But worst of all, Mr. Speaker, even though the bill creates a fund for directing moneys recovered from wrongdoers, the moneys do not go to the enforcement agencies within the Government to continue their efforts to try to stop fraud and abuse. It is incredible to me, Mr. Speaker, that in all the talk about Medicare, that this is what we have in this Republican bill.

O.J. SIMPSON IS GUILTY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, I said earlier during someone else's 5-minute special order that I was going to discuss the O.J. Simpson case. I used to represent, for 6 years, the precinct in Los Angeles, the real estate name is Brentwood, CA, where Nicole Simpson had her throat slashed to her spine, and where young Ron Goldman, doing a simple act of kindness, bringing over a pair of reading glasses belonging to Nicole Simpson's mother, then stumbled on to a situation where he yelled either hey, hey, hey or hey, O.J.

The word on the streets of Brentwood, in Los Angeles, from the lawyer of the Goldman family is that one of the defense witnesses lied on the stand.

□ 1815

That he actually told all of his friends that, ''O.J. is going to kiss me if he beats this,'' and that he actually physically saw O.J. Whether that is true remains to be seen. This is somebody who should be polygraphed, should be arrested for perjury, if in fact he told all of his friends that he heard Goldman say, ''Hey, O.J.'', which means he gave his life beyond common courtesy as a Good Samaritan in trying to interfere into what he thought was a beating, until he saw the flash of the knife in the moonlight. I believe that Ron Goldman, at age 25, did die as a hero.

Mr. Speaker, in these short few minutes I want to discuss what I would like to do in an hour special order. If this truly was the double murder or the trial of the century, then it should be discussed on the floor of this, the world's most important legislative body, this Knesset, this House of Commons, this Duma. This House should discuss this issue.

Last night I watched an hour on the murder of Stanford White, the New York architect, on the roof garden of Madison Square Garden which he designed. If that was the trial of the century, and it was only 6 years into the century, or the Lindburgh trial, when I was an infant, was the trial of a century, and this has eclipsed all of that; if more people were aware of the O.J. murder than the atrocity of the bombing in Oklahoma City, or just about anything other than the assassination of President Kennedy or Pearl Harbor, for those of us old enough to remember that, then it should be discussed on this floor.

In this brief, 5-minute introduction to what I intend to do here for an hour, let me say three things. One, of course, O.J. Simpson did it. Of course he did it. Of course the jury did not hear Nicole's statements, because it was hearsay, to several friends. ''He will kill me and he will get away with it. He will O.J. his way out of it. He thinks he is above the law.''

O.J. Simpson is now called the butcher of Brentwood, my former area that I raised five of my children in. Two of my children came home from the hospital to a little house on Chenault three short blocks from the murder scene. Of course he did it.

No. 2, Mr. Speaker, I am going to, with my last breath, defend cameras in the courtroom, because about 50 million people in this country became the 13th juror. They knew more than the alternates did. We must never sequester human beings like this again. They feel they are locked up with less contact with the outside world than Simpson, so of course they felt they were angry with the State. But we must keep the cameras in the courtroom or we would not have know more evidence than the jury itself knows.

No. 3, we must reopen this case. I said this to Mr. Garcetti. I said this to my friend, Sheriff Sherwin Block. And I have said it to the detectives, the prime detectives, one of the trio of detectives that handled most of the evidence. And he said to me on the phone last week, ''Congressman, we had gobs of evidence we did not use.''

How can Garcetti stamp his foot like a petulant child, when a third of this country believes O.J. Simpson was not just not found guilty, not that he was acquitted, but that he is innocent. You cannot leave a third of this country in a fog that a murderer or double killers, maybe more than one, Colombian necklacing drug lords are out there going to terrorize some other family.

We must put this to rest. And here is what I told the detectives and in 4 short minutes, they bought my case. Reopen it. Take Johnny Cochran and Simpson at his word and go look for the killer or killers. Let us reinterview everybody that was interviewed in this case and then a second and a third tier of potential witnesses.

Go over every speck of evidence. It is locked up. Play one lab in this country off against the other. And then come out with a paper or report 6 months or a year from now. And those of us who were the 13th jurors who followed this trial know what the verdict will be. It was the butcher of Brentwood. Mr. Simpson, who if he had any decency, would not ruin his children's lives. He slaughtered their mother. He would go to Mexico, or some foreign country, and get out of our face.

He is shocked that we are not groveling and accepting him back. He told the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER], on the Tuesday before the murder, that he voted for Bush and that he told that to Clinton's face when they played golf.

I will do this in a 60-minute special order, Mr. Speaker. But let me close on this line. As I told the Presidential candidates in New Hampshire, that Republican millionaires who voted for Bush are more a jury of his peers and they would have found him guilty.

These poor, emotionally distraught jurors were not his peers. Not his peers. He did it. He simply did it, and he has not gotten away with it yet; not in the court of public opinion.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2259, DISAPPROVAL OF CERTAIN SENTENCING GUIDELINE AMENDMENTS

Ms. PRYCE, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104–279) on the resolution (H. Res. 237) providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2259) to disapprove certain sentencing guideline amendments, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

AMERICANS SHOULD PAY ATTENTION TO THE REPUBLICAN MEDICARE REFORM AGENDA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, there are many items and subjects debated on the floor of the House, as the previous speaker indicated, from the O.J. Simpson trial to some items that are considered to be very parochial, very regional, very specific.

But there will be a debate on the floor of the House this week which I am afraid has not caught the attention of the American people. The reason I have this fear is because of the gravity and importance of this debate, not only to tens of millions of senior citizens across America, but to all of their families as well.

You can measure the importance of an item in the U.S. House of Representatives by the time we dedicate to that item, in most cases, but not when it comes to this Gingrich Medicare reform. Take a look at this chart as an indication of the time that we have spent in committee hearing on the Medicare reform plan of NEWT GINGRICH.

Well, we spent 10 days looking into Ruby Ridge. We spent 10 days looking into Waco. We have spent 28 days of committee hearings on Whitewater. And how many days have we spent on a $270 billion cut in Medicare? Look closely. One. One day.

The fact of the matter is that even as of this weekend, we are just learning what is included in this bill; a bill which will literally affect every family in America.

My mother is 86 years old. She lives by herself. She has had some medical problems. Thank goodness for Medicare. It's been there when she needed it, and that story is told over and over again. She is happy, but equally important, her family is happy.

As her son, and my brothers, we are all very content that she is under Medicare and has quality health care available to her and a quality of life, which was not around 30 years ago.

So, the Republicans come to the floor and say, We are just trying to preserve Medicare. Well, excuse me if I am skeptical. Medicare was created by the Democrats. A person like BOB DOLE voted against the Medicare plan when it was originally proposed, and many Republicans did as well.

This plan for Medicare has been in place for 30 years, a creation of the Democrats, has worked and worked well. We fear, many of us on the Democratic side of the aisle, that the Gingrich Medicare reform plan is a disaster.

Mr. Speaker, I think the Republicans know it as well. They will not bring it out in the light of day. They will not let us see the details of it. They will not let us have committee hearings. They will not even let us offer but one amendment, one substitute. They are talking about maybe 2 hours of debate on the floor of the House for something that could literally affect American families for decades to come.

Let me tell my colleagues several of the things they should know about it. The Republicans want to cut $270 billion out of Medicare spending. They say that is to save Medicare. That is not what the trustees say.

The trustees say we need to reduce spending by $90 billion, one-third of the amount. Why did they triple the cuts to increase premiums for seniors, to reduce the services available? They need the money for other purposes, and the purposes are very clear. They want to create a tax-break package. A package which, frankly, goes way beyond what working families need.

It is a tax-break package primarily for the wealthiest people in this country: $245 billion dollars. Nothing new. This is the old Republican philosophy. The big business philosophy. The trickle-down philosophy. If you give enough money to the wealthiest people in this country, the Republicans believe that somehow it will eventually get down to working families.

Well, I applaud them for their consistency, even though they have been proven wrong historically and economically. But here they go again. To find the money for it, they want to cut Medicare.

The other thing that troubles me greatly is if you talk to people who receive Medicare payments, the providers, you will find that by and large they are honest and ethical people who are working hard to provide good quality health care, and God bless them for their hard work.

But they will also acknowledge that there are a lot of wrongdoers as well. One to two percent of the people who turn in bills to Medicare are frankly trying to rip-off the Government through fraud and waste and abuse. We know it and we know it costs us dearly.

We estimate 10 percent of all Medicare billing each year is fraudulent; $18 billion lost that should be spent to help people and reduce our deficit. We have had some tough laws on the books. They should get tougher. But know what? The Gingrich Republican approach on Medicare reform lightens the load; makes it harder to prove fraud on the part of those who would try to rip-off the system.

They say it is a sweetheart deal which the Speaker cut with some of the interest groups. I do not know if it is or not, but the bottom line is the Federal prosecutors who have looked at the Republican Medicare reform plan have come to the conclusion that it is going to make it tougher to go after the wrongdoers. That is not fair and it is not fair to the seniors and it is not fair to the taxpayers.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the people of the United States will tune into this debate this week. The Republicans have tried to keep it under wraps. Now it is time to bring it out into the light of day and make sure America knows what is in store for them if these Gingrich Medicare reform plans go through.

MEDICARE REFORM SHOULD ROOT OUT FRAUD AND ABUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I have conducted numerous town meetings and hearings in my district on Medicare. As my friend, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN], just said, unfortunately, hearings have not taken place in this institution in this body for the public to hear them.

But at these hearings which I have conducted, and in town meetings, I have heard over and over again people's anger about the $270 billion in Medicare cuts in order to pay for tax breaks for the wealthiest citizens in this country, the people who need them the least.

But what also concerns me and what troubles me is something else that I hear at these hearings, these town meetings, and that is people believe there is a good deal of fraud in the Medicare system. That fraud is something we have to aggressively pursue and prosecute and root out and do something about.

That is why it particularly troubles me and concerned me to see an article in USA Today, an editorial on Friday, and the headline reads, ''Medicare Reform Invites Doctors To Bend the Rules. Easing Limits on Physicians' Self-Referral Is Bound To Cost the Medicare Program Billions of Dollars That It Can't Afford.''

USA Today goes on to say:

> No wonder the American Medical Association has signed on to Medicare reform, with the deal that they made with Republican leadership. The Republican Medicare bill actually promotes fraud, waste and abuse in several areas, particularly in its weakening of the ban on physician referral of Medicare and Medicaid patients for tests and treatment in places where the doctor has a financial interest.

Another newspaper talking about this agreement made between Republican leadership and the American Medical Association says:

> Regrettably the Speaker's concessions made an already bad Medicare bill substantially worse. The Gingrich bill was never designed to give the elderly high-quality health care. It is less likely to do so now.

Unfortunately, this piece of legislation, this Medicare bill which the American people have not been able to find out much about, because there have not been hearings in this institution, that Gingrich Medicare bill eliminates fraud by legalizing it. It simply makes things legal that were not legal before. It encourages more fraud, instead of less.

Not too long ago, about a week ago, in the Committee on Commerce, a committee on which I sit, the committee that heard the Medicare and Medicaid bills. Rather, did not really hear them, because we were not allowed to have hearings, but a committee that discussed Medicare and Medicaid and allowed amendments and we talked about the bill, my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. STUPAK], offered a substitute bill that would have, instead of cutting $270 billion in Medicare in order to give tax breaks to the wealthiest citizens in this country, would have gone directly after fraud and abuse in the Medicare program.

Unfortunately the chairman of the committee ruled the Stupak substitute out of order. We were not able to debate this or discuss this and we were not allowed to vote for a bill, instead of $270 billion in cuts to Medicare beneficiaries and to give tax breaks to the wealthiest citizen, instead it would have devoted resources to rooting out fraud.

□ 1830

The Office of Inspector General reports that every year for every $1 spent on going after fraud and investigators and inspectors and prosecutors, that $80 is recovered that can go back into the Medicare system. So why are we cutting $270 billion out of Medicare to pay for tax breaks for the wealthy and why are we cutting back on the enforcers and the investigators and the prosecutors and the people that for every dollar spent can recover $80?

I think it goes back to that editorial in USA Today about the arrangement that the American Medical Association made with the Republican leadership in this House. It is troubling to me that we could save much more than even the trustees said. They said that we need to cut $89 billion in order to keep Medicare strong for the next decade or