These demonstrations should also be extended in order to ensure a full and fair test of the CNO managed care concept. These demonstrations are consistent with our efforts to introduce a wider range of managed care options for Medicare beneficiaries. I believe we need more time to evaluate the impact of CNOs on patient outcomes and to assess their capacity for operating under fixed budgets.

Mr. Speaker, it is important to recognize that the extension of this demonstration will not increase Medicare expenditures for care. CNOs actually save Medicare dollars by providing better and more accessible care in home and community settings, allowing beneficiaries to avoid unnecessary hospitalizations and nursing home admissions. By demonstrating what a primary care oriented nursing practice can accomplish with patients who are elderly or disabled, CNOs are helping show us how to increase benefits, save scarce dollars and improve the quality of life for patients.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to consider this bill carefully and join me in seeking to extend these cost-savings and patient-enhancing CNO demonstrations for another 3 years.

WEED THE SEED PROGRAM

HON. JAMES A. TRAFICANT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 11, 1997

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, in 1989, at a time when communism was beginning to fall in Eastern Europe, Congress approved the Support for Eastern European Democracy [SEED] Act. The purpose of the SEED Act was to provide special enterprise funds to assist the fledgling democracies in the development of free-market economies. Originally intended to be used for economic restructuring and all-important humanitarian relief, the funds have become part of a never-ending web of corruption and mismanagement. America has already lost millions and millions of dollars of hard-earned taxpayer money through these funds, yet we keep throwing more good money after bad.

The funds were established as private, nonprofit corporations. As such they are subject to little government oversight. According to a 1990 Senate Appropriations Committee report (101–519) the only role that the U.S. Agency for International Development [USAID] is to have in the process is to ''simply write the check on a periodic basis when the enterprise funds determine that additional funding is necessary.'' This was done to give the boards of directors and the funds' managers wide latitude in determining how to invest the money and also to allow them the flexibility to react to market situations. While on the surface this may appear to be the best way to encourage the growth of market mechanisms, better, in fact, than traditional aid programs, it actually amounts to a situation in which there is no accountability to the investor, namely the American taxpayer. When the funds lose money as a result of poor investment practices it is the taxpayer who ultimately loses, with no way to recoup those losses.

Unfortunately, it is not uncommon for money to be lost as a result of an ill-advised investment. There is a significant lack of quality personnel who are willing to relocate to Eastern Europe to oversee the funds. As a result the most prudent courses are not followed and it is almost the norm for investments to result in a net loss. In addition, the proper economic and political environments, to foster success, often do not exist. As an example, the original schedule for disbursement was to be carried out in lump sums over 3 years. However, the funds are experiencing difficulty in meeting this schedule and thus it has been extended. Other funds, such as the Hungarian Fund and the Polish Fund have requested, and the Polish Fund was granted, supplemental funding demonstrating that the funds are not self-sustaining, as was originally intended. The most striking example, however, of the failure of funds' investments, is the case of the Czech and Slovak American Enterprise Funds (CSAEF). Authorized in 1991, the first two large investments failed terribly, resulting in a loss of $2 million. In all bad investments have resulted in a loss of two-thirds of the CSAEF investment portfolio.

A 1995 investigation conducted by an inspector general of U.S. Agency for International Development confirmed allegations of mismanagement and corruption within the system. Skyrocketing overhead costs are largely the result of corrupt management practices, as money is often used to line the pockets of corrupt profiteers. The president of the Hungarian Fund was found to have paid two U.S. executives salaries upwards of $400,000, forcing a salary cap to be imposed. Even more disturbing is the fact that a Hungarian government official received payments through the fund. The CSAEF, in addition to making poor investments, has been embroiled in scandal. John Petty, former deputy chairman of the CSAEF, was forced to resign due to his improper conduct in managing fund monies. The investigation discovered that he gave his mistress, who was working for the fund as an executive assistant, a more than 50 percent raise so that her salary amounted to $85,000 per year.

The funds have simply not served their purpose. Corruption and mismanagement, coupled with poor environments for investment, have kept the funds from being an effective mechanism in moving Eastern Europe toward a market economy. The money has not been used for its original intent, economic restructuring and humanitarian relief. Instead, investments have been mismanaged and corruption has been a trademark of the system.

At a time when we are searching for ways to balance the budget, when some even go so far as to propose an amendment to the Constitution, we cannot afford to waste money overseas. Rather than continuing to slash to the bone funding for vital domestic programs, it seems logical to eliminate programs that simply do nothing to benefit the American people. This program wastes hard-earned taxpayer dollars. The American people deserve to have their money work for them, not to have it squandered abroad. H.R. 564 will prohibit USAID from spending any money allocated to it to finance the funds and will effectively phase them out over 2 years following its passage into law.

It is time to end wasteful overseas spending and to put that money to better use here at home. To that end, I encourage Members of Congress to join me by cosponsoring H.R. 564.

LOVE YOUR NEIGHBOR WEEK IN DADE COUNTY

HON. ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 11, 1997

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize ''Love Your Neighbor Week'' and its driving force, Jim Ward.

Encompassing Valentine's Day, the week seeks to encourage reaching out to all people in the community. Its mission is to identify us as a community that cares for all people without regard to race, ethnicity, religion, or social status. Toward that goal, Mr. Ward is seeking to mobilize all organizations that call south Florida home. This includes public, private, educational, business, and civic groups.

The pledge asks individuals to ''live the spirit of Love Your Neighbor [LYN] in my daily life; to be kind and considerate to everyone; and to unite my community through thoughts, actions, and words.'' Organizations are asked to display LYN decals and signs and employees are asked to use the phrase in greeting customers.

Mr. Ward, a 27-year resident of south Florida, and Dade County's human resources director, is the man who put together this celebration of community. He has pledged to ''go anywhere in behalf of the cause and to do all the work'' necessary to see that this program gets off the ground.

Mr. Ward and all the volunteers who have put this healing exercise together deserve our thanks and support in their effort to make the world a better place.

LEGISLATION TO RAISE AWARENESS OF MAMMOGRAPHY AND BREAST CANCER GUIDELINES INTRODUCED

HON. JENNIFER DUNN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 11, 1997

Ms. DUNN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, on January 23, the National Cancer Institute declined to recommend that women in their forties seek annual breast cancer screening. Research into the benefits of mammography for women in this age group is wholly inadequate. Further, without definitive guidelines, the lives of America's mothers, wives, sisters, and daughters are at risk. This year, an estimated 33,000 women in their forties will be diagnosed with breast cancer—these are women in the prime of their lives, women whose children are still in kindergarten, and women entering the peak of their careers.

Guidelines for women aged 40 to 49 were in place until 1993, when they were rescinded by the National Cancer Institute. This occurred despite the lack of confidence in available research and differing opinions by respected medical organizations on the wisdom of the rescission. Research performed in two studies last year found a 44 and 36 percent lower death rate among women who received mammograms in their forties, and a number of studies have shown that breast tumors in women under the age of 50 may grow far more rapidly than in older women, suggesting