Selection**

Colorectal cancer is the third most common cancer among men and women in the United States, with an estimated incidence of 140,300 cases annually. In 2002, 56,600 Americans died from colorectal cancer, making it the nation’s second leading cause of cancer-related death. Life expectancy for developing colorectal cancer is approximately 6 percent with over 90 percent of cases occurring after age 50 (American Cancer Society, 2002). The estimated long-term cost of treating stage II colon cancer is approximately $60,000 (Brown et al., 2002).

Cervical cancer is the ninth most common cancer among women in the United States, with an estimated incidence of 13,000 cases annually. Cervical cancer ranks thirteenth among all causes of cancer death, with about 4,100 women dying of the disease each year (American Cancer Society, 2002). The incidence of cervical cancer has steadily declined, dropping 46 percent between 1975 and 1999 from a rate of 14.8 per 100,000 women to 8.0 per 100,000 women (Ries et al., 2002). Despite these gains, screening continues to be a significant public health issue. It has been estimated that 60 percent of cases of cervical cancer are due to a lack of or deficiencies in screening (Sawaya and Grimes, 1999).

**Prevention—Cancer Screening**

**Improbability**

Early diagnosis of colorectal cancer while it is still at a localized state results in a 90 percent survival rate at 5 years (Ries et al., 2002). The American Cancer Society’s (ACS) guidelines recommend screening for colorectal cancer beginning at age 50 for adults at average risk using one of the following five screening regimens: fecal occult blood test (FOBT) annually; flexible sigmoidoscopy every 5 years; FOBT plus flexible sigmoidoscopy every 5 years; double contrast barium enema every 5 years; or flexible sigmoidoscopy every 5 years (American Cancer Society, 2003). The United States Preventive Services Task Force strongly recommends screening for men and women 50 years of age and older for colorectal cancer. Screening has been found to be cost-effective in saving lives, with estimates ranging from $10,000 and $25,000 life-year saved.

**Immunization (Adult)—Rationale for Selection**

**Impact**

Pneumonia and influenza are the seventh leading cause of death in the United States (The Commonwealth Fund, 2002). Pneumococcal disease causes 10,000 to 15,000 deaths annually; influenza causes an average of 110,000 hospitalizations and 20,000 deaths annually in the United States Department of Health and Human Services, 2003). Approximately 30-40 percent of elderly people who have invasive pneumonia will die from the disease (US Environmental Protection Agency, 1996). The elderly are also at increased risk for complications associated with influenza, and approximately 90 percent of the deaths attributed to the disease are among those aged 65 and older (Vishnu-Priya et al., 2000).

To decrease the burden of these diseases, including incapacitating malaise, doctor visits, hospitalizations, and premature deaths, experts recommend vaccination. Yet one-third to one-half of older adults (aged 65 and older) do not receive the vaccine (The Commonwealth Fund, 2002). Coverage rates for high-risk adults who suffer from chronic disease are especially poor, with only 26 percent receiving an influenza vaccination and 13 percent a pneumococcal vaccination (Institute of Medicine, 2000).

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The clerk will call the roll. The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The PRESIDING OFFICER.
AMENDMENT NO. 1097
Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows: The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. McConnel] proposes an amendment numbered 1097.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows: (Purpose: To protect seniors with cancer)

At the end of subtitle A of title I, add the following:

SEC. ___. PROTECTING SENIORS WITH CANCER.

Any eligible beneficiary (as defined in section 1860D(3) of the Social Security Act) who is diagnosed with cancer shall be protected from high prescription drug costs in the following manner:

(1) SUBSIDY ELIGIBLE INDIVIDUALS WITH AN INCOME ABOVE 100 PERCENT OF THE FEDERAL POVERTY LINE.—If the individual is a subsidy-eligible individual (as defined in paragraph 1860D–19(a)(4) of such Act), such individual shall have access to qualified prescription drug coverage (as described in section 1860D–6(a)(1)(B) of such Act), including payment of:

(A) for 2006, a deductible of $275;

(B) the limits on cost-sharing described in section 1860D–6(c)(2) of such Act up to, for 2006, an initial coverage limit of $4,500, and

(C) for 2006, an out-of-pocket limit of $3,700 with 10 percent cost-sharing after that limit is reached.

(2) SUBSIDY ELIGIBLE INDIVIDUALS WITH AN INCOME BETWEEN 100 PERCENT AND 160 PERCENT OF THE FEDERAL POVERTY LINE.—If the individual is a subsidy-eligible individual (as defined in paragraph 1860D–19(a)(4) of such Act), such individual shall have access to qualified prescription drug coverage (as described in section 1860D–6(a)(1)(B) of such Act), including payment of:

(A) no deductible;

(B) no monthly beneficiary premium for at least one Medicare Prescription Drug plan available in the area in which the individual resides; and

(C) reduced cost-sharing described in subparagraphs (C), (D), and (E) of section 1860D–19(a)(1) of such Act.

The number of subsidy-eligible individuals, including pay-

a subsidy-eligible individual (as de-

vidual who is diagnosed with cancer shall have the right to a drug plan in which the beneficiary shall pay no deductible, no monthly premium, no more than a 2.5-percent copayment for any drug spending up to $4,500 a year, no more than a 5-percent copayment for drug spending between $4,500 and $5,800 a year, and no more than a 2.5-percent copayment for any drug spending over $5,800.

My amendment states that any senior in Medicare who is diagnosed with cancer shall have the right to a drug plan in which the beneficiary shall pay no deductible, no monthly premium, no more than a 5-percent copayment for drug spending up to $4,500, no more than a 10-percent copayment for drug spending between $4,500 and $5,800, and no more than a 2.5-percent copayment for any drug spending over $5,800.

My amendment provides that any senior in Medicare who is also diagnosed with cancer, an income between 100 percent and 160 percent of the poverty level, shall have the right to a drug plan in which the beneficiary shall pay no more than a $10 deductible, no monthly premium, no more than a 5-percent copayment for drug spending up to $4,500, no more than a 10-percent copayment for drug spending between $4,500 and $5,800, and no more than a 2.5-percent copayment for any drug spending over $5,800.

My amendment also provides that any senior in Medicare and diagnosed with cancer, with an income between 100 percent and 160 percent of the poverty level, shall have the right to a drug plan in which the beneficiary shall pay no more than a $35 deductible, an average monthly premium not greater than $35, no more than a 10-percent copayment for drug spending up to $4,500, no more than a 20-percent copayment for drug spending between $4,500 and $5,800, and no more than a 10-percent copayment for any drug spending over $5,800.

My amendment provides that any senior in Medicare and diagnosed with cancer, with an income above 160 percent of the poverty level, shall have the right to a drug plan in which the beneficiary shall pay no more than a $125 deductible, an average monthly premium not greater than $35, no more than a 50-percent copayment for drug spending up to $4,500, and no more than a 10-percent copayment for drug spending over $5,800.

With this amendment, which conforms to the provisions within the bill, all seniors with cancer get help with prescription drug costs, especially the poor and moderate-income seniors.

Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Two minutes.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, the Boxer amendment is very simple. It says if a person is receiving cancer drugs and they come to a period of time—as this bill is written—where they run out of the ability to get help from the Medicare Program, that they, in effect, are covered.

We want a cancer patient to have no donut hole, no gap in coverage. That is what the Boxer amendment is all about.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, do we have any time?

Mr. REID. We have at least 4 minutes.

Mr. KENNEDY. Will the Senator yield me a minute?

Mr. REID. Of course.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, the Boxer amendment provides the additional resources for the treatment of cancer. I think all of us understand the importance of the continuity of care in the treatment of disease generally. That is why I am going to continue to vigorously fight for additional resources to fill in this gap in the future for all diseases. But it is particularly important to fill this gap for people who are afflicted with the disease of cancer. They are waiting for Congress to fill in this gap.

It does seem to me, because of the compelling reasons for the continuity of care in terms of diseases generally we ought to be able to find the additional resources to fill this gap. The Boxer amendment does not replace the fundamental structure of this legislation. It finds the additional resources to be able to make sure there will be continuity of care for what is, for many families, their Number 1 health concern. So that is a very compelling reason. I hope the amendment will be favorably considered.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask the Senator to withhold the suggestion of a quorum.

Mr. KENNEDY. I withhold.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

If no one yields time, time will be charged equally to both sides.

Who yields time?

The minority leader.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all time be yielded back.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the McConnell amendment No. 1097.

Mr. McCONNELL. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. LIEBERMAN) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY) would vote "yea."

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURNS). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 97, nays 1, as follows:

[Roll Call Vote No. 249 Leg.]

YEAS—97

YEASTOOD—1

The amendment we just voted for did nothing, not one thing, for cancer patients, except reiterate what is already in the underlying bill.

What my amendment does, and why I hope we will rise to the occasion and support it, is to send a strong signal to anyone diagnosed with cancer, and to their families, friends, and loved ones, that if and when they are diagnosed with cancer, they will not face the benefit shutdown that is now in this bill.

I will show my colleagues on this chart that at $4,500 of drug costs, the benefit shuts down. I want my colleagues to think about someone they know with cancer, someone who is battling cancer. Do we want to put this burden on them? They must take their drugs. They cannot cut their pills in half in order to survive.

The Cancer Society tells us that 6 million to 7 million Medicare beneficiaries are battling some form of cancer, and 300,000 of them will die of cancer. Please, let us relieve this burden of having to pay 100 percent of their drug costs during this benefit shutdown. I beg my colleagues to take a stand. I beg my colleagues to be compassionate. I beg my colleagues to be independent for once on an amendment and support the cancer patients who are counting on us today to at least relieve them of this terrible financial burden that will hit them just when they are the sickest.

I urge an aye vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Before I use my time, I have a unanimous consent request. That unanimous consent request is that the time lapse between the next two votes be 10 minutes instead of 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRASSLEY. As President, first, from a parliamentary point of view, this amendment, if adopted, would subject the entire bill to a budget point of order.

We have enough people in this body who maybe do not want a prescription drug bill that could take down the whole bill.

The other reason is, all the concerns the Senator has mentioned we have taken into account within the $400 billion capacity of our legislation. We have before us this $400 billion to provide prescription drug benefits to our seniors. We have used that $400 billion to help low-income seniors with prescription drug costs if they have cancer, diabetes, or anything else for which they need drugs.

We have used the $400 billion to limit the catastrophic costs of prescription drugs to all seniors. We do not create two drug classes for the sick and the ill, and that is why we should move forward with this amendment so it does not bring down the whole bill on a potential budget point of order.

I move to table the amendment, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. LIEBERMAN) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY) would vote "nay."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 54, nays 44, as follows:

[Roll Call Vote No. 250 Leg.]

YEAS—54

NOT VOTING—2

Kerry

Lieberman

The motion was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 1095

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are now 2 minutes equally divided prior to the vote on the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico.

The Senate will please be in order.

The Senator from New Mexico will suspended until the Senate is in order.

The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. BINGAMAN. I ask unanimous consent that the RECORD reflect we are updating the asset test to a limit of $10,000 per individual and $20,000 per couple.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. GRASSLEY. Reserving the right to object, have we seen this? We do not seem to know about this.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will be in order.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Reserving the right to object, we do not know about the
modification—or do we? We do not seem to.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, this is what the bill was intended to say. It is exactly what we have shared with your staff. It is just that there was a typo in it.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I withdraw the reservation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. BINGAMAN. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Florida, Mr. GRAHAM, be added as a cosponsor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BINGAMAN. I also ask unanimous consent that we be allowed 2 minutes to advocate for the amendment and the opposition get 2 minutes as well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I will take one of those 2 minutes and Senator DOMENICI the other.

This is a Bingaman-Domenici amendment. The purpose of it is not to eliminate the asset test. That was an earlier amendment I offered and then withdrew. Instead, it is to update the asset test, where you would still be required to demonstrate that your income was below poverty or in that range, but instead of having to demonstrate that your total combined assets were only $4,000, you would be able to show that they were less than $10,000.

This eliminates the paperwork burden that currently is imposed in most States on people who are required to itemize their assets and essentially provide a full financial statement to get the full low-income benefit.

We think this is a needed update on the asset test. It will allow a lot more people to get the full benefit.

I yield the remaining time to Senator DOMENICI.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, this is a very simple amendment. I believe it is absolutely fair and nothing more than simple equity. We have had an asset test under Medicaid, which applies here, since 1988. It is $4,000. That means there is an income test and an asset test of $4,000. I believe the time has come to change that $4,000 to some-thing more reasonable—not gigantic, just $10,000. It says the income test still applies, but you can own assets up to $10,000.

It also says you do not have to fill out all kinds of forms. You can sign an affidavit under penalty of felony, as to what your assets are, and that suffices. If there is anything this bill needs it is simplicity. So this adds simplicity to this form. But most of all, for the poor people, it permits them to own a car today. You know, hardly any cars are worth less than $4,000. I think you can be poverty stricken and still own an automobile.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. DOMENICI. I believe the amendment should be adopted.
Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

This amendment provides:

(Purpose: To protect seniors with Alzheimer’s disease)

At the end of subtitle A of title I, add the following:

SEC. __. PROTECTING SENIORS WITH ALZHEIMER’S DISEASE.

Any eligible beneficiary (as defined in section 1860D–3(3) of the Social Security Act) who is diagnosed with Alzheimer’s disease shall be protected from prescription drug costs in the following manner:

(1) Subsidy eligible individuals with an income below 100 percent of the federal poverty line—If the individual is a qualified medicare beneficiary (as defined in section 1860D–19(a)(4) of such Act), such individual shall receive the full premium subsidy and reduction of cost-sharing described in section 1860D–19(a)(1) of such Act, including the payment of—

(A) no deductible;
(B) no monthly beneficiary premium for at least one Medicare Prescription Drug plan available in the area in which the individual resides; and
(C) reduced cost-sharing described in subparagraphs (C), (D), and (E) of section 1860D–19(a)(1) of such Act.

(2) Subsidy eligible individuals with an income between 100 and 135 percent of the federal poverty line—If the individual is a specified low income medicare beneficiary (as defined in paragraph 1860D–19(4)(B) of such Act) or a qualifying individual (as defined in paragraph 1860D–19(4)(C) of such Act) who is diagnosed with Alzheimer’s disease, such individual shall receive the full premium subsidy and reduction of cost-sharing described in section 1860D–19(a)(2) of such Act, including payment of—

(A) no deductible;
(B) no monthly premium for any Medicare Prescription Drug plan described paragraph (1) or (2) of section 1860D–19(a) of such Act; and
(C) reduced cost-sharing described in subparagraphs (C), (D), and (E) of section 1860D–19(a)(2) of such Act.

(3) Subsidy eligible individuals with income between 135 percent and 250 percent of the federal poverty level—If the individual is a subsidy-eligible individual (as defined in paragraph 1860D–19(4)(A) of such Act) who is diagnosed with Alzheimer’s disease, such individual shall receive sliding scale premium subsidy and reduction of cost-sharing for subsidy-eligible individuals, including payment of—

(A) for 2006, a deductible of only $50;
(B) only a percentage of the monthly premium (as defined in section 1860D–19(a)(3)(A)(i)); and
(C) reduced cost-sharing described in clauses (iii), (iv), and (v) of section 1860D–19(a)(3)(A).

(4) Eligible beneficiaries with income above 250 percent of the federal poverty level.—If an individual is an eligible beneficiary (as defined in paragraph 1860D–19(3)(3) of such Act), is not described in paragraphs (1) through (3), and is diagnosed with Alzheimer’s disease, such individual shall have access to qualified prescription drug coverage (as described in section 1860D–6(a)(1) of such Act), including payment of—

(A) for 2006, a deductible of $275;
(B) the limited annual spending described section 1860D–6(c)(2) of such Act up to, for 2006, an initial coverage limit of $4,500; and
(C) for 2006, an annual out-of-pocket limit of $3,700 with 10 percent cost-sharing after that limit is reached.
Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Dorgan amendment be offered now and the pending amendment be set aside. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection. The amendment from North Dakota.

AMENDMENT NO. 1103 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1092

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report. The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:
The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN] for himself and Mr. PAYROK, proposes an amendment numbered 1103.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To reduce aggregate beneficiary obligations by $2,400,000,000 per year beginning 2009)

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted, insert the following:

SEC. 3. AGGREGATE REDUCTION IN MONTHLY BENEFICIARY OBLIGATIONS.

Section 1860D–12(e) is amended by adding at the end the following:

``(d) AGGREGATE REDUCTION IN MONTHLY BENEFICIARY OBLIGATIONS.—The Administrator shall for each year (beginning with 2009) determine a percentage which—

(1) shall apply in lieu of the applicable percentage determined under subsection (c) for that year, and

(2) will result in a decrease of $2,400,000,000 for that year in the aggregate monthly beneficiary obligations otherwise required of all eligible beneficiaries enrolled in a Medicare Prescription Drug Plan or a Medicare Advantage plan that provides qualified prescription drug coverage. This subsection shall not apply in determining the applicable percent under subsection (c) for purposes of section 1860D–21'.'

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, this is an amendment that deals with the question of what to do about the $12 billion of remaining available out of the $400 billion Congress set aside for a prescription drug benefit plan in the Medicare Program. According to CBO, the underlying bill is $12 billion of that $400 billion, so what do we do with that $12 billion? If the bill on the floor of the Senate to add prescription drugs to the Medicare Program costs $388 billion, and we have allocated $400 billion, the question is, what do you do with the other $12 billion? So we had a group of people—I am not quite sure who they were—negotiate over a period of time, and they have now developed a plan for what to do with the $12 billion. By the Senator from North Dakota, most direct, and most appropriate use of the $12 billion would be to improve the prescription drug benefit for Medicare recipients. After all, that is why we are here. That is the purpose of this discussion and debate. That is the purpose of writing this legislation: to provide a prescription drug benefit to the Medicare Program that serves the interests of our senior citizens. Regrettably, the Grassley amendment before us, to which I have just offered a second-degree amendment, does not accomplish those goals. So I offer an amendment that is very simple. It says let's try to improve this prescription drug benefit plan for senior citizens with the $12 billion that is available.

Let me just mention a word generally about Medicare. We have people on the floor of the Senate who don't like Medicare. They don't say it, but they know it. One of my colleagues said it yesterday in New York City. It is the only flash of candid comment that I have seen recently. Congressman THOMAS, in the New York Times, dated 6/26, says: 'Some of our friends [Democrats, he means] . . . are saying if this bill becomes law, it will be the end of Medicare as we know it. Our answer to that is, we certainly hope so.'

Let me read it again so we understand what he is saying: "Some of our friends [Democrats, he means] . . . are saying if this bill becomes law, it will be the end of Medicare as we know it. Our answer to that is, we certainly hope so." When I was a young boy in a town of 400 people, my dad asked me to drive an old fellow to the hospital in Dickinson, ND. He was a man with a very serious health problem but no insurance. He had no relatives, had no vehicle, had no resources. So I was a teenager just about out of high school. I got him in my car and drove him to St. Joseph's Hospital in Dickinson, ND, and dropped him off there to be treated. He had a serious health problem but no insurance, no money, nothing.

The fact is, that was at a period of time in the late 1950s and early 1960s when a good many senior citizens had no capability to get health care. They were in the case that insurance companies were not in the market to sell. It wasn't the case that insurance companies were running after old folks to ask them: Can we please sell you a health insurance policy? They want to insure 22-year-olds—healthy, vibrant, young 22-year-olds.

That is where they make money. They don't make money by chasing 75-year-old people and selling them health insurance policies. Back in the early 1960s, one-half of America's elderly had no health insurance—none at all.

Then along came Medicare. The Congress had a real debate about that. I wasn't here then, but you know there were naysayers who say no to everything for the first time. They said no. They don't want to do that. Well, we did create Medicare, and now 99 percent of the senior citizens in this country don't have to go to bed at night worrying about whether they can get medical care because they have health care coverage under Medicare. God bless them for that. They needed it, they deserved it, and this country provided it through the Medicare Program.

Some say: We have incredible problems financing this program. Yes, we have some financial problems, no question about that. Do you know how we solve those problems? Go back to the old life expectancy. Go back 100 years. People are living longer. People are living longer. People are living longer. Good for them. Good for us. Good for our country.

Is it a problem to have good news? I do not think so. We will solve these issues but even as we have done that, even as people are living longer and better lives, these new miracle medicines that have been created since Medicare was created are very expensive but very necessary for people to continue to live and thrive. We have no prescription drug coverage in the Medicare Program.

Clearly, if we wrote Medicare starting from scratch today, we would have prescription drug coverage. That is clear. Everyone who says prescription drugs were not a key medical expense when Medicare was created, so now we have to put that coverage in the Medicare Program.

Because some people do not like the Medicare Program—to wit my colleague, Congressman THOMAS who said, "certainly we hope this will be the end of Medicare as we know it,"—they want to privatize Medicare. Now, keep in mind that the private sector is the sector that would not insure old people in the first place, which is the reason why Congress had to develop the Medicare Program.

That brings us back to this question of what to do with the $12 billion. We are struggling to put together a benefit that means something to the people who need it. This is not theory. It is not a debate in the abstract. It is about some 85-year-old widow who, today, is going to the pharmacy to buy a bottle of a grocery store and trying to figure out how much her prescription drugs are going to cost so she can figure out how much money she has left for groceries. That is happening in a real sense today across this country.

We have $12 billion. We also have a bill that says to senior citizens: You pay $35 a month on an optional basis if you want this prescription drug insurance. And a month later you pay $275 for prescription drugs. Between $275 and $4,500, the Federal Government will help you by paying 50 percent of your prescription drug costs. And then between $4,500 and $5,800, there is what is famously called the donut hole, which means you receive no coverage.

So you are not covered until you spend $275, then you are partially covered, then you are not covered again, and then average you get no prescription coverage. This is the most Byzantine, complicated system we could possibly put together. It clearly is done by committee. We could not have done this so
badly if it were done without a committee.

Having said all of that, the question is, What do we do with the $12 billion? We are told today, with the Grassley amendment, that we will provide $6 billion in the bill to test an alternative bidding system for paying PPOs—and if this is not complicated enough, just stay with me—that would reimburse these PPOs based on the median amount of the three lowest bids. There is nothing here that protects American consumers by ensuring we are not paying private health plans substantially more than traditional Medicare costs.

Here is what it means in English. It means we are going to have an experiment with private sector delivery, but we are going to incentivize insurance companies. We are going to provide them some of this money so that they will actually want to offer this plan, so we can say at the end of it that somehow this plan is a good plan.

We already know that does not work. My colleague, Senator Hollings, says there is no education in the second kick of a mule. We know this does not work. We know what happens. We know the Medicare Payment Advisory Committee, MedPAC, which is a nonpartisan committee that advises Congress on Medicare payment policies, says private plans cost 15 percent more than traditional Medicare. We know that. We do not have to spend $6 billion on giving money to private insurers to do an experiment. We know what does not work. We know the cost advantage of Medicare, and yet our colleagues continue to resist and continue to insist that we move Medicare beneficiaries into the private sector. And now with half of the $12 billion, they say let’s do this little experiment.

Will it enhance the health of senior citizens? No. Will it improve health care? No. Will it improve the underlying bill, improve the benefits, reduce the costs? No, not at all. This is just like a puppy dog following the master home. It is putting more and more money down this chute to pursue this dream of trying to demonstrate something we already know does not work.

Mr. DURBIN. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. DORGAN. I will be happy to yield.

Mr. DURBIN. Do I understand that senior citizens, given the choice between traditional Medicare and Medicare HMOs, have already voted and that 88 or 89 percent of them want traditional Medicare; that they do not want to put their medical fate in the hands of these HMO private insurers who are unreliable, who may or may not cover the procedures they need? Haven’t the seniors of this country, with their experience, already voted on this issue we are considering?

Mr. DURBIN. The seniors have already made that judgment. They have already decided that. So we want to take $6 billion and give it to private health insurers at a time when Senators have been coming to the Chamber and saying we cannot improve this plan because we do not have any money. I have quotes of all the Senators, and I shall not name them all. I could read them to you. We have the list of 10 weeks of the Senators. Why can’t we improve it? Because we are limited by money. So now we have $12 billion more? That is what happens when you go into a room, shut the door, make a little deal, and say this is how we want to use this money: Let’s just try this experiment and try an experiment that we failed at previously. It makes no sense to me. It is a byzantine failure, in my judgment, to do it this way.

What I am proposing in my amendment is use the money to actually improve the program for senior citizens. We can drive down the cost of the prescription drug policies and improve the coverage.

Mr. DURBIN. I ask the Senator, if he will hold further, is the Senator aware of a recent survey of seniors—over 600 across the United States—where they were told what this plan, S. 1, is all about? They said the fact that the $35 premium is not mandated in this law may be simply a suggestion; it may go much higher; the fact private insurance companies that provide the prescription drug benefit may decide to change the benefit or go out of business every 2 years; the fact there is a $275 deductible, and the fact there is no education in the second kick of the mule for the sickness of the senior citizens—when they looked at all those items, is the Senator aware of the fact that most of the seniors, when asked, said they did not believe that S. 1 really answered the need in America that seniors are looking for?

Mr. DORGAN. I know that is the case. I have seen the same survey to which the Senator referred. I think there are some provisions in this bill that we do not do something rather than do nothing, but when we do something, let’s do something right and something that benefits senior citizens. This is the case when you cite the polls, when you cite what our previous experience has been. It is a case, especially with respect to the use of this $6 billion, of the old joke from the movies: What are you going to believe, me or your own eyes?

The fact is, we have already had those experiences and how the much additional costs are involved in the private sector delivery of this benefit, and we also know what Medicare does and how Medicare works. We know the private insurers have about a 14-percent overhead in administrative costs and delivering their service. We know that. We also know Medicare has about a 4-percent cost, a dramatic advantage.

For that reason alone, you would want to begin to pay for this basic 2-weeks of the traditional Medicare delivery system. Against all odds, we have people in this Chamber who, I guess, although they do not say it, believe along with Congressman Thomas that this bill ought to be the end of Medicare as we know it. Congressman Thomas said: Our answer to that is, we certainly hope so.

Mr. DURBIN. I ask the Senator, is it possible Halliburton is going to get some of these services with the six—I will withdraw that question. I ask the Senator, if one believes in privatization and competition, why does the private sector need a $6 billion subsidy to compete with Medicare? If they are more efficient, if they are customer friendly, why do they need this Federal subsidy of $6 billion to offer an attractive health care package to seniors?

Mr. DORGAN. First, they do not need it, and no subsidy is warranted. The point of my amendment is to say if you have $12 billion, and they say let’s take $6 billion and use it for an experiment that we know does not work, let’s instead use that money to help seniors. The underlying question says let’s take another $6 billion and test whether focusing on wellness will work, which we know it does work. We do not exactly have to have an experiment on that. Do things that promote wellness and the fact is you save money on the acute care side by not having people go into the hospital because they are taking care of themselves and have the kind of preventive care that is necessary to take care of themselves.

I have another amendment pending. It has been pending for nearly a week. I hope it will be approved by the end of this process. It is a very inexpensive amendment that deals with that very kind of wellness approach.

If senior citizens have heart disease, Medicare covers cholesterol screening. It makes sense, does it not? But Medicare does not cover cholesterol screening if one does not know they have heart disease. Heart disease is our biggest killer in this country. We ought to cover cholesterol screening across the board. That is the way one can discover who is at risk for heart disease at a point when steps can be taken to prevent it. Yet Medicare does not cover that screening unless a person already has evidence of heart disease.

There are many things we should do to improve Medicare’s preventive coverage. My hope is that perhaps we will have that amendment approved before the end of this process.

My colleague from Illinois talked about HMOs a moment ago. We are not in the trenches of the HMO debate as it was first envisioned by the White House, which said to senior citizens, here is a Faustian bargain: we will give you a prescription drug benefit but only if you enroll in an HMO. Talk about a goofy proposal; that is it. It has been tried with HMOs. There were some HMOs that did some good things, held down some prices. I understand that. But we have all also heard the stories of HMOs not taking
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good care of people. I guess we do not need to review the HMO stories about what happens to patients when profits were at stake. For instance, a woman falls off a cliff in the Shenandoah Mountains, sustains very serious head injuries, and is flown to a hospital where she is hauled into an emergency room on a gurney in a coma. After a long convalescence, she finally gets out of the hospital only to be told by her HMO that they will not cover her emergency room treatment because she did not have prior approval to use the emergency room. This is a woman who is hauled in on a gurney in a coma.

I will not revisit all of those HMO stories because it will take too much time, but I will say this: With Medicare, we know what works. Some of my colleagues make the case that it costs too much. Do my colleagues really know what costs too much in Medicare? It costs too much because people are living too long. What a wonderful set of changes in this country. With great health care, people are living longer.

I probably should not talk about my uncle again, but I have an 81-year-old uncle who runs the 400 meter and 800 meter Olympic trials is probably running today. He runs 3 miles a day at 81 years old. Forty years ago, one reached 81 years old and they had to be in a chair someplace, but not any longer. People live longer, doing things no one ever expected them to do. And that includes my uncle. Good for them. Good for him. But because people live longer, Medicare costs more. That is not a sign of failure; it is a sign of success.

Now we are trying to add to Medicare that which should have been added some long while ago: The miracle drugs that provide miracles but only if one can afford them. We are talking about covering the drugs that keep seniors out of the hospital and do not have to go into an acute care hospital bed. That is what we are dealing with.

With this amendment, we are dealing with $12 billion. Instead of bifurcating it into two different experiments, one of which failed and one of which we do not need because we know the answer, what I propose we do is use that $12 billion to reduce from $43 to $38 the premium our senior citizens will have to pay for this prescription drug benefit, starting in 2009.

There are people who live on $350 or $450 a month, their total income from their miserable little Social Security payment, who are living alone in a small town, are struggling to buy food, struggling to buy the necessities of life. There are people who have been told by their doctor: Oh, by the way, you have heart disease and diabetes, and here are the prescription drugs you need; and they sit at home knowing they do not have a penny to pay for those prescription medicines. Talk to those seniors and understand how important this coverage is. The coverage ought to be good and extensive coverage, and it ought to provide what we know we should provide for senior citizens.

Second, it ought to be done in an affordable way. Unfortunately, another wrong idea is taking hold that there is no defined benefit, which means the premiums can vary. The monthly premiums will increase year after year because we have not done enough to put downward pressure on prescription drug prices. As prescription drug prices increase, the monthly premium will increase. The expectation is that the monthly premium starts at $35 and goes to $60 in a 10-year period. My amendment proposes about a $6 reduction in the monthly premium for senior citizens. That is a more effective way to use this $12 billion. Either that, or I would propose we extend the coverage through the $1,300 gap that exists in coverage, which I think would also represent a meritorious way of using this amount of money.

My colleague, Senator Pryor from Arkansas, is in the Chamber and he may wish to address this issue as well. We have a common position on behalf of myself and my colleague Senator Pryor, so I yield the floor in the hope that Senator Pryor will wish to make some comments as well.

Mr. Grassley. Mr. President, it is unfair for Medicare beneficiaries on the other side of the aisle to give us statistics that say 89 percent of the seniors are in fee-for-service Medicare and only 11 percent are in Medicare+Choice and that is a nationwide average. It is an accusation, not a fact, that it does not speak to the seniors of America who like Medicare+Choice and I have figures from four cities—Miami, New York, San Francisco, and Chicago. In Miami, 45 percent of the senior citizens have chosen managed care, the Medicare+Choice option, as opposed to fee-for-service; New York, 22 percent; San Francisco, 29 percent. In Chicago, it was only 6 percent. That may be one reason whymy colleagues keep bringing this up quite regularly. This data is from the Congressional Research Service, and it is as recent as March 2003.

When people, wherever they are in the Senate, want to denigrate Medicare+Choice by saying only 11 percent of the people in this country join in and that is such a small percentage and that these figures are evidence it is not liked, go to Miami and ask 45 percent of the citizens who belong to Medicare+Choice why they like it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. Pryor. Mr. President, last night was a difficult night for me because I was lying in bed worrying about the insurance companies and how we were not getting them enough money during this Congress. Of course, I am being facetious because I think we have a very clear choice.

I commend Senator Dorgan, Senator Durbin, and a number of others who have shown national leadership on this effort to try to make this bill better. I think there is a broad consensus that we want to add a prescription drug benefit to Medicare. We want to help seniors all over this country, but at the same time we have to make sure it is set in the right way. It has to make sense.

Quite frankly, one of the things that to me does not make sense, and probably to most people around the country does not make sense, is that we might put a petty heap of money to the insurance industry.

All over the country—and I know it is certainly true in my State—insurance companies are raising premiums. It may be health care premiums—everybody knows those are going up. It may be property and casualty; it may be homeowners policies, auto policies, medical malpractice, legal malpractice. You name it, across the board, as far as I know, the price of every single kind of insurance in this country is going up.

Nonetheless, there are some in this Congress who want to actually give them a sizable chunk of money that could go to people who really need the help.

I take my hat off to Senator Dorgan for his leadership. One thing he has figured out is a way to make the monthly premium less for people. Now, saving $6 to a person at my income level, and all of our income levels, that is not a lot of money, but for those senior citizens all over this country who live below the poverty level—the only money they get every month is Social Security, maybe a little help from the family—is a lot of money. Six dollars may make this program affordable for them. It is real money. It is money that at the end of the year, if you add it up, is only $72 a year, but that is real money to so many Americans all over the country.

The purpose of the bill, not just this amendment but the whole bill, is to help Americans afford their prescription drugs. I know that Senator Durbin, who is in the Chamber, and Senator Dorgan and a number of others in this Chamber have tried to make prescription drugs more affordable in this legislation. There have been different efforts tried in different ways. One of the things I tried was to strengthen re-importation from Canada to try to make prescription drugs more affordable, but certainly making the premiums more affordable makes the program more accessible to more Americans. That is a win/win/win for everybody.

So I thank the Senator from North Dakota for yielding me some of his time. I know he is frantically talking to colleagues to try to have them adopt this amendment when we vote on it this afternoon.
billion per year to make premiums cheaper. It will reduce the typical premium—this is average—by $6 a month. I take my hat off to the folks in this Chamber who worked out compromise after compromise after compromise trying to put solutions in place to make this bill something that will become law, something that the majority of Members can vote for, not just in this Chamber but the House, something the President can sign.

I believe that people in this country deserve to have access to these wonderful prescription medications that are in many ways miracle drugs. It is a shame for this country to have these drugs available on the marketplace but so expensive that people cannot afford them. That is what we are trying to accomplish.

I yield the floor.

Mr. DURBIN. I thank my colleague from Arkansas as well as my colleague from North Dakota. They have come to the floor and said to the Members of the Senate, look, we found $12 billion. Imagine $12 billion over a period of time. We are in the middle of debating a prescription drug bill. What would the Senate do with new found money, $12 billion worth?

We took a look at the underlying bill, the prescription drug bill. There are a lot of problems with it. There is no guaranteed monthly premium, it is a deductible. It has a period of time when there is no coverage. You are paying prescription drug bills and you have no protection, no coverage. There are a lot of uncertainties in this bill.

You would think the first thing you would do with the $12 billion is make this a stronger bill, try to take care of some of the weaknesses, the deficiencies.

Wrong. Given $12 billion, an agreement has been reached not to give the money to the seniors to help them pay for prescription drugs but to give $6 billion to HMOs and private insurance companies, a $6 billion Federal subsidy so they can experiment with alternatives to Medicare.

I am like my colleague from Arkansas: I could not get a moment's rest last night for fear that we just were not going to give enough money to the insurance companies when this was all over with. My wife, all my sleep the night before worried about the fact that maybe pharmaceutical companies would not get all the money that we could possibly throw their way. Then along comes this amendment. We can rest easy tonight because we will give $6 billion to HMOs. This industry which manufactures the milk of human kindness for senior citizens and families across the America by denying basic health care coverage so they can run up profits, is going to get a Federal subsidy.

What a delicious irony that we can help poor seniors trying to pay for prescription drugs because, Senator, we do just not have enough money. And we cannot help our schools, we cannot pay for President Bush's No Child Left Behind, this unfunded mandate on everybody's local schools because, Senator, we just do not have enough money. But the $6 billion we just found we are going to give to the HMO insurance industry.

When they write the history of this debate, this amendment will stand out. This amendment is a tribute to selfishness, a tribute to shortsightedness. Why in the world aren't we helping the people who need this the most? Why are we giving the money to the HMOs so they can experiment with an effort to end Medicare?

I just ran into Bill Thomas in the hallway, chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, most powerful man when it comes to Medicare in the House of Representatives. He said in today's New York Times:

Some of our friends on the other side of the aisle are saying if this bill becomes law, it will be the end of Medicare as we know it. Our answer to that is, we certainly hope so.

Well, thank you, Congressman Thomas, for your candor. And your candor is the reason why so many Senators have now come to the Senate and said the way this is going is to subside HMOs with even more money so they can be more profitable and try to force Medicare out of business. That is what it is all about.

My colleagues will have two choices. They can join me in voting with Senator Dorgan, Senator Pryor, and others and say if you have $12 billion, for goodness' sake, put it into this bill. Make this bill a little better for seniors. Reduce the cost for seniors. Give them some assurance of what they will pay. Provide more prescription drug coverage. That is one option. I will support it.

If it does not succeed, I will offer a second option. It reaches a point under the bill we are debating during the course of a year, when there is a gap in coverage where the Federal Government will not help pay one penny on your prescription drugs, and about $3,700 into the year out-of-pocket expenses for prescription drugs, this plan cuts off. The underlying plan says you are on your own until you get in the range of $5,500. Then we will start paying you again. So there is a gap in coverage where that senior citizen, that widower, widow herself, has to pay all of the prescription drug bills until she reaches the catastrophic coverage level.

This would not be a problem if you did not have over $3,700 in prescription drugs a year. But a lot of seniors do. We have run into the letters from them in Illinois, heard their testimony on Capitol Hill from across the country.

I will offer an alternative to my colleagues in the Senate that says simply this: We can help the sick people who suffer from some of the most expensive diseases that afflict senior citizens can pay for their medication. So we will take the $12 billion and we will put it into the basic bill and cover heart disease, cancer, Alzheimer's, diabetes and its complications.

We are not going to leave you high and dry. At the end of $3,700 of subsidy from the Government, we are going to get back $12 billion and spend another $1,500 to $1,800 of their own money before they have coverage. You can help them pay for those cancer therapies or you can send $6 billion in Federal subsidies to HMO insurance companies.

That is the choice. It is a fairly straightforward choice.

According to a July 2002 study, heart disease and hypertension are the most expensive conditions to treat. Millions of Medicare beneficiaries are suffering from them and struggling to pay for their medications. That is one of the conditions we would help pay for with the $12 billion. $6 billion of which is headed for these private insurance companies' subsidy.

The majority of America's cancer patients are on Medicare. They are your parents and grandparents. They are struggling with all forms of cancer. Nearly 60 percent of current cancer diagnoses and 50 percent of all cancer-related deaths occur in people 65 years and older.

I am not identifying a problem that does not exist. It exists. Ask any family about cancer. We all have stories to tell. And you know how expensive it is now to keep that loved one alive to try to give them a chance to survive. This bill cuts them off and leaves them high and dry. My amendment gives them a chance.

More than 2 million of all Medicare beneficiaries will have cancer in 2003. Let me give an example of a couple who wrote to my office. They wrote a couple years ago from a downstate community, a small community. It is one of the letters that Senators get every day, one that we saved. It was sent to us in September of 2002.

Dear Senator Durbin:

My wife has multiple myeloma, which is a cancer of the bone marrow. This disease, while controllable, is not curable. As a result, she has to take a great deal of drugs for physical as well as mental anxiety. The current year our cancer prescription drug bill [and this is the year 2000] was $4,500. This year our regular prescription drug bills will be more.

Now my wife Marion has been put on Thalidomide. A great many multiple myeloma
patients are now on Thalidomide. Said drug is very expensive. With a low dose [and this is in the year 2000] it is $455.99 a month.

Incidentally, we checked. That same low dose now costs $645 a month. So in 3 years, that's up over $200 a month. It costs them $5,500 a year just for that drug. This is an elderly couple in their retirement on a fixed income, fighting cancer, putting every dollar in their savings into keeping one of them alive. I think about that couple.

Please don't say to these people and these families that you can't take $12 billion and not give it to these seniors to help them pay these bills. I think you can.

I don't have to tell you the story of Alzheimer's. Is there a family in America that does not have a loved one or a friend who is struggling with some form of dementia? God bless those people. They are living longer, but as we do life gets more complicated. Let me give an example of a gentleman in Maplewood, MN. His annual out-of-pocket drug costs for Alzheimer's are $7,000—annual cost. This man is 78 years old. He pays as much out of pocket for prescription drugs as he does for all of his other household expenses combined. He is a World War II vet, father of three. He is a full-time caregiver for his wife. He hasn't had a vacation in 5 years. He has given up what he loves to do because he just can't afford them.

"I am managing the cost, but I'm pretty nervous about it," he says. Medicare can do something to help. Yes, it can. That is our choice. Are we going to do something to help these seniors facing the most expensive medical conditions or are we going to give $6 billion to private HMOs in a Federal subsidy?

The last one I include is diabetes and its complications. I am sad to report to you, those who are following this debate, diabetes is reaching epidemic proportions in America. Over 6 percent of the American population suffers from some form of diabetes. In the late stages of diabetes, the complications become horrible: Amputations, blindness, severe problems.

Faced with this in your senior retirement years, if you are on a prescription drug plan, do you really want to say to these people and these families battling diabetes and its complications: We are going to cut you off. We would love to give you more but frankly we can't give you more. Our HMO insurance companies. Those are the ones who really need a helping hand.

You couldn't take that argument to any town in America. You couldn't take it to any town in America. You couldn't take it to any family with a loved one struggling with one of these diseases.

So my friends on the floor of the Senate are going to have a choice: $6 billion in Federal subsidies for HMOs or $6 billion to help seniors struggling with these terrible, life-threatening, expensive conditions, to pay their prescription drug bills. I think that choice is easy. I hope the majority of the Senate agrees.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time? The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I might consume to address the issue of the amendment by the Senator from North Dakota and his attempt to take money from the $12 billion that is the bipartisan compromise that is a major compromise on this amendment between Republicans and Democrats. The $12 billion is being divided: $6 billion to make the marketplace provider organizations more competitive, to save money, and to get people into organizations that particularly chronic disease; and the other $6 billion to go for Medicare demonstration projects to do the same, have about the same result, to have chronic disease management.

The reason for this compromise is both approaches deal with the issue that 5 percent of the sick people under Medicare are responsible for about 50 percent or 55 percent of the cost of Medicare. It is a small segment of people if we find we found 5 percent of our employees, or a certain problem we had with our business that was just 5 percent of it, but it was 50 percent of the cost of our business, we would have in on that problem with the particular business.

The Federal Government is in the business of providing health care for our seniors. If we have 5 percent of our senior populations who, for various reasons, are the cause of 50 percent of the costs of Medicare obviously we ought to concentrate on that 5 percent. We have plans to do that. This is how we use this $12 billion, and we do it in a bipartisan way.

Honestly, the Senator from North Dakota is very open about it; he has a better idea how to use that money. He would take it to lower the monthly premium by $2.50, still costing $32.50 a month on Social Security. And think about this bill which says to this family from Illinois and others just like them: I am sorry, but at some point we are going to take it from you. That is unfair.

I don't know how many Members on the other side of the aisle have worked with this issue we are trying to put $6 billion toward, chronic disease management. A lot of people reading this bipartisan compromise that is a major compromise that is a major compromise.

So my friends on the floor of the Senate are going to have a choice: $6 billion to private HMOs in a Federal subsidy or $6 billion to give to these people and these families and disease management services. These are very worthwhile projects and have the potential to help many beneficiaries get better care and considerably reduce the size of the Medicare Program.

I don't know how many Members on the other side of the aisle have worked with this issue we are trying to put $6 billion toward, chronic disease management. A lot of people reading this bipartisan compromise that is a major compromise.
I use, as a basis for my statement, that in the larger cities of America a much higher percentage of seniors have decided to join Medicare+Choice. They do it voluntarily. They can go in one year and get out the next, if they don't like it. The great percentage is in favor of Medicare+Choice. They like it because they get more for their money. First, they do not have to pay Medigap insurance. Second, they might get things such as eye glasses and a better deal on prescription drugs than people who are in traditional Medicare fee for service. Where they have had a chance to have that option, a much higher percentage of seniors than 11 percent will join. All you do is talk to people in your State who go to Arizona, California, and Florida for maybe the winter and find out about what people in those States have when they join Medicare+Choice. They ask, Why can't we have that in more places in the country?

One of the complaints people made about the President’s program was that if you were going to get prescription drugs, if you wanted prescription drugs, if you wanted to stay in traditional Medicare, you could not get them. I don't think that is before us which the Senator from North Dakota wants to detract from and use the money somewhere else. I think we need to keep this balanced approach. We need to keep the fairness, the competition, the right to choose. Seniors should have options just as other people have.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I call up my amendment, which I send to the desk pursuant to the unanimous consent request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] proposes an amendment numbered 1108.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To provide additional assistance for certain eligible beneficiaries under part D.)

At the appropriate place insert the following:

Section 1860D–26, as added by section 101, is amended by adding at the end the following:

```
(d) ADDITIONAL ASSISTANCE FOR CERTAIN ELIGIBLE BENEFICIARIES.—

(1) PROGRAM.—Subject to paragraph (2), the Administrator shall implement a program for the period beginning on January 1, 2009, and ending on September 30, 2013, to provide additional assistance to applicable eligible beneficiaries during the initial coverage limit described in section 1860D–6(c)(3) for the year but have not reached the annual out-of-pocket limit under section 1860D–6(c)(4)(A) for the year in order to reduce the cost-sharing requirement during this coverage gap.

(2) FUNDING LIMITATION.—The Administrator shall implement the program described in paragraph (1) in such a manner that will result in a decrease of $12,000,000,000 in cost-sharing for covered drugs under part D by applicable eligible beneficiaries during the period described in such paragraph. The Administrator shall take appropriate steps to ensure that the costs of the program during such period do not exceed $12,000,000,000.

(3) APPLICABLE ELIGIBLE BENEFICIARY.—For purposes of this subsection, the term ‘applicable eligible beneficiary’ means an eligible beneficiary with cardiovascular disease, diabetes and its complications, cancer, or Alzheimer’s disease who is enrolled under part D.
```

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I will speak briefly because I have to go to another meeting and return for the vote.

I have great respect for the Senators from Iowa and Montana, but I struggle to understand why we are giving a $6 billion subsidy to the HMOs in America. If they are so good, if they are so efficient, if the free market is truly better than the Government-run Medicare system, why in the world do they need $6 billion worth of the taxpayers' money? You know that of that $6 billion hundreds of millions of dollars are going to go to them in profits. We are literally subsidizing the profits of these companies. We are creating this artificial environment that suggests these companies can do a better job or better than Medicare with the $6 billion federal subsidy to make it work.

I can't understand why my colleagues on the conservative side who are hidebound apostles of the free market don't even wince when it comes to sending $6 billion to the HMOs and the private insurance industry in order to let them play on the field for health care for seniors in America. I don't get it. I certainly don't understand why you wouldn't reach that same conclusion that the most vulnerable people in America—our senior citizens who are struggling with heart disease, cancer, Alzheimer’s, and diabetes and its complications. Why is the money for the boards of the HMOs, the good expenditure of tax dollars and the money for the family rooms of senior citizens struggling with these deadly diseases not a good investment with taxpayer dollars?

The underlying bill is the biggest breakthrough for the American pharmaceutical industry since the establishment of patents in the Constitution. This amendment with $6 billion in flat out tax subsidies to HMOs is the answer to the prayers of the insurance companies in America.

Is that what the Senate is all about? Are we supposed to come here to make certain that the wealthiest corporations in America get wealthier? I don't think so. They are doing quite well. The rate of return for pharmaceutical companies across America is 18 percent. The average rate for the top companies is 3 percent. These companies are immensely wealthy and profitable. We help them even more with this bill. We know how well the insurance companies are doing. We know the bonuses they give their executives and we are going to plow in $6 billion to make it even wealthier.

There is something else wrong. We know that a lot of average citizens in America—particularly senior citizens—are struggling. Pick up the morning papers. Whether it is the Washington Post or the New York Times, they go to speak to seniors in their real-life environment and talk to them about how they survive. Some of them are well off. Some are lucky. They have saved a lot of money, but the millionaires and the generous retirement benefits a lot of them do not. A lot of them are literally struggling month to month, some even week to week, just to get by.
This morning in the Washington Post there was a story about a widow lady who said: At the end of the month, I'm lucky if I have a dollar left over. At the end of the article she said: I wonder how many Senators have ever thought about trying to live on $1,100 per month. I don't have a clue how she does it. I don't know how a lot of people do it in my State. Why wouldn't we want to help these people? Why is it the pharmaceutical companies and the HMOs are more important than the most vulnerable of us? I just don't get it.

Frankly, I think a lot of our colleagues, as I said earlier, ought to take these arguments, which sound so good on the floor of the Senate, back to the real world of the State they represent, take them into the town of their choice, the public meeting of their choice, and explain to people why HMOs need a subsidy but seniors do not need a helping hand. It just does not work.

So I will be offering an amendment that says we will take this $12 billion and focus it on the elderly people who suffer from some of the worst and most demanding diseases.

I reserve the remainder of my time. Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I listened quite closely to the Senator from Illinois, as well as my good friend from North Dakota, who is presently not in the Chamber. I am very sympathetic. If I had my way, we would be spending this newly found $12 billion very much in the way the Senator suggested. In fact, there are a lot of good ways. It is not only true with Alzheimer's... it is also lowering the premium. There are a lot of ways we could be spending dollars to help get more drug benefits to more seniors. There is no doubt about that. But, unfortunately, we are 100 Senators.

The Senator from Illinois, the Senator from North Dakota, and I have a view of how some of these dollars should be spent in a perfect world, but the world is not perfect. This is a democracy. It is messy. As Winston Churchill once said—I will paraphrase very poorly, but the Senator knows this quote—basically, Winston Churchill said: A democracy, for all its fits and starts and delays and inefficiencies and flaws, is still the best of all. And all that, is the world's worst form of government, except for all the others.

Here we are, in a democratic process, trying to figure out how to get prescription drug benefits to seniors. We have 100 Senators, I don't know of very many times Senators. We don't have many Senators who don't speak their views. I don't know very many Senators who don't have strong views about subjects. I don't know of many Senators who are not thoughtful, articulate, and fighting hard for their constituents. And we have, as it turns out, Senators from two political parties: 51 Republicans, 48 Democrats, and 1 Independent. At this time we are all attempting to finally get prescription drug benefits to seniors. This issue has been debated for 4 years, at least. It has been a politicized issue for 4 years. There has been a lot of talk for 4 years of rhetoric on both sides of the aisle for 4 years, and during all the talking there has not been any action; it has been all words, no deeds.

Well, here we are, at a time—after 4 years of just political posturing, to a large degree—where we are on the brink of getting prescription drug benefits passed for our seniors in our country. Is it the best bill in the world? No. Could it be better? Yes. Do all Senators wish it could be better? Yes. But is it a good start? Is it a beginning? Is it a platform on which we can begin to build? Absolutely.

If we go back and look at the history of health care and assistance by the Government in providing health care to the needy and to Americans generally, it is a history of building, of starting somewhere, building on it, and making it better and better all the time.

Back in the 1930s it was the Wagner-Murray-Dingell legislation that was introduced to provide national health insurance for Americans. That was the idea: We need national health insurance for Americans. Well, it was debated and debated. Not a lot more really happened. Then suddenly things changed in the 1960s. The idea of Medicare came along: Why not help at least our seniors? If we can't get national health insurance, the very least we can do is help our senior citizens get a break with respect to their health care bills. That is a good place to at least begin to get a good, solid segment of the population. And we did, back in 1965, by providing Medicare. And look what has happened since then. We have kept building on Medicare to make it better.

When Medicare was first enacted, 50 percent of a Part B premium was paid by the senior and the Government paid the other 50 percent of the premium for Part B. That is for doctor services. Now it is 25 percent. It has been improved over time. We also have added more benefits, some screening provisions. End-stage renal treatment has been added. There is a list of new additions to help our senior citizens.

Here we are, on getting another major benefit: prescription drugs. After all these years, all the years of talking and talking and politicking and giving statements and speeches, we are finally on the brink of getting prescription drug benefits passed.

It has not been easy. Why has it not been easy? It has not been easy because there are two competing philosophies on the floor of the Senate on how to get prescription drug benefits to seniors. Even though the two competing philosophies are very different from each other, Senators on both sides of the aisle—most Senators—most Senators do not want to work as hard as they can to try to fit these competing philosophies together in order to pass legislation this year to begin finally getting prescription drug benefits to seniors.
have decided to split it, 6 and 6; $6 billion to the PPOs, have it available potentially for PPOs, if that is needed for the bidding process, beginning in the year 2009. I don't know how many Senators are going to be here in 2009, but at least then. The $6 billion, beginning in 2009, will then go, under Medicare fee for services, for disease management, chronic care, to help particularly seniors who really need that disease management and chronic care. Without that need, because there is very little disease management today under traditional Medicare. That is one of its shortcomings. That is what we have done.

Again it is a balance, a start, a beginning. I have a lot of sympathy with my friends on this side of the aisle. If I had my druthers and I were the only one writing this bill, I would take that $12 billion and spend it along the lines they are suggesting. But I am not the only Senator here. I am one of 100. It is my job, and the job of the chairman of the committee, Senator GRASSLEY, to try to find a balance—not for the sake of balance but for the sake of getting legislation passed so we can finally get prescription drugs to seniors.

If amendments offered by the Senators from North Dakota or Illinois were to pass, guess what would happen. First of all, those are killer amendments. If those amendments were to pass, that would mean this bill is jeopardized. That would mean senior citizens may not get the prescription drug benefits we are all trying to get; albeit just a first step, or it could also mean, on the other hand—and this is perhaps even more likely—if that amendment were to pass, I will bet you dollars to donuts—which is not a good phrase to use because we are trying to put dollars in the donut hole—the conservative part of this body, the Republican side of the aisle, would not be going to take that $12 billion and spend it our way. And they have the votes. They have the White House. So this amendment puts in jeopardy a very delicate, very balanced kind of deal between competing philosophies, fairly and evenly, so that we can get prescription drug legislation passed, so that we are just not talking about it anymore and finally doing something about it.

If it were to pass or looked like it would pass, the other side, which has more votes than this side has, would say: We will spend it our way.

Then colleagues on my side of the aisle would be quite distressed. They would be forced to ask themselves if they would support on final passage a bill way off to the right for competition instead of the bill which currently exists, particularly with the underlying amendment. I wish we could do more but at least it is a first step. If the history of Medicare is any indication, in the future years we will continue to make it better. We will work on that donut hole. We will fill in the gaps. We will make sure premiums are not too high.

We will try to help with Alzheimer's and all the other measures we desperately need to pay attention to as the days and years go by.

I implore my colleagues to think a little bit. Resist the siren song of doing something that sounds good but which could very well jeopardize the whole bill. This is fair. It has $6 billion which may or may not be used for PPOs, depending upon what the bids are. This bill cuts off after a 5-year period; no more $6 billion can be spent. And $6 billion management instead of the bill which currently exists, particularly with the underwriting. The Secretary of Health and Human Services shall retain or designate one or more Medicare backup plans so that beneficiaries initially covered by a private insurer under this act who are subsequently covered by a Medicare backup plan have the option of retaining a Medicare backup plan or entering private insurance under this act.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendments be set aside so that I may send to the desk on behalf of Senator LEVIN an amendment to ensure that current retirees who have prescription drug coverage, who will lose their coverage as a result of enactment of this legislation, would have the option of drug coverage under Medicare fallback. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will report. The legislative clerk read as follows: The Senator from Montana [Mr. BAUCUS], for Mr. LEVIN, proposes an amendment numbered 1111.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendments be set aside so that I may send to the desk on behalf of Senator LEVIN an amendment to ensure that current retirees who have prescription drug coverage, who will lose their coverage as a result of enactment of this legislation, would have the option of drug coverage under Medicare fallback.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendments be set aside so that I may send to the desk on behalf of Senator LEVIN an amendment to ensure that current retirees who have prescription drug coverage, who will lose their coverage as a result of enactment of this legislation, would have the option of drug coverage under Medicare fallback.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendments be set aside so that I may send to the desk on behalf of Senator LEVIN an amendment to ensure that current retirees who have prescription drug coverage, who will lose their coverage as a result of enactment of this legislation, would have the option of drug coverage under Medicare fallback.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendments be set aside so that I may send to the desk on behalf of Senator LEVIN an amendment to ensure that current retirees who have prescription drug coverage, who will lose their coverage as a result of enactment of this legislation, would have the option of drug coverage under Medicare fallback.
(a) AUTHORITY TO CONDUCT DEMONSTRATION PROJECT.—The Secretary shall waive such provisions of the Medicare program established under title XVIII of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395 et seq.) as are necessary to conduct a demonstration project under which frontier extended stay clinics are treated as providers of items and services under the Medicare program.

(b) CLINICS DESCRIBED.—A frontier extended stay clinic is described in this subsection if it—

(1) is located in a community where the closest short-term acute care hospital or critical access hospital is at least 75 miles away from the community or is inaccessible by public road; and

(2) is designed to address the needs of—

(A) seriously or critically ill or injured patients who, due to adverse weather conditions or other reasons, cannot be transferred quickly to acute care referral centers or critical access hospitals;

(B) patients who need monitoring and observation for a limited period of time.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the terms "critical access hospital" and "short-term acute care hospital" have the meanings given such terms in subsections (e) and (m), respectively, of section 1395f of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395f).

AMENDMENTS NOS. 906, 938, 988, 1027, AND 1041

MR. BAUCUS. Mr. President, on behalf of the chairman of the committee, Senator Grassley, I ask unanimous consent that the following amendments be set aside and that the following amendments be agreed to en bloc, and that the motions to reconsider be laid on the table en bloc: Amendments Nos. 906, 938, 988, 1027, and 1041.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendments were agreed to en bloc.

MR. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following amendments be set aside and that the following amendments be agreed to en bloc:

(a) TEMPORARY INCREASE OF THE MEDICAID FMAP.—Section 401(a)(6)(A) of the Jobs and Growth Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2003 (Public Law 108–027) is amended by striking "after September 2, 2003," after "(42 U.S.C. 1315)" and inserting "after September 2, 2003,

(b) RETROACTIVE EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect as if included in the enactment of section 401 of the Jobs and Growth Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2003 (Public Law 108–027).

The bill, as amended, was read the third time and passed, as follows:

S. 312

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. EXTENSION OF AVAILABILITY OF SCHIP ALLOTMENTS FOR FISCAL YEARS 1998 THROUGH 2001.—

(a) EXTENDING AVAILABILITY OF SCHIP ALLOTMENTS FOR FISCAL YEARS 1998 THROUGH 2001.—

(1) RETAINED AND REASSIGNED ALLOTMENTS FOR FISCAL YEARS 1998 AND 1999.—Paragraphs (2)(A)(i) and (2)(A)(ii) of section 2104(g) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395f(dd)(ii)) are each amended by striking "fiscal year 2002" and inserting "fiscal year 2004.

(2) EXTENSION AND RETENTION OF RETAI AND REASSIGNED ALLOTMENTS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2000.—

(a) PERMITTING AND EXTENDING RETENTION OF PORTION OF FISCAL YEAR 2000 ALLOTMENT.—

Paragraph (2) of such section 2104(g) is amended—

(i) by striking "1999" and inserting "1998, 1999, or 2000"; and

(ii) by adding at the end of subparagraph (A) the following:

(III) the fiscal year 2000 allotment, the amount specified in subparagraph (A) is equal to the amount specified in subparagraph (A) for fiscal year 2000 by the end of fiscal year 2002, 50 percent of that amount shall remain available for expenditure by the State through the end of fiscal year 2004 and thereafter.

(b) R EASSIGNED ALLOTMENTS.—Paragraph (i) of such section 2104(g) is amended—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by inserting "or" for fiscal year 2000 by the end of fiscal year 2002," after "fiscal year 2001,";


(iii) in subparagraph (A)(i), by striking "or" at the end of subclause (I),

(iv) by striking the period at the end of subclause (I),

(v) by striking "(ii) by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (A)(i), and inserting "or"; and

(vi) by adding at the end of the following new subclause:

(III) the fiscal year 2000 allotment, the amount specified in subparagraph (C)(i) (less the total of the amounts under clause (ii) for such fiscal year), multiplied by the ratio of the amount specified in subparagraph (C)(i) for the State to the amount specified in subparagraph (C)(ii),

(vi) in subparagraph (C)(ii), by striking "or" and inserting "1998, or 1999, or 2000;";

(vii) in subparagraph (B), by striking "with respect to fiscal year 1998 or 1999;";
(vi) in subparagraph (B)(iii)—
(i) by inserting "with respect to fiscal year 1998, 1999, or 2000," after "subsection (e);" and
(ii) by striking "2002" and inserting "2004;" and
(iii) by adding at the end of the following new subparagraph:
"OF PORTION OF FISCAL YEAR 2001 ALLOTMENT.—For purposes of subparagraph (A)(i)(III) of section 1902(a)(10)(A), the State provides that eligibility shall not be regularly reetermined more often than once every year under this title or for children described in subparagraph (B) of section 1902(a)(10)(A) that are children of individuals who have attained age 19 and whose family income exceeds 150 percent of the poverty line.

(ii) WITH RESPECT TO MEDICAID EXPENDITURES.—With respect to expenditures for assistance under title XIX and this title.

(iii) NO IMPACT ON DETERMINATION OF BUDGET NEUTRALITY FOR WAIVERS.—In the case of a qualifying State (as defined in paragraph (2) of section 1115) that uses amounts paid under this section for expenditures described in clause (ii) that are incurred under a waiver approved for the State, any determination with respect to such waiver shall be determined without regard to such amounts paid.

(2) QUALIFYING STATE.—In this subsection, the term "qualifying State" means a State that—

(A) as of April 15, 1997, has an income eligibility standard with respect to any 1 or more categories of children (other than infants) that is at least 200 percent of the poverty line or has an income eligibility standard that is less than 200 percent of the poverty line under a waiver under section 1115 that is based on a child's lack of health insurance;

(B) satisfies the requirements described in paragraph (3).

(3) REQUIREMENTS.—The requirements described in this paragraph are the following:

(A) SCHIP INCOME ELIGIBILITY.—The State has a State child health plan that (whether implemented under title X or this title)—

(i) as of April 15, 1997, has an income eligibility standard that is at least 200 percent of the poverty line or has an income eligibility standard that is less than 200 percent of the poverty line under a waiver under section 1115 that is based on a child's lack of health insurance;

(ii) subject to paragraph (B), does not limit the acceptance of applications for children; and

(iii) provides benefits to all children in the State who apply for and meet eligibility standards on a statewide basis.

(B) NO WAITING LIST IMPOSED.—With respect to children whose family income is at or below 200 percent of the poverty line, the State does not impose any numerical limitation, waiting list, or similar limitation on the eligibility of such children for child health assistance under such State plan.

(C) ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS.—The State has implemented at least 3 of the following policies and procedures (relating to the care of children under title XIX and this title):

(i) UNIFORM, SIMPLIFIED APPLICATION FORM.—With respect to children who are eligible for medical assistance by section 1902(a)(10)(A), the State uses the same uniform, simplified application form (including, if applicable, permitting application other than in person) for purposes of establishing eligibility for benefits under title X and this title.

(ii) ELIMINATION OF ASSET TEST.—The State does not apply any asset test for eligibility under section 1902(a)(10)(A) or this title.

(iii) ADOPTION OF 12-MONTH CONTINUOUS ENROLLMENT.—The State provides that eligibility shall not be regularly reetermined more often than once every year under this title or for children described in subparagraph (B) of section 1902(a)(10)(A), and the State carries out such determinations with respect to face-to-face interviews, forms, and frequency as the State uses for purposes under this title, and, as part of such determinations, provides for the assessment of the eligibility of such children for assistance under title XIX and this title.

(iv) SAME VERIFICATION AND REDETERMINATION POLICIES; AUTOMATIC REASSESSMENT OF ELIGIBILITY.—With respect to children who are eligible for medical assistance under section 1902(a)(10)(A), the State provides for initial eligibility determinations and redeterminations of eligibility using the same verification policies (including with respect to face-to-face interviews), forms, and frequency as the State uses for purposes under this title, and, as part of such determinations, provides for the assessment of the eligibility of such children for assistance under title XIX and this title.
PRESCRIPTION DRUG AND MEDICARE IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2003—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. BREAUX. I thank the Chair. Mr. President, I would like to make a couple comments before we begin voting. This legislation is historic. It is incredibly important. It is the first reform in a major way to the Medicare Program since we wrote it over 35 years ago in 1965.

To get this legislation adopted by the Congress and signed into law by the President, there obviously has to be a great deal of work, a great deal of legitimate compromise among the various parties that have put this package together. That is what this bill does.

There are some Members of Congress who argue the Federal Government should do nothing with regard to Medicare—that the private sector should do everything and that the Federal Government should do nothing. There are others on the other hand, who take the position that with regard to Medicare the Federal Government should do everything and the private sector should do nothing.

What we have been able to put together, under the leadership of the chairman and ranking member and many others who have worked so hard, is a compromise that says let's combine the best of what the Government can do with the best of what the private sector can do and put that package together. That is why we have gotten to the point we are today.

We saw a bill come out of the Senate Finance Committee in a bipartisan fashion with 16 votes in favor; only five votes against it. I predict when the final vote comes on this bill, we will see the same type of bipartisan representation with a significant number, maybe over three-fourths of the Senate saying, yes, this has sufficient improvement and reform in it for me to support it.

It has enough Government involvement to make sure it is paid for, enough Government involvement to make sure it is run properly but not micromanaged, and it has enough private sector involvement to deliver, for the very first time, through a competitive private delivery system, prescription drugs for all seniors regardless of where they are or in what program they happened to be included.

It also says the private sector will offer, for the first time on a voluntary basis, to seniors who want to move into a new system a private delivery system that will cover drugs, will cover hospitals, and will also cover physician charges. That is a historic opportunity to combine the best of what Government can do with the best of what the private sector can do.

There is going to be a very important amendment offered by Chairman Grassley and the ranking member, Senator Baucus. Because we were able to get a score that said there is $12 billion extra money available, the question then became, How do we divide it? I never had a harder choice to make than I had in the difficult time spending money. We normally get into fights when we do not have enough money. Lo and behold, we found there was $12 billion in extra funds.

The question then for the Senate is how are we going to allocate that money? Senator Baucus and Senator Grassley, working with Senator Kennedy and others, came up with a plan that is fair. We put it together.

The question is on agreeing to the McGovern amendment No. 1102. I urge all of our Members to vote for it. In fact, I think the vote should be approximately like it came out in the Finance Committee. We lost a few what I would say were on the left, we lost a few what I would say were on the right, of the political spectrum. But in the end the vast majority supported this legislation in the committee and will do so on the Senate floor.

I certainly ask them to support the Grassley-Baucus amendment when it is voted on as well.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 1102

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the McConnell amendment No. 1102.

Mr. HATCH. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Kerry) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. Lieberman) are necessarily absent.
I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY) would vote “yea”.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 98, nays 0, as follows:

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY) would vote “nay.”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 57, nays 41, as follows:

\[\text{Section 1860D-19(a)(1)}\]
\[\text{section 1860D-19(a)(1)}\]
\[\text{section 1860D-19(a)}\]
\[\text{section 1860D-19(a)}\]
\[\text{section 1860D-19(a)}\]
\[\text{section 1860D-19(a)}\]
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Yes, $12 billion is a lot of money; $6 billion of that $12 billion he wants to take away from this provision, this bipartisan provision, that would be used for things he stands for. He has been talking about chronic disease management. He has been talking about managing to a better extent people with chronic diseases. We have put $6 billion into demonstration projects like that to save the taxpayers’ money. Well? Because 5 percent of the seniors cause 50 percent of the costs to Medicare. That is why those demonstration projects are very important. That is why I hope you will vote against this amendment.

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll. Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. LIEBERMAN) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY) would vote “yea.”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 39, nays 59, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 254 Leg.]

NAYS—59

Kerry

Lieberman

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote and to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 1092 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2092

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there are 2 minutes equally divided on the Dorgan second-degree amendment.

Who yields time?

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, the importance of this amendment is answering the question, what to do with $12 billion? I propose we use that $12 billion to reduce the premium that senior citizens will be required to pay for this prescription drug benefit, roughly $7 a month, from $35 to $28.

The rebuttal to my amendment has been: This really doesn’t mean very much. Frankly, this means a great deal to senior citizens. The underlying amendment represents the worst of all worlds. It says, let’s give $6 billion to insurance companies. And I guarantee you, you dye that money purple, you will have purple pockets in the insurance industry. That is where it is going. Let’s have $6 billion go to the insurance industry to conduct an experiment that we already know has failed.

I don’t understand why that is the way we want to use billions of dollars. Why not use it to help senior citizens close the coverage gap or, as I suggest, to reduce monthly premiums which start to kick in this in this bill and then ratchet up and up and up as prescription drug prices increase. Pass my amendment and help senior citizens reduce these premiums.

The amendment (No. 1103) was rejected.
Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. Who is recognized to speak in opposition to the amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader was recognized.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, very briefly, this amendment is the culmination of several days of debate where both Democrats and Republicans have come together, again bringing different issues to the table, but together it is a positive, strong amendment for the American people and for senior citizens.

On the one hand, it invests $6 billion, that is not in the underlying bill, in preventive medicine, which almost does not exist in traditional Medicare, and in chronic disease management.

All of us know 5 percent of the beneficiaries are responsible for 50 percent of the cost and we know we need to manage those people better. So we have $6 billion for preventive medicine and chronic disease management.

In addition, there is $6 billion to support the concept of private enterprise, competition, the private entities, which we believe is the only salvation but critical if we are going to address the long-term, 75-year unfunded liabilities that are incurred when we add a new prescription drug benefit.

For that reason, I urge our colleagues on both sides of the aisle to recognize that we worked together, Democrats and Republicans, to come to this carefully negotiated agreement that will be to the benefit of seniors and individuals with disabilities.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, parliamentary inquiry. My understanding was prior to a vote there was to be time divided between opponents and supporters. We have just heard from three supporters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The agreement was the time to be evenly divided.

Mr. DORGAN. Evenly divided between whom?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The managers.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from North Dakota be given 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, there does need to be opposition, it seems to me, for those who believe this is not the right way to use $12 billion. The $12 billion was made available. Twelve billion is what we discovered. The CBO estimate was below the $40 billion available for this program. So the question was: How shall the $12 billion be used?

We have spent all of our lives in this Chamber making choices. Too often we make the wrong choices in circumstances such as this. We come back with a plan that says let’s use the $12 billion for two purposes, and both of them are for experiments. In both cases, we know the answer to the experiment, $6 billion to the insurance companies so we can incentivize—subsidize—the insurance companies to see if they can provide the prescription drug benefit at equivalent or less cost than Medicare does. We know the answer to that. That experiment has been done.

As senior citizens all across this country what would you rather have, better benefits or lower costs or would you like to have $12 billion in demonstration projects? That is the choice. The choice has been presented to us at this point in this amendment to say let’s bifurcate this into two $6 billion pots, both of which will be demonstration projects, the answer to which we know in both cases. First, the circumstance with subsidizing the insurance companies, we know the answer to that. They are going to provide this benefit at higher costs. We know that. Second, does wellness and chronic care help? Yes, we know that. Why do we not take the $12 billion and use it to provide better benefits or lower costs for senior citizens? After all, that is why we started this process, to provide a prescription drug benefit that works for senior citizens.

We come to the end of this process, and we have a group of people who go into a closed room and come out with a deal that says we have decided how the $12 billion should be used.

Ask senior citizens how they would like it used and I guarantee there is only one answer from every corner of this country: Use it to provide this prescription drug benefit that works for senior citizens.

We ask senior citizens how they would like it used and I guarantee there is only one answer from every corner of this country: Use it to provide this prescription drug benefit that works for senior citizens.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, par-

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio (Mr. V OINOVICH) is necessarily absent.

Mr. V OINOVICH. Mr. President, I am interested to know when the Senator from North Dakota last voted?

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time between amendments prior to the votes, and there be unanimous consent that the time be 2 minutes equally divided for debate. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. V OINOVICH. No.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the Bingaman amendment numbered 1066; to be followed by a vote in relation to the Rockefeller amendment numbered 975, as modified; to be followed by a vote in relation to the Rockefeller amendment numbered 1011, to be followed by a vote in relation to the Sessions amendment, No. 1092, to be followed by a vote in relation to the Rockefeller amendment numbered 975, as modified; to be followed by a vote in relation to the Bingaman amendment numbered 1066, provided further that there be no amendment in order to the amendments prior to the votes, and there be 2 minutes equally divided for debate. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senate will be in order.

The Senator from Montana.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the chairman of the committee, Senator GRASSLEY, I ask unanimous consent that at 5 p.m. today the Senate proceed to a vote in relation to the Sessions amendment, No. 1011, to be followed by a vote in relation to the Rockefeller amendment numbered 975, as modified; to be followed by a vote in relation to the Bingaman amendment numbered 1066, provided further that there be no amendment in order to the amendments prior to the votes, and there be 2 minutes equally divided for debate. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment (No. 1092) was agreed to.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. ENSIGN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senate will be in order.

The Senator from Montana.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the chairman of the committee, Senator GRASSLEY, I ask unanimous consent that at 5 p.m. today the Senate proceed to a vote in relation to the Sessions amendment, No. 1011, to be followed by a vote in relation to the Rockefeller amendment numbered 975, as modified; to be followed by a vote in relation to the Bingaman amendment numbered 1066, provided further that there be no amendment in order to the amendments prior to the votes, and there be 2 minutes equally divided for debate. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time between now and 5 o’clock be equally divided.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, and I ask...
unanimous consent that the time be equally divided. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll. The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from West Virginia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. Baucus. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished ranking member of the Finance Committee.

AMENDMENT NO. 975, AS MODIFIED

Mr. President, in accordance with the agreement just entered into, I send a modification of my amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is so modified. The amendment (No. 975), as modified, is as follows:

On page 10, line 12 and strike, "(other than a dual eligible individual, as defined in section 1980D–19(a)(4)(E))".

On page 21, strike lines 22 through 25, and insert "title XIX through waiver under 1115 where covered outpatient drugs are the sole medical assistance benefit."

On page 107, line 3, strike "30 percent" and insert "77 percent."

On page 116, line 10, insert "and" after the semi-colon.

On page 116, line 12, strike "", and insert a period.

On page 116, strike lines 13 through 17.

On page 116, line 24, insert "and" after the semi-colon.

On page 117, line 2, strike "", and insert a period.

On page 117, strike lines 3 through 7.

On page 117, line 13, insert "and" after the semi-colon.

On page 117, line 17, strike "", and insert a period.

On page 117, strike lines 18 through 23.

On page 118, line 6, insert "and" after the semi-colon.

On page 118, in line 13, insert "or" after the semi-colon.

On page 118, line 14, strike "." or "" and insert a period.

On page 118, strike line 15.

Beginning on page 118, strike line 16 and all that follows through page 119, line 9.

On page 119, line 10, strike "(F)" and insert "(E)".

On page 119, line 15, strike "(G)" and insert "(F)".

On page 119, line 19, strike "(C), (D), or (E)" and insert "(C), (D), or (E)".

On page 120, line 3, strike "(H)" and insert "(G)".

On page 120, lines 5 and 6, strike "who is a dual eligible individual or an individual!".

Beginning on page 121, line 24, strike "dual eligible" and all that follows through "and on page 122, line 1.

On page 146, line 6, insert before the period "and to the design, development, acquisition or installation of improved data systems necessary to track prescription drug spending for purposes of implementing section 1933(c)."

Beginning on page 146, strike line 23 and all that follows through page 149, line 21, and insert the following:

"(c) FEDERAL ASSUMPTION OF MEDICARE PRESCRIPTION DRUG COSTS FOR DULLY ELIGIBLE BENEFICIARIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of section 1927(a)(1)(A) and (B) for a calendar quarter in a year (beginning with 2006) the amount computed under this subsection is equal to the product of the following:

(A) STANDARDIZATION DRUG COVERAGE UNDER MEDICARE.—With respect to individuals who are residents of the State, who are entitled to, or enrolled for, benefits under part B of title XVIII, or are enrolled under part B of title XVIII and are receiving medical assistance under subparagraph (A)(i), (A)(ii), or (C) of section 1902(a)(10) or (D) of section 1902(t) that includes covered outpatient drugs (as defined for purposes of section 1927) under the State plan under this title (including such a plan operated under a waiver under section 1115)—

(i) the total amounts attributable to such individuals in the quarter under section 1980D–19 (relating to premium and cost-sharing subsidies for low-income Medicare beneficiaries); and

(ii) the actuarial value of standard prescription drug coverage (as determined under section 1906–6(f)) provided to such individuals in the quarter.

(B) STATE MATCHING RATE.—A proportion computed by subtracting from 100 percent the Federal medical assistance percentage (as defined in section 1905(b)) applicable to the State and the quarter.

(C) PHASE-OUT PROPORTION.—Subject to subparagraph (D), the phase-out proportion for a quarter in—

(i) 2006 is 100 percent;

(ii) 2007 is 95 percent;

(iii) 2008 or 2009 is 90 percent;

(iv) 2010 is 85 percent; and

(v) 2011, 2012, or 2013 is 80 percent.

(D) MEDICAID AS SECONDARY PAYOR.—In the case of an individual who is entitled to a Medicare Prescription Drug Plan under part B or drug coverage under a MedicareAdvantage plan, and medical assistance including covered outpatient drugs under this title, medical assistance shall continue to be provided under this title for covered outpatient drugs under this title, to the extent that such medical assistance is provided under the Medicare Prescription Drug Plan or a MedicareAdvantage plan.

Beginning on page 152, strike line 3 and all that follows through page 153, line 15, and insert the following:

"(f) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this section, the term 'subsidy-eligible individual' means the recipient of the term in subparagraph (D) of section 1980D–19(a)(4)."

(C) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 1902(a)(1) (42 U.S.C. 1396a(a)(1)) is amended by inserting before the word "Secretary" the following: " reduced by the amount computed under section 1953c(c)(1) for the State and the quarter.

(2) Section 1108(f) (42 U.S.C. 1308(f)) is further amended—

(A) by striking the first sentence and inserting "A primary plan, and
debt obligations (whether by a failure to obtain insurance, or otherwise) in whole or in part.

(B) in subparagraph (B)(ii), as redesignated by subsection (a)(2)(B), by striking the first sentence and inserting the following: "A primary plan, and

(C) in subparagraph (B), as redesignated by subsection (a)(2)(B), by striking the first sentence and inserting the following: "A primary plan, and

(D) in subparagraph (C), as redesignated by subsection (a)(2)(B), by striking the first sentence and inserting the following: "A primary plan, and

(E) in subparagraph (D), as redesignated by subsection (a)(2)(B), by striking the first sentence and inserting the following: "A primary plan, and

(F) in subparagraph (E), as redesignated by subsection (a)(2)(B), by striking the first sentence and inserting the following: "A primary plan, and

(G) in subparagraph (F), as redesignated by subsection (a)(2)(B), by striking the first sentence and inserting the following: "A primary plan, and

(H) in subparagraph (G), as redesignated by subsection (a)(2)(B), by striking the first sentence and inserting the following: "A primary plan, and

(I) in subparagraph (H), as redesignated by subsection (a)(2)(B), by striking the first sentence and inserting the following: "A primary plan, and

(J) in subparagraph (I), as redesignated by subsection (a)(2)(B), by striking the first sentence and inserting the following: "A primary plan, and
June 24, 2003

Hon. Charles E. Grassley, Chairman, Committee on Finance, U.S. Senate,

Long Term Care Pharmacy Alliance, Washington, DC, June 24, 2003.

Chairman, Committee on Finance, U.S. Senate,

I strongly urge my colleagues to support this amendment which would fix that in a budget-neutral fashion. I hope my colleagues will support this amendment which I consider one of the most moral and humane of amendments that has come before this body on this issue.

I thank the President Offi cer.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to this amendment. In S. 1 bene benefi ciaries who are enrolled in both Medicaid and Medicare will continue to receive the generous drug coverage they currently know through the Medicare program.

Some of my colleagues have argued that by having dual eligibles remain in both Medicaid and Medicare Congress is treating these vulnerable seniors as second-class citizens and subjecting them to a lower quality benefi t.

This is not the case. In fact, this letter from the Long Term Care Pharmacy Alliance applauds S. 1 for keeping the duals in Medicaid.

Specifically, the letter states, “This approach will preserve the time-tested safeguards designed to prevent medication errors and ensure quality care for the majority of these benefi ciaries in the institutional setting.”

The policy decision to cover the drug cost for dual eligibles in Medicaid was not made in vacuum. These vulnerable citizens deserve the best benefi t available, which is the benefi t provided through Medicaid. I amremind my colleagues that the intent of this legislation is to expand prescription drug coverage to our senior citizens who do not have enough money for drugs or who are faced with paying a large share of their income for their drug coverage.

This does not describe the current coverage experienced by those who are dually eligible.

These seniors currently have a drug benefi t through the Medicaid program. In fact, many advocates and benefi ciaries describe and know this benefi t to be very benefi cial. Medicaid was created to assist individuals who do not have the means to pay for their share of health care costs. That is a responsibility shared between the Federal Government and the States. Medicaid pays for many benefi ts that Medicare does not.

We all know that the purpose of S. 1 is to provide prescription drugs to seniors that do not currently have access to drugs or are paying extremely high drug costs.

However, recognizing the costs associated with covering the cost of providing prescription drug coverage to the dual eligible population, S. 1 does provide nearly $18 billion in new Federal dollars to compensate States for some of these costs.

This is because S. 1 provides minimum standards that ensure that every aspect of the benefi t provided through Medicaid is the same high quality that is provided through part D of the Medicare program.

I remind my colleagues that adoption of this amendment will not expand coverage at all; it will simply shift the cost to the Federal government and in time to the other Medicare benefi ciaries.

In closing, I remind my colleagues that S. 1 helps to deliver care that is consistent with current law and has been familiar to vulnerable benefi ciaries.

I urge my colleagues to defeat this amendment.

I ask unanimous consent to print the letter to which I referred in the RECORD. 

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LONG TERM CARE PHARMACY ALLIANCE, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN GRASSLEY: On behalf of the Long Term Care Pharmacy Alliance, I appreciate this opportunity to express our support for provisions of Medicare legislation you have advanced to protect the nation’s frail elderly benefi ciaries residing in nursing facilities. In particular, we are concerned that your legislation would allow dual eligible benefi ciaries to retain their prescription drug benefi t under Medicare. 

While most Medicare benefi ciaries are able to walk into pharmacies to pick up their prescriptions or to receive vials of pills through the mail; a sizable percentage of benefi ciaries cannot do so and need special services that retail and mail order pharmacies do not provide. Nursing home residents have specifi c diseases and multi-physician conditions that require specialized pharmacy care.

To meet these needs, long-term pharmacies provide specialized packaging, 24-hour mail order, infusion therapy services, geriatric-specific formularies, clinical consultation and other services that are indispensible in the long-term care environment. Without such treatment, we cannot expect positive therapeutic outcomes for these patients.

Failure to take into consideration the special pharmacy needs of the frail and institutionalized elderly will lead to a marked increase in medication errors and other adverse events.

In recognition of these concerns, your proposed legislation to expand the current system of Medicare coverage to provide specialized pharmacy services to dual-eligible benefi ciaries residing in nursing facilities.

We strongly urge our colleagues to contem plate the implications of this proposal before statutorily mandating such action. Nevertheless, we strongly recommend additional language to address the special pharmacy needs of benefi ciaries residing in nursing facilities who are not dually-eligible for Medicare and Medicaid.

Such language would require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to review the current standards and practice for pharmacy services provided to patients in nursing facilities and to report to the Congress its
citizens who paid into the program during their working years—not just some senior citizens. And it should stay that way.

This amendment rights this wrong. It says we will not take away the Medicare that the poor have earned by a lifetime of hard work.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. BINGAMAN addressed the Chair. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I request that the manager allot me 5 minutes.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from New Mexico.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. BINGAMAN. I thank the Senator from Montana.

AMENDMENT NO. 1066

Mr. President, I would like to take this opportunity to explain amendment No. 1066, which is scheduled to be one of the amendments considered in this next block of amendments.

Mr. President, I am concerned that the prescription drug coverage in S. 1 is not sufficient to fully meet the needs of our seniors and that those seniors who elect to participate in Part D and get this prescription drug benefit will be restricted from purchasing supplemental coverage.

The Kaiser Family Foundation estimates that in 2006—which is the year this legislation really takes effect, this benefit occurs—the average Medicare beneficiary will spend $3,160 per year on prescription drugs. Under the current plan, those individuals will have $1,700 that same year in out-of-pocket expenses in addition to the $420 they pay in Part D premiums. Therefore, the average Medicare beneficiary who elects Part D will have approximately $2,180—yes, in out-of-pocket expenses. This can translate into, for example, a $175 a month. That is a significant expenditure for a lot of individuals and couples on a fixed income.

It would seem reasonable to allow these individuals who want to protect themselves against unpredictable and increasing prescription drug expenses to purchase supplemental insurance coverage that would allow additional prescription drugs to be purchased.

Medigap was designed to fill the gaps in Medicare. A sizable gap exists in the prescription drug benefit we are offering in this bill. Yet the current bill specifically prohibits seniors from filling that gap with a Medigap policy.

Section 103 of S. 1, which is the bill we are considering, explicitly prohibits people who elect Part D prescription drug coverage from purchasing additional prescription drug coverage as part of any Medigap plan.

Let me give you the quotation out of the bill. It says:

No Medicare supplemental policy that provides coverage of expenses for prescription drugs may be sold, issued, or renewed under this section to an individual who is enrolled under Part D.

So you essentially have a choice: Am I going to enroll in this new Part D and get this benefit and therefore forego any Medigap policy or am I going to stay out?

We are telling seniors whose cost burden, on average, will be $2,100 a year, and 10 percent of whom are likely to have out-of-pocket expenses of $4,000 or more per year, they will not be allowed to seek additional prescription drug relief.

This amendment I am offering would give seniors the option of purchasing more prescription coverage as part of a comprehensive Medigap plan. The amendment calls on the National Association of Insurance Commissioners to devise two new Medigap plans that would each offer prescription drug coverage to beneficiaries who elect Part D.

There are currently 10 standard Medigap plans. They are designated A through J, and they offer insurance to seniors. Of those, plans H, I, and J offer prescription drug coverage in addition to Part A and Part B wraparounds. Of these, H and J are the most commonly elected plans.

Under S. 1, the way it now stands, seniors who elect Part D would no longer qualify for H, I, or J. However, if the amendment is adopted, the two new policies designed by the National Association of Insurance Commissioners would be similar to the current Medigap policies of H and J, but their prescription drug coverage would be tailored to wrap around the Part D coverage. So seniors who are currently H or J subscribers would have the option of electing Part D and still maintaining a Medigap plan similar to what they have now.

The amendment would give the National Association of Insurance Commissioners 18 months to develop and report back on these two new plans. In my view, it would be a substantial improvement to the current bill.

As I said, my amendment will give the National Association of Insurance Commissioners 18 months to develop and report back on two new plans. The NAIC is the appropriate body to develop these plans because they have a system already in place for doing so with appropriate representation from all interested and affected parties. The NAIC can best determine how the benefits proposed in this amendment can be designed in order to avoid over-utilization and to coordinate with the existing Medigap benefit packages. They were the body employed to develop the current Medigap plans A through J and they are the body best equipped to develop these two new plans.

This amendment is similar to language already included in the House version of the bill and has already had a great deal of support in the House of Representatives.

This amendment also provides a provision to stabilize the Medigap market.
during this time of transition. The current bill states that seniors who are enrolled in H, I, or J at the time when they elect Part D will be displaced from their current Medigap plans and given open enrollment into any other Medigap plan offered in their State. Our amendment will still guarantee them the option of enrolling in substitute coverage without the risk of discrimination based on age, health status, utilization, etc. However, our amendment will reduce the chaos of this situation by keeping the majority of Medigap subscribers with their current carriers.

Let me explain. Beneficiaries displaced from H, I, or J will have the option of choosing any other Medigap plan—A-G—that their carrier offers or one of the two new plans. If their current carrier does not choose to offer one of the new plans then they will have the option of switching carriers in order to obtain a medigap policy that includes catastrophic coverage. Thus, the majority of seniors will be staying with their current carriers and thus, those carriers will be better able to predict the affect of this shift and better able to ease the transition for their subscribers.

This is a simple amendment that will elicit very little controversy. People may raise concerns because it will be difficult to construct a standardized wrap around benefit to complement Part D when Part D is not standardized. But this is not a reason to deny people access to supplemental coverage. Rather, we are giving the NAIC 18 months to put together such a plan.

Consumer groups such as the Consumer Union and Medicare Advocacy support our amendment because it provides much needed additional coverage options for our Nation's seniors. Likewise, insurance carriers like it because it allows them to continue to provide a service that they have been providing up until this point and yet it does not force them to offer these new plans if they do not see them as viable. The cost of the amendment should be negligible as it is not adding any additional Government expenditure nor expediting a beneficiary's trip to the catastrophic threshold. This amendment simply gives seniors an opportunity to continue to seek the insurance industry an opportunity to meet the needs of our seniors not met by Medicare Part D.

Mr. President, I ask my colleagues to review this amendment before they vote. I think it is an excellent amendment. I ask them to join me in supporting it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

AMENDMENT NO. 2017

Mr. GRAHAM of Florida. Mr. President, I rise to speak on an issue that will come before the Senate shortly. That is an amendment to strike the language from this legislation which is found in section 605, the legal immigrant child health provision. Let me give the background on section 605. What this legislation would do would be to allow States on a State option basis to elect to provide health care for pregnant women and children during the period of their pregnancy, plus 60 days thereafter, and immigrant children. In both categories, we are talking about legal immigrants, not people who have arrived outside the system and undocumented. These individuals come to the United States under all of the procedures that allow for legal immigration, with the most prominent category being family reunification.

The regeneration of immigrant children has already been considered by the Senate Finance Committee, first in 2001, then in June of 2002, and most recently in the consideration of this legislation. This provision was sustained in the chairman's marks, included in place by Senator Grassley and Senator Baucus, by a vote of 13 to 8. There has been both consideration and approval of this provision by the Finance Committee.

It has been alleged that the provision of these services will encourage illegal immigration. We are talking exclusively about pregnant women and children who have entered the United States on a legal basis. Prior to 1996, there was no restriction on health care benefits for legal immigrants. We are now carving out from the current exclusion of health care two categories, which are both humane and very much in the public interest, that pregnant women have adequate access to health care and that children grow up with adequate health care.

It has been alleged that there are a number of benefits which have also been made available to legal immigrants. We are limiting that to refugees and those with designated health care benefits. That has been done.

Mr. President, I ask them to join me in supporting it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. NICKLES of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I believe our side has 2 minutes remaining. I ask unanimous consent for 4 minutes and yield the Senator from Alabama 2 minutes.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, included in the Medicare prescription drug reform bill in section 605 is a Medicaid reform of work for noncitizens, reversing a policy adopted by this Senate in 1996 by a vote of 74 to 24. Section 605 is a very substantial change in our current policy. It will cost, according to CBO estimates, $500 million over just 3 years. It is not to be taken lightly. Frankly, we haven't debated on it.

I have offered an amendment that would strike the existing language in section 605, along with a sense of the Senate that this matter go back to the Finance Committee for hearings this fall, the time when the Finance Committee plans to be addressing Medicaid welfare reform. That is what this is about. It is Medicaid welfare reform, not Medicare senior citizens reform. That is clearly unconnected to the purpose of the bill. It was slipped in as some sort of compromise. We ought not to allow that to happen, to erode a very important part of the 1996 Welfare Reform Act. The administration, which is very favorable to matters that would help immigrants in this country, opposes this change. They say it should be done, if at all, as part of the welfare reform this fall.

That is why our sense of the Senate calls on the Finance Committee to re-evaluate it as part of their requirement this fall on reform welfare. Millions of people come to this country legally. They do not want to be put on welfare. Those sponsors say they will pay for the medical welfare needs of those people they sponsor. That is by affidavit and it should be honored, not undercut.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I wish to compliment Senator Sessions for his leadership. I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the Sessions amendment to strike out this provision that does not belong in a Medicare bill.

This is a Medicaid provision. That is a welfare provision. We are going to re-authorize welfare later this summer. It should be considered at that time. This is part of the reforms that were made in 1996 when we passed the welfare reform act, one of the most successful bills we ever passed. If we are going to undermine that, do it with a little consideration. The administration opposes this because it doesn't belong here, and it is bad policy. This turns immigration policy on its head.

Let me read the current law on immigration policy. For a legal immigrant who comes into this country, it is required that the sponsor of that immigrant sign an affidavit of support to the U.S. Department of Justice which states:

By signing this form, you, the sponsor, agree to support the intending immigrant...
and any spouse or children immigrating with him or her, and to reimburse any Government agency or private entity that provides these sponsored immigrants with Federal, State, or local public benefits.

This provision in the underlying bill would turn this law on its head and would basically take hundreds of millions of dollars away from Medicare recipients and give them to immigrants. So this is changing immigration law and Medicaid law. It needs to be dealt with in the Medicaid bill and welfare reform bill. It doesn't belong in this bill.

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the Sessions amendment.

In proposing this amendment, Senator SESSIONS argues that the restoration of health benefits to legal immigrants has not been fully reviewed or discussed. He also argues that SCHIP and Medicaid provisions are welfare reform measures and therefore not germane to the prescription drug bill. The amendment also states that Congress deliberately limited benefits available to legal immigrants when it removed these benefits in 1996. I respectfully disagree with all of these three assertions.

First of all, the Senate Finance Committee has already extensively reviewed this issue. In 2003, the Finance Committee held a series of hearings on health coverage for the uninsured, including legal immigrants. During the TANF reauthorization mark-up in June 2002, there was a full debate on the restoration of health benefits to legal immigrants, and the Immigrant Children's Health Improvement Act passed as an amendment by a vote of 12 to 9. This year, during Finance Committee mark-up of the prescription drug bill, there was once again full debate on extension of health benefits to legal immigrants. Senator NICKLES offered an amendment to strike the immigrant children's health provision from the chairman's mark and that amendment failed by a vote of 8 to 13.

Second, I disagree with Senator SESSIONS' argument that Section 605 of the bill is not germane to Medicare prescription drug legislation. Every time this sort of provision comes to a vote, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle question the vehicle. When the immigrant health provisions came up in committee last year, as part of the TANF reauthorization mark-up, Senator HATCH remarked that, "If we start playing with health care policy, this bill isn't going to go through." This year, Senator Sessions is saying that TANF reauthorization is the appropriate vehicle. I ask my colleagues on the other side of the aisle then—which one is the appropriate vehicle?

In fact, the restoration of health benefits to legal immigrants is also a major component of the effort to add a prescription drug benefit under Medicare. Senators GRASSLEY and BAUCUS realized this when they included this provision in the prescription drug mark as part of a compromise agreement that included both Senator Kyl's undocumented aliens provision to re-imburse hospitals for the cost of treating undocumented aliens and Senator GRAHAM's legal immigrants provision.

Finally, benefits to legal immigrants were cut in 1996 as a cost-saving measure, not as a matter of welfare reform. Section 605 of the underlying bill is also consistent with policies approved by President Bush. Last year, the President signed legislation restoring food stamp benefits for legal immigrant children. The immigrant child health provisions would make these same children eligible for Medicare and SCHIP. In an interview with the Associated Press in May 2002, Tommy Thompson, Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services, stated that he had no "philosophical objection" to lifting the ban on providing health care benefits to legal immigrants.

Senator SESSIONS' amendment also has significant dire consequences for women and children, and could add costs to the Medicaid program, which I am certain Senator Sessions did not intend. Current restrictions prevent thousands of legal immigrant children and pregnant women from getting the same access to preventive health care services that they would have as citizens. As a result of the restrictions, immigrant children have fewer opportunities to see a pediatrician and receive treatment before minor illnesses become serious and life-threatening. Families who are unable to get basic preventive care for their children have little choice but to turn to emergency rooms—the least cost-effective place to provide care—when their children become sick. Similarly, without prenatal care, a woman may give birth to a baby with low birth weight and the baby is at risk and resulting in hundreds of thousands of dollars in neonatal intensive care costs.

Frankly, I am saddened that we must fight over a bipartisan, thoughtful and extensively reviewed provision that will protect the health of children who legally came to our country and had no control over the length of time they were legal immigrants. We must ensure that it is restored.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, with all deference to my colleague from Alabama, I strongly oppose this amendment to strike the provisions that would allow States to cover legal immigrants under Medicaid and SCHIP. As health care measures these provisions are an appropriate addition to this legislation, and I am grateful that the chairman of the Senate Finance Committee included them in his bill.

Legal immigrants are legally permitted to receive Federally-funded SCHIP benefits for 5 years from the date they are first eligible. The argument was made that people shouldn't come to this country if they are going to be a public charge.

But the reality is that legal immigrants don't come here for our benefits. They come because they want to work so they can make better lives for themselves and for their children. They work hard and they make a vital contribution to our economy. Many are forced to take low-paying jobs. And many of these jobs do not provide health insurance.

Immigrant families need access to health insurance just as much as citizen families. They are also just as deserving of this coverage as citizen families. Immigrants work hard. They pay taxes. They contribute to the communities. Immigrant children are also required to register for the Selective Service when they turn 18. According to the American Immigrant Law Foundation, 60,000 legal immigrants are on active duty in the Armed Forces.

Now, when an immigrant woman becomes pregnant, or her child gets sick, she has few places to turn except to emergency care, which is the most expensive means of providing care. Many States have realized that this is not an acceptable way to address the health care needs of these families. Some 20 States now provide health care services to legal immigrants using their own funds. So the notion of caring for these families has been transferred to States and hospitals.

To respond to this situation, Senator GRAHAM introduced S. 984, the Immigrant Children's Health Improvement Act TICHA, which allows States to use Federal Medicaid and SCHIP funding to provide coverage for pregnant women and children who are legal immigrants. The chairman of the Finance Committee included this provision in the Finance Committee report in fiscal years 2005, 2006, and 2007. This proposal has strong bipartisan support in both the Senate and in the House. It was adopted on a bipartisan basis last year by the Finance Committee, and a bipartisan group of Finance Committee members voted against stripping this provision from this bill this year.

The administration has suggested that this proposal would somehow create a new burden on the States. In fact, the proposal only gives States the option to provide this coverage, and allows them to use Federal resources to do so, thus giving them significant fiscal relief. No new burden would be imposed on the States. The National Governors Association and the National Conference of State Legislatures both support restoring these benefits. Even Governor Bush of Florida has indicated he supports this proposal.

Where are the children live in poor or "near-poor" noncitizen families. That is more than one-quarter of the total population of poor or "near-poor" children. Almost half of all low-income immigrant children are uninsured and they are more than twice as likely to be uninsured as low-income citizen children with native-born parents.
Many of these children will eventually become American citizens. By denying all but emergency health care, we increase the risk that these children will suffer long-term health consequences, which could reduce their ability to fully develop, and become productive, contributing citizens.

It is also worth noting that the Medicaids/SCHIP ban also affects citizen children living in immigrant families. As many as 85 percent of immigrant families have at least one child who is a citizen. Although many of these children are eligible for Medicaid and SCHIP, receipt among eligible citizen children of noncitizen parents is significantly below that for other poor children. Parents may be confused about their children's eligibility, or concerned that somehow claiming these benefits will affect the status of other family members.

Making sure that pregnant immigrant women, and their children, have access to health care, including preventive care, is an investment in the future workforce of this Nation. I believe providing health care for all of our citizens, including pregnant women and children who are immigrants, is vital for our future economic strength. It is also the right thing to do. For that reason, I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CORNYN). The Senator from Montana is recognized.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I know we have an agreement that the vote will start at about 5 o'clock. I ask unanimous consent to speak for 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 1033, AS MODIFIED

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I send a modification of Senator Mikulski's amendment to the desk on municipal health services and ask unanimous consent that it be modified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 1033), as modified, is as follows:

At the end of title VI, add the following:

SEC. 610. EXTENSION OF MUNICIPAL HEALTH SERVICE PROGRAMS.

The last sentence of section 9215(a) of the Consolidated Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1985 (42 U.S.C. 1396b–1 note), as previously amended, is amended by striking "December 31, 2004", and inserting "December 31, 2006".

AMENDMENT NO. 1007, AS MODIFIED

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I send a modification to Senator Lilienthal's amendment No. 1067 on kidney disease to the desk and ask unanimous consent that it be modified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, the amendment is so modified.

The amendment (No. 1067), as modified, is as follows:

On page 510, after line 18, add the following:

SEC. 611. MEDICARE COVERAGE OF KIDNEY DISEASE EDUCATION SERVICES.

(a) COVERAGE OF KIDNEY DISEASE EDUCATION SERVICES.

SECTION 127. Sec. 1881(b) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395x) is amended—

(A) in subsection (sh)(1); and

(B) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

"(w) kidney disease education services (as defined in subsection (ww));"; and

(B) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"Kidney Disease Education Services

(w) The term 'kidney disease education services' means educational services that are—

(A) furnished to an individual with kidney disease who, according to accepted clinical guidelines identified by the Secretary, will require dialysis or a kidney transplant; and

(B) provided, upon the referral of the physician managing the individual's kidney condition, by a qualified person (as defined in paragraph (2)); and

(C) designed—

(i) to provide comprehensive information regarding—

"(1) the management of comorbidities; and

(2) each option for renal replacement therapy (including peritoneal dialysis, hemodialysis (including vascular access options), and transplantation); and

(3) to ensure that the individual has the opportunity to actively participate in the choice of therapy.

(2) The term "qualified person" means—

(A) a physician (as described in subsection (r)(1));

(B) an individual who—

(i) is a registered nurse;

(ii) is a registered dietitian or nutrition professional (as defined in subsection (v)(2));

(iii) is a clinical social worker (as defined in subsection (hh)(1));

(iv) is a physician assistant, nurse practitioner, or clinical nurse specialist (as those terms are defined in subsection (aa)(5)); or

(v) is a transplant coordinator; and

(ii) meets such requirements related to experience and other qualifications that the Secretary finds necessary and appropriate for furnishing the services described in paragraph (1); or

(C) a renal dialysis facility subject to the requirements of section 1881(b)(1) with personnel who—

(i) provide the services described in paragraph (1); and

(ii) meet the requirements of subparagraph (A) or (B).

(3) The Secretary shall develop the requirements under paragraph (2)(B) after consulting with physicians, health educators, professional organizations, accrediting organizations, kidney patient organizations, dialysis facilities, transplant centers, network organizations described in section 1881(c)(2), and other knowledgeable persons.

(4) In promulgating regulations to carry out this subsection, the Secretary shall ensure that such regulations ensure that each beneficiary who is entitled to kidney disease education services under this title receives such services in a timely manner that ensures the beneficiary receives the maximum benefit of those services.

(5) The Secretary shall monitor the implementation of this subsection to ensure that beneficiaries who are eligible for kidney disease education services receive such services in the manner described in paragraph (4).

(2) PAYMENT UNDER PHYSICIAN FEE SCHEDULE. —Section 1848(b)(3) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w–4(b)(3)) is amended by inserting ".

(3) PAYMENT TO RENAL DIALYSIS FACILITIES. —Section 1881(b) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w–1(b)) is amended by section 433(b)(3), as amended by section 433(b)(5), is further amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(13) For purposes of paragraph (7), the single composite weighted formula determined under such paragraph shall not take into account the amount of payment for kidney disease education services (as defined in section 1861(ww)). Instead, payment for such services shall be made to the renal dialysis facility on an assignment-related basis under section 1848.

(4) ANNUAL REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than April 1, 2004, and annually thereafter, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall submit to Congress a report on the number of Medicare beneficiaries who are entitled to kidney disease education services (as defined in section 1861(ww) of the Social Security Act, as added by paragraph (1))"
under title XVIII of such Act and who receive such services, together with such recommendations for legislative and administrative action as the Secretary determines to be appropriate to fulfill the legislative intent that resulted in the enactment of that subsection.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to services furnished on or after January 1, 2004.

NOTICE
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Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to provide tax incentives to encourage greater diversity of ownership in telecommunications businesses. My bill is a response to the increasing ownership of television and radio properties by large media companies. I strongly believe that promoting a diversity of views on the airwaves is an important public policy goal. The only way to accomplish that goal is to broaden the ownership of broadcast stations. The television and radio spectrum is a limited resource. The trend in recent years has been a greater concentration of ownership of that resource by the large media companies. We need to reverse that trend.

Mr. Speaker, small businesses that wish to enter telecommunications businesses face significant barriers. To enter a broadcast business, a small business must purchase an existing property. Owners of those properties find it more advantageous to sell large businesses than to small businesses. Therefore, small businesses quite often do not have a seat at the table when there are negotiations over the sale of broadcast properties.

My bill would attempt to reduce those barriers by providing limited deferral of capital gain taxation when a telecommunications property is sold to a small business. It would provide the sellers of those properties a positive incentive to consider a small business purchaser.

Large segments of our society historically have been underrepresented in the ownership of radio and television properties. I believe that it is vital that those groups have access to the television and radio spectrum so that their views may be represented on our airwaves. Therefore, my bill would provide a larger deferral of capital gain taxation when the sale is to a small business owned and controlled by individuals from these historically underrepresented groups.

Mr. Speaker, I understand that some may attack my bill as being the re-enactment of a flawed prior program. The provisions in my bill are quite similar to the tax certificate program that was repealed by the Congress in 1995. Sixty-fold to 3 percent. Since that program was repealed, the number of minority-owned broadcast properties has declined.

The bill that I am introducing today contains provisions specifically designed to address the abuses in the prior program. It is limited to small business purchasers, it contains restrictions on the number of purchases that can be made by any one business, it contains recapitulation provisions to prevent the use of the small business as a front for another party, and it contains provisions designed to prevent avoidance of the ownership requirements through options or other sophisticated transactions.

I am hopeful that we can avoid the emotionally charged rhetoric that occurred in 1995 when this issue was last considered. All small businesses, regardless of their ownership, would be eligible for the benefits of my bill. It is true that the bill provides a slightly larger incentive when the small business purchaser is owned and controlled by individuals who are from segments in our society historically underrepresented in ownership of broadcast businesses. I believe this incentive is appropriate so that the views of those groups are heard on our Nation's airwaves. The bill simply attempts to ensure that small businesses, including minority owned small businesses, have a seat at the table when a broadcast property is being sold.

Mr. Speaker, I am hopeful that we will be able to deal with this issue on a bipartisan basis. We should all support the goal of expanding diversity in ownership of broadcast properties. I am pleased that in the past Senator McCain introduced a similar proposal in the Senate. I am hopeful that we can find bipartisan support in the House. Following is a brief description of the provisions of the bill.

DEATH TAX REPEAL PERMANENCY ACT OF 2003

SPEECH OF

HON. DENNIS MOORE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 18, 2003

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 8, Permanent Death Tax Repeal Act and in support of the Democratic substitute.

I have long been a supporter of providing estate tax relief to American families, small business owners, and farmers who have worked their entire lives to transfer a portion of their estates upon their death. I have also been an advocate, however, for ensuring that we transfer to our children and grandchildren a healthy economy and a government that maintains its commitment to Social Security and Medicare.

In the last Congress, I voted to repeal the estate tax and later voted to override President Clinton's veto of that legislation. Again, in the 107th Congress, I voted to repeal the estate tax as a stand-alone measure and later voted for President Bush's $1.35 trillion tax cut, which contained a provision to phase out and ultimately repeal the estate tax.

When I voted for the president's tax bill last year, I did so with his assurance that we would have the money to pay for it without dipping into the Social Security Trust Fund. Unfortunately, due to the recession and the war on terrorism, the budget surpluses projected last year did not materialize and we are now borrowing money from Social Security Trust Funds to pay for even our most basic needs including the war on terrorism.

While I agree that we should fix provisions of last year's tax cut to increase certainty in the tax code that will help people plan for their financial future, we should also make sure that we are not borrowing money—particularly from the Social Security Trust Funds—to pay for these cuts while we are simultaneously trying to enhance our national security needs. We should also ensure that we aren't raising other taxes to pay for provisions that are, quite frankly, political in nature and have nothing to do with ensuring that the tax burden is reduced on our small businesses and farms.

For example, Mr. Speaker, the underlying bill contains a hidden tax on all decedents. By fully repealing the estate tax, this bill would have the effect of repealing a provision in the bill referred to as the "step up in basis," that protects heirs from paying capital gains on estates.

Anyone who has ever sold a "capital" asset, such as real estate, stocks, bonds, or even a personal residence, knows that cost basis is what the gain or loss on the sales price is measured against. Generally speaking, cost basis is the purchase price of property subject to certain adjustments upward or downward. For example, if property was purchased in 1950 at a cost of $10,000 and sold in 2001 at $100,000, an individual would have a taxable capital gain of $90,000. The step-up basis interacts with estates such that when this property passes by reason of death, the heir inherits the asset with a new cost basis equivalent to the market value of the asset on the date of the benefactor's death. Taking the example above, if the property were transferred in 2001 at a value of $110,000 and the heir sold the property in 2006 for $120,000, the heir would only have a taxable capital gain of $20,000 instead of $110,000.

Should this bill become law, an owner of farmland, stocks, mutual funds, or even a personal residence would have lost the opportunity to pass the asset to the next generation without paying along the owner's cost basis, thus reducing the future capital gains bill that will have to be paid when the heirs sell the asset. In short, this amounts to a tax increase on all estates due simply to the increased cost basis of the estate.

I believe there is a more responsible way to provide estate tax relief to our small business owners and farmers. The substitute will provide substantial and immediate relief by increasing a family's exclusion from $1 million to $6 million. It would also preserve the step-up...
NASA Glenn Research Center and Dr. Michael Schwartz, President of Cleveland State University, will co-chair this year’s Fiesta of Hope Scholarship Luncheon.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in paying special tribute to Esperanza on occasion of the 20th anniversary celebration. Our communities are served well by having such honorable and philanthropic organizations, like Esperanza, who genuinely care about the well-being of Northeastern Ohio’s Hispanic community.

Mr. Speaker, today, as we consider a resolution recognizing the work of our late colleague in the alleviation of hunger, I would like to honor George Thomas “Mickey” Leland for his contributions to this country and the world. He may have been the greatest advocate for the hungry that the House of Representatives has ever known. Mickey was born on November 27, 1944, in Lubbock, Texas. From 1972, when he was first elected into public office, until his death in 1989, Mickey Leland fought on behalf of the hungry, poor and less fortunate around the world. Neither partisanship nor race nor political boundaries prevented Mickey from reaching those who needed him. Republicans and Democrats alike respected Mickey for his determination and moral rectitude. I urge my friends and colleagues in this chamber to honor Mickey’s memory by rededicating ourselves to eradicating world hunger and the poverty which is its cause.

In 1984, Leland co-authored legislation creating the House Select Committee on Hunger. It was the Committee’s responsibility to focus solely on the widespread problems of hunger and malnutrition. Mickey chaired the Committee from its inception until his death. The Committee’s efficacy stemmed from his unwavering moral leadership. He legislated on infant mortality, fresh food for at-risk women and children, and comprehensive services for the homeless. Mickey Leland refused to narrow the scope of his energy and dedication to his own country. Following reports of famine in sub-Saharan Africa, Speaker “Tip” O’Neill appointed Leland to lead a bipartisan Congressional delegation created to assess the magnitude of Africa’s needs. The findings of that delegation resulted in $800 million in humanitarian relief.

In his pursuit to help the needy, Mickey traveled around the world. He met with Fidel Castro to reunite Cuban families and traveled to Moscow as part of joint U.S.-Soviet food initiative to Mozambique following the Cold War. He met privately with Pope John Paul II in 1987 and 1989 to garner support for his efforts in Africa. Mickey did everything he could. Those of us who were privileged to serve with him in this Congress were always inspired and challenged by Mickey to do more to alleviate the suffering of the people whom Jesus called “the least of these.” Mickey died just as he lived, trying to help. He never passed leadership to others when he could infuse a project with his warmth and energy. Mickey was leading a mission to a refugee camp in Ethiopia when his plane crashed, killing him and 15 others. Mickey died on August 7, 1989, near Gambela, Ethiopia.

Ms. SCHAACKSKY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 8 and in support of the Pomery substitute. The House Republican leadership and President Bush are once again putting the interests of the Bush class ahead of the needs of working families and our future well being. They are once again demonstrating that they have the wrong priorities.

Providing tax relief for low wage hard working families remains a low priority for House Republicans and the Bush Administration. Instead, they want to once again provide even more tax breaks for parents at the very least by eliminating that inheritance tax. Republicans are denying immediate assistance to 12 million children who come from families that earn between $10,500 to $26 a year, and where one million of the children have parents that currently serve or have served in the military. Nearly 674,000 children or one in four children back in my home state of Illinois would have qualified for this aid. This is an outrage. Talk about having your priorities backwards.

Proponents of this legislation make baseless claims that it will help small businesses, farmers and working families. The claim that the estate tax puts small family farms out of business. The National Farmers Union disputes this assertion, “There is no evidence that the estate tax has forced the liquidation of any farms, and existing estate tax already exempt 98 percent of all farms and ranches.” The fact is that the estate tax currently affects only the richest 2 percent of estates, and the number dramatically shrinks as the exemption rises to $3.5 million in 2009. H.R. 8 eliminates the tax on the wealthiest 2 percent of all Americans—people like Bill Gates and Ken Lay. In my home state of Illinois less than 2500 families would benefit from the repeal of the estate tax. The rest of the public would not benefit from it at all. In fact, it will hurt their future and further damage our struggling Bush economy, where 2.7 million private sector jobs have been lost.

H.R. 8 will hurt our economic future because it would add at least an additional trillion dollars to the federal deficit over the next two decades. The vast majority of Americans will have to make sacrifices to pay for this tax cut for millionaires. If this bill is enacted into law there will be less money available for Social Security, Medicare, and prescription drugs for seniors, to not mention homeland security and education. Mr. Speaker, how can it be that we are not having the Leave No Child Behind Act but we do have money to give more tax cuts for the super rich? How can this be?
Let me be clear. I am a strong supporter of small businesses and family farms and I am not against reforming the estate tax. I believe that families with modest assets should be exempt from the estate tax. That is why I support the Pomeroy substitute which exempts estates worth less than $3 million from an individual and $6 million from families from the estate taxes. The substitute would exempt 99.65 percent of all estates.

The Bush Administration and their Republican colleagues have a one track mind. They are once again attempting to lower taxes for the richest 1%. Just last month the Bush Administration and leaders in Congress passed tax cuts for millionaires and tax dodging corporations. President Bush made it a top priority and Vice President Cheney personally negotiated the final bill language with the Republican Congressional leadership. The tax bill passed last month will provide a $604,000 tax break for Vice President Cheney and $332,000 to Treasury Secretary John Snow. In total, it could provide up to $3.2 million in total tax savings for President Bush, Vice President Cheney and Secretary Snow. I wonder how much the families of President Bush, Vice President Cheney, and the Cabinet would benefit from repeal of the estate tax?

H.R. 8 undermines our basic sense of fairness. The legislation undermines progressive aspects of our tax code. It replaces it with a regressive tax code that puts more of a burden on middle and low wage families. A regressive tax code restricts opportunities for those who are not born into wealthy families. William Gates Sr., a supporter of the estate tax recently said, “What makes America great is not the broad ownership of property and enterprise. We all succeed to the extent that children are born without vast disparities in access to education, health care, and opportunity. We are weakened when our policy makers are more concerned with preserving existing wealth and power than creating avenues for new asset creation and opportunity.” I couldn’t agree with him more.

Finally, the estate tax gives wealthy individuals an incentive to contribute to charity. Charitable organizations are very concerned about efforts to repeal the estate tax. According to the Joint Economic Committee Democrats, eliminating the estate tax could reduce contributions by 6 to 12 percent. This would reduce revenues for soup kitchens, AIDS prevention programs, and other vital community organizations that rely on charitable contributions to stay afloat.

Support America’s families. Oppose the underlying bill and support the Pomeroy substitute.

IN MEMORY OF THE HONORABLE BOB STUMP

HON. SILVESTRE REYES
OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 25, 2003

Mr. REYES. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I reflect today on the passing of my dear friend Congressman Bob Stump. Bob was a great man and I am deeply saddened by his passing. He was a great American, a respected legislator, and a good friend.

He served with great distinction in Congress for twenty-six years, two years as Chairman of the House Armed Services Committee and six years as Chairman of the Veterans Affairs Committee.

I had the honor and privilege to serve on both of these committees with Bob as my Chairman. Although we did not always see eye to eye, I always had a great deal of respect for Bob’s patriotism and leadership. Bob was a true supporter of men and women in uniform. Under his leadership, we made huge strides to improve the quality of life for our troops and veterans, increasing pay, housing, and healthcare allowances, increasing assistance to disabled veterans and their survivors, and strengthening the Montgomery GI Bill to help millions of veterans fulfill their educational and career goals.

Bob was a modest and decent man who, in dedicating the majority of his life to public service, was a dedicated patriot and a true American Hero. Bob’s enthusiasm and spirit touched the lives of all who had the pleasure of meeting him. Although his presence is greatly missed in the halls of the House, I know that Bob is and will be well remembered.

My thoughts and prayers are with the Stump family and with everyone else who loved and admired him.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.
Along with Reverend Jackson, and many others, I was at the Supreme Court the day when this case was heard. I was very proud to speak to the thousands and thousands of young people, and to the Michigan students and BAM who had come to Washington from all over the country to protest the effort to eliminate affirmative action.

Believe me, the inspiration and involvement of our youth, and as adults we must support their organization efforts. Thank God, they are preparing themselves to take over the world. This victory speaks volumes to their efforts.

I was sitting in the audience when Solicitor General Ted Olson, the Administration’s lead litigator, argued against affirmative action, declaring that the University of Michigan—and by implication all other universities and institutions—should use race-neutral means for its admissions.

I thought how sad it was to witness our own government arguing against the interests of so many of its own people.

I would suggest race-neutral admissions would be fine—just as soon as this becomes a race-neutral country. And not a day sooner.

In upholding the University of Michigan law school’s affirmative action program, race will continue to be a critical component in achieving parity and equal opportunity for all. Let me make clear that it is not a war all. The Supreme Court did uphold affirmative action.

I was there when Justice Scalia told the University of Michigan that it had a choice: it could either set aside the measure—take out race or it could lower its standards and pursue racial diversity.

How income—and who can you get?

Justice Scalia was, in fact, offering a false dichotomy: in reality, you cannot be a top-flight university without diversity.

While the University of Michigan is required to provide an equal opportunity for all, and not just in the interests of minorities but in the interests of the country as a whole.

In making this decision not only stood with us, they actively opposed Prop 209 by marching, engaging in peaceful protests, and holding meetings and rallies.

All the “street heat” that could be brought to bear, Reverend Jackson helped bring it.

During those days, I was chair of the California Board of Regents. We convinced the California Board of Regents to end affirmative action on all campuses.

I would suggest race-neutral admissions would be fine—just as soon as this becomes a race-neutral country. And not a day sooner.

In upholding the University of Michigan law school’s affirmative action program, race will continue to be a critical component in achieving parity and equal opportunity for all. Let me make clear that it is not a war all. The Supreme Court did uphold affirmative action.

I was there when Justice Scalia told the University of Michigan that it had a choice: it could either set aside the measure—take out race or it could lower its standards and pursue racial diversity.

How income—and who can you get?

Justice Scalia was, in fact, offering a false dichotomy: in reality, you cannot be a top-flight university without diversity.

While the University of Michigan is required to provide an equal opportunity for all, and not just in the interests of minorities but in the interests of the country as a whole.
Prop 209 passed. Thank God for our historically Black Colleges. Our African American students are now going south benefiting from their excellent education. But what we have learned is that 70 percent of these students do not return to California. What a brain drain we have in California.

Shame on California.

One of the authors described the process of eliminating affirmative action, at Boalt Hall, the University of California's premiere law school, as “watching justice die.”

In looking at the Administration’s position on affirmative action, we have to face that particular choice within the larger context of the Bush Administration’s class war on America’s most vulnerable and their policies of rewarding the rich.

This Administration and its allies in Congress are rolling back advances in racial equality, economic opportunity, and gender equity.

First Trent Lott lamented the defeat of Strom Thurmond's white supremacist Dixiecrat Party in 1948.

The Administration may have rushed to disown itself from those remarks, but its policies are taking us back to those days nonetheless.

The Administration is creating massive tax cuts for the rich, but twenty million children of America's working families were left off their master plan for the child tax credit. They did this deliberately. It was not a mistake.

So were single mothers who apparently don't deserve tax credits in the world of George Bush. Look at its attack on Title IX, for example. A program that is featured in this legislation remains in this bill, I will oppose it. However, as long as this poison pill provision related to health care tax credits, I can't support this bill. I do support consumer protections in the first place.

It's an Administration that is wiping out decades of progress on Clean Air and Clean Water, even though asthma, childhood cancer rates, and scores of other health problems associated with pollution are on the rise, especially among children. It's an administration that puts our tax dollars into a $400 billion dollar defense budget to build more missiles, yet cuts after school programs. However, what started as a good bipartisan bill has been tarnished by the addition of an anti-consumer provision that is troublesome enough that I cannot vote for it. Language was added to this bill to strip essential consumer protections for those purchasing health insurance using tax credits granted under the Trade Assistance Act (TAA). These existing, carefully negotiated consumer protections are designed to ensure adequate coverage for those using the tax credit. They are enjoyed by every member of this Congress, and they are critical to providing meaningful health coverage.

Proponents of removing these consumer protections call it "consumer choice." But as a former insurance regulator, I can tell you that families facing unemployment and possible loss of health insurance due to U.S. trade policy need health insurance that is both affordable and provides adequate coverage. They should not be forced to "choose" one over the other.

Under current law, insurance companies were agree to offer coverage to displaced workers under this program are substantially limited in their ability to turn down applicants, charge excessive premiums or otherwise seek to cover only the healthiest individuals. With these requirements, the promise of help for these people and their families would be meaningless. Understand, however, these are not special protections. These are standard protections and they are being stripped in this bill.

Making coverage cheaper by restricting it to the healthy undermines its purpose—health security for those who need it most. It's like making automobile air bags out of tissue paper—a tactic sure to make cars cheaper for all and hurt only those few who are in accidents—those whose goal it is to protect in the first place.
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fourteen with this status in the entire State of Ohio. Not only has Father Dolan significantly raised the bar on academic standards and excellence at Padua, he also focused on the improvement of the school’s athletic facilities. These significant exterior developments created new baseball and softball fields, new track fields and facilities, parking and roadway improvements, and a new football stadium. Father Dolan ensured that appropriate landscaping graced the boundaries of every new development.

Moreover, Father Dolan’s goal for Padua included financial stability for the school, and aid for eligible students. During his tenure, Father Dolan secured a major funding effort to build a strong endowment, entitled “The Campaign For Tomorrow.” This significant endeavor exists to increase the amount of financial aid to students in need. This endowment is also designed to maintain the school’s technological level, and also provides teachers with cutting-edge educational training.

Mr. Speaker and Colleagues, please join me in honor and recognition of Father Walter L. Dolan as he retires as President of Padua Franciscan High School, and as he retires from active ministry. Father Dolan’s contributions throughout his ministry are significant and immeasurable, and his work and service will be greatly missed. His leadership, experience, guidance and concern for others have deserved to uplift the entire Padua community, and the entire Cleveland community, and his gift of faith and compassion will forever light our community.

IN HONOR OF ROY BOHNER

HON. MARTIN FROST
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 26, 2003

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Mr. Roy Orthmor Bohner, who recently celebrated his 51st anniversary working with Lockheed Martin Missiles and Fire Control in Dallas, TX. Roy Bohner has been a dedicated employee of MFC since he began working there many years ago as an Engineering Trainee and a junior hydraulics design engineer. Some of his notable accomplishments include a design of an autopilot for a radio controlled drone aircraft, a successful R&D program to do flight control analysis, and design studies for a “fly-by-wire” control system named Electro-GRAM. In addition to his service in Dallas, Roy spent some time at the General Dynamics plant, now Lockheed Martin Aeronautics in Fort Worth, as part of the Industry Assist program.

Prior to joining MFC, Roy served our country in World War II as a member in the 11th Army Division, and he continues to contribute to this Nation through his loyalty and dedication to his projects at Lockheed Martin. A man of ardent and great humor, Roy’s objective is to be the oldest living employee at Missiles and Fire Control in Dallas.

Roy is an exemplary model of the American worker who is dedicated to continue serving this great Nation.

Mr. Speaker, Roy Bohner deserves special recognition for his tremendous achievement and dedication. He serves as a role model to the rest of us, and I wish him success in his future endeavors.

TRIBUTE TO MARIE DAVIS OF NORTH ADAMS, MI

HON. NICK SMITH
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 26, 2003

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Marie Davis of North Adams, Michigan. A lifelong resident of North Adams, Marie has enriched the lives of others through her outstanding participation in civic and volunteer activities, and her many accounts of life in North Adams.

Marie was born on August 14, 1909 and is a lifelong resident of North Adams. She attended school there and graduated from North Adams High School, and has been a member of the North Adams United Methodist Church. Marie has also represented North Adams as a member of the Women’s Congress at the Hillsdale County Fair for many years.

Mrs. Davis is best known for her historical accounts of life in North Adams and has kept diaries of all major events that have occurred there. She has written and published five books about local history, including: “This is North Adams”, “100 Years of Sports in North Adams”, “The History of North Adams Schools,” and “1886–2002: The History of the North Adams Fire Department.”

Marie Davis will celebrate her 94th birthday on August 14, 2003, and is still considered North Adams’ official historian, continuing to chronicle the lives and events of that community.

North Adams is a small midwestern town with tree-lined streets, friendly neighbors, and thanks to Mrs. Davis, a preserved heritage. I am pleased to recognize the efforts of Marie Davis in preserving the memories, stories and values of the past for present and future generations.

GENERAL ERIC K. SHINSEKI

HON. CURT WELDON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 26, 2003

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the outstanding service of one of America’s true heroes, General Eric K. Shinseki.

General Shinseki retires from the Army after a career that spanned the globe and 38 years of service in peace and war. Let me be very clear, what General Shinseki has accomplished as chief is tied directly to the welfare of soldiers and their ability to remain the world’s greatest warfighters and we owe him a debt of gratitude.

General Shinseki was just a young cadet at West Point, when General of the Army Douglas MacArthur, gave his distinguished Farewell speech on the banks of the Hudson to the Corps of Cadets. General MacArthur’s words embodied the creed of military service: “Duty,” “honor,” “country”—Those three hallowed words reverently dictate what you
want to be, what you can be. They are your rallying points to build courage when courage seems to fail, to regain faith when there seems to be little cause for faith, to create hope when hope becomes forlorn—General Douglas MacArthur’s Farewell Speech, May 12, 1962.

These ideals—of duty, honor and country so eloquently expressed by General MacArthur that one can only imagine the personified in General Shinseki’s distinguished career. General Shinseki graduated from the United States Military Academy in 1965 and later received a Master of Arts Degree in English Literature from Duke University.

As a young officer, General Shinseki served two combat tours in Vietnam. He was twice wounded, and earned two Purple Hearts as well as four Bronze Star Medals. He then went on to serve for more than ten years throughout Europe in positions of increasing authority and responsibility. In 1998, General Shinseki was promoted to lieutenant general and returned to the Pentagon as Deputy Chief of Staff for Operations and Planning.

General Shinseki’s duties culminated with his promotion as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff in the Army in 1999. Already, as Vice Chief of Staff, he had developed an innovative plan to prepare the Army to face the unique challenges of the 21st century. Soon after becoming Chief of Staff of the Army, General Shinseki embarked on a bold plan to transform the Army to a lighter, more lethal, more flexible and transportable force that would be fully capable of meeting the full range of threats that face today’s Army. He was a visionary who began transformation long before the term became popular.

Perhaps most poignantly, General Shinseki should be remembered as the gladiator President Roosevelt spoke of so long ago:

It is not the critic who counts, not the man who points out how the strong man stumbles, or where the doer of deeds could have done them better. The credit belongs to the man who is actually in the arena; whose face is marred by dust and sweat and blood: who strives valiantly; who errs, and comes short of what he should; who knows in the end the triumph of high motives, the great devotions; who, knowing the certain know that their children. The man who is actually in the arena, whose face is marred by dust and sweat and blood: who strives valiantly; who errs, and comes short of what he should; who knows in the end the triumph of high motives, the great devotions; who, knowing the certainty of defeat.—Address at the Sorbonne, Paris, November 11, 1918.

THE CASE FOR LABOR STANDARDS IN TRADE AGREEMENTS

HON. BARNEY FRANK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 26, 2003

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask that excerpts of a recent speech by Mr. Levin of Michigan be printed.

In recent years the major industrial growth in El Salvador, Nicaragua and Guatemala has been in the maquilas, assembling apparel in free trade zones. 100,000 to 150,000 people work in the garment maquilas of each nation. 75-25 percent of the workers on average are women, and with an average age of 18-25.

A majority are the sole source of income for themselves and their children. By law, the work week is supposed to be 44 hours, with overtime on a voluntary basis. The typical worker receives about 65 to 75 cents per hour. If paid by piece the average could be as low as 10 cents per piece. Almost every nation in the world has agreed through the International Labor Organization (ILO) to respect five core labor standards: prohibitions on child labor and forced labor, non-discrimination, and the rights to associate and to bargain collectively. In the garment maquilas, the most salient are the right to organize and to bargain collectively.

In Central America today, the basic labor-management dynamic is like the United States at the turn of the last century. In Nicaragua and El Salvador, an employer can fire any employee whom it believes is sympathetic to an organizing effort simply by paying severance.

In one plant I visited in Nicaragua workers had quite recently been working 70- to 80-hour days (apparently for the same $100 a month) in the hope of getting ahead at a job which they thought was about to go. When the workers resented the pace and conditions in the plant, the management fired them.

In Guatemala, we talked with a worker who had personally witnessed other employees who had been trying to organize being beaten with bats at work.

In Nicaragua and Guatemala, we heard numerous reports of employers using the criminal process in order to break up unions in maquilas and other sectors. In El Salvador, we visited a free trade zone in which a plant was shut down to avoid its workers being able to organize. We heard high credible evidence that the leaders of the organizing effort were subsequently blacklisted as they sought other employment.

In Guatemala, it is not legally possible for a union to attempt to organize within an entire industry, like the garment industry, without having in advance 50 percent plus one of the workers signed up and registering with the government.

Nicaraguan and Guatemalan employers cannot strike without government approval. The Subcommission’s Trade Rights Report, and numerous other reports from groups like Human Rights Watch, confirm that the facts and incidents are the constant reality.

In El Salvador, Beatrice Alamanni de Carillo, a vendor judge and professor, serves as Prosecutor for the Defense of Human Rights. She was appointed by the National Assembly, with a majority from the conservative Arena Party. Her comments:

In the private sector an anti-union culture persists in great measure and for many years, employers have generated a climate that does not contribute to the promotion of worker organization in their workplace. . . . The Ministry of Labor and Social Welfare has not demonstrated a real will to guarantee in practice the rights of workers, either individually or collectively. There is a very loud clamor that the authorities of that Ministry do not make their best efforts to adequately check working conditions in businesses, and, in addition, they tolerate and promote an anti-union culture in the country.

In each country, the rights to associate and organize and to bargain collectively are not realities. The laws themselves are inadequate. Even where there are laws on the books, they are not well enforced and are often used against workers trying to organize.

As far as I could determine, there is not a single effective collective bargaining agreement in any of the garment maquilas of the three countries, though there are almost 400,000 workers.

In Central America, a leader of the union connected with the Christian Democrats put it this way: the problem is that employers have “impunity,” “they make up their own laws.”

You may jump to the conclusion that I came back discouraged. That is not accurate. The issue of core labor standards is addressed in CAFTA by including a fully enforceable obligation to adopt these standards, it will have an important impact on socio-economic dynamics in these countries by helping develop a middle class.

In the last decade the apparel/textile maquilas have been the major source of economic growth and new employment in each of the three nations I visited, and in Honduras.

The realities within the maquilas today are built on a total imbalance in relationships between employer and employee. The vast majority of workers, young women, are particularly vulnerable, with overriding fear that for them losing a job means an end to their income.

It is essential in order to provide opportunities to the CAFTA countries to expand trade and strengthen commercial ties with the region. It is equally essential that the rules of trade and investment be shaped in a way that maximizes the benefits to those countries and the U.S.

For workers to be able to break the cycle of poverty, they need to have the ability to join together, to participate, to improve their economic status. This is an antecedent to helping those workers use the potential of globalization to create, join, or expand the middle class.

Hernando de Soto recently authored The Mystery Of Capital: Why Capitalism Succeeds In The West And Fails Everywhere Else, which posits that economies develop where property rights are formalized, are clearly and efficiently defined, are enforceable, and may be exercised by all; in this way all property can become capital. Labor market standards help workers maximize a key property right—property in one’s own labor.
A key reason to seek a minimum floor of respect for the five core, internationally-recognized labor standards is to ensure that the CAFTA countries will not compete in a race to the bottom in their efforts to promote trade and attract investment. Some argue that the race to the bottom is a myth, that income levels will rise when trade and investment flows increase, and that all domestic standards will rise as income levels increase. These arguments ignore the fact that, as with all other economic factors, investment dollars are scarce and there is fierce competition to attract those dollars. When the competition is over labor-intensive industries, one of the key points of competition is the labor market pool.

A New York Times article from about two years ago quoted the President of El Salvador regarding inter-regional competition, who stated, “The difficulty in this region is that there is labor that is more competitively priced than El Salvador.”

Another article from about one year ago in the Washington Post described the interesting changes in patterns of trade, with banana trade with Ecuador attracting an increasing share. The explanation, according to one major fruit company executive, is that “the costs in Ecuador are so much lower. There are no unions, no labor standards, and the pay is as low as two dollars a day.” If the promise of expanded trade—increased incomes and lower levels of income inequality—is to be realized, it is important that the CAFTA countries not compete with each other based upon abuse of core labor standards. The best way to do that is to establish new labor standards.

Through increased trade, as well as agriculture, means some further displacement in the United States. Comparative advantage is sound economics, but the distortion of the labor market by suppression of workers and the advantages this provides to foreign workers is unacceptable. With the negotiation of CAFTA, and the consequent elimination of the CBI labor standards criteria, including a fully enforceable obligation to enforce the five core labor standards, is even more important.

The further integration in apparel and textiles, as well as agriculture, means some further displacement in the United States. Comparative advantage is sound economics, but the distortion of the labor market by suppression of workers and the advantages this provides to foreign workers is unacceptable. With the negotiation of CAFTA, and the consequent elimination of the CBI labor standards criteria, including a fully enforceable obligation to enforce the five core labor standards, is even more important.

The further integration in apparel and textiles, as well as agriculture, means some further displacement in the United States. Comparative advantage is sound economics, but the distortion of the labor market by suppression of workers and the advantages this provides to foreign workers is unacceptable. With the negotiation of CAFTA, and the consequent elimination of the CBI labor standards criteria, including a fully enforceable obligation to enforce the five core labor standards, is even more important.

The further integration in apparel and textiles, as well as agriculture, means some further displacement in the United States. Comparative advantage is sound economics, but the distortion of the labor market by suppression of workers and the advantages this provides to foreign workers is unacceptable. With the negotiation of CAFTA, and the consequent elimination of the CBI labor standards criteria, including a fully enforceable obligation to enforce the five core labor standards, is even more important.

The further integration in apparel and textiles, as well as agriculture, means some further displacement in the United States. Comparative advantage is sound economics, but the distortion of the labor market by suppression of workers and the advantages this provides to foreign workers is unacceptable. With the negotiation of CAFTA, and the consequent elimination of the CBI labor standards criteria, including a fully enforceable obligation to enforce the five core labor standards, is even more important.

The further integration in apparel and textiles, as well as agriculture, means some further displacement in the United States. Comparative advantage is sound economics, but the distortion of the labor market by suppression of workers and the advantages this provides to foreign workers is unacceptable. With the negotiation of CAFTA, and the consequent elimination of the CBI labor standards criteria, including a fully enforceable obligation to enforce the five core labor standards, is even more important.

The further integration in apparel and textiles, as well as agriculture, means some further displacement in the United States. Comparative advantage is sound economics, but the distortion of the labor market by suppression of workers and the advantages this provides to foreign workers is unacceptable. With the negotiation of CAFTA, and the consequent elimination of the CBI labor standards criteria, including a fully enforceable obligation to enforce the five core labor standards, is even more important.

The further integration in apparel and textiles, as well as agriculture, means some further displacement in the United States. Comparative advantage is sound economics, but the distortion of the labor market by suppression of workers and the advantages this provides to foreign workers is unacceptable. With the negotiation of CAFTA, and the consequent elimination of the CBI labor standards criteria, including a fully enforceable obligation to enforce the five core labor standards, is even more important.

The further integration in apparel and textiles, as well as agriculture, means some further displacement in the United States. Comparative advantage is sound economics, but the distortion of the labor market by suppression of workers and the advantages this provides to foreign workers is unacceptable. With the negotiation of CAFTA, and the consequent elimination of the CBI labor standards criteria, including a fully enforceable obligation to enforce the five core labor standards, is even more important.

The further integration in apparel and textiles, as well as agriculture, means some further displacement in the United States. Comparative advantage is sound economics, but the distortion of the labor market by suppression of workers and the advantages this provides to foreign workers is unacceptable. With the negotiation of CAFTA, and the consequent elimination of the CBI labor standards criteria, including a fully enforceable obligation to enforce the five core labor standards, is even more important.

The further integration in apparel and textiles, as well as agriculture, means some further displacement in the United States. Comparative advantage is sound economics, but the distortion of the labor market by suppression of workers and the advantages this provides to foreign workers is unacceptable. With the negotiation of CAFTA, and the consequent elimination of the CBI labor standards criteria, including a fully enforceable obligation to enforce the five core labor standards, is even more important.

The further integration in apparel and textiles, as well as agriculture, means some further displacement in the United States. Comparative advantage is sound economics, but the distortion of the labor market by suppression of workers and the advantages this provides to foreign workers is unacceptable. With the negotiation of CAFTA, and the consequent elimination of the CBI labor standards criteria, including a fully enforceable obligation to enforce the five core labor standards, is even more important.

The further integration in apparel and textiles, as well as agriculture, means some further displacement in the United States. Comparative advantage is sound economics, but the distortion of the labor market by suppression of workers and the advantages this provides to foreign workers is unacceptable. With the negotiation of CAFTA, and the consequent elimination of the CBI labor standards criteria, including a fully enforceable obligation to enforce the five core labor standards, is even more important.

The further integration in apparel and textiles, as well as agriculture, means some further displacement in the United States. Comparative advantage is sound economics, but the distortion of the labor market by suppression of workers and the advantages this provides to foreign workers is unacceptable. With the negotiation of CAFTA, and the consequent elimination of the CBI labor standards criteria, including a fully enforceable obligation to enforce the five core labor standards, is even more important.

The further integration in apparel and textiles, as well as agriculture, means some further displacement in the United States. Comparative advantage is sound economics, but the distortion of the labor market by suppression of workers and the advantages this provides to foreign workers is unacceptable. With the negotiation of CAFTA, and the consequent elimination of the CBI labor standards criteria, including a fully enforceable obligation to enforce the five core labor standards, is even more important.

The further integration in apparel and textiles, as well as agriculture, means some further displacement in the United States. Comparative advantage is sound economics, but the distortion of the labor market by suppression of workers and the advantages this provides to foreign workers is unacceptable. With the negotiation of CAFTA, and the consequent elimination of the CBI labor standards criteria, including a fully enforceable obligation to enforce the five core labor standards, is even more important.

The further integration in apparel and textiles, as well as agriculture, means some further displacement in the United States. Comparative advantage is sound economics, but the distortion of the labor market by suppression of workers and the advantages this provides to foreign workers is unacceptable. With the negotiation of CAFTA, and the consequent elimination of the CBI labor standards criteria, including a fully enforceable obligation to enforce the five core labor standards, is even more important.

The further integration in apparel and textiles, as well as agriculture, means some further displacement in the United States. Comparative advantage is sound economics, but the distortion of the labor market by suppression of workers and the advantages this provides to foreign workers is unacceptable. With the negotiation of CAFTA, and the consequent elimination of the CBI labor standards criteria, including a fully enforceable obligation to enforce the five core labor standards, is even more important.

The further integration in apparel and textiles, as well as agriculture, means some further displacement in the United States. Comparative advantage is sound economics, but the distortion of the labor market by suppression of workers and the advantages this provides to foreign workers is unacceptable. With the negotiation of CAFTA, and the consequent elimination of the CBI labor standards criteria, including a fully enforceable obligation to enforce the five core labor standards, is even more important.

The further integration in apparel and textiles, as well as agriculture, means some further displacement in the United States. Comparative advantage is sound economics, but the distortion of the labor market by suppression of workers and the advantages this provides to foreign workers is unacceptable. With the negotiation of CAFTA, and the consequent elimination of the CBI labor standards criteria, including a fully enforceable obligation to enforce the five core labor standards, is even more important.

The further integration in apparel and textiles, as well as agriculture, means some further displacement in the United States. Comparative advantage is sound economics, but the distortion of the labor market by suppression of workers and the advantages this provides to foreign workers is unacceptable. With the negotiation of CAFTA, and the consequent elimination of the CBI labor standards criteria, including a fully enforceable obligation to enforce the five core labor standards, is even more important.
INTRODUCTION OF THE KILAUEA POINT NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE EXPANSION ACT OF 2003

HON. ED CASE
OF HAWAII
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 26, 2003

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce a bill to authorize expansion of the Kilauea Point National Wildlife Refuge on the Island of Kaua‘i. This bill is a vital component of one of my principal goals in Congress: to ensure that federal and/or state or private protection is extended to as many of Hawai‘i’s threatened and irreparable areas as possible, both to ensure the survival and recovery of Hawai‘i’s unique endangered and threatened species and to preserve the remaining unspoiled natural treasures of our beautiful islands for future generations.

The Kilauea National Wildlife Refuge, located at the northwestern tip of Kaua‘i, was established in 1985. The initial acreage of 31 acres was increased to 203 acres through additional acquisitions in 1993 and 1994. The refuge provides invaluable habitat for many native seabirds, including the Laysan Albatross, the Red-footed Booby, and the Wedge-tailed Shearwater, as well as for the endangered nene (Hawaiian Goose). Native plants have also been reintroduced to the area. The Refuge and its historic lighthouse have become one of Hawai‘i’s world-class tourist destinations, visited by some 400,000 visitors each year.

The proposed expansion area consists of three indispensable land parcels that are currently available for purchase and could be added to the eastern boundary of the Refuge. The Kilauea River runs through the land, which also includes an exclusive loko (irrigated terrace for traditional cultivation of taro), the staple crop of Native Hawaiians) which could be restored to support endangered Hawaiian water birds, including the Koloa duck, Hawaiian coot, Hawaiian stilts, and Hawaiian moorhen. There is also a high quality estuarine ecosystem at the lower reaches of the river, which includes habitat for endangered birds as well as native stream life, such as the hihiwai (an endemic snail) and o‘opu (native goby). The proposed addition also provides an excellent habitat for the nene, Hawai‘i’s state bird, which was only recently saved from extinction. The beach is also sometimes used by endangered Hawaiian monk seals, and endangered sea turtles nest in the area. These three parcels are available for sale and each of the owners has expressed a desire to see the land protected from development. But given rampant urbanization on Kaua‘i (and elsewhere in Hawai‘i) and the high demand for waterfront property, we could very well lose this remarkable opportunity to add high-quality wildlife habitat to our national refuge system.

The Kilauea community strongly supports protecting the land from development. In fact, the Kilauea Point National Wildlife Refuge is a model for management of other federal refuges nationwide. The operations of the Refuge are supported by community volunteers, who give daily tours of the Refuge and help in the preservation of native plant species. The principal volunteer group, Kilauea Point Natural History Association, even has a small store in the Visitor Center, the proceeds of which go to the Refuge and for environmental education throughout Hawaii.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill, and invite you to come to the Island of Kaua‘i to visit the Refuge. I know that if you did so, you would be convinced as I am of the importance of protecting these lands.

WHEREAS, Jackson City Schools’ “JEEP III” received First Place honors for the State of Ohio; and

WHEREAS, Jackson City Schools will be recognized in Washington, DC at the National Youth Awards Program for Energy Achievement sponsored by the National Energy Education Development (NEED) Project; therefore, I join with the residents of the entire 18th Congressional District of Ohio in congratulating Jackson City Schools for their outstanding pursuit of excellence.

IN HONOR OF SAINT BONIFACE PARISH

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 26, 2003

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of the parish community of Saint Boniface Parish, as they celebrate 100 years of faith and hope in Cleveland’s Westside neighborhood. Throughout the past century, Saint Boniface Parish has served as a spiritual refuge—radiating hope, encouragement, education and faith.

Father Casimir Reichlin began the ministry of Saint Boniface in February of 1903. His visionary focus aimed at educating children within the framework of the neighborhood parish has remained as significant and impactful today as it was 100 years ago. As Saint Boniface Parish was born, so was Saint Boniface School. In 1904, Reverend A. M. Seeholzer was named Pastor of Saint Boniface Parish. Under the guidance of Father Reichlin, Pastor Seeholzer oversaw the construction of a four-room frame building that would serve parishioners and students for the next 12 years.

In March of 1923, parishioners and spiritual leaders of Saint Boniface Parish celebrated the grand opening of the new Saint Boniface School. The sturdy, two-story brick structure contained 16 classrooms, accommodating more than 700 students, in grades kindergarten through high school. Today, Saint Boniface School provides preschool, kindergarten and first grade instruction.

Mr. Speaker and colleagues, please join me in honor and recognition of every member of Saint Boniface Parish, as they celebrate 100 years of fostering faith, hope, enlightenment and love within our Cleveland community. Saint Boniface Parish continues its dedication to providing educational and spiritual growth, elevating the lives of countless children, adults and families within our community.

A RESOLUTION HONORING JOSIE COLE, L’EGRAND SMITH SCHOLARSHIP WINNER OF PARMA, MI

HON. NICK SMITH
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 13, 2003

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, let it be known that it is with great respect for the outstanding record of excellence she has compiled in academics, leadership and community service, that I am proud to salute Josie Cole,
TRIBUTE TO ADRIAN SPOTTON HOOPER, A LEGACY OF MARITIME ACHIEVEMENTS

HON. CURT WELDON OF PENNSYLVANIA IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 26, 2003

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of Adrian Spotton Hooper, one of Pennsylvania's most distinguished maritime leaders and community leaders. Mr. Hooper was Chairman of Penn's Landing Corporation, in Philadelphia, PA, during the area's initial development and head of the Independence Seaport Museum when it was moved to the waterfront. In fact, there would be no Independence Seaport Museum without Adrian's leadership.

Mr. Hooper, born and raised in West Philadelphia, had been fascinated by the sea since his youth. He ran away from home at the age of 15 and tried to join the Merchant Marine, but was forced to return after his father intervened and arranged for him to sail on a Norwegian vessel in the North Atlantic for a few months. Mr. Hooper got sailing out of his system for a while, and graduated from Lower Merion High School in 1941. But to the sea he soon returned. As soon as World War II broke out, Adrian joined the Navy. He wanted to be at sea and fight in the war so badly that he memorized the eye chart, because he was blind in one eye. He went on to serve our country as a torpedoman on a destroyer in the Atlantic and the Pacific until 1945. After the war, Mr. Hooper earned a bachelor's in business from the University of Pennsylvania's Wharton School in 1950. That year, he married Elizabeth Wharton Shober, and they moved to Devon, PA. He also began his professional career as a dispatcher for Interstate Oil Transport Company and served as chief executive officer until the company was sold in 1981 to Southern Natural Resources.

Mr. Hooper's career was interrupted in 1951 when he joined the Army during the Korean War. He served stateside until 1953. After the war, Mr. Hooper returned to the Interstate Oil Transport Company and served as chief executive officer until the company was sold to Universal Space Net, a satellite tracking firm in California. The firm has done work for NASA, the Air Force, and aerospace firms.

Mr. Hooper's first wife died in 1996, and he married Susan M. Borresen Hooper in 1999. In addition to his wife, Mr. Hooper is survived by daughters Suzanne, Elizabeth, and Dana; a son, Adrian Jr.; stepchildren Karen and Devon Walsh; and four grandchildren.

Mr. Hooper's legacy was not only in the principles he stood for and the improvements he brought to Pennsylvania, but also in his wonderful family, his wife and children. Mr. Hooper's legacy is sure to include his keen understanding that the most important elements of our maritime infrastructure are people—shelter workers, commercial seafarers, merchant fleet operators, and many others who make America the maritime nation that it is today.

Mr. Speaker, our region has lost an exceptional leader, and I have lost a good friend. I wish the family of Adrian Hooper my heartfelt condolences and may they find comfort in knowing that the many people he impacted deeply value his dedication and generosity and the example of his life and work. Adrian Hooper exemplified the spirit of service that has made this country great. It is proper to remember and honor a man of such worth and character with great respect for what he accomplished and stood for.

THE REALITY PRINCIPLE

HON. BARNEY FRANK OF MASSACHUSETTS IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 26, 2003

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, President Bush's serious personal involvement in the effort to bring about Middle East peace deserves both praise and, more important, strong support from all Americans. As a strong supporter of the State of Israel and its right to exist as a democratic, Jewish state in a secure environment, I firmly believe that what President Bush is doing is very much in furtherance of the achievement of that goal, and I am pleased that he is taking the risks that are inherent when any peacemaker genuinely and in good faith pushes for peace in the Middle East.

As Thomas Friedman noted in a recent column in the New York Times, President Bush's involvement is essential if we are to reach peace. As Mr. Friedman also notes, and those of us who seek peace must be prepared to acknowledge this, "it may be that the Palestinians are capable only of self-destructive revenge, rather than constructive restraint and reconciliation." That is, one can be sure that peace is attainable on grounds that will allow Israel to live securely and without the constant threat of terrorist attacks on its citizens. But as Mr. Friedman adds, "surely Israel has more to gain in the long term by giving Mr. Abbas every chance to prove otherwise, and to empower him to do so."

There are two very tough decisions now facing the government of Israel, and I believe that those of us who have been and are consistent defenders of Israel's right to exist, in the face of the overwhelming hostility of so many neighboring countries, should be explicit in urging the Israeli government to take the necessary action to test the Palestinians willingness to embrace genuinely a two-state solution. One of those decisions is to be willing to...
withdraw settlements from much of the West Bank and all of Gaza. The other, even harder given the understandable emotion that the murder of innocent civilians triggers, is to show the restraint that the Bush Administration has asked Israel to show with regard to retaliation against the leaders of Hamas and other terrorist groups who deny Israelis the right to act in its own defense, but I do urge the government to consider seriously the wisdom of Mr. Friedman's argument for restraint as a very important step towards testing the prospects for peace.

I have been struck, in conversations with Israeli government officials, by the confidence they have expressed in the good intentions of the new Palestinian Prime Minister, Mahmoud Abbas. But it is also clear that he faces great difficulties, including, sadly, the hostility of Yasir Arafat, whose unwillingness seriously to make peace has been a major factor contributing to the turmoil in the region. Refraining from actions which will unnecessarily undercut Prime Minister Abbas, is clearly in the interest of Israel, certainly until it becomes clearer as to whether he will be able to achieve the peace that Israel believes he seeks.

Thomas Friedman's article in the New York Times for Saturday, June 21, spells out this nut of interest. With patience and constructive restraint and reconciliation, the Bush Administration has made it possible for Mr. Abbas to take his place, in which case what Israel is doing is actually self-destructive. Self-destructive is, in fact, a useful term to describe the Palestinian leaders today. "Both sides," notes the Israeli political theorist Yaron Ezrahi, "have crossed the line where self-defense has turned into self-destruction, only an external force can bring people back to their senses. And that force is necessary only of an interim peace settlement, corral terrorist groups. I do not deny Israel's right to try to do it in a way that will nurture one. And the people who get that the best are Israelis. In a Yediot Ahronot poll released Friday, two-thirds of Israelis were critical of Mr. Abbas's decision to target the bombings of Hamas officials and said they wanted Mr. Abbas to be given a chance to establish his authority.

It may be that Abbas can't step up to this. It may be that the Palestinians are capable only of self-destructive revenge, rather than constructive restraint and reconciliation. But surely, those who have suffered in the long term by giving Mr. Abbas every change to prove otherwise, and to empower him to do so, rather than killing one more Hamas "senior operative," who will only be replaced by three others.

Because if the two sides cannot emerge from this dead end, then you can forget about a two-state solution, which is what both Hamas's followers and the extremist Jewish settlers want. They each want a one-state solution, in which their side will control all of Israel, the West Bank and Gaza. The one-state solution would mean the end of the Zionist enterprise, because Israel can't rule such an entity, in which there would soon be more Arabs than Jews, only by apartheid or ethnic cleansing. It would also mean the end of Palestinian nationalism, because the Israelis will crush the Palestinians rather than give them a state. That is the outcome we are heading toward, though, unless the only reality principle left, the United States of America, really intervenes—with its influence, its wisdom and, if necessary, its troops.

HONORING CLINICA MARIPOSA

HON. SAM FARR
OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 26, 2003

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Clinica Mariposa, Planned Parenthood of Watsonville, CA. During a time when healthcare services are continually becoming more expensive, and information on reproductive health is becoming more restricted, Planned Parenthood has provided invaluable services and resources to the Watsonville community. For nearly thirty years, Clinica Mariposa has offered education, outreach, and medical services to an ever-growing population that depends on these affordable services.

Since the establishment of Planned Parenthood services in Watsonville in 1974, there has been a demonstrated commitment to affordability, cultural sensitivity, confidentiality, and high medical standards. All of these things contribute to the achievement of Planned Parenthood’s goal of “every child, a wanted child, every family a healthy family.”

It is frightening that in a country based on opportunity and equality, there are so many people who are without healthcare. Planned Parenthood has been one of the local healthcare networks that provide a broad range of affordable services. Over the years, the growing health needs of the Watsonville community have been answered by Planned Parenthood and their ever-expanding services and resources. By utilizing community-based satellites at farm labor camps and community agencies in addition to the Penny Lane location, Planned Parenthood fills a special role serving low-income residents regardless of their insurance status.

In an atmosphere where the constitutionally established right to reproductive choice is being threatened, and access to comprehensive sex education is being limited, the presence and services of Planned Parenthood are critical now more than ever. The presence of Planned Parenthood in Watsonville has ensured that residents have the full spectrum of choices and opportunities regarding their health. In addition, through school-based education programs, Planned Parenthood has worked to reduce unintended teen pregnancies by giving young people the information and skills they need to make healthy choices.

The exceptional services that Planned Parenthood offers would be impossible without the dedication of the staff, the generosity of their many supporters, and the support of community leaders. I applaud the hard work of all those who have devoted their time and energy to the cause of affordable, high-quality healthcare at the Watsonville Planned Parenthood.

INTRODUCING THE “SMALL BUSINESS FEDERAL SAFEGUARD ACT”

HON. ED CASE
OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 26, 2003

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, small businesses are the lifeblood of our economy and generate nearly half of our nation’s GDP, yet the federal government is shutting small businesses out of the federal contracting process by bundling small contracts together into large megaprojects.

In my State of Hawaii for example, the federal government has created large megaprojects for military housing projects. This allows huge corporations to swoop in and win the contracts, even though Hawaii’s small businesses could do the work. Bundling has put these projects, and many other government contracts, out of the reach of small businesses and forces them to become subcontractors. I have heard from countless small business owners who said subcontracting for a large prime contractor is detrimental to their financial health and unfairly forces them to abide by the large employer’s rules.

Today I introduce a companion bill to S. 633. This bill will strengthen the definition of a bundled contract and prevent federal agencies
from circumventing statutory safeguards intended to prevent contract bundling. This is a fair and temperate solution, and I ask for my colleagues' support.

A PROCLAMATION HONORING MR. AND MRS. THOMPSON ON THEIR 70TH WEDDING ANNIVERSARY

HON. ROBERT W. NEY
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 26, 2003

Mr. NEY. Mr. Speaker, Whereas, Victor and Ruth Thompson were united in marriage June 26, 1933, and are celebrating their 70th anniversary this year; and
Whereas, Victor and Ruth have demonstrated love and a firm commitment to each other; and
Whereas, Victor and Ruth have proven, by their example, to be a model for all married couples; and
Whereas, Victor and Ruth must be commended for their incredible devotion to each other;
Therefore, I join with the residents of the entire 18th Congressional District of Ohio in congratulating Victor and Ruth Thompson as they celebrate their 70th Wedding Anniversary.

IN HONOR AND REMEMBRANCE OF SAMUEL LADERMAN

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 26, 2003

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor and remembrance of Samuel Laderman—beloved family man, respected attorney and CPA, and friend and mentor to countless.

Mr. Laderman began his career in the late 1940s first as an accountant. A few years later, he earned a law degree from Cleveland Marshall Law School, which singled him out as one of the few attorneys who also held a CPA license. Mr. Laderman built his career in law and accounting based on expertise, integrity, and a strong work ethic. He forged lifelong professional relationships based on trust, fairness, good will and his ever-present vivacious personality and quick wit.

Aside from his great professional success, Mr. Laderman possessed a kind heart, great sense of humor, and his main priority, focus and greatest love was his family. He was happily married to his college sweetheart, Cecile “Cece” Perry for 58 years. Together they lovingly raised two daughters, Flora and June, and a son, Gerald. Their closeness as a family and deep faith carried them through the tragic loss of their daughter June, who lost her battle with leukemia as a teenager. In her honor and memory, Mr. and Mrs. Laderman worked to help others through their creation of the June Beverly Laderman Memorial Fund with University Hospitals of Cleveland. Mr. Laderman volunteered his time and talents within our community on a regular basis. He was a member of the Cuyahoga County Bar Association, and was first president of the Hillel Alumni Association of Cleveland. In addition, Mr. Laderman was past president of the Cleveland Heights Chapter of B’nai Brith, and served on the board of B’nai Jeshurun Synagogue.

Mr. Speaker and Colleagues, please join me in honor and remembrance of Samuel Laderman—beloved family man, respected attorney, CPA, and friend and mentor to countless. I offer my deepest condolences to his beloved wife Cecile; beloved children, Flora and Gerald; to his three adoring grandchildren, extended family, and to his many colleagues and friends. Mr. Laderman’s life has left a luminous mark upon our community, and his spirited work ethic and personal and professional legacy will be remembered always.

IN HONOR OF DUANE SCHAELZER

HON. MARTIN FROST
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 26, 2003

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the outstanding service of Arthur Duane Schaezler, a gentleman who has recently celebrated his 51st anniversary with Lockheed Martin Missiles and Fire Control in my district.

Duane Schaezler served this country as an Air Force navigator for three years before he obtained his BS in Aeronautical Engineering from the University of Texas in 1949. Duane joined what was then-Chance Vought Aircraft in 1951 and has since applied his vast expertise and expert technical knowledge in the areas of guidance, navigation, flight dynamics and control systems.

Duane is an excellent example of a dependable and deliberate American whose positive work ethic and loyalty are so important in today’s society.

Today, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Duane Schaezler on his incredible accomplishment of fifty-one years with Lockheed Martin and wish him continued success in the future.

TRIBUTE HONORING 2003 LEGRAND SMITH SCHOLARSHIP FINALISTS THOMAS CLEVENGER OF JACKSON, MICHIGAN, AND JEREMY WAGNER-KAISER OF BATTLE CREEK, MICHIGAN

HON. NICK SMITH
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 26, 2003

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, It is with a sincere pleasure to recognize the finalists of the 2003 LeGrand Smith Congressional Scholarship Program. This special honor is an appropriate tribute to the academic accomplishment, demonstration of leadership and responsibility, and commitment to social involvement, demonstration of leadership and responsibility, and commitment to social involvement displayed by these remarkable young adults. We all have reason to celebrate their success, for it is in their promising and capable hands that our future rests.

The finalists of the LeGrand Smith Congressional Scholarship Program are being honored for showing that same generosity of spirit, depth of intelligence, and capacity for human service that distinguished the late LeGrand Smith of Somerset, Michigan. They are young men and women of character, ambition, and initiative, who have already learned well the value of hard work, discipline and commitment.

These exceptional students have consistently displayed their dedication, intelligence and concern throughout their high school experience. They stand out among their peers due to their many achievements and the disciplined manner in which they meet challenges. While they have already accomplished a great deal, these young people possess unlimited potential, for they have learned the keys to success in any endeavor.

As a Member of Congress of the United States of America, I am proud to join their many admirers in extending our highest praise and congratulations to the finalist of the 2003 LeGrand Smith Congressional Scholarship program.

HONORING RALPH AND ELEANOR LOCKER ON THE OCCASION OF THEIR 64TH WEDDING ANNIVERSARY

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 26, 2003

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor and recognition of Mayor Ralph and Eleanor Locher, as they celebrate the sixty-fourth year of their marriage. Their committed partnership to each other also reflects their deep commitment and service to our entire Cleveland community.

Mayor and Mrs. Locher met in their rural hometown of Bluffton, Ohio. As a young boy, Mayor Locher and his family emigrated from Romania and settled in Bluffton. Mrs. Locher was born and raised in Bluffton. Their dedication for each other and for politics originated during their teen years in high school, as they were avid members of the high school debate team—and they’ve been inseparable ever since.

Mayor and Mrs. Locher attended Dayton University together. After they graduated, they moved to Cleveland and were married in June of 1939. Mr. Locher went on to attend law school at Western Reserve University, while Mrs. Locher worked as a teacher. Soon after, daughter Virginia was born. Mrs. Locher became the steel frame of the Locher family, evolving into the role of mother, supportive wife and civic activist. Throughout Mayor Locher’s impressive career as attorney, mayor and judge, Mrs. Locher was a constant and committed advocate, organizer and friend. Their unbreakable alliance has served to encourage, uplift, and bring out the best in one another.

Mr. Speaker and colleagues, please join me in honor and recognition of Mayor Ralph Locher and Eleanor Locher as they celebrate sixty-four years of marriage. The longevity of their union underscores a deep and abiding love. While they have already accomplished a great deal, these young people possess unlimited potential, for they have learned the keys to success in any endeavor.

As a Member of Congress of the United States of America, I am proud to join their many admirers in extending our highest praise and congratulations to the finalist of the 2003 LeGrand Smith Congressional Scholarship program.
Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege today to recognize an outstanding engineer from my district. Mr. William Guy Redmond, Jr., recently celebrated the remarkable accomplishments of over 50 years of service to Lockheed Martin Missiles and Fire Control in Dallas, Texas.

Guy Redmond came to what was then-Chance Vought Aircraft Company as a young man after serving in the U.S. Navy and receiving degrees from SMU and MIT. Over the years, Guy has amassed over 20 patents. He is highly respected by all for his integrity and technical expertise and unwavering dedication to his organization.

In 1983, Guy was recognized through a nomination for the coveted IEEE Pioneer award for his contributions to the company and the community.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize Guy Redmond again today for his enormous accomplishments at Lockheed Martin and offer my heartfelt congratulations on his 51st anniversary. I’m sure the members of this body will agree with me that 50 years of constancy and dedication is a feat not accomplished by many, and I wish him great success in his future endeavors.

JAMES AND ANN MCENTEE HONORED FOR YEARS OF SERVICE TO THE PEOPLE OF SANTA CLARA COUNTY

HON. ZOE LOFGREN OF CALIFORNIA

HON. MICHAEL M. HONDA OF CALIFORNIA

HON. ANNA G. ESHOO OF CALIFORNIA

SPEECH OF

HON. HENRY A. WAXMAN OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution and join my colleagues in condemning the ongoing Palestinian terrorist attacks that threaten to derail the renewed effort to bring Israelis and Palestinians back to the peace process.

Since the Aqaba summit, 22 Israeli civilians have been murdered in terrorist attacks even as the Israeli Government has taken measures to release Palestinian prisoners, dismantle settlement outposts, allow Palestinian workers back into Israel and transfer revenue funds to the Palestinian treasury.

This is not a cycle of violence. This is a cycle of terror where Hamas and Islamic Jihad bargain for a "ceasefire" so they can buy time to regroup and rearm.

I was shocked, therefore, to hear President Bush condemn Israel’s attack on Hamas leaderAbdel Aziz Rantisi and Secretary of State Powell speak out against Israel’s attempt to arrest other Hamas operatives.

Although the Israelis are willing to take risks for peace, they have every right as a sovereign state to defend their vital interests. The United States, as a nation engaged in the global war on terrorist groups, should stand firmly with Israel on this issue. The same cof-fers that fund Al Qaeda funnel money and weapons to Hamas and Islamic Jihad, and the same state sponsors of terrorism that arm Hezbollah and smuggle mortars, explosives, and weapons into Gaza.

I stand with the President’s in support of a two state solution that will bring security and stability to the region. The reality is, however, that the future of the Road Map depends on the direction of the Palestinian leadership. Although newly appointed Palestinian Prime Minister Mahmoud Abbas faces challenges, he has the ability to move in the direction of peace by shutting off the constant stream of anti-Israeli hatred and incitement on Palestinian television and newspapers.

Likewise, it is the responsibility of the Arab states, the European Union, Russia, and the United Nations to support Prime Minister Abbas by joining the United States in isolating Arafat and shutting down the financing of terrorist networks that seek to undermine Palestinian reform.

The Road Map for peace requires all parties involved to maintain a commitment to these principles and to understand that the cessation of terrorism is the first step toward that vision.

CONDEMN TERRORISM INFLICTED ON ISRAEL SINCE AQABA SUMMIT AND EXPRESSING SOLIDARITY WITH THE ISRAELI PEOPLE

SPEECH OF

HON. ERIC CANTOR OF VIRGINIA

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support H. Res. 294, and I thank Mr. DELAY for scheduling this important resolution this week.

On June 4, 2003, President Bush, Prime Minister Sharon, and Prime Minister Abbas came together to pledge their commitment to the “Road Map” to Peace. At this summit, Mr. Abbas promised to reign in the terror groups that have plagued Israel with 3 years of relentless terror. Since this summit, 29 Israelis have been murdered and over 120 have been wounded in terrorist attacks by Palestinian organizations such as Hamas, Islamic Jihad, and Yasser Arafat’s own Fatah. In all, the Israeli defense forces have counted 319 separate attacks on soldiers and civilians.

Mr. Speaker, the United States sustained a horrifying terrorist attack on September 11, 2001, and responded by pursuing and attacking those responsible for the cowardly murder of innocent civilians on American soil. Israel has lived with a perpetual September 11 since its inception and must be allowed to pursue those who wish to murder innocent Israeli civilians. The terrorist actions of the last few weeks demonstrate that these organizations are not interested in peace, but rather the complete eradication of the State of Israel. We must condemn those who use terror against civilians as a means to destroy freedom and peace.

Israel, like the United States, was founded on the common values of democracy, freedom, and peace. Today, I reiterate that we...
must stand by Israel, our strongest ally in the Middle East, in its fight against the terrorist organizations that seek to destroy the peace. We must maintain our commitment to Israel’s security and the safety of its citizens. Peace must come with security, not in spite of it. Israel has always made a sincere commitment to peace in the region. Many times its commitment to peace has come at the expense of innocent life. Before the process can move forward, we must compel the Palestinian authority to take immediate and effective steps to dismantle the terrorist infrastructure on the West Bank and Gaza Strip. Only then can we come to a peaceful solution of this conflict in which Israel, the Jewish State, can live side by side with a democratic Palestinian State in peace and security.

TRIBUTE TO MAYOR PAUL BAUMUNK

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 26, 2003

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the mayor of Lindenhurst, Illinois, Paul Baumunk, whose outstanding leadership and commitment to community service has significantly benefited the people of Lindenhurst.

A longtime resident of Lindenhurst, Mayor Paul Baumunk served as a teacher in Lake County for 31 years, both with the Lake Forest High School and the College of Lake County Vocational Center. He also served as a member of the Lindenhurst Plan Commission and the Lindenhurst Lakes Commission. In addition, Paul somehow found the time to participate in the Chamber of Commerce, the Lindenhurst Men’s Club, the Lyons Club and in VFW Post #4894.

Although he has always been a devoted public servant, Paul has always held his family as a top priority. He and Joy, his wife of 32 years, originally settled in the community of Lindenhurst in 1977 to raise their son Philip and daughter Amy. Paul’s retirement will allow him to spend more time with his family, something he will greatly cherish.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you and my other distinguished colleagues join me in congratulating Mayor Paul Baumunk on his retirement after 12 years of diligent service to the Village of Lindenhurst, Illinois. Paul has been a valuable member of the community for which he cares so deeply, and his service will be greatly missed. I wish him the best of luck in future endeavors, and I know he will enjoy his retirement for many years to come.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ERNIE FLETCHER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 26, 2003

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, June 25, 2003, I had been present for Rollcall Vote No. 312, 313, 314, 315, 316, and 317, I would have voted the following way: Rollcall Vote No. 312, S. 858—“Yea”; Rollcall Vote No. 313, H.R. 2474—“Yea.”}


THE U.S. SUPREME COURT DECISION ON AFFIRMATIVE ACTION IN HIGHER EDUCATION

HON. HILDA L. SOLIS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 26, 2003

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to applaud the Supreme Court’s decision to uphold affirmative action. The Court’s ruling this week was a tremendous victory for all those who believe that diversity is one of our nation’s greatest strengths. The historical significance of this important ruling cannot be underestimated. For millions of minority students—Latino, African-American, Native American—it means the opportunity at a better education, higher wages, and a promising future.

The Court’s ruling is especially important to Latinos, our nation’s fastest growing and largest minority group. Fewer than 10 percent of college-age Latinos have bachelor’s degrees. Clearly, many challenges remain to increase Latino enrollment at colleges and universities across the country. Affirmative action is key to breaking down the barriers to higher education for Latinos.

Affirmative action is not only beneficial to minority students, but also to non-minority students. Greater diversity on our college campuses ultimately produces students who are better equipped to thrive in an economy and society that is increasingly multicultural.

As Justice O’Connor noted in the Court’s decision, the future of our nation relies on leaders who are comfortable with “diverse people, cultures, ideas and viewpoints.” O’Connor was most likely influenced in her opinion by an unlikely coalition of business, military, civil rights, and education groups that urged the Court to uphold affirmative action because its produces leaders who are prepared for today’s increasingly global economy.

The country’s highest court has ruled that race may be a factor in college admissions because the nation has a compelling need for racial and ethnic diversity on our college campuses. The ruling calls into question race-neutral affirmative action plans used in several states, including my own state of California where there has been a significant increase in the rejection of Latino freshman applicants to California public universities since the state’s race-neutral plan was implemented. Given the Supreme Court’s decision, I hope California will review and revise its affirmative action policies so that public universities in my state truly reflect the state’s very diverse population. The Court has spoken about the importance of diversity. Now should California.

Throughout the United States, there are millions of Latinos and Latinos who want to succeed. They want equal educational and economic opportunity. The Court’s ruling provides great hope for these young people. Again, I applaud the Court for this landmark decision.

CONDEMNING TERRORISM INFlicted ON ISRAEL SINCE AQABA SUMMIT AND EXPRESSING SOLIDARITY WITH THE ISRAELI PEOPLE

SPEECH OF
HON. RON KIND
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 25, 2003

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my concern over the recent terrorism conducted by Palestinian extremists against the citizens of the state of Israel. This comes just weeks after a groundbreaking summit where both Palestinians and Israelis came together and agreed to the Road Map to Peace. It is most unfortunate that one small sect of extremists shake the relationship between the two.

My colleagues and I mourn the loss of 22 innocent Israeli citizens who have fallen victim to this terror since the summit. In addition, we mourn the loss of the dozens of civilian Palestinians who have also died as a result of terrorism. These lives, I believe, should also be mentioned.

Mr. Speaker, I will vote in favor of this measure today, but I think we missed a great opportunity to send a clear message that this Congress is fully committed, along with the President, in support of the Roadmap for Peace. The Roadmap recognizes the importance of including both Israelis and Palestinians in establishing much desired peace in the region. While the Roadmap may have its flaws, I believe it is the only way to get both parties back on the track to peace.

The people of the United States stand firm in our commitment to the security and health of a democratic Israel. We must continue to do all we can to promote negotiations to advance the peace process in the Middle East. Together we can root out the terrorism that plagues the region and move forward with one goal in mind, peace.

TRIBUTE TO FRAN AND MARIE BONNER

HON. PAUL E. KANJORSKI
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 26, 2003

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize two very exceptional people I am proud to call my constituents as they reach a milestone that has become more and more rare in today’s world. Fran and Marie Bonner recently celebrated their 40th wedding anniversary. Even more uncommon is their steadfast dedication to public service, giving back to their community and fellow citizens. I am honored to highlight the achievements of two people who have contributed so much to Northeastern Pennsylvania.

Francis Peter Bonner and Marie Ann Clatch were engaged on Christmas day in 1961. They met in 1959 at The Madison Restaurant in Hazleton when Fran was registering Marie to vote. His first words to her were “Are you registered to vote?” When she said no he promptly registered her as a Democrat, and she has been both his girl and a Democrat ever since.
June 26, 2003
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Mr. FORBES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Chief Warrant Officer David Williams, U.S. Army Apache helicopter pilot who was a Prisoner of War during Operation Iraqi Freedom. Iraqi forces detained him for 21 days as a POW after his helicopter was grounded near Karbala, Iraq. Williams valiantly fought and survived imprisonment after being captured.

Chief Warrant Officer Williams moved to Hampton Roads, VA with his family and grew up in Chesapeake, Virginia. From early childhood, David was always enthralled with planes and the magic of air flight. After graduating from Great Bridge High School in Chesapeake, Williams enrolled in community college and joined the Army as a full time Reserve. Serving as a crew chief on a med-evac Huey helicopter, Williams searched for a bigger challenge. He was assigned to the Army’s 106th Special Operations Aviation Regiment and also went through Survival, Evasion, Resistance and Escape school while traveling the world doing preparatory combat missions.

Next week, we will welcome back David Williams to his hometown of Chesapeake, Virginia with a host of events and celebrations for his heroic return. We are pleased to salute him for protecting our flag and our freedom. The Independence Day holiday is a perfect time to show our deep appreciation to this brave citizen and soldier who spent his childhood in the Fourth District of Virginia.

Williams showed tremendous bravery and commitment to his country while held by his Iraqi captors. Today we recognize him for his unwavering patriotism and dedication to both his job and the American people.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in honoring Chief Warrant Officer David Williams for his bravery and dedication abroad, his service to Chesapeake, the Commonwealth of Virginia, and the American people.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JIM SAXTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 26, 2003

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, June 25, 2003, I was unable to cast my vote for roll calls 312, 313, 314, 315, 316, and 317 due to the fact that I was attending a funeral for my dear friend from Arizona, Representative Bob Stump.

Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" for all 6 votes.

LEGISLATION ADDRESSES SHOCKING PROBLEM OF PRISON RAPRE

HON. FRANK R. WOLF
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 26, 2003

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I recently shared with our colleagues several personal accounts related by survivors of the brutal and inhumane act of sexual assault in our nation’s prisons.

H.R. 1707, the Prison Rape Reduction Act of 2003, addresses this most serious problem of prison rape. I was pleased to co-author this legislation with my Virginia colleague, Rep. Bobby Scott. The bill is pending mark-up in the House Judiciary Committee and we are hopeful that it will be on the House floor soon. I believe in being tough on crime. But this has nothing to do with being tough on crime. It has everything to do with human dignity and ending deliberate indifference toward sexual assaults in prisons, maintaining order in prisons, and reducing social costs of prisons and nationwide deal with physically and psychologically damaged former inmates.

Today I want to share additional stories from those whose lives have been forever changed by the sexual assaults happening every day in the prisons of America.

Imagine knowing that someone you love is being repeatedly raped, abused, and degraded and that there is little to nothing that you can do about it.

For the last two and a half years, my family and I have been paralyzed by this knowledge and our inability to stop the rape and abuse.

My name is Vivian Edwards and I am here to tell you about my nephew, Roderick John Johnson. In my family, he goes by Keith.

Keith is a Navy vet from Marshall, Texas in January of 2000 for a non-violent crime. He wrote a $300 check even though he knew that he did not have the funds to cover the cost of violating the terms of his parole for a burglary that he committed over 10 years ago.

From the beginning, my nephew knew that being a gay man put him at risk, so he informed prison officials that he was gay in hopes that he would be offered protection. My nephew was offered no protection. While at Alford, he was placed in the general population.

He might as well have been put in a lions’ den. He was immediately given the nickname “CoCo” by the other inmates which made it clear to all inmates that he was available for sexual exploitation. The prison officials also began to call Keith by this nickname and refer to him as “she” or “her.”

Keith was raped by a member of the gang called ‘Gangster Disciples’ in early October 2000. My nephew informed prison officials about what had happened and that he feared for his life. He asked for medical attention. He was denied help and denied medical assistance. They told him that medical care was only available for an emergency. My nephew was raped! How can someone say that is not an emergency?

He was violent and he was punished for that violence. Keith was punished for being raped. It was as if they were saying that he deserved the abuse.

Keith went to several of his family members from prison. He was afraid to tell most of us that he was being sexually abused. But the letters started to change, and we eventually told the world what was happening. I can still remember reading the words: “they make me do things I don’t want to do” and just crying. He told us that he feared for his life.

We called the prison to find out what was going on. Staff at the prison said that they would check into Keith’s complaints. They said Keith’s complaints didn’t warrant an investigation but they would move him to another prison wing. He wasn’t safe there either.

Keith eventually wrote to the local congressman and continued to write and call on Keith’s behalf, but nothing ever changed—he was never safe.

During a period of 18 months, Keith appealed before the classification committee of Alford seven times. Each time he asked to be put in protective custody, but his requests were denied each time.

Each time they denied Keith the protection that he so badly needed, he was sent back to the general population and raped and...
forced to perform sexual acts against his will. He was traded between various gangs in prison—the Bloods, the Crips, the Tangos, the Mandingo Warriors—and sold out for $5 and $20 for acts.

By December of 2001, Keith feared for his life so much that he purposely incurred a serious violation. He was given the maximum punishment and received 35 days in solitary confinement. Ironically, this was the first and only protection that he ever received. Sadly, this punishment also included extending his sentence for more than two years past the date that he would have been eligible for release.

After Keith’s seventh life endangerment claim, he began writing the ACLU and other outside organizations for assistance. The ACLU National Prison Project came to his rescue. They filed a federal lawsuit on behalf of my nephew against several Texas prison officials that ignored his pleas for protection against gangs who forced him into sexual slavery.

Keith had asked us to pray for him, and we did. On Friday, March 31st, I was moved to a safety protection unit soon after the ACLU National Prison Project filed the lawsuit.

Keith has tested negative for HIV, but still lives in constant fear that he might have contracted other diseases from countless forced acts. Prison rape is a medical crime that not only affects the victim, but also the family. As I said before, my entire family has been horrified and devastated for the past four and half years because of what has happened to Keith. Today we are praying for Keith, but we are also fighting for him and for every other prisoner that has been a victim of rape while in prison as well.

I have tried to write this story many times, but I find myself in tears at the thought of revealing the events. But I know that years later, I am finding the courage, little by little, to speak out. I pray that this courage will be with me today.

My name is Hope. In July 1997 I was incarcerated following an arrest for a drug related offense. I had been sent to a rehab facility in Virginia, but because of my extreme withdrawal symptoms from heroin and cocaine, they pulled me out of this facility and sent me, instead, to jail.

I went to the DC jail on no particular charges, but simply because I needed medical attention and was pending indictment. From the DC jail I was transferred to a medical unit at CCA (a privately contracted jail adjacent to DC jail). This was where anyone with medical concerns, pregnancy, injury, extreme illness, or other debilitating circumstances was sent.

The unit consisted of male and female inmates. When I got there, I was surprised to realize that male guards were on staff guarding the mixed population. Male guards were allowed to watch us changing, showering, and using the toilet.

Also to my surprise, male and female inmates were allowed recreational time together on this unit. I met a woman pregnant with her third child all of which were conceived in jail.

I was denied a shower for more than 2 weeks. When I finally was permitted to have one, the guards didn't allow me to shave. They took me to a private, hospital-type room. He proposed I smoke with him, and this he thought allowed him access to rape me. He attacked me while I was showering.

I was terrified, and I didn't know what to do. I thought my only option was toATED because of my withdrawal, and I didn’t know who would believe me.

Then, it happened again on a subsequent night. I was doped up on the psycho meds that had been prescribed to aid with my withdrawal symptoms. Again, he took me to the nurse's station to shower, and this time he allowed himself to me, and the relieving guard was on position. He gave me a shower and then the guard came to get me at 3 a.m. He allowed to watch us changing, showering, and using the toilet.

His semen stained sweatpants were taken as evidence of my roommates, that I was wanted at the officer's station. Miller is still under criminal investigation. I owe a lot to my attorneys who believed in me and my family who supported me.

I was convicted of a drug charge and placed in the Federal Medical Center at Carswell in Fort Worth, Texas from January 12, 1998 until September 10, 2000.

While in prison, I took all of the required Bureau of Prisons courses—from substance abuse prevention to classes that taught me job skills. I never once had an incident report written against me. In fact, I was rewarded with time credited for good behavior. Upon my release, I walked away with a $250 check from the Bureau of Prisons and permanently devastated emotional and mental state as a result of my rape.

On that night in March of 2000, I was woken up at approximately 3:30 a.m. by prison guard Michael Miller, a Senior Officer of the Bureau of Prisons. He told me, in the presence of a medical technician, that I was wanted at the officer's station.

I was scared to death that they'd called me because something had happened to my husband who had heart problems and diabetes, or to my twins. I could not have been more wrong. I should have feared for my own safety. After entering talking to the officer, he put me on a phone call stating that if a Lieutenant heads for the Camp to give him the "signal." After hanging up, Miller started forcing himself on me, kissing me and groping my breasts. I was pushed into a store-room where supplies were kept for the inmates. He continued to assault me; the more violent he became. He tried to force me to perform oral sex on him. He then threw me against the wall and violently raped me.

I can still remember him whispering in my ear during the rape: "Do you think you're special? I can do whatever I want to you because of who I am, and who I work for. I can do whatever I want to you." He continued to assault me; the more violent he became. He tried to force me to perform oral sex on him. He then threw me against the wall and violently raped me.

I was terrified, and I didn't know what to do. I thought my only option was to TED because of my withdrawal, and I didn’t know who would believe me.
as associate vice chancellor for academic programs for the Florida Board of Regents. From there he was recruited to start the Florida Education Fund, a program designed to help African-Americans earn doctorates and law degrees. During his 17 years leading the Fund to new heights, Ike helped thousands of young people on their path to higher education.

When Ike was not working long hours at the Fund, he was devoting his energies to a host of other civic boards and committees. He served on the Advisory Committee on the Education of Blacks in Florida and as Chairman of the Board of Commissioners of the Tampa Housing Authority. As the first African-American chairman of the Greater Tampa Chamber of Commerce, Ike was responsible for making the board more representative of our diverse business community and focusing business and community leaders on the virtues of educating our young people.

In 1999, Ike was diagnosed with acute leukemia. Ike faced his illness with the same courage and positive attitude that he applied to all other facets of his life. Through chemotherapy and multiple transplants, Ike fought to the end, and he never stopped giving back to his community.

I consider it the highest honor, privilege and joy to have called Ike Tribble my dear friend and a mentor. Ike’s passion and commitment to improving the lives of those around him was unsurpassed. Like so many touched by Ike, I have gathered this evening in extending my sincere thanks and heartfelt congratulations to Susan Booth as she is named a Paul Harris Fellow. The Paul Harris Fellow recognition was created in memory of Paul Harris, the founder of Rotary as a way to show appreciation for contributions to the Foundation’s charitable and educational program. Every Paul Harris Fellow receives a pin, medallion and a certificate when he or she becomes a Fellow, identifying the recipient as an advocate of the Foundation’s goals of world peace and international understanding. The commitment and passion that Susan has demonstrated is indeed a reflection of all that the Rotary stands for. It is wonderful to see her work so proudly recognized by her community.

Founder of the Archway Foundation, Susan has spent nearly fifteen years collecting donations to feed and clothe homeless children in Romania. Inspired by a television program about Romanian orphans abandoned when communism collapsed, Susan, a railroad conductor on a commuter train between Connecticut and New York’s Grand Central Station, switched to night shifts so that she could earn a master’s degree in Social Work. Upon completing her degree, Susan went to Bucharest on a week’s vacation in search of these Romanian orphans who were living in sewers and abandoned buildings. With only a short list of contacts, Susan was fortunate to find an individual who knew where to look. “In that sewer, I found my life’s work,” she has said. Indeed, she has dedicated countless hours to her mission.

Operating out of her own home and a post office box, Susan collects clothing and donations and has been awarded hundreds of thousands in charitable grants. Through her hard work and the generosity of her contributors, Archway has been able to purchase two small homes in Romania as well as employ Romanian caregivers to keep the children in a family situation. Each house is used as a soup kitchen from which volunteers take food out to hundreds of homeless children every week and provides groceries to squatter families who take refuge in abandoned buildings.

It is not often that you find an individual with such dedication and commitment. Susan’s good work has touched the lives of thousands of needy children. More importantly, she has inspired countless numbers of people to donate their time and energy to provide one of life’s most precious gifts—hope. I am proud to announce today to join the Devon Rotary and the many family and friends who have gathered this evening in extending my sincere thanks and heartfelt congratulations to Susan Booth as she is named a Paul Harris Fellow. Yours is a legacy that is sure to continue to inspire generations to come.

HONORING THE CAREER OF CHARLOTTE LESSER

HON. JANE HARMAN
OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 26, 2003

Ms. HARMAN. Speaker, in the course of my career as a public official I have been privileged to work with some truly remarkable people—often unsung heroes who contribute every day, unselfishly and unsparingly, to the health and well-being of our communities. One such person is my friend and constituent Charlotte Lesser, and I rise today on the occasion of her retirement as Director of Health Education at the Beach Cities Health District (BCHD) to commend her for her many achievements and contributions.

For 10 years, Charlotte Lesser has successfully spearheaded BCHD efforts to provide critical assistance to South Bay citizens in need. Under her leadership, BCHD has developed organizations and services that promote health education activities and fitness awareness for the residents of Manhattan Beach, Redondo Beach and Hermosa Beach. And as is the case with so many local leaders, Ms. Lesser volunteered her time to strengthen South Bay communities through her involvement with the South Bay Family Healthcare Center, the South Bay Youth Project, the Wellness Community, and the South Bay Coalition for Alcohol and Drug-Free Youth.

In addition to her work as a champion of local health care services, Charlotte Lesser chaired the Redondo Beach Chamber of Commerce and founded and directed the Manhattan Beach Neighborhood Watch.

In recognition of her unwavering commitment to the community, in 1999, Charlotte Lesser was named Los Angeles County Woman of the Year. But Charlotte is also my trusted friend and has been a wonderful resource to my staff and me.

Mr. President, I join the community in thanking Charlotte Lesser for her years of service and accomplishment, for they are evidence of her dedication and boundless energy. Although she is retiring from BCHD, her achievements will not end there. I look forward to her upcoming appointment to the Los Angeles County Commission for Women. I know she will continue to be an active leader and community advocate.
According to the U.S. Department of Transportation, each $1 billion in new infrastructure investment creates 47,500 jobs and $6.2 billion in economic activity. The bill will create more than two million jobs—virtually eliminating the job losses that have occurred since the Bush Administration came into office—and restore more than $1 trillion to our economy. Moreover, in the wake of the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks, the bill gives priority to infrastructure investments that focus on enhanced security for our Nation’s transportation and environmental infrastructure systems. By ensuring that projects in ready-to-go projects, the bill will provide a much-needed jumpstart to our economy. The bill provides funds for each of the critical areas of our Nation’s transportation and environmental infrastructure, including: $8 billion for highways and transit; $3 billion for airports; $21.5 billion for rail including high-speed rail, freight rail, and Amtrak; $13 billion for environmental infrastructure including wastewater, drinking water, wet weather, and Corps of Engineers projects; $2.5 billion for port security; and $2 billion for economic development and public buildings.

In addition, this infrastructure investment will increase business productivity by reducing the costs of producing goods in virtually all industrial sectors of the economy. Increased productivity results in lower prices for labor, capital, and raw materials and generally leads to lower product prices and increased sales. Also, the bill takes into account the fiscal crisis that the states are currently facing and allows recipients of the funds an extended period of time to meet their state and local match requirements. Simply put, this bill will strengthen the fabric of our Nation’s infrastructure while creating jobs for the millions of people who have lost their jobs under the Bush Administration. This investment will specifically help unemployed construction workers. The number of unemployed private construction workers is 715,000—an 80 percent increase over the comparable period in the last year of the Clinton Administration. The unemployment rate for construction is currently equal to 8.4 percent, more than 68 percent higher than the rate in May 2000. A recent national survey found that transportation construction contractors hire employees within three weeks of obtaining a project contract. These employees begin receiving paychecks within two weeks of hiring. By giving priority to those projects that can award bids within 90 days of enactment, the bill ensures that this money is readily dispersed to needed projects that will get people working again.

This investment will also help address the disproportionate effect that the increase in unemployment has had on people of color. The rate of unemployment for African Americans is 10.8 percent—twice the rate for whites. The unemployment rate for Hispanic Americans is 8.2 percent—more than 50 percent higher than the rate for whites. Under the existing federal rule, states, cities, and transportation authorities are required to provide at least 10 percent of the amounts made available to Disadvantaged Business Enterprises, including minority- and women-owned businesses (e.g., Enron). Federal disbursements to these areas are having more trouble finding new jobs. The average length of unemployment is now almost 20 weeks, the longest it has been in nearly two decades. In the past two years, the number of workers who have been unemployed for longer than six months has increased by 1.3 million to nearly 1.9 million—an increase of more than 216 percent. One-half of those out of work for more than 10 weeks and one in five have been out of work for more than six months.

The response of the Bush Administration has been tax breaks for the wealthy. And once those are enacted into law, pass more tax breaks for the wealthy. The Administration could have developed a bipartisan plan to use the surplus it inherited to invest in our Nation’s infrastructure, shore up the Social Security Trust Fund, and pay down the national debt, however, it has squandered each of those opportunities. Instead, the Administration continues to pursue policies that favor only a small portion of the population (the ultra-wealthy) and push our economy further and further into debt and recession. As the economy continues to founder, the need for legislation that will create jobs has become even more apparent.

Unlike the Republican “trickle down” approach to the economy, the Rebuild America Act of 2003 stimulates the economy by creating jobs—especially jobs in nonresidential construction—and rebuilding our Nation’s infrastructure. This bill provides $50 billion to enhance the safety, security, and efficiency of our Nation’s infrastructure, including improvements to rail, highway, transit, aviation, maritime, water resources, environmental, and public building infrastructure. By leveraging Federal infrastructure investments, the 10-year cost to the Federal Treasury would be less than $34 billion.

Moreover, the bill fully offsets this $34 billion cost to the Treasury by cracking down on abusive corporate tax shelters (e.g., Enron), and extending customs user fees.
Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, 54 years ago, on June 27, 1949, President Harry Truman deployed the U.S. Navy’s 7th Fleet to the Taiwan Strait to protect Taiwan against the possibility of an invasion by the People’s Republic of China, PRC. Since then, we have committed ourselves to defending Taiwan, as enshrined in the Taiwan Relations Act of 1979. President Bush himself declared in 2001 that America would do whatever it takes to defend Taiwan. In light of the threat posed by the PRC’s military buildup in Fukuin, we must unequivocally stand by our promises to support Taiwan. America cannot afford to lose a democracy in such a volatile region—and the people of Taiwan cannot afford to lose their safety, security, and freedom.

I rise today to call attention to an important resolution that I introduced today concerning the safety and security of Taiwan, and the right of Taiwan’s 23 million people to determine their own future. In the past 2 decades, Taiwan has undergone a remarkable transformation from a one-party, martial law dictatorship to a fully-fledged democracy that respects human rights and human freedoms. Taiwan, again, has proven herself one of America’s staunchest allies, recently pledging her support for continued humanitarian aid to both Afghanistan and Iraq. At the same time, however, Taiwan’s democracy faces a serious military threat from the People’s Republic of China. The PRC continues to regard Taiwan as a renegade province, despite the fact that it has never exercised control over the island. The PRC continues to openly entertain the use of force against Taiwan, thereby jeopardizing the stability of the entire Asian Pacific region.

A Washington Post report of June 11, 2003, reveals the PRC’s plans to build up its military for the purpose of “unification with Taiwan.” Already, the PRC has set up 400 short-range ballistic missiles in the province of Fukuin, directly targeted at Taiwan, capable of purchasing advanced weaponry systems, such as fighting aircrafts, submarines, and destroyers. The Washington Post reports that the PRC is accelerating its military acquisitions and notes that this buildup is “intended to create a force capable of bullying Taiwan and thwarting U.S. invasion plans in any conflict between China and Taiwan.” In other words, the PRC is preparing to use force and coercion to take over a territory it has no legal right to, and to impose its totalitarian ideology on a people who have fought long and hard for their freedom, and who have no wish to live under Communist rule.

The resolution I introduced today is a step towards protecting a fellow democracy from the threat of Chinese aggression. The resolution calls on the Bush administration to seek from the leaders of the PRC a public and immediate renunciation of any threat or use of force against Taiwan. This includes the dismantling of the Fukuin missiles and other military apparatus designed to intimidate Taiwan. The administration must let the PRC government know that America will no longer tolerate the constant harassment targeted towards the people of Taiwan. If the PRC government refuses to dismantle the missiles, the administration should then authorize the release of the missile system to Taiwan and to defend itself against any Chinese attack.

Mr. Speaker, these PRC missiles in Fukuin province are not conducive to a peaceful resolution of current Taiwanese-Chinese relations. We can not expect the people of Taiwan to live their daily lives under such threatening and uncertain conditions. In the name of democracy, we must ensure that the future of Taiwan is determined peacefully, and with the expressed consent of the Taiwanese people. Also, I urge both my colleagues and the administration to support Taiwanese efforts to hold a referendum vote on the issue of admittance into the World Health Organization.
The people of Taiwan deserve to have their voices heard in this ongoing debate, the outcome of which will have a monumental effect on their health and well-being. As the foremost promoter of freedom and democracy around the world, we cannot in good faith deter the people of Taiwan from holding their referendum. There can be no double standard when it comes to exercising democracy.

Mr. Speaker, no group but the citizenry of Taiwan has the right to determine the future of Taiwan. I ask that my colleagues join me in supporting democracy for the Taiwanese people, and ensuring their safety and security. Let us ensure that it will never be necessary to send the 7th Fleet to the Taiwan Strait again.
Thursday, June 26, 2003
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HIGHLIGHTS

Senate passed S. 1—Prescription Drug and Medicare Improvement Act.

House Committee ordered reported the Defense and Legislative appropriations for fiscal year 2004.

House Committees ordered reported 11 sundry measures.

House passed H.R. 1, Medicare Prescription Drug, Modernization, Health Savings and Affordability Act.


Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S8605–S8645

Measures Introduced: Thirty-one bills and six resolutions were introduced as follows: S. 11, S. 1338–1367, S. Res. 187–190, and S. Con. Res. 56–57. (See next issue.)

Measures Reported:

S. 1025, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2004 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, with amendments. (S. Rept. No. 108–80)


S. Res. 62, calling upon the Organization of American States (OAS) Inter-American Commission on Human Rights, the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, the European Union, and human rights activists throughout the world to take certain actions in regard to the human rights situation in Cuba.

S. Res. 138, to amend rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate relating to the consideration of nominations requiring the advice and consent of the Senate.

S. Res. 149, expressing the sense of the Senate that the international response to the current need for food in the Horn of Africa remains inadequate, and with an amended preamble.

S. Res. 174, designating Thursday, November 20, 2003, as “Feed America Thursday”.

S. Res. 175, designating the month of October 2003, as “Family History Month”.

S. Res. 178, to prohibit Members of the Senate and other persons from removing art and historic objects from the Senate wing of the Capitol and Senate office buildings for personal use.

S. 148, to provide for the Secretary of Homeland Security to be included in the line of Presidential succession. (See next issue.)

Measures Passed:

State Children’s Health Insurance Program Amend Act: Senate passed S. 312, to amend title XXI of the Social Security Act to extend the availability of allotments for fiscal years 1998 through 2001 under the State Children’s Health Insurance Program, after agreeing to the following amendment proposed thereto: Pages S8633–35

Grassley Amendment No. 1113, to make a technical correction. Pages S8633–35
Prescription Drug and Medicare Improvement Act: By yeas to nays (Vote No. 262), Senate passed S. 1, to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to make improvements in the Medicare program, to provide prescription drug coverage under the Medicare program, after agreeing to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, and after taking action on the following amendments proposed thereto: Pages S8605–33, S8635–44 (continued next issue)

Adopted:

Baucus (for Cantwell) Modified Amendment No. 942, to prohibit an eligible entity offering a Medicare Prescription Drug plan, a Medicare Advantage Organization offering a Medicare Advantage plan, and other health plans from contracting with a pharmacy benefit manager (PBM) unless the PBM satisfies certain requirements. Pages S8606, S8612–17

By 97 yeas to 29 nays (Vote No. 249), McConnell Amendment No. 1097, to protect seniors who are diagnosed with cancer from high prescription drug costs.

By 69 yeas to 29 nays (Vote No. 251), Bingaman/Domenici Modified Amendment No. 1065, to update, beginning in 2009, the asset or resource test used for purposes of determining the eligibility of low-income beneficiaries for premium and cost-sharing subsidies.

Nelson (FL) Amendment No. 936, to provide for an extension of the demonstration for ESRD managed care.

Nelson (FL) Amendment No. 938, to provide for a study and report on the propagation of concierge care.

Thomas/Lincoln Modified Amendment No. 988, to provide for the coverage of marriage and family therapist services and mental health counselor services under part B of the Medicare program.

Baucus (for Snowe) Amendment No. 1027, to express the sense of the Senate regarding the implementation of the Prescription Drug and Medicare Improvement Act of 2003. Page S8633

Baucus (for Murkowski/Stevens) Amendment No. 1041, to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to conduct a frontier extended stay clinic demonstration project.

Subsequently, the adoption of Amendment No. 1041 (listed above) was vitiated.

By a unanimous vote of 98 yeas (Vote No. 252), McConnell Amendment No. 1102, to protect seniors who are diagnosed with Alzheimer's disease from high prescription drug costs. Pages S8624, S8635–36

Subsequently, the amendment was modified.

By 71 yeas to 26 nays (Vote No. 255), Grassley/Baucus Modified Amendment No. 1092, to evaluate alternative payment and delivery systems.

Grassley (for Bond) Amendment No. 1014, to include pharmacy services in the study relating to outpatient pharmacy therapy reimbursements.

Baucus (for Dodd) Amendment No. 1015, to provide for a study on making prescription pharmaceutical information accessible for blind and visually-impaired individuals.

Grassley (for Hatch) Amendment No. 1059, to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to conduct a review and report on current standards of practice for pharmacy services provided to patients in nursing facilities.

Grassley (for Hatch/Wyden) Amendment No. 1106, to establish a Citizens Health Care Working Group to facilitate public debate about how to improve the health care system for Americans and to provide for hearings by Congress on the recommendations that are derived from this debate.

Grassley (for Murkowski) Amendment No. 1086, to ensure that pharmacies operated by the Indian Health Service and Indian health programs are included in the network of pharmacies established by entities and organizations under part D.

Baucus (for Mikulski) Modified Amendment No. 1033, to extend certain municipal health service demonstration projects.

Baucus (for Lincoln) Modified Amendment No. 1067, to provide coverage for kidney disease education services under the Medicare program.

Lincoln Amendment No. 959, to establish a demonstration project for direct access to physical therapy services under the Medicare program.

Lincoln Amendment No. 935, to clarify the intent of Congress regarding an exception to the initial residency period for geriatric residency or fellowship programs.

Reid (for Jeffords) Amendment No. 1038, to improve the critical access hospital program.

Reid (for Johnson/Cochran) Amendment No. 1095, to provide for a 1-year medication therapy management assessment program.

Grassley (for Murkowski/Stevens) Amendment No. 1096, to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to conduct a frontier extended stay clinic demonstration project.
Grassley (for Brownback/Nelson (NE)) Amendment No. 1122, to provide for improvements in access to services in rural hospitals and critical access hospitals.  
(See next issue.)

Grassley (for Coleman) Amendment No. 1074, to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to make improvements in the national coverage determination process to respond to changes in technology.  
(See next issue.)

Grassley (for Collins) Amendment No. 1023, to provide for the establishment of a demonstration project to clarify the definition of homebound.  
(See next issue.)

Grassley (for Kyl) Amendment No. 1114, to require the GAO to study the impact of price controls on pharmaceuticals.  
(See next issue.)

Grassley (for Kyl) Amendment No. 1115, to express the sense of the Senate concerning Medicare payments to physicians and other health professionals.  
(See next issue.)

Grassley (for Chambliss) Amendment No. 1045, to provide for a demonstration project for the exclusion of brachytherapy devices from the prospective payment system for outpatient hospital services.  
(See next issue.)

Grassley (for Craig) Amendment No. 1058, to restore the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund to the financial position it would have been in if a clerical bookkeeping error had not occurred.  
(See next issue.)

Grassley (for Baucus) Amendment No. 1117, to establish the Safety Net Organizations and Patient Advisory Commission.  
(See next issue.)

Grassley (for Bayh) Amendment No. 1044, to adjust the urban health provider payment.  
(See next issue.)

Grassley (for Shelby) Amendment No. 1056, to prevent the Secretary of Health and Human Services from modifying the treatment of certain long-term care hospitals as subsection (d) hospitals.  
(See next issue.)

Grassley (for Murray) Modified Amendment No. 961, to make improvements in the Medicare-Advantage benchmark determinations.  
(See next issue.)

Grassley (for Bond/Roberts) Amendment No. 1013, to ensure that patients are receiving safe and accurate dosages of compounded drugs.  
(See next issue.)

Grassley (for Kyl) Amendment No. 1121, to express the sense of the Senate concerning the structure of Medicare reform and the prescription drug benefit to ensure Medicare's long-term solvency and high quality of care.  
(See next issue.)

Grassley (for Collins) Modified No. 989, to increase Medicare payments for home health services furnished in a rural area.  
(See next issue.)

Grassley (for Dole/Edwards) Amendment No. 1126, to provide for the treatment of certain entities for purposes of payments under the Medicare program.  
(See next issue.)

Grassley (for Reed) Amendment No. 996, to modify the GAO study of geographic differences in payments for physicians’ services relating to the work geographic practice cost index.  
(See next issue.)

Grassley (for Specter) Amendment No. 1118, to express the sense of the Senate regarding the establishment of a nationwide permanent lifestyle modification program for Medicare beneficiaries.  
(See next issue.)

Grassley (for Specter) Amendment No. 1085, to express the sense of the Senate regarding payment reductions under the Medicare physician fee schedule.  
(See next issue.)

Allard/Feingold Amendment No. 1017, to provide for temporary suspension of OASIS requirement for collection of data on non-Medicare and non-Medicaid patients.  
Pages S8608–09

Baucus (for Harkin) Amendment No. 968, to restore reimbursement for total body orthotic management for nonambulatory, severely disabled nursing home residents.  
Page S8606

Graham (SC) Modified Amendment No. 948, to provide for the establishment of a National Bipartisan Commission on Medicare Reform.  
Page S8606

Dayton Modified Amendment No. 960, to require a streamlining of the Medicare regulations.  
Page S8606

Baucus (for Feingold) Amendment No. 1054, to establish an Office of the Medicare Beneficiary Advocate.  
Page S8612

Enzi Amendment No. 1030, to encourage the availability of Medicare-Advantage benefits in medically underserved areas.  
Page S8606

Grassley Amendment No. 1133, to provide for a managers’ amendment.  
(See next issue.)

Rejected:

Harkin Modified Amendment No. 991, to establish a demonstration project under the Medicaid program to encourage the provision of community-based services to individuals with disabilities. (By 50 yeas to 48 nays (Vote No. 247), Senate tabled the amendment.)  
Pages S8606–09

By 39 yeas to 59 nays (Vote No. 248), Edwards/Harkin Amendment No. 1052, to strengthen protections for consumers against misleading direct-to-consumer drug advertising.  
Pages S8606, S8609–10

Reid (for Boxer) Amendment No. 1036, to eliminate the coverage gap for individuals with cancer.  
(See next issue.)
Sanford Amendment No. 1132, to allow eligible beneficiaries in Medicare Advantage plans to elect zero premium, stop-loss drug coverage protection.

(See next issue.)

Kerry Amendment No. 958, to increase the availability of discounted prescription drugs.

Page S8606

Lincoln Modified Amendment No. 934, to ensure coverage for syringes for the administration of insulin, and necessary medical supplies associated with the administration of insulin.

Page S8606

Baucus (for Jeffords) Amendment No. 964, to include coverage for tobacco cessation products.

Page S8606


Page S8606

Akaka Amendment No. 980, to expand assistance with coverage for legal immigrants under the Medicaid program and SCHIP to include citizens of the Freely Associated States.

Page S8606

Akaka Amendment No. 979, to ensure that current prescription drug benefits to Medicare-eligible enrollees in the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program will not be diminished.

Page S8606

Bingaman Amendment No. 973, to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the authorization of reimbursement for all Medicare part B services furnished by certain Indian hospitals and clinics.

Baucus (for Lautenberg) Amendment No. 986, to make prescription drug coverage available beginning on July 1, 2004.

Page S8606

Murray Amendment No. 990, to make improvements in the Medicare Advantage benchmark determinations.

Page S8606

Dayton Amendment No. 977, to require that benefits be made available under part D on January 1, 2004.

(See next issue.)

Baucus (for Dorgan) Amendment No. 993, to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage of cardiovascular screening tests under the Medicare program.

Page S8606

Smith/Bingaman Amendment No. 962, to provide reimbursement for Federally qualified health centers participating in Medicare managed care.

Page S8606

Hutchison Amendment No. 1004, to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to freeze the indirect medical education adjustment percentage under the Medicare program at 6.5 percent.

Page S8606

Conrad Amendment No. 1019, to provide for coverage of self-injected biologics under part B of the Medicare program until Medicare Prescription Drug plans are available.

Page S8606

Conrad Amendment No. 1020, to permanently and fully equalize the standardized payment rate beginning in fiscal year 2004.

Page S8606
Conrad Amendment No. 1021, to address Medicare payment inequities.

Clinton Amendment No. 999, to provide for the development of quality indicators for the priority areas of the Institute of Medicine, for the standardization of quality indicators for Federal agencies, and for the establishment of a demonstration program for the reporting of health care quality data at the community level.

Clinton Amendment No. 953, to provide training to long-term care ombusdmen.

Clinton Amendment No. 954, to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to develop literacy standards for informational materials, particularly drug information.

Reid (for Corzine) Modified Amendment No. 1037, to provide conforming changes regarding federally qualified health centers.

Reid (for Inouye) Amendment No. 1039, to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to provide 100 percent reimbursement for medical assistance provided to a Native Hawaiian through a Federally-qualified health center or a Native Hawaiian health care system.

Enzi/Lincoln Amendment No. 1051, to ensure convenient access to pharmacies and prohibit the tying of contracts.

Hagel/Ensign Amendment No. 1012, to provide Medicare beneficiaries with an additional choice of Medicare Prescription Drug plans under part D that consists of a drug discount card and protection against high out-of-pocket drug costs.

Baucus (for Akaka) Amendment No. 1061, to provide for treatment of Hawaii as a low-DSH State for purposes of determining a Medicaid DSH allotment for the State for fiscal years 2004 and 2005.

Stabenow/Levin Amendment No. 1075, to permanently extend a moratorium on the treatment of a certain facility as an institution for mental diseases.

Stabenow/Levin Amendment No. 1076, to provide for the treatment of payments to certain comprehensive cancer centers.

Stabenow/Levin Amendment No. 1077, to provide for the redistribution of unused resident positions.

Ensign/Lincoln Amendment No. 1024, to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to repeal the Medicare outpatient rehabilitation therapy caps.

Smith/Feingold Amendment No. 1073, to allow the Secretary to include in the definition of 'specialized Medicare+Choice plans for special needs beneficiaries' plans that disproportionately serve such special needs beneficiaries or frail, elderly Medicare beneficiaries.

Baucus (for Mikulski) Amendment No. 1088, to provide equitable treatment for children's hospitals.

Baucus (for Mikulski) Amendment No. 1089, to provide equitable treatment for certain children's hospitals.

Baucus (for Mikulski) Amendment No. 1090, to extend certain municipal health service demonstration projects.

Baucus (for Levin) Amendment No. 1110, to require that beneficiaries initially covered by a private insurer under this act who are subsequently covered by a Medicare fallback plan have the option of retaining a Medicare fallback plan.

Baucus (for Murkowski/Steves) Amendment No. 1041, to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to conduct a frontier extended stay clinic demonstration project.

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that following passage of S. 1 (listed above), the bill be held at the desk, and when the Senate receives H.R. 1, House companion measure, all after the enacting clause be stricken and the text of S. 1 be inserted in lieu thereof; Senate insisted on its amendment, request a conference with the House thereon, and the Chair be authorized to appoint conference on the part of the Senate; providing further, passage of S. 1 be vitiated and the bill be returned to the Senate Calendar.

Check Truncation Act: Senate passed H.R. 1474, to facilitate check truncation by authorizing substitute checks, to foster innovation in the check collection system without mandating receipt of checks in electronic form, and to improve the overall efficiency of the Nation's payments system, after striking all after the enacting clause and inserting the text of S. 1334, Senate companion measure.

Subsequently, S. 1334 was returned to the Senate Calendar.

Commending August Hiebert: Senate agreed to S. Res. 186, commending August Hiebert for his service to the Alaska Communications Industry.

Rhodes Scholarships: Senate agreed to S. Res. 187, expressing the sense of the Senate regarding the centenary of the Rhodes Scholarships in the United States and the establishment of the Mandela Rhodes Foundation.
Honoring Maynard Holbrook Jackson, Jr.: Senate agreed to S. Res. 188, honoring Maynard Holbrook Jackson, Jr., former Mayor of the City of Atlanta, and extending the condolences of the Senate on his death. (See next issue.)

Commending General Eric Shinseki: Senate agreed to S. Res. 190, commending General Eric Shinseki of the United States Army for his outstanding service and commitment to excellence. (See next issue.)

Adjournment Resolution—Agreement: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that when the Senate receives an adjournment resolution from the House, it be agreed to, providing that the text is identical to the resolution being held at the desk. (See next issue.)

Nominations Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nominations:
- Joshua B. Bolten, of the District of Columbia, to be Director of the Office of Management and Budget. (See next issue.)

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:
- Rick A. Dearborn, of Oklahoma, to be an Assistant Secretary of Energy (Congressional and Intergovernmental Affairs).
- Scott J. Bloch, of Kansas, to be Special Counsel, Office of Special Counsel, for the term of five years.
- Penrose C. Albright, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security. (New Position)
- Rene Acosta, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Attorney General

Messages From the House: (See next issue.)

Measures Referred: (See next issue.)

Measures Placed on Calendar: (See next issue.)

Measures Read First Time: (See next issue.)

Executive Communications: (See next issue.)

Executive Reports of Committees: (See next issue.)

Additional Cosponsors: (See next issue.)

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: (See next issue.)

Approving Appropriations—Labor/HHS/EDUCATION AND MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
Committee on Appropriations: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business bills:
- An original bill (S. 1356) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004; and
- An original bill (S. 1357) making appropriations for military construction, family housing, and base

FAIR CREDIT REPORTING ACT
Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: Committee concluded hearings to examine affiliate sharing practices in relation to the Fair Credit Reporting Act, focusing on privacy protections, security risks and threats to the credit reporting system, retail credit card programs, and merchandise returns, after receiving testimony from Vermont Assistant Attorney General Julie Brill, Montpelier; Joel R. Reidenberg, Fordham University School of Law, and Martin Wong, Citigroup, Inc., both of New York, New York; Ronald A. Prill, Target Financial Services, Minneapolis, Minnesota, on behalf of the National Retail Federation; Edmund Mierzwinski, U.S. Public Interest Research Group, Washington, D.C.; Terry Baloun, Wells Fargo Bank, Sioux Falls, South Dakota; and Angela Maynard, Keycorp, Cleveland, Ohio.

BUSINESS MEETING
Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

S. 1264, to reauthorize the Federal Communications Commission, with amendments;

H.R. 1320, to amend the National Telecommunications and Information Administration Organization Act to facilitate the reallocation of spectrum from governmental to commercial users, with an amendment;

An original bill to authorize funds for highway safety programs, motor carrier safety programs, hazardous materials transportation safety programs, and boating safety programs;

S. 1262, to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 2004, 2005, and 2006 for certain maritime programs of the Department of Transportation, with amendments; and

S. 1218, to provide for Presidential support and coordination of interagency ocean science programs and development and coordination of a comprehensive and integrated United States research and monitoring program, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

NOMINATIONS:
Committee on Finance: Committee concluded hearings to examine the nominations of Josette Sheeran Shiner, of Virginia, to be a Deputy United States Trade Representative, with the rank of Ambassador, and James J. Jochum, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Commerce, after each nominee testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

BUSINESS MEETING
Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

S. Res. 90, expressing the sense of the Senate that the Senate strongly supports the nonproliferation programs of the United States, with an amendment;

S. Res. 62, calling upon the Organization of American States (OAS) Inter-American Commission on Human Rights, the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, the European Union, and human rights activists throughout the world to take certain actions in regard to the human rights situation in Cuba;

S. Res. 149, expressing the sense of the Senate that the international response to the current need for food in the Horn of Africa remains inadequate, with an amendment; and

The nominations of Robert W. Fitts, of New Hampshire, to be Ambassador to Papua New Guinea, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador to the Solomon Islands and Ambassador to the Republic of Vanuatu, Marsha E. Barnes, of Maryland, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Suriname, John E. Herbst, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to Ukraine, Tracey Ann Jacobson, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador to Turkmenistan, George A. Krol, of New Jersey, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Belarus, John F. Maisto, of Pennsylvania, to be Permanent Representative of the United States of America to the Organization of American States, with the rank of Ambassador, Greta N. Morris, of California, to be Ambassador to the Republic of the Marshall Islands, Roger Francisco Noriega, of Kansas, to be an Assistant Secretary of State (Western Hemisphere Affairs), William B. Wood, of New York, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Colombia, and certain Foreign Service Officer promotion lists.

INTERNATIONAL PARENTAL ABDUCTION
Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee concluded hearings to examine the Department of State's Office of Children's Issues, focusing on responding to international parental abduction, after receiving testimony from Senator Lincoln; and Maura Harty, Assistant Secretary of State, Bureau of Consular Affairs.

NOMINATIONS:
Committee on Governmental Affairs: Committee ordered favorably reported the nominations of Judith Nan Macluso, to be an Associate Judge of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia; Fern Flanagan Macaluso, to be an Associate Judge of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia; and Joshua B. Bolten, of the District of Columbia, to be Director of the Office of Management and Budget.
BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Indian Affairs: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

S. 281, to amend the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century to make certain amendments with respect to Indian tribes, to provide for training and technical assistance to Native Americans who are interested in commercial vehicle driving careers, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute; and

The nominations of Lisa Genevieve Nason, of Alaska, Georgianna E. Ignace, of Wisconsin, John Richard Grimes, of Massachusetts, each to be a Member of the Board of Trustees of the Institute of American Indian and Alaska Native Culture and Arts Development, and Charles W. Grim, of Oklahoma, to be Director of the Indian Health Service, Department of Health and Human Services.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

S. Res. 174, designating Thursday, November 20, 2003, as “Feed America Thursday”; and

S. Res. 175, designating the month of October 2003, as “Family History Month”; and

The nominations of Diane M. Stuart, of Utah, to be Director of the Violence Against Women Office, Department of Justice; and Thomas M. Hardiman, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Pennsylvania.

Also, committee resumed markup of S. 1125, to create a fair and efficient system to resolve claims of victims for bodily injury caused by asbestos exposure, but did not complete action thereon, and recessed subject to call.

GROWING WAHHABI INFLUENCE

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Terrorism, Technology, and Homeland Security concluded hearings to examine the ideological structure of Wahhabism, an extreme and violent form of Islam, and its potential for political and social influence in the United States, after receiving testimony from David Aufhauser, General Counsel, Department of the Treasury; Larry A. Mefford, Assistant Director, Counterterrorism Division, Federal Bureau of Investigation, Department of Justice; and Alex Alexiev, Center for Security Policy, and Stephen Schwartz, Foundation for Defense of Democracies, both of Washington, D.C.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Measures Introduced: Measures introduced will appear in the next issue of the Record.

Additional Cosponsors: (See next issue.)

Reports Filed: Reports were filed today as follows:

H.R. 438, to increase the amount of student loans that may be forgiven for teachers in mathematics, science, and special education, amended (H. Rept. 108–182);

H.R. 2211, to reauthorize title II of the Higher Education Act of 1965, amended (H. Rept. 108–183);

H.R. 2210, to reauthorize the Head Start Act to improve the school readiness of disadvantaged children, amended (H. Rept. 108–184); and

H.R. 74, to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain land in the lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit, Nevada, to the Secretary of the Interior, in trust for the Washoe Indian Tribe of Nevada and California (H. Rept. 108–185). (See next issue.)

Guest Chaplain: The prayer was offered by the guest Chaplain, Rabbi Milton Balkany, Dean, Bais Yaakov of Brooklyn, New York.

Journal: Agreed to the Speaker’s approval of the Journal of June 25 by yea-and-nay vote of 357 yeas to 68 nays, Roll No. 327.


Agreed To:

Hastings of Florida amendment No. 4 printed in H. Rept. 108–176, debated on June 25, that directs the Director of Central Intelligence to establish a pilot project to improve recruitment of ethnic and cultural minorities and women with diverse skills...
and language abilities (agreed to by recorded vote of 418 ayes with none voting “no”, Roll No. 318;
Pages H5943–44

Rejected:
Kucinich amendment No. 5 printed in H. Rept. 108–176, debated on June 25, that sought to direct the Inspector General of the Central Intelligence Agency to conduct an audit of all communications between the CIA and the Office of the Vice President that relate to weapons of mass destruction obtained or developed by Iraq (rejected by recorded vote of 76 ayes to 347 noes, Roll No. 319); and
Pages H5944–45

Lee amendment No. 6 printed in H. Rept. 108–176, debated on June 25, that sought to require a GAO study on intelligence sharing by the Department of Defense and intelligence community with United Nations inspectors searching for weapons of mass destruction (rejected by recorded vote of 185 ayes to 239, Roll No. 320).
Pages H5945–46

H. Res. 295, the rule that provided for consideration of the bill was agreed to on June 25.
Page H5946

Recess: The House recessed at 11:48 a.m. and reconvened at 12:53 p.m.
Pages H5951–52

Motions to Suspend the Rules on Wednesdays During the Remainder of the One Hundred Eighth Congress: The House agreed to H. Res. 297, providing for motions to suspend the rules by recorded vote of 226 ayes to 203 noes, Roll No. 323.
Pages H5946–51, H5973–74

Late Report: The Committee on Appropriations received permission to have until midnight to file a privileged report making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004.
Page H5979

Pages H5974–90

Rejected the Obey motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations. Earlier, a point of order was sustained against another Obey motion that sought to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report it back forthwith with an amendment that increases funding for various programs including fitness facilities, family housing, and barracks.
Page H5986

Point of order was sustained against the Obey amendment that sought to reinstate funding for various programs including fitness facilities, family housing, and barracks.
Pages H5989–90

Earlier, the House agreed to H. Res. 298, the rule that provided for consideration of the bill by voice vote. Agreed to order the previous question by yea-and-nay vote of 220 yeas to 200 nays, Roll No. 324.
Pages H5978–79

Suspension—Support for Freedom in Hong Kong: The House agreed to suspend the rules and agree to H. Res. 277, expressing support for freedom in Hong Kong (agreed to by 2/3 yea-and-nay vote of 426 yeas to 1 nay, Roll No. 326). The motion was debated on June 25.
Pages H5990–91

Order of Business—DoD Appropriations: Agreed that it be in order on Tuesday, July 8, for the Speaker, as though pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule 18, to declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of a bill reported pursuant to section 6 of H. Res. 299, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, which shall proceed according to the following order: the first reading shall be dispensed with; all points of order against consideration of the bill are waived; general debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations; after general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule; points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI are waived; during consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.
Page H5992

State Children’s Health Insurance Program (SCHIP) Allotments: The House passed H.R. 531, to amend title XXI of the Social Security Act to extend the availability of allotments for fiscal years 1998 through 2001 under the State Children’s Health Insurance Program (SCHIP) by unanimous consent.
Pages H6006–07

Medicare Prescription Drug, Modernization, Health Savings and Affordability Act: The House passed H.R. 1, to amend title XVIII of the Social
Security Act to provide for a voluntary program for prescription drug coverage under the Medicare Program, to modernize the Medicare Program and to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a deduction to individuals for amounts contributed to health savings security accounts and health savings accounts, to provide for the disposition of unused health benefits in cafeteria plans and flexible spending arrangements by 216 ayes to 215 noes with 1 voting “present,” Roll No. 332.

Pursuant to Section 3 of the rule in the engrossment of H.R. 1, the Clerk shall add the text of H.R. 2596, as passed by the House as a new matter at the end of H.R. 1, conform the title of H.R. 1 to reflect the addition of the text of H.R. 2596 to the engrossment, and then lay H.R. 2596 on the table. (See next issue.)

Rejected the Thompson of California motion to recommit the bill jointly to the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Energy and Commerce with instructions to report the same back to the House promptly with amendments in the nature of a substitute that establish the Prescription Drug and Medicare Improvement Act. By recorded vote of 208 ayes to 223 noes, Roll No. 330. (See next issue.)

Rejected the Rangel amendment in the nature of a substitute numbered 1 printed in H. Rept. 108–181 that sought to provide prescription drug coverage for all Medicare beneficiaries, enhance Medicare+Choice plans, includes payments for oncology providers and related cancer drug therapy programs; improve rural health delivery; and implement various provisions dealing with Medicare Parts A and B, Medicaid, regulatory reduction and the re-importation of prescription drugs by recorded vote of 176 ayes to 255 noes with 1 voting “present”, Roll No. 330. (See next issue.)

H. Res. 299, the rule that providing for consideration of both H.R. 1, Medicare Prescription Drug and Modernization Act, and H.R. 2596, Health Savings and Affordability Act was agreed to by recorded vote of 221 ayes to 203 noes, Roll No. 322. Earlier agreed to order the previous question by yea-and-nay vote of 226 yeas to 203 nays, Roll No. 321.

Health Savings and Affordability Act: The House passed H.R. 2596, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a deduction to individuals for amounts contributed to health savings security accounts and health savings accounts, to provide for the disposition of unused health benefits in cafeteria plans and flexible spending arrangements by yea-and-nay vote of 237 yeas to 191 nays, Roll No. 328. Sections 3 of H. Res. 299, the rule providing for consideration of the bill, provides that in the engrossment of H.R. 1, the clerk shall add the text of H.R. 2596, as passed by the House as a new matter at the end of H.R. 1, and then lay H.R. 2596 on the table.

(See next issue.)

Independence Day District Work Period: The House agreed to H. Con. Res. 231, providing for a conditional adjournment of the House of Representatives and a conditional recess or adjournment of the Senate.

(See next issue.)

Senate Concurrence in Adjournment Resolution: Agreed that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 2 p.m. on Tuesday, July 1, 2003, unless it sooner has received a message from the Senate transmitting its concurrence in H. Con. Res. 231, in which case the House shall stand adjourned pursuant to that concurrent resolution.

(See next issue.)

Calendar Wednesday: Agreed to dispense with the Calendar Wednesday business of Wednesday, July 9.

(See next issue.)

Speaker Pro Tempore: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Tom Davis of Virginia to act as Speaker pro tempore to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions through Monday, July 7.

(See next issue.)

Senate Messages: Messages received from the Senate today appear on pages H5941, and H5992.

Reerrals: S. 163 was referred to the Committees on Education and the Workforce and Resources, S. 498 was referred to the Committee on Financial Services, S. 867 was referred to the Committee on Government Reform, and S. 1207 and S. 312 were held at the desk.

(See next issue.)

Call of the House: On the Call of the House, 421 members reported their presence, Roll No. 329.

(See next issue.)


Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and at 2:47 a.m. on Friday, June 27, pursuant to the provisions of H. Con. Res. 231, the House stands adjourned until 2 p.m. on Tuesday, July 1, 2003, unless it sooner has received a message from the Senate transmitting its adoption of H. Con. Res. 231, in which case the House shall stand adjourned pursuant...
to that concurrent resolution until 2 p.m. on Monday, July 7.

**Committee Meetings**

**MANDATORY COUNTRY OF ORIGIN LABELING LAW REVIEW**

*Committee on Agriculture*: Held a hearing to review the mandatory country of origin labeling law. Testimony was heard from the following officials of the USDA: Charles Lambert, Deputy Under Secretary, Marketing and Regulatory Programs; Nancy Bryson, General Counsel; and Keith Collins, Chief Economist; and public witnesses.

**DEFENSE AND LEGISLATIVE APPROPRIATIONS**

*Committee on Appropriations*: Ordered reported the following appropriations for fiscal year 2004: Defense and Legislative.

**FOREIGN RELATIONS AUTHORIZATION ACT**


**FINANCIAL MAINSTREAM—BROADEN ACCESS**

*Committee on Financial Services*: Subcommittee on Financial Institutions and Consumer Credit held a hearing entitled “Serving the Underserved: Initiatives to Broaden Access to the Financial Mainstream.” Testimony was heard from Wayne Abernathy, Assistant Secretary, Financial Institutions, Department of the Treasury; Dennis Dollar, Chairman, National Credit Union Administration; and public witnesses.

**COMPETITIVE SOURCING FOR 21ST CENTURY**

*Committee on Government Reform*: Held a hearing titled “New Century, New Process: A Preview of Competitive Sourcing for the 21st Century.” Testimony was heard from David M. Walker, Comptroller, GAO; Angela Styles, Director, Office of Federal Procurement Policy, OMB; Philip Grone, Principal Assistant Deputy Under Secretary, Installations and Environment, Department of Defense; Scott J. Cameron, Deputy Assistant Secretary, Performance and Management, Department of the Interior; and public witnesses.

**ASIA AND THE PACIFIC—U.S. SECURITY POLICY**

*Committee on International Relations*: Subcommittee on East Asia and the Pacific held a hearing on U.S. Security Policy in Asia and the Pacific: Restructuring America’s Forward Deployment. Testimony was heard from the following officials of the Department of Defense: Peter Rodman, Assistant Secretary, International Security Affairs; and Adm. Thomas B. Fargo, USN, Commander, U.S. Pacific Command; and Christopher LaFleur, Special Envoy, Northeast Asia Security Consultations, Bureau of East Asian and Pacific Affairs, Department of State.

**AMERICAN SERVICEMEMBERS’ PROTECTION ACT AMENDMENTS**

*Committee on International Relations*: Subcommittee on Europe approved for full Committee action H.R. 2550, to amend the American Servicemembers’ Protection Act of 2002 to provide clarification with respect to the eligibility of certain countries for United States military assistance.

**HOMETOWN HEROES SURVIVORS BENEFITS**

*Committee on the Judiciary*: Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, and Homeland Security held a hearing on H.R. 919, Hometown Heroes Survivors Benefits. Testimony was heard from Michael E. Williams, Jr., Fire Rescue Training Specialist, Office of the State Fire Marshall, Department of Insurance, State of North Carolina; and public witnesses.

**OVERSIGHT—CONSULAR IDENTIFICATION CARDS**

*Committee on the Judiciary*: Subcommittee on Immigration, Border Security, and Claims held an oversight hearing on “The Federal Government’s Response to the Issuance and Acceptance in the U.S. of Consular Identification Cards.” Testimony was heard from Roberta S. Jacobson, Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Western Hemisphere Affairs, Department of State; Steven McCraw, Assistant Director, Office of Intelligence, FBI, Department of Justice; C. Stewart Verdery, Assistant Secretary, Policy and Planning, Border and Transportation Security Directorate, Department of Homeland Security; and a public witness.

**MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES**

*Committee on Resources*: Subcommittee on Fisheries Conservation, Wildlife and Oceans held a hearing on the following bills: H.R. 1204, to amend the National Wildlife Refuge System Administration Act of 1966 to establish requirements for the award of concessions in the National Wildlife Refuge System, to provide for maintenance and repair of properties located in the System by concessionaires authorized to use such properties; and H.R. 2408, National Wildlife Refuge Volunteer Act of 2003. Testimony was heard from Marshall P. Jones, Jr. Deputy Director, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior; and public witnesses.
NASA FLEXIBILITY ACT
Committee on Science: Subcommittee on Space and Aeronautics approved for full Committee action, as amended, H.R. 1085, NASA Flexibility Act of 2003.

COMPUTER RESERVATION SYSTEMS REGULATIONS AND SMALL BUSINESS—TRAVEL INDUSTRY
Committee on Small Business: Subcommittee on Regulatory Reform and Oversight held a hearing entitled: “CRS Regulations and Small Business in the Travel Industry” Testimony was heard from Tom Sullivan, Chief Counsel, Office of Advocacy, SBA; and public witnesses.

NATIONAL RAIL INFRASTRUCTURE FINANCING PROPOSALS
Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Subcommittee on Railroads held an oversight hearing on National Rail Infrastructure Financing Proposals. Testimony was heard from the following officials of the Department of Transportation: Allan Rutter, Administrator, Federal Railroad Administration; and Roger Nober, Chairman, Surface Transportation Board; Joseph Boardman, Commissioner, Department of Transportation, State of New York; and public witnesses.

VETERAN'S LEGISLATION
Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Ordered reported the following measures: H.R. 1516, as amended, National Cemetery Expansion Act of 2003; H.R. 2297, as amended, Veterans Benefits Act of 2003; H.R. 116, as amended, Veterans' New Fitzsimons Health Care Facilities Act of 2003; H.R. 1720, as amended, Veterans Health Care Facilities Capital Improvement Act; H.R. 2357, as amended, to amend title 38, United States Code, to establish standards of access to care for veterans seeking health care from the Department of Veterans Affairs; H.R. 2433, as amended, Health Care for Veterans of Project 112/Project SHAD Act of 2003; H.R. 2595, to restore the operation of the Native American Veteran Housing Loan Program during fiscal year 2003 to the scope of that program as in effect on September 30, 2002; and H. Con. Res. 159, declaring Emporia, Kansas, to be the founding city of the Veterans Day holiday and recognizing the contributions of Alvin J. King and Representative Ed Rees to the enactment into law of the observance of Veterans Day.

PROJECT BIOSHIELD ACT

NEW PUBLIC LAWS
(For last listing of Public Laws, see DAILY DIGEST, p. D713 )

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR FRIDAY, JUNE 27, 2003
Senate
No meetings/hearings scheduled.

House
No committee meetings are scheduled.
Next Meeting of the SENATE
10:15 a.m., Friday, June 27

Program for Friday: Senate will be in a period of morning business.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
2 p.m., Monday, July 7

Program for Monday: To be announced.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

ANDREWS, Robert E., N.J., E1375
BRADLEY, Jeb, N.H., E1359
CANTOR, Eric, Va., E1369
CASE, Ed, Hawaii, E1365, E1367
CRANE, Philip M., Ill., E1370
DAVIS, Jim, Fla., E1372
DEL AUNO, Rosa L., Conn., E1373
ESHOO, Anna G., Calif., E1369
FAIR, Sam, Calif., E1364, E1367
FLETCHER, Ernie, Ky., E1370
FORBES, J. Randy, Va., E1371
FRANK, Barney, Mass., E1363, E1366
FROST, Martin, Tex., E1362, E1369
GILMOR, Paul E., Ohio, E1368
HARMAN, Jane, Calif., E1373
HONDA, Michael M., Calif., E1369
KANJORSKI, Paul E., Pa., E1366, E1370
KIND, Ron, Wisc., E1370
KUCINICH, Dennis J., Ohio, E1362, E1365, E1368, E1369
LEE, Barbara, Calif., E1360
LOFGREN, Zoe, Calif., E1369
McCARTHY, Carolyn, N.Y., E1362
MENENDEZ, Robert, N.J., E1373
MOORE, Dennis, Kansas, E1357
MORAN, James P., Va., E1359
NEY, Robert W., Ohio, E1366, E1368
OBERSTAR, James L., Minn., E1374
POMEROY, Earl, N.D., E1361
RANGET, Charles B., N.Y., E1377, E1358
REYES, Silvestre, Tex., E1359
SAXTON, Jim, N.J., E1371
SCHAKOWSKY, Janice D., Ill., E1359
SMITH, Nick, Mich., E1362, E1365, E1368
SOLIS, Hilda L., Calif., E1370
VITTER, David, La., E1373
WAXMAN, Henry A., Calif., E1369
WELDON, Curt, Pa., E1362, E1366
WOLF, Frank R., Va., E1371

(Senate and House proceedings for today will be continued in the next issue of the Record.)