

orable Dante Fascell. For over 40 years, Dante Fascell represented the people of south Florida in both the State legislature and the U.S. Congress.

Very few Americans can claim to have had as distinguished a record of service to their country as Dante Fascell. Born in New York in 1917, his family relocated to Florida when he was 8 years old. He earned his law degree from the University of Miami in 1938, and then served his country with honor in WWII from 1941-46. After leaving the Army, he returned to the private practice of law until he was elected to the Florida State Legislature in 1951. Three years later, he was elected to the U.S. Congress in 1954, where he served with honor until his retirement in 1992.

Dante Fascell came to Congress when virtually all of south Florida was one congressional district. Perhaps no other man has had a greater impact on the face of today's south Florida. He authored the bill that made the Florida Keys a national marine sanctuary, as well as barring offshore drilling there. In 1990, Mr. Fascell enacted legislation that created the prestigious North-South Center at the University of Miami, to foster understanding and better relations within our hemisphere.

As chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, he was a tireless advocate for Radio Marti and the National Endowment for Democracy, both of which promoted the ideas of democracy around the world. He also co-authored the War Powers Resolution of 1973 which required the President to consult with Congress before initiating any military action against a foreign power. Dante Fascell continues to be active in these issues today, currently serving on the board of trustees of the North-South Center and with a number of other activities and organizations in the Miami area.

---

HAPPY 32D ANNIVERSARY

**HON. DON YOUNG**

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, February 22, 1995*

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, under the new spirit of a family friendly Congress, I would like to wish my wife, Lu, a happy 32d anniversary this day, February 22, 1995.

---

EDI REFORM ACT OF 1995

**HON. JAMES A. TRAFICANT, JR.**

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, February 22, 1995*

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, in 1994 the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development [HUD] awarded over \$319 million to depressed communities under the Economic

otherwise qualified, they will be selected as funding levels permit. Should, before passage of this legislation, the EDI program be consolidated into a program that awards grant money based on a formula, as has been proposed by the administration, extent of unemployment must be taken into consideration.

In either case, Mr. Speaker, severe unemployment—the root of hopelessness yet heretofore all but ignored—figures prominently in the process.

The EDI is a wonderful program. Enacted in early 1994 as a way to enhance and strengthen section 108 loan guarantees, it has served to not only stimulate the \$2 billion section 108 program, but to help secure repayment as well. A public entity, for example, may couple an EDI grant with a section 108 loan to create a large loan pool for businesses to tap into. Such an entity may also use the EDI grant to buy down its own interest rates—thus attracting businesses previously avoiding or fleeing depressed communities.

Last year, cities as diverse as Indianapolis, Atlantic City and Selma have received anywhere between \$300,000 and \$450,000 to further their efforts to rejuvenate their proud communities and revitalize needy sections of town. Businesses are attracted to places like these, Mr. Speaker. More importantly, businesses choose to stay—thus creating jobs and restoring hope.

The EDI Reform Act of 1995, therefore, will ensure that these jobs are created where they are most needed—in high unemployment areas. Now, cities such as Youngstown, OH, or Yuma, AZ, which suffer from unemployment rates double and triple that of the national average, will have a better chance at improving their communities.

Despite the merits of the EDI Program, it now glosses over the extent of unemployment and, in pending proposals, all but ignores the problem. My bill will make this good program better.

I urge my colleagues to support the EDI Reform Act of 1995.

---

THE LINE-ITEM VETO

**HON. LEE H. HAMILTON**

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, February 22, 1995*

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert my Washington Report for Wednesday, February 22, 1995 into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

THE LINE-ITEM VETO

Hoosiers often express their frustration with unnecessary federal spending—especially for the “pork-barrel” projects that seem to be funded year after year. I share this frustration, and have worked for years to curtail the practice of omnibus spending bills that include thousands of individual

VARIOUS VERSIONS

Under current law, the President has authority to submit a request to Congress to defer or rescind specific, line-item appropriations. These requests are known as “rescissions”. Yet the law is not very tough. Congress needs to approve the rescissions for them to take effect, but there is no requirement that Congress ever consider the President's request.

In recent years, many have argued for a system that requires Congress to take an immediate vote on the President's line-item rescissions package. No longer able to ignore the President's requests, Members would be forced to take a stand on individual spending items. This enhanced rescission proposal is one form of a line-item veto. With my support, the House has passed such legislation several times. However, the measure has never come to a vote in the Senate.

The House has considered many different versions of the line-item veto over the years. I have supported some and opposed others. The key points for me are that they be tough on exposing unnecessary spending and preserve the constitutional balance of powers.

HOUSE BILL

In early February, the House passed a version of a line-item veto. It would give the President 10 days after signing a spending or revenue bill to submit a package of spending cuts or targeted tax benefits to be eliminated. These recommendations would go into effect unless Congress rejected the package by a two-thirds vote in both the House and the Senate.

This version went too far in some ways and not far enough in others. I continue to support a line-item veto. But the final version that passed the House shifts far too much power to the President, threatens the constitutional separation of powers, and is not tough enough on tax loopholes and deficit spending. There is a better alternative.

The version I favored would allow the President to use the line-item veto at any time—not just within 10 days—and would permit the President to force Congress to use the savings for deficit reduction instead of for other programs. It would require Congress to take an immediate vote on the President's package, which could be enacted with majority approval. Under this system, the President could turn the national spotlight on an item of unnecessary spending and force Congress to cast an explicit and immediate vote on it. The President would win most of these votes. The approach achieves the purpose of a line-item veto without a dangerous shift of power to the President. The House did not approve this version, but passed another version.

My key concern with the version that passed the House is that it would shift enormous power to the President. It would allow him and 146 Members of the House or 34 Senators—representing as little as 7% of the population—to control the fiscal policy of the entire federal government. In addition, this version would allow the President to cut all or part of any program—a power few governors have. It would permit a President basically to rewrite an entire spending bill. Congress should not surrender the budget-

much power. In recent years, presidential power has grown at the expense of congressional authority.

The version that passed the House is also weak on controlling wasteful tax loopholes. It defines "targeted tax benefits" as tax loopholes that benefit 100 or fewer taxpayers. Tax benefits cost us as much as \$400 billion per year, but this definition of tax benefits does not even begin to scratch the surface of the problem. I voted for a broader definition which would have allowed targeting any tax provision giving "different treatment to a particular taxpayer or limited class of taxpayers". This was the definition contained in the GOP's "Contract With America." Most tax benefits are worthy, but some can be wasteful and costly.

This bill now goes to the Senate for consideration, where Senators of both parties have expressed reservations about its constitutionality, as well as its limited effect on tax loopholes and deficit reduction. These concerns may be addressed in the Senate. I want to vote for a tough line-item veto that will stand the test of time.

#### LIMITATIONS

A line-item veto can help eliminate government waste, but it is easy to overestimate its effectiveness. The only kind of spending a line-item veto applies to is discretionary spending, not those parts of the budget that have increased most dramatically—entitlements and interest on the debt. Discretionary spending is the area of the budget that has been held most in check. As a share of total federal spending it has fallen from 44% in 1985 to 36% this year. The line-item veto is less about deficit reduction than responsible spending policy.

#### CONCLUSION

Despite its drawbacks, a line-item veto can be a useful tool in eliminating wasteful spending and tax loopholes. The tough version I have supported would achieve this without resulting in a dangerous shift of power to the President.

#### TRIBUTE TO DR. JOEL FRANKEL

### HON. PETER DEUTSCH

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, February 22, 1995*

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Dr. Joel Frankel for his outstanding contributions to his community and his profession.

The Concordia Chapter of the City of Hope, National Medical Center, and the Beckman Research Institute have chosen to present their annual Spirit of Life Humanitarian Award to Dr. Frankel for his over 25 years of outstanding commitment to the people of Broward County, and to the science of medicine.

Dr. Frankel was born and raised in Israel. Following service in the Israeli Army, he moved to New York City to pursue higher education. He graduated magna cum laude from Adelphi University, and went on to study medicine at the State University of New York.

Following his graduation from medical school, he spent 5 years at Mount Sinai Medi-

Frankel is a founder and chairman of the board of the Florida Institute of Health. FIH is a rapidly growing multispecialty group practice that began in 1993 and currently is composed of 50 physicians and serves approximately 70,000 patients.

Dr. Frankel and his wife Ellen have been married for 27 years, and they have 2 children, Michael, 21; and Stacy, 17.

Dr. Frankel's contributions to his community make him eminently worthy of the award being bestowed upon him. City of Hope, one of America's foremost medical and research centers, is dedicated to patient care, education, and research in leukemia and other cancers, diseases of the heart, lung, blood, and basic studies in genetics, the neuroscience, diabetes, and AIDS.

I salute Dr. Frankel and the City of Hope for their exemplary public service.

#### THE "ERISA TARGETED HEALTH INSURANCE REFORM ACT OF 1995"

### HON. HARRIS W. FAWELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, February 22, 1995*

Mr. FAWELL. Mr. Speaker, last year reform of health care focused on what was wrong with the system. This year reform should be driven by what is working in the system and how we can expand on what is being done. Yesterday, I introduced the ERISA Targeted Health Insurance Reform Act. I also introduced a related bill, the Targeted Individual Health Insurance Reform Market Act which I will explain separately.

Joining as original cosponsors of the ERISA targeted bill are: My colleagues Representatives BILL GOODLING, DICK ARMEY, TIM PETRI, MARGE ROUKEMA, CASS BALLENGER, PETE HOEKSTRA, BUCK MCKEON, JAN MEYERS, JIM TALENT, JAMES GREENWOOD, TIM HUTCHINSON, JOE KNOLLENBERG, LINDSEY GRAHAM, DAVE WELDON, and DAVID MCINTOSH.

Our approach to fixing the problems—primarily lack of access to affordable coverage—is fundamentally different than that taken by the Clinton administration and Congress last year. In developing this legislation, we took the hippocratic oath: First, do no harm. We carefully target reforms to fix the problems without doing harm to the choice and quality of care enjoyed by most Americans. Moreover, we will not disturb the revolution in innovation and competition going on in the private sector—instead, we will build on it.

The legislation we are introducing addresses the problem areas in health care insurance: portability, preexisting conditions, and affordable coverage for small employers.

Most importantly, the framework builds on the successful and time-tested cornerstone of employee benefits law, the Employee Retirement Income Security Act [ERISA]. Under

ability and limits on preexisting conditions under health plans will help eliminate job lock. It gives increased purchasing power for employers and employees. Increased health plan competition will mean more affordable choice of coverage for many Americans.

Our legislation makes these targeted reforms without forcing Americans to give up their current coverage or restrict their choice of coverage—it should actually expand choice. Nor do we impose employer mandates, price controls, or a one-size-fits-all benefit package. Moreover, the legislation does not require any Government subsidies, expenditures, or taxes.

We have worked with many organizations in developing this legislation and have received a number of letters supportive of our effort to begin the debate on health insurance reform. So far, we have supportive letters from: the National Federation of Independent Business, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the ERISA Industry Committee, the National Association of Wholesalers, the National Association of Manufacturers, the Self-Insurance Institute of America, Associated Builders and Contractors, the Association of Private Pension and Welfare Plans, the National Business Coalition on Health, the National Retail Federation, the National Restaurant Association, Mutual of Omaha, and New York Life.

I've attached a section by section analysis of the first bill, the ERISA Targeted Health Insurance Reform Act, that has five subtitles (A through E). I will now explain what is contained in subtitles A and B. Subtitle A, entitled "Increased Availability and Continuity of Health Coverage for Employees and Their Families" deals with the subject matter of portability, limitations on preexisting condition exclusions, and private standard setting organizations. Subtitle B, entitled "Requirements for Insurers Providing Health Insurance Coverage to Group Health Plans of Small Employers" contains fair rating standards and rules relating to insurance availability in the small group market. After I've explained this, I will, at another time, explain subtitles C, D, and E.

#### THE ERISA TARGETED HEALTH INSURANCE REFORM ACT OF 1995

#### SUMMARY

The ERISA Targeted Health Insurance Reform Act of 1995 presents a well-targeted and workable framework within which incremental health insurance reform can be enacted this year.

The framework builds on the successful and time-tested cornerstone of employee benefits law set in 1974 under ERISA. Under the umbrella of ERISA, near "universal health coverage" has been afforded the employees of larger companies. It is long-overdue that cost-conscious small employers be given the opportunity to achieve the economies of scale and freedom from excessive government regulation and taxation that have been ERISA's hallmark. The problems of uninsured families can be strongly attacked by removing barriers and releasing the purchasing power of employers acting