

Mr. Speaker, I ask you and my colleagues to join me in congratulating one of the greatest teams in the annals of basketball, and of course one of the greatest players ever, Michael Jordan. In the more than 100 game that they played, the Bulls always delivered a championship performance.

And finally, I would like to congratulate and thank the greatest fans in the world for their undying support of the Chicago Bulls.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair certainly appreciates the gentlewoman from Illinois for holding up the shirt for display in her speech.

#### SUPPORT THE ELIMINATION OF NEA'S FUNDING

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

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, here we go again. Just as this Congress is set to debate the funding of the National Endowment for the Arts, NEA Chairwoman, Jane Alexander, has again shown us that both she and the taxpayer funded NEA, must go.

Last Sunday, at the New York Lesbian and Gay Video and Film Festival, director Cheryl Dunye premiered her film, "Watermelon Woman," funded by the tax dollars of hardworking Americans.

In the words of the director herself, this pornographic film depicts black "lesbians experiencing their sexual desire for each other." This film was produced from a \$31,000 grant from the NEA.

I believe that in the opinion of most Americans, Watermelon Woman has absolutely no serious artistic, or political value.

NEA Chairwoman Alexander and the National Endowment for the Arts are attempting to pull the wool over the eyes of taxpaying Americans by marketing this sexually explicit film as black history.

As Edmund Peterson, chairman of Project 21 and a leading black conservative put it, in Friday's Washington Times, "There is no demand in the black community for this movie; this is a classic example, of the Clinton administration, being in bed with the gay-lesbian movement, and funding a project through tax dollars, that can't get funded any other way."

Mr. Speaker, this is not the first time that Miss Alexander and the NEA have demonstrated a desire to divert our tax dollars to controversial works that demean the religious beliefs and moral values of mainstream Americans. One should not forget the March 1994 performance of Ron Athey, at the Minneapolis Walker Art Center.

This NEA-funded performance featured Mr. Athey carving a design into the back of an assistant, mopping up the blood with paper towels, and then sending the paper towels on a line, out over the shocked audience.

Miss Alexander defended the performance, stating in the Washington Post, "not all art is for everybody."

Many in Congress denounced this performance as an obscenity. Miss Alexander and the NEA responded by awarding more of our hard-earned tax dollars to the Walker Art Center.

Miss Alexander and the NEA have repeatedly thumbed their noses at Congress and the American public.

I call on President Clinton to find the moral courage within himself to protect the children of America from these obscenities, and to demand the immediate resignation of Jane Alexander. Mr. President, you cannot have it both ways.

Middle America does not share the NEA's values. The American taxpayer and the working families of the Third District of North Carolina do not want their money spent on so-called works of art, like a crucifix in urine, or photographs, which exploit our children.

This week, the House is scheduled to debate funding for the National Endowment for the Arts.

It is time the Government got out of the business of funding this so-called art.

I urge each of my colleagues to support the elimination of the NEA's Federal funding. The taxpayer cannot afford it and our children do not deserve it.

#### INCLUSION OF REPUBLICAN MSA PROPOSAL THWARTS EFFORTS TO MAKE HEALTH INSURANCE ACCESSIBLE AND AFFORDABLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I am a very strong supporter of health care reform and of the Kennedy-Kassebaum bipartisan legislation to afford us a first step in dealing with some very important issues that face working families today on the issue of health care. There is a serious problem that we do have today that working families face, two particularly.

First, is the whole issue of health insurance portability, that when you leave one job and go to another, what happens to your health care? People find themselves in that position today more and more without the opportunity of having the kind of health care coverage they need in switching jobs that is good for them or for their families.

The second issue that is very critical and important is the limits on coverage for individuals who have a pre-existing condition where insurance companies will deny the opportunity for health insurance to somebody who has a preexisting condition.

Mr. Speaker, I have a preexisting condition; I am a cancer survivor. Ten years ago I was diagnosed with ovarian cancer. Fortunately, today I am cancer free. But there is not a small business

or some business who wants to put me in their insurance pool because it drives those premiums sky high. Or if I go out and get insurance on my own, it is 12 or \$14,000 a year to cover people who are cancer survivors.

These are serious health care problems. They face approximately 21 million Americans in this Nation. Too many families, working families, in my district, the Third District in Connecticut, pay their bills, they work hard, they play by the rules, and they do live in fear of losing their health insurance if they change their jobs. Too many of them cannot even get health care coverage because of this preexisting medical condition. This is not only bad health care policy, it is wrong.

We have an opportunity with the Kennedy-Kassebaum bill, a bipartisan bill that addresses both of these issues. As I said, this is a first step. It is not all that we want to accomplish in health care reform, but it is a way in which we can modestly reform the health insurance industry to meet the needs of working families.

Sadly, under the banner of reform with this bipartisan bill, the congressional majority and the Speaker of the House today took the floor to talk about an opportunity for health care reform, but under this banner of reform what we have seen the congressional majority and the Speaker of the House do is to twist this opportunity, and in fact what would result would hurt consumers, and it would, in fact, increase the number of insured, the reason being the introduction of something called a medical savings account.

Medical savings accounts are expensive, they are destructive, and they are bad health care policy. They encourage the healthiest and the wealthiest individuals to opt out of the insurance pool. They allow individuals to create private accounts to pay for their medical expenses, and in exchange individuals get a bare bones catastrophic insurance plan with extremely high deductibles. It is shortsighted. What it does by people opting out, the healthiest and the wealthiest opting out of the traditional insurance pool, you leave the most frail, the sickest people in that pool, thereby driving the premiums up.

Mr. Speaker, I will tell you in order for the insurance companies to take care of these more sickly people, that cost goes up, and I am going to quote you a group, The American Academy of Actuaries, not a liberal group. These are the green eye shade people who look very carefully at the cost of insurance. Their estimate is that the process of skimming, getting the healthy out of this system, would result in a possible 61 percent increase in health care premiums for those who remain in traditional plans. If rates rise, people will no longer be able to afford insurance, and you thereby increase the number of uninsured in this country, certainly not what we want to try to do.