premiums for the most wealthy. The most wealthy are going to have to pay more for Medicare part B. If someone is single and making $100,000, they will have to pay more for Medicare part B. If someone is married and makes over $150,000, they will have to pay more for Medicare part B. We are telling the most affluent that they have a rule to play in this.

Mr. Chairman, their bill lets the wealthy get all the benefits the poor get. Give me a break.

When I look at this bill, I know we have three major goals. We are going to get our financial house in order. We are going to do that and balance our budget. We are going to save our trust funds. We are going to protect them, and we are going to preserve them, and we are going to strengthen them, and we are also going to change this social, and corporate, and farming welfare state into an opportunity society. but we are going to save our Medicare trust fund, and how are we going to save it? In part because of a strong criminal fraud that we have in our bill.

When my colleagues voted against the rule, they voted against making crime in health care a Federal offense because in our rule we make health care fraud a Federal offense. We make it a Federal offense not just in Government programs, but in private programs as well. Theft and embezzlement, a federal offense. False statements, a federal offense. Bribe and graft, a Federal offense. Illegal enumerations, Federal offense. Obstruction of justice, a Federal offense. My colleagues voted against it when they voted against the rule. In our bill, contrary to what the previous speaker said, we have injunctive relief, we have subpoena power, we have grand jury disclosure. It is in our bill. Read it. My colleagues and continually distorting the facts, and, when the American people know what we have done, they are going to like it, and when I speak to the American people and my constituents, they say why would I object to a plan that does not increase copayments, does not increase deductible, does not increase my premium, allows me to have private care? My colleagues are into the old system. They are not giving their constituents choice. We are going what the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT] did in 1980. He said we should allow people in Medicare to get into a private-sector plan. The problem is he is 20 years later not in step.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 seconds to point out that my good friend's district would be cut $251 million between now and the year 2002 to give to the wealthy a large and unrequested tax cut.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON].

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will take this opportunity to remind the gentlewoman that wearing of badges is against the House rules.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Chairman, I will observe that.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, are the wearing of buttons, or sloganeering, or communicative badges against the rules of the House?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has stated that on several occasions today.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, if someone is wearing that when addressing the House, they are violating the rules of the House?

The CHAIRMAN. The are indeed.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, if they have been informed of that, they are, therefore, willfully violating the rules of the House?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair just reminds all Members that the rules are here to maintain a level of comity in the House and it would be proper for all Members to observe the rules.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Chairman, let me make a statement.

Did I not say I would be glad to observe that? Did the Chair not hear me? Did anyone else hear me? I said I will be glad to observe that rule, so it is not willful.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, would wearing a paper bag over one's head violate the same rule of the House?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman knows the answer to that. Let us move on.

Mr. WILLIAMS. No, the gentleman would not ask the question if he knew the answer.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair's guess is that the gentleman does know.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I am not asking for a guess. I am asking for a parliamentary ruling. Would wearing a paper bag over one's head, as has been done by some of our Republican colleagues in previous Congresses, violate the same rule of the House?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would respond by saying that the Chair was not here at the time, but the Chair's understanding was that that was ruled a breach of decorum at the time, and the Chair promises the gentleman that, if he sees anyone with a bag over their head today, he will ask them to remove it.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON].

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Chairman, I have really risen to speak in behalf of the amendment, and I do want to say that the Democrats have provided, I think, a reasonable alternative, a reasonable plan, that addresses saving health care. It also reads for senior citizens. Medicare needs to be reformed. Why? Because the trustees said it needed to be reformed to make sure there was financial stability.

But also, since my colleague raised the concern of the badge I was wearing, let me tell him why I had worn that badge inadvertently into the House and really in error. It was not meant to affront the House. But I do want to say it so my colleague understands: ''Shame on you. No to the Republican plan.''

Mr. Chairman, I may not be able to wear that, but I can say it over and over again:

> Shame on you, balancing the budget on the most vulnerable people in society. No to any plan that is so atrocious it does not indicate what it would do to poor people, senior citizens, rural communities, and inner cities, and no rule removes that moral obligation for the shame on your conscience.

The CHAIRMAN. The Committee will rise informally in order that the House may receive a message.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. STEARNS) assumed the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will receive a message.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Edwin Thomas, one of his secretaries.

The SPEAKER pro tempore The committee will resume its sitting.

MEDICARE PRESERVATION ACT OF 1995

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS], a member of the committee.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS], my good friend, to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL], to the minority leader, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT], let me first of all say, Your argument about tax cuts for the rich is clearly false, but let's really look at this argument in two ways.

First of all, Mr. Chairman, all the tax cuts were paid for before we even started talking about Medicare. Confirmed by CBO, these tax cuts were paid for as follows: welfare reform is $90 billion in savings; FCC spectrum auction is $15 billion; Uranium Enrichment Corporation is $2 million; and appropriation reductions are $38 billion in savings. My friends in the House and to all Americans, you should realize that they were paid for—$245 billion—was saved even before we even started talking about saving Medicare.

So the point is that there is nothing about this tax cut that is coming from Medicare savings or going for the rich.

When we are going broke in a program like Medicare and spending less, we cannot put the savings into anything. That is math 101. There is not more cash by slowing of the growth in Medicare. There is less debt. Now the trust fund will be able to build up a reserve for those future generations. It is like reducing the principal on one's home mortgage. It does not mean that you have more cash. It means that you pay less obligation to the bank. By slowing the spending growth, we insure that the Medicare trust fund stays solvent. Solving this growth means the program will survive, and, Mr. Chairman, as mentioned before, the lockbox insures any savings from waste, fraud, and abuse goes to the trust fund.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LEVIN].

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

□ 1600

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Chairman, the majority likes to quote the Trustees. They never say this. Here is what they say. The majority is asking for $270 billion in Medicare cuts, almost three times what is necessary to guarantee the life of the hospital insurance trust fund. As this chart shows, our substitute extends it for the same period as they do.

Second, there is a critical fact: Without the Medicare cuts there is not the money for the tax break, period.

Third, they talk about Medicare fraud and abuse. They should not brag about increasing penalties when their bill makes it more difficult to convict anybody. We can have life imprisonment. In their bill, we cannot convict anybody.

Fourth, you talk about market-driven forces. Seventy percent of your savings comes from old-fashioned price controls, 17 percent comes from hitting seniors. In fact, the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS] likes to brag that he is a radical. I would say to the gentleman, he can have that label. We Democrats want reform, not radical change.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Montana [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, it is this amendment that has the arithmetic that the trustees say will keep Medicare fiscally solvent. The Republican proposal is nothing new for them. For half a century, congressional Republicans have harbored a subtle but sinister opposition to Social Security, and later, to Medicare.

When Social Security was first created in 1935, 99 percent of the Republican Members of Congress voted against it, and a third of a decade later, in 1965, when Medicare was created, 93 percent of Republicans in Congress voted against it.

What is different now? Because at last they have the majority, and they are determined that they will gut, today, Medicare, tomorrow Social Security, programs which they have always opposed and which they oppose here today with their new majority.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. JOHNSON], chairman of the Subcommittee on Oversight of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, it will not work. You cannot increase benefits, you cannot tell the American people you will increase benefits, cut premiums, and save Medicare. Medicare is insolvent next year. It is bankrupt 5 years thereafter. To get up here with a program that says ''We are going to do this for you, that for you, and add benefits, but we are going to cut premiums, folks, and we are going to save Medicare,'' the American people do not want those kinds of answers anymore.

Let us look at this premium issue. What do the Republicans do? We say listen, you seniors out there, you have to keep with the level of burden you are carrying now. You are carrying 31 percent, just the part B costs. You keep carrying it. Seniors with $75,000 retirement incomes are going to carry more. What is this rich-poor business? Not one word of support for raising premiums on seniors who have a retirement income of $75,000 or more.

All we say to seniors is to save this program, keep doing what you are doing, and if you can afford it, do a little more if you have over $75,000 in income. What the Democrats say, we are going to cut it to 25 percent. We are going to give you a break. We are going to give you more benefits and lower premiums. Do you know what that does? That makes people working hard day in, day out, earning $30,000, $35,000, and $40,000 pay more taxes.

Six of the last ten years they have increased Medicare taxes. This is a back-ended, under-the-ground, surreptitious tax increase, because they are going to make the taxpayers pay more of the part B costs than they are currently paying, as costs are rising.

The second deceptive aspect of the plan the Democrats are offering, and it is more of the same, they only fix part A. Part B is in just as much trouble. Mr. Chairman, we have to save Medicare, not part A of Medicare.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. CARDIN].

Mr. CARDIN. Let me just correct this, Mr. Chairman. The gentlewoman from Connecticut is not accurate when she says we are cutting premiums. We are not. We are sticking with current law. They are changing current law. By changing current law, they are increasing the burdens on our seniors by increasing the part B premium.

The Democratic substitute or the substitute that we are offering stays with existing law. The dollar amount is currently in law and it goes back to 25 percent and then goes back to a COLA increase. They are increasing it, we are keeping current law.

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GREENWOOD].

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, just a little while ago I had a young man, a sophomore in high school, down here for a leadership council meeting. He was sitting in my office and we were having a little chat. He looked up at the screen and he heard one of the Members of the other party speaking. He said, ''Is that true?'' I said, ''No, that is not true. That is a lie.'' He said, ''Are they allowed to do that?'' I said, ''They are not supposed to, but they do.'' Half of our job today is to try to correct these misstatements. There have been an awful lot of statements about this bill, weakening the ability to crack down on waste, fraud, and abuse.

Here are the facts: Our bill creates a new criminal statute, outlaws fraud, provides for fines of up to $500,000. Their bill limits the penalty for that offense at $50,000. Our bill says if you make a false statement there is a 5-year prison term, up to a $500,000 fine. The substitute limits that fine to $50,000. We make a new crime of theft and embezzlement. We make it a felony that carries a 10-year prison term and a half million dollar fine. The minority's substitute makes no mention of this crime.

The same thing on bribery and graft. Our bill, there is a half million dollar fine, 15-year prison term. Nothing over there. Our bill, obstruction of criminal investigation of a health care crime, a prison term, a half million fine, and nothing from the other side. Our bill is the toughest bill in the history of the Medicare Program on waste, fraud, and abuse. We ought to support it for that reason, if for no other.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREENWOOD. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman should have known the statements that were just made about how sound the Republican program is were false. They would have been punishable under current law under the should have known rule. We are sound until 2010. They are sound until 2006, I will give them the credit, but the difference is a $300 billion loss in 2010. When we are still solvent.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT].

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

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, the Republicans would have us believe that Medicare is standing on the brink of bankruptcy. Having told 37 million beneficiaries whose lives depend on Medicare, having told them that their security is becoming worthless, they

have the audacity to say the Democrats are scaring people.

In truth, the Medicare hospital insurance trust fund is not standing on the brink of bankruptcy, it is sitting on a surplus of $136 billion. That is not my definition of insolvency. It is true that this year Medicare will be drawing down that surplus, but even in 1999, the insurance trust fund will have assets of almost $100 billion. That is not my idea of a crisis.

Do we need to reduce the cost of Medicare? Sure we do, but the Democratic substitute lowers the cost by $90 billion over 7 years, and that end result—$90 billion of relief to the hospital insurance trust fund—is all the Republicans accomplish by $270 billion of savage cuts, because not only do they reduce the cost of Part A, but they also reduce the payroll taxes paid into it by $36 billion. I urge my colleagues to support the Democratic substitute.

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY], the distinguished whip.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Chairman, for days, weeks, even months we have heard the rhetoric regarding the future of Medicare. We have heard all the scare tactics, we have seen the attack ads, we have read the newspapers, but beyond the hype, beyond the clouds of misinformation, some basic facts emerge.

First, Medicare is going broke, and it will be broke in 7 years.

Second, the Republicans are not cutting Medicare.

Third, Democrats do not have a serious alternative that will save Medicare for the next generation.

The American people can begin to understand the basic differences in the approaches to saving Medicare between the Republicans and the Democrats. Republicans want to reform the whole system. We want to make commonsense changes which will promote greater choices, give greater flexibility to seniors, crack down on fraud and abuse, and put reasonable limits on Medicare growth.

Democrats ignore reform. They lack the courage to make commonsense changes to the system. They would prefer to keep the current system, which, if unreformed, will bankrupt this country. To me, Mr. Chairman, the Democrat alternative is just a joke wrapped in fraud and shrouded by farce. They save Medicare only enough to save their own political hides. In fact, secretly, Democrats would rather do nothing than to reform Medicare.

Mr. Chairman, political cowardice is no substitute for responsible policy. If we do nothing to save Medicare, the country faces a stark choice: Either we forget about ever achieving fiscal responsibility, or the government will be forced to rapidly raise payroll taxes and income taxes. As we all know, even President Clinton now suffers from taxer's remorse over his last huge tax increase, so clearly, raising taxes is not a serious alternative.

Mr. Chairman, as Edmund Burke once said, ''For evil to succeed, good people simply need to do nothing.'' The Democrats are doing nothing to save Medicare, and their inaction is a fool's choice. I urge my colleagues to vote for a brighter future for this country. Vote to save Medicare and reject this half-hearted Democrat substitute.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FATTAH].

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

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Democratic alternative and oppose the Republican plan.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN].

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I want the public that may be watching this debate to understand the depth of cynicism that the Republicans have in presenting their Medicare proposal. I am going to put into the RECORD a series of key words and phrases given to the Republicans to use in this debate. Members may well recognize some words like ''save, preserve, protect, proud to support.'' Then when they talk about the Democratic proposal they are supposed to say ''politics as usual, the politics of the past.'' Maybe an energetic reporter will look through these comments today to see how many of these phrases were dutifully used by the Republicans for their proposal and against ours.

The second level of cynicism, to talk about the insolvency of the Medicare trust fund, to use that as an excuse for their package, the Medicare trust fund was nine times out of sync, and each time it was, without fanfare and partisan propaganda, restored. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is notable for what it does not do. What it does not do, unlike the Gingrich bill, is make the elderly pay larger premiums just to keep their Medicare benefits. It does not destroy the fee-for-service Medicare system that people are already in, and that they like, and it does not offer them these phony choices that will be paid for by savaging the Medicare program fee-for-service.

This amendment does not do what the Republicans do, which leaves people unprotected if they are forced out of Medicare into these Medicare-plus plans for balanced budgets, and doctors will charge them extra bills for their services. Unlike the Gingrich bill, it does not take billions of dollars out of Medicare to finance tax cuts, or to finance deficit reduction. This substitute preserves Medicare without doing all these onerous things, and for that reason, Mr. Chairman, we ought to support it.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS], chairman of the Subcommittee on Health of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I would ask the gentleman from California, what is this reporter going to do? I just heard him use the word ''preserve.'' I guess there are only certain words people can use because there are only obviously clues and keys. My belief is, you think your program preserves Medicare. We believe our program preserves Medicare.

□ 1615

That word is going to be used on this floor back and forth. The difference is, how long and under what circumstances is Medicare preserved, and how do you preserve it? Yes, you preserved it nine times in the last 10 years. Six of those were increases in the payroll tax or lifting the lid on wages subject to the payroll tax.

What you have here is an honest representation of the difference in the plans. I know you do not like it, but it is the truth. If you will read the bill, I said read the bill, the Republican program stays sound through 2010. After 2010, yes, we have to find some money, but 2010 is when the baby boomers become eligible for Medicare. Our plan is solid. We do not have to look for new money until we fix it for the baby boomers.

The Democrats have said, they are sound at 2006. I agree, you are sound at 2006. What is the difference between 2006 and 2010? $300 billion. That is that red line. I know that is hard for you to envision. Red lines, $300 billion in the hole. At the time you are trying to work with the baby boomer commission, which you have in your bill as well, you are also going to have to find money to fill a $300 billion hole.

Mr. Chairman, we do not. Our program better preserves and protects Medicare. It strengthens it. We do not go to the well like you do in terms of increasing taxes. We do it through slowing the growth and allowing innovative programs using market-based techniques to save the system. That is the difference between our approach and yours.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY].

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

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, the Medicare cuts in the Republican bill will have a devastating impact on the quality of care New York seniors receive. It is very clear that the cuts will double the premiums, eliminate protections against higher medical fees, and make it harder for seniors to see their own doctor. For seniors living on fixed incomes, this Republican plan will mean real hardship.

The Republican Members know that, and that is why Speaker GINGRICH has been making back-room deals to win votes. Unfortunately, when NEWT GINGRICH plays ''Let's Make a Deal,'' America's seniors lose. Frankly, all this deal-making is absolutely shameful.

Let me just ask our Republican colleagues, if this is such a great bill, if it

is so good for seniors, why all the deals? You do not have to make deals to get votes for good bills, just bad ones.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Oregon [Ms. FURSE].

Ms. FURSE. Mr. Chairman, it is very simple. If we need to save $90 billion, do it. We can do it with the Democratic bill. The only difference is, the Democratic bill puts the savings in the trust fund, not into wealthy people's pockets. It does not cost seniors more, it protects the trust fund.

I believe that we can cure the Medicare system, but let us use a scalpel, not a meat ax. Let us vote for the Democratic alternative.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. MATSUI], a very fine member of our Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS] for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I have to say that this notion that the bill, if in fact, it passes does not pay for tax cuts is nonsense. What the Republicans plan to do, if this bill passes today, is to bring it back and put it on the reconciliation bill, and that way, they will be able to use the $270 billion in savings on Medicare to pay for the $245 billion in tax cuts. If, in fact, this Medicare bill goes down today, they will not be able to do the $245 billion tax cut, because they will not be able to put it on reconciliation. So it is obvious what is really going on.

I might also further point out what this debate is really all about. Everybody says, well, this is really just slowing the growth of Medicare on the Republican side. That is right. It is slowing the growth of Medicare. In the year 2002, just 6 years, 7 years from now, the average Medicare recipient will have $6,500 spent on them per year. Per capita, $6,500.

Mr. Chairman, they do not tell you the growth in the private sector. The private sector growth will go up to $7,600, a gap of $1,100. So I and anybody 30, 40, 50 years old in the work force will get $7,600, but if you are 60, 70, 80, 90 years old, you are going to get $1,000 less.

Why do we have Medicare in the first place? Medicare was passed in 1964 because seniors were not in the workplace, because seniors could not have access to private health insurance. As a result of that, they were left uninsured. We had a 25 percent poverty rate in senior citizens in 1964. It is down to 11 percent now and we should be very proud of that.

What we are going to do is we are going to bankrupt the senior citizens of America. That poverty rate is going to go up. We are going to be doing major damage to the senior citizens of this country, and I think, as the minority leader said, this is really an issue of values.

Mr. Chairman, I ask my Republican colleagues, what are your values? What do you stand for? Why are you here? Do you believe in the future of this country, or do you want to play games with senior citizens, those people that supported you in the prime of your life?

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE].

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I want to urge my colleagues to get behind this very rational Democratic substitute that cures the problems that will be created by the Republican Medicare plan. We will be saving Medicare with this $90 billion that the trustees say that is all that is necessary.

We do not need the tax cut for the wealthy. We will be eliminating the dramatic increases in the Part B premium, and there will be no forced choices for seniors under this. They do not have to go into HMOs, they can still choose their own doctors.

Even more important, it does not hurt the quality of health care. Hospitals will not have to close or cut back considerably. Payments to hospitals are reduced by less than one-half the amount in the Republican bill. Lastly, and just as important, this substitute deals with prevention.

If we can have more preventive care, which is provided in this substitute, we can save a lot of money and seniors will not have to be hospitalized, they will not have to be institutionalized.

Mr. Chairman, I urge support for the Democratic substitute.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI].

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, in listening to the debate I must ask our Republican colleagues, who are you trying to convince? In listening to the defense of your Medicare cuts, methinks thou doth protest too much. But it is understandable, when it must be a bitter pill to swallow to cut senior citizens' benefits, increase their premiums to give a tax break to the wealthiest Americans. Indeed, as the Speaker calls the tax cut, the crown jewel of the contract.

America's senior citizens and disabled people depend on Medicare for their health and security. The choice before the House today is between the Republican plan, which would threaten their security, and the Democratic plan, which would protect health and security for America's seniors.

In summary, the Republican bill cuts $180 billion more than what is needed to make the trust fund solvent, inflicts excessive new premiums on beneficiaries, forces low-income seniors into managed care, repeals important Federal nursing home standards, decimates the safety net in teaching hospitals, and weaken protections.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support the Democratic alternative

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself three-quarters of a minute.

Mr. Chairman, I just received a copy of Congress Daily, and I want to call it to the particular attention of my dear friend, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLILEY]. Under the subject ''Health'', it reads ''Bliley Hints At Compromise On $270 Billion Medicare Savings.''

''Even as President Clinton suggested he might be willing to meet Republican demands that the budget be balanced over 7 years rather than 10, a key House Republican today hinted the GOP might be willing to compromise on the previously inflexible $270 billion savings target for Medicare.''

It looks like my Republican colleagues are being asked to walk the plank. I think that is a fine idea. But my friends over there should be told what they are facing and that maybe a compromise is in the offing.

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Michigan for his remarks, and I meant it sincerely. If the President comes forward with a plan that saves Medicare until 2010, I am willing to look at it. I am certainly willing to sit down and negotiate with him. There is nothing wrong with that. I just wish he would stop standing on the curb and throwing bricks and come to the table and negotiate. That is all I ask for.

Mr. Chairman, with that, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GREENWOOD].

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, as has been so often the case in this long day's debate, Republicans have to come to the podium time and time again to correct some of the misapprehensions left by the other party.

My good friend, the gentleman from California talked about what a terrible thing it was that even though we keep the part B premium at 31.5 percent, it goes up a little bit in dollars. It goes up a little bit in dollars. Well, I think the gentleman needs to be reminded of something.

During the 30 years that the Democratic Party presided over Medicare, the part B premium increased 1,500 percent. It started out at $3. As the Democratic Party allowed the cost of this program to inflate and to inflate out of control, it has been they who have caused the part B premium to increase.

Another statement that I think needs to be made for the record: Repeatedly today the Democratic Party has tried to have it both ways. We are not paying doctors enough, they say. We are not paying doctors high enough fees, we will drive them out of fee-for-service and into managed care, and then 2 seconds later they turn around and say, we have made some sort of a deal with the doctors to pay them too much.

The fact of the matter is that the substitute before us treats physician fees almost precisely the way our bill

does. Physicians will make lower fees under the Republican bill than they would have otherwise, and that is consistent with what the Democrats have been trying to do.

Another inconsistency on fraud and abuse. Our plan makes false statements in health care a felony. The Democratic substitute leaves it as a misdemeanor, just like a speeding ticket. After listening to the Democratic debate today, I understand why they do not want to increase this penalty.

Mr. Chairman, this is a short-term game for the minority party, because the fact of the matter is that within a few short months the Republican leadership in the Congress and the President of the United States will resolve this issue through negotiations, and I guarantee you that the negotiated product will look very much like the bill that we have presented to the House today.

When that bill is signed, it will go into effect, and very early next year the senior citizens of America will live under this proposal, this reform that we have brought to the floor, and they will love it and they will thank us for it, and I think they will reelect us for it as well.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLECZKA].

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Chairman, I have just heard through the grapevine here that there is a meeting going on with NEWT GINGRICH and Governor Wittman from New Jersey and a side deal is being cut for the New Jersey Delegation. However, prior to that old rumor, the old rumor was that the Republicans from New Jersey were voting against the plan, so we will see whether or not this compromise works.

Mr. Chairman, if in fact my Republican friends think it is a cut, why are the New Jersey Republicans voting against it because their hospitals, they contend, are cut too much? Something is inconsistent here. Maybe they should take the floor and explain their stand.

□ 1630

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Michigan [Ms. RIVERS].

Ms. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I am a mom. I have got two kids, and I understand how handling money goes on. My older daughter says to me, ''Can I borrow a dollar?'' I say, ''You can borrow a dollar, but you can't spend it on candy.'' She says, ''I won't.'' Two hours later I come back, and there are candy wrappers everywhere. I say, ''I told you not to spend it on candy.'' She said, ''I didn't. I used another dollar I had.'' I said, ''Well, that was your lunch money.'' She said, ''I know, I used your dollar for lunch money.''

Well, everybody knows what happened; everybody knows what you are trying to do; and, seniors of America, the majority is trying to spend your money on candy. Do not let them.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like to inquire from the gentleman from Florida and the gentleman from Michigan who seeks to use your last time?

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I am down to my last speaker, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR]. I am going to yield him all my time.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, we have one last speaker that I share with the distinguished gentleman from Florida and that would be to close.

The CHAIRMAN. That would be the appropriate time to do that and that would give him 3½ minutes to close. The gentleman from Texas has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I believe that since we are offering the amendment which is set forth in the rule, that the right to close is on this side. That would leave my colleagues on the other side to deal with that.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas has the right to close as the floor manager of the base bill.

Mr. DINGELL. Am I correct, Mr. Chairman, that we get to close on this side?

The CHAIRMAN. You can close on your side right now, and it will be followed by the gentleman from Texas.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DINGELL. Is it not in the rules that where the offeror of the amendment is designated in the rule that it is the right of that individual to close?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is informed by the Parliamentarian that it is the manager of the bill who has the right to close.

Mr. DINGELL. I am sure that is true in the case of the debate on the bill. I note that this is not debate on the bill. This is the debate on the amendment.

I would note as a further parliamentary inquiry that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS] and I are essentially the managers of the bill as the managers of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is informed that when the committee chairman is defending the committee position, the committee chairman has the right to close on an amendment.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I think this is a novel ruling, but I will not challenge it.

Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Members will record their presence by electronic device.

The call was taken by electronic device.

The following Members responded to their names:

[Roll No 728]

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—419

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allard
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentsen
Bereuter
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bryant (TX)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cardin
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clinger
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Coleman
Collins (GA)
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cooley
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cunningham
Danner
Davis
de la Garza
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
DeLay
Dellums
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Dornan
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Durbin
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Ensign
Eshoo
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Fawell
Fazio
Fields (TX)
Filner
Flake
Flanagan
Foglietta
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fowler
Fox
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Funderburk
Furse
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Green
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hefner
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Holden
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jackson-Lee
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E.B.
Johnson, Sam
Johnston
Jones
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kim
King
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaFalce
LaHood
Lantos
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Lincoln
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Longley
Lowey
Lucas
Luther
Maloney
Manton
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Martini
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum
McDade
McDermott
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Metcalf
Meyers
Mfume
Mica
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Moran
Morella
Murtha
Myers
Myrick
Nadler
Neal
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Paxon
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Petri

Pickett
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Pryce
Quillen
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Reed
Regula
Richardson
Riggs
Rivers
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Roth
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Sabo
Salmon
Sanders
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Schiff
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Stockman
Stokes
Studds
Stump
Talent
Tanner
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thompson
Thornberry
Thornton
Thurman
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Waldholtz
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Ward
Waters
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—13

Berman
Chapman
Fields (LA)
Frank (MA)
Frost
Gekas
Hoyer
McCrery
Stupak
Tejeda
Tucker
Williams
Young (AK)

□ 1653

The CHAIRMAN. With 419 Members having answered to their names, a quorum is present, and the committee will resume its business.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I have a further parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, as I recall the ruling of the Chair, it was that if the committee has a position on the amendment, it is the right of the committee to conclude the debate on that point. Is that correct?

The CHAIRMAN. The ruling was that the manager of the bill has the closing, and that is how the Chair is instructed by the Parliamentarian.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, is it possible for the Chair to inform us what is the committee position? I would note that the committee has taken no action on this particular proposal.

If I read the rule correctly, the amendment is offered by authority of the Committee on Rules, which has empowered the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS] and I to offer this particular amendment. The amendment was never considered in the Committee on Commerce or in the Committee on Ways and Means. That being so, Mr. Chairman, if the Chair could help us greatly by informing us what is the position of the committee so we can understand if it qualifies under the Chair's prior ruling?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER] is still the manager of the bill under the terms of the rule.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, further parliamentary inquiry. I note H.R. 2485, in its current form, is not reported from either the Committee on Commerce or the Committee on Ways and Means, and the amendment which is offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS], and it is offered by authority of the Committee on Rules. We are, therefore, the managers of that particular amendment and not my good friends on the Republican side of the aisle.

The CHAIRMAN. The base bill is still the bill that came through the two committees and was joined in the Committee on Rules, the Chair is informed by the Parliamentarian. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER] is still the manager of the base text.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR], the distinguished minority whip.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] will be recognized for 3½ minutes.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Chairman, indeed this is a historic debate, a historic vote.

Supporters of this plan that we will be voting on on final passage say that this will be a courageous vote, that somehow they are doing something on this floor that they will be proud of. But there is nothing courageous about cutting Medicare to pay for tax breaks for the wealthy, and there is no pride in asking our senior citizens to pay more and get less so the wealthiest Americans can have it all.

But there is one thing supporters of this bill are right about. This is a historic vote. With this vote, we turn back 30 years of progress, 30 years of trust, 30 years of hope that our parents and grandparents will always have the health care that they need.

Mr. Chairman, the seniors who stand with us against this plan do not have much money. They do not have expensive homes or fancy cars. But when Medicare premiums go up, these are the people who are going to have to choose between buying food and buying medicine. They do not want to be a burden on their kids, and they do not want a handout.

If these cuts go through, you are going to take away the one thing, the one thing that they thought they would never lose. You are going to take away their dignity, and that is unforgivable.

Now, today, the same people who kept their plan hidden for 9 months, who refused to allow more than 1 day of hearings, who actually had seniors arrested when they tried to speak out, are accusing us of trying to scare senior citizens. That is an insult to the seniors of America. The same Republicans who cut the backroom deals with the AMA, who promoted savings accounts that would benefit only the wealthy insurance companies, now want us to trust them to save Medicare.

It seems like my colleagues on the Republican side of the aisle hope that we forget history. For 30 years, the Republican Party has not lifted a finger to save Medicare, and for 30 years they have waited for this moment to dismantle the system, and we are not going to let them turn back the clock now.

The Gibbons-Dingell-McDermott substitute proves you do not need $270 billion to shore up the Medicare system until the year 2,000, and it proves that you can do it without increasing premiums, without forcing seniors into HMO's, without limiting the choice of doctors, and without the massive tax breaks for the wealthy.

We may be nearing the end of this debate on the floor today, and we just had a little skirmish here about who is going to close, but the debate in this country is just beginning. It is not closing, and it will continue around the kitchen tables of every home in America where sons and daughters will scrimp and save to care for their parents, and there will come a day when they face the tough choices between educating their kids and paying their parents' medical bills, and they are going to ask, ''Why, did you vote, why did you vote for tax breaks for people who did not even need them, instead of helping us?''

I urge my colleagues, Mr. Chairman, say ''no'' to these tax breaks. Say ''yes'' to this substitute and say ''yes'' to Medicare.

□ 1700

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Chairman, for a moment I must once again expose what many Democrats have repeated over and over today, that medical care savings will be used for tax cuts. They know it is not true. As the Washington Post said, it is medagoguery, political medagoguery.

They know that savings in the Medicare Trust Fund, under law, cannot be spent for anything other than health care benefits for our seniors. They know that. They know that in this bill itself there is lockbox language that prevents the use of these funds for anything other than paying medical bills. And, yes, finally, they know that in the budget reconciliation language, which will be before us next week, that Medicare has been taken completely out of pay-go under all of the budget considerations.

This is truly nothing but an effort to gain political advantage. They keep saying it because they hope that they will divert Americans from the real

Medicare problems. Yes, the political response, I say to my colleagues, would be to sidestep this issue. We have seen that happen over and over again in previous Congresses. But our new majority will not be typical Washington politicians. Throughout the debate, many Democrats spoke only of the past. We will make the tough decisions and speak to the future.

Our plan is a serious solution to a very real Medicare crisis. Their plan is politics of the past, temporary fixes and Band-aids. Our plan is a long-term solution, a vision, hopes and dreams for all Americans. Their plan bankrupts Medicare well before the baby boomers retire. Our plan saves Medicare through the eve of baby-boomer retirement.

The latest actuary estimate that has just been given to us, delayed because of the unavailability of the specific language of the substitute, is that their plan saves Medicare through the year 2005, and our plan saves Medicare through the year 2011. Six years longer.

When this bill passes in a few minutes, Republicans will differ from politicians who came before us, because we will have kept our word.

Mr. Chairman, I am proud of this bill. It has been called the Gingrich bill, but it is the product of the effort of many of us in this body. And, yes, he deserves credit for it.

We said that we would save Medicare. Today, we will. We said we would preserve Medicare. Today, we will. We said we would protect Medicare. Today, we will.

America is truly in a new world of responsibility on Capitol Hill; responsibility to seniors who have worked hard all their lives and deserve to know that their health care benefits will be there for them; responsibility to middle age Americans who today are working with the expectation that the benefits will be for them; and, yes, to our children and to their children, to show them that we will make the tough decisions in concern for them, and not leave it to them to simply have to pay higher taxes.

Mr. Chairman, I urge a ''no'' vote on the substitute and an ''aye'' vote on the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 149, noes 283, not voting 1, as follows:

[Roll No. 729]

AYES—149

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentsen
Berman
Bishop
Bonior
Borski
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Cardin
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Danner
de la Garza
DeLauro
Dellums
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Durbin
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Flake
Foglietta
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gibbons
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hefner
Hinchey
Holden
Hoyer
Jackson-Lee
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)
Kennelly
Kleczka
LaFalce
Lantos
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lincoln
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
McCarthy
McDermott
McHale
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Moakley
Montgomery
Moran
Murtha
Nadler
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Pomeroy
Poshard
Rangel
Reed
Richardson
Rivers
Rose
Roybal-Allard
Sabo
Sawyer
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Skaggs
Spratt
Stark
Stokes
Studds
Tejeda
Thornton
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Velazquez
Vento
Ward
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Woolsey
Wynn
Yates

NOES—283

Allard
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bereuter
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Boucher
Brewster
Browder
Brown (OH)
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bryant (TX)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chapman
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clinger
Coble
Coburn
Coleman
Collins (GA)
Combest
Condit
Cooley
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis
Deal
DeFazio
DeLay
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Ensign
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Filner
Flanagan
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Fox
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Funderburk
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gephardt
Geren
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gingrich
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutknecht
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kanjorski
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kim
King
Kingston
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Linder
Livingston
LoBiondo
Longley
Lucas
Manzullo
Martini
Mascara
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Metcalf
Meyers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Minge
Mink
Molinari
Mollohan
Moorhead
Morella
Myers
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Orton
Oxley
Packard
Parker
Pastor
Paxon
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce
Quillen
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Regula
Riggs
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Roukema
Royce
Rush
Salmon
Sanders
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Schiff
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stenholm
Stockman
Stump
Stupak
Talent
Tanner
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thompson
Thornberry
Thurman
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Torres
Upton
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Waldholtz
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wolf
Wyden
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—1

Tucker

□ 1725

Mrs. SLAUGHTER and Messrs. SERRANO, WYDEN, MINGE, and VOLKMER changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Mr. RUSH changed his vote from ''present'' to ''no.''

So the amendment in the nature of a substitute was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD) having assumed the chair, Mr. LINDER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2425) to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to preserve and reform the Medicare Program, pursuant to House Resolution 238, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute 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.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. GEPHARDT

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. GEPHARDT. I am opposed to the bill in its present form, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. GEPHARDT moves to recommit the bill H.R. 2425 to the Committees on Ways and Means and Commerce with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Strike section 15611 (and redesignate the succeeding provisions and conform the table of contents accordingly).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say to Members this motion is very simple. It knocks out the part B premium increases that our senior citizens will face if this measure passes. I think it is the least we can do before this measure passes.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARKEY].

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, we will, with this one amendment, the only amendment we are allowed to make, and it automatically goes into the bill, ensure that Medicare part B premiums will only go up what current law requires. Otherwise, of the 37 million seniors on Medicare, 11 million of them are widows living on under $8,000 a year. By the year 2000, by the year 2002, this is a $300 a year hidden tax on them in order to put together a pile of money which will give someone making $350,000 a year 60 of these widows' money each year for a $19,000 tax break.

Mr. Speaker, it is the only vote we can ask our colleagues to make, the only amendment we can make here today. We ask Republicans to give us a yes vote on this one page out of 900 pages that ensures that that premium increase is not unfairly used by 60 each of these elderly widows to provide for a tax cut of $19,000 a year in the year 2002 for those that do not need it, making over $350,000 in our society.

Mr. Speaker, they built our country. They sacrificed for our country. They would not mind sacrificing again, but to ask for this sacrifice from the most vulnerable elderly widow population, in my opinion, is beneath what this House of Representatives should do here today. We ask for only one yes vote in the course of this entire debate, and it is on this very simple amendment. On this issue there is one thing that separates the senior citizens from the Republican majority, on this issue the senior citizens are right and they are wrong.

□ 1730

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LEWIS].

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge my colleagues to support this motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, I said to my Republican colleagues, they should not raise premiums for our seniors, not when they can find money to give tax breaks to the rich. That is not right. That is not fair. That is not just.

How long? How long until they realize what they are doing to our seniors? Not long. Not long until our seniors know what they have done.

Mr. Speaker, on this day, let the word go forth from this place into every State, every city, every town, every village, every hamlet, that it was the Republicans who voted to cut Medicare in order to give a huge tax break to the rich.

The Republican plan is too radical, too extreme, it is too much. It is more than wrong. It is a shame and a disgrace. Do the right thing. Support the motion to recommit.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, the action that is being proposed today, and the action that is being proposed next week in Medicaid, together are really the beginning steps of dismantling these programs as we have known them.

Mr. Speaker, when these programs were born, they were born on a simple premise that there would be a national standard of benefits that everyone in these programs would enjoy. With these changes that are being called for in Medicare today, and Medicaid next week, that premise is being taken away.

In Medicare, the so-called new ideas on the other side mean that people can choose medical savings accounts, and if they decide that they are going to be well for the rest of their life, they can have money put into that account and have a high-deductible account.

Mr. Speaker, there are many other choices. The problem is the choices are for a different standard of benefits.

Then, Mr. Speaker, in Medicaid we are going to have a competition now in the State legislatures. The elderly are going to be there pleading for their cause. The children of our country are going to be there pleading for their cause, and the disabled Americans who now claim 15 percent of Medicaid will be there pleading for their cause.

Mr. Speaker, is this the kind of competition that we want to have go on around this country? These programs have worked because we have gotten everybody on a level playing field and the competition is not between the companies that can find the well people as opposed to the sick people. The competition should be between those competitors who can most efficiently organize the resources of our medical system.

In the name of human decency, vote for this motion to recommit and vote against this bill which is wrong for America and wrong for the American people.

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition.

Mr. Speaker, I must say with some sadness that we are ending this debate in the same spirit of misinformation that has characterized our opponents consistently. The fact is there is a provision in the medigrant program which provides that senior citizens at the poverty level, and below, have all of their Part B premium paid for by the taxpayers, 100 percent.

So, the poorest of the widows that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARKEY] spoke of will pay zero under our plan. Not one penny. My guess is the gentleman might even have known that, had he done any research, had he cared about the facts. This characterizes the whole plan.

Mr. Speaker, another colleague spoke about tax cuts. There are no tax cuts today. There is no budget today. This is about Medicare.

Now, we believe that saving Medicare matters; matters for the most human of reasons. Matters because of my mother-in-law, Virginia Ginther, who is 80 and on Medicare. It matters because of my mom and dad, Bob and Kit Gingrich, who are on Medicare.

But Medicare is not just about the elderly. Medicare matters to the children of those who have retired. To my wife Marianne; to her brother, John; to my sister, Rob and her husband Dave; to my sister, Susan and her husband, Jim; to my brother, Randy, an his wife, Jill; to my sister, Kathy, and her brother, Jesse; to my sister-in-law, Marilyn, and her brother, Ray.

They love their parents and they also know that someday they are going to retire. And they wish somebody had the guts in this city to start protecting the system, so it will not collapse when the baby boomers retire.

But it is not even just about the baby boomers. Medicare is also about our children's future. My daughter, Kathy, and her husband, Paul; my daughter, Jackie, and her husband, Mark; my sister Candace. My younger relatives, a number of them were here the day I became sworn in as Speaker. Young kids, Lauren and Kevin; Emily and Susan; my nephews, Mark and John, and my niece, Holly.

Do my colleagues know why it is important for them? Because if we continued to go down the irresponsible, unorganized, inefficient, bureaucratic, waste and fraud-filled system, the Health Care Financing Administration centralized bureaucracy, they would be crushed with taxes. They would be crushed with debt. They would pay higher interest on their student loans; higher interest on their house; higher interest on their car; they would be crushed in trying to open a business. And in the end, when their parents retired, the entire system would collapse and they would have to live through the mess.

Now, I am not going to abandon those children because of a bunch of 30-second commercials that are dishonest demagoguery.

Mr. Speaker, let me just say, and maybe this makes us different from the politicians who used to run this place, we want to solve problems for all Americans. We want no racial division. We want no class warfare. We want no conflicts between generations.

The only solutions worthy of America are solutions that try to help all Americans. That is why the Medicare Preservation Act takes the long view; not just a Band-Aid to get through one more election, and then have another Band-Aid for one more election and hope that for your career, we get by so the collapse will occur after you retire. That is not what we are for.

We want a solution to preserve and protect Medicare for the current seniors. We want a solution to set the stage for the baby boomers to retire with safety and security. We want a solution to protect younger Americans from higher taxes, higher interest rates, crushing debt, and a bankrupt Government.

Let me mention just one other thing about how we got here and what we did. The Medicare Preservation Act creates MedicarePlus. It was a team effort. We did things differently. We asked the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER], and the chairman of the Committee on Commerce, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLILEY], to form a joint task force, and also the subcommittee chairmen, the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS] and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BILIRAKIS] to join that task force.

We had able help from a number of Members, and I particularly single out the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HASTERT] who was originally chosen by Bob Michel and lead the health care project in 1993 and 1994, and the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. JOHNSON] who has expressed extraordinary skill in this area.

We met as a team. Not by committee jurisdiction, not by territorial boundaries, not driven by ego, but as a group working together.

Mr. Speaker, I have to say we could never have done this without the staffs. In particular, I want to mention Ed Kutler, Howard Cohen, Mary McGrane, Chip Kahn, and also the legislative counsels, Noah Wofsy and Ed Grossman, because the truth is we are a team. We could not get the job done without the expert staff, and at the same time we represent the legal authority of our people.

Mr. Speaker, we did one other thing that seems to truly confuse the press and shock our friends on the left. We did not ask one particular genius to hide in a room and design an entire thing. We did not have any Ira Magaziners on our side.

We actually practiced listen, learn, help, and lead. We met with everybody. We met with the hospitals. We met with senior citizens. We held over a thousand—I know it is hard for those who have always believed in a closed system to understand this—we held over a thousand town hall meetings.

We reached out to people who knew how to deliver health care. We listened to our Members. Frankly, we would have listened and worked with any Member, any Member willing to agree to the objective of saving this system for a generation. But we would not work with any Member whose only goal was to break up the structure and design an amendment which was pathetically incapable of saving this system.

That is why we worked the way we worked. And I will say to my friends over here now, when we start the next project, for those Members who truly want to help us get there, our door is open. For those Members who just want to oppose and distort, our door is closed.

Mr. Speaker, I will close with this line, because it goes back to the allegation of the gentleman from Massachusetts. The poverty line for single persons is $7,551. That means that virtually 90 percent of the widows that gentleman was referring to will, in fact, have 100 percent of their part B eligible for payment under medigrant, if they apply, and that is literally the way the system works.

That is why not a single one of those poor widows has to pay a penny more. I only wish the gentleman from Massachusetts had one his homework before making such an absurd allegation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge everyone to vote for the Medicare Preservation Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT].

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 183, noes 249, not voting 1, as follows:

[Roll No. 730]

AYES—183

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentsen
Berman
Bevill
Bishop
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant (TX)
Cardin
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Danner
de la Garza
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Durbin
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Holden
Hoyer
Jackson-Lee
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Klink
LaFalce
Lantos
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lincoln
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McDermott
McHale
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moran
Murtha
Nadler
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Pomeroy
Poshard
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Richardson
Rivers
Rose
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sawyer
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Slaughter
Spratt
Stark
Stokes
Studds
Stupak
Tanner
Tejeda
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Velazquez
Vento
Volkmer
Ward
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates

NOES—249

Allard
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bereuter
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Brewster
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clinger
Coble
Coburn
Collins (GA)
Combest
Condit
Cooley
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis
Deal
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Ensign
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Flanagan
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Fox
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Funderburk
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Geren
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gingrich
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kasich
Kelly
Kim
King
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Linder
Livingston
LoBiondo
Longley
Lucas
Manzullo
Martini
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHugh

McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Metcalf
Meyers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Minge
Molinari
Moorhead
Morella
Myers
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Orton
Oxley
Packard
Parker
Paxon
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce
Quillen
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Riggs
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Roukema
Royce
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Schiff
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stenholm
Stockman
Stump
Talent
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Upton
Visclosky
Vucanovich
Waldholtz
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—1

Tucker

□ 1800

Mr. DOOLEY changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. GEPHARDT was allowed to speak out of order.)

WELCOME BACK TO THE GENTLEMAN FROM TEXAS, FRANK TEJEDA

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY].

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker. I thank the distinguished minority leader for yielding to me. I just want the House to know that one of our colleagues has returned today because he felt this was a very important vote. He has been through a very serious operation and surgery, and he is just one of the neatest guys, and he understands how important this is. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEJEDA] has returned and is here today.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I am making an inquiry as to when the proper point would be to make a point of personal privilege on the privileges of the House to clarify a number of erroneous statements made about my statements in the well of the House before the recommittal vote.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Personal privilege for that reason is not in order at this point.

Mr. MARKEY. I would ask the Speaker as to what the proper time would be.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will consult with the Chair at a later point.

The question is on the passage of the bill. Under the rule, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 231, nays 201, not voting 1, as follows:

[Roll No. 731]

YEAS—231

Allard
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bereuter
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clinger
Coble
Coburn
Collins (GA)
Combest
Cooley
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis
Deal
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Ensign
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Flanagan
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Fox
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Funderburk
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Geren
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gingrich
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kasich
Kelly
Kim
King
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Livingston
Longley
Lucas
Manzullo
Martini
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Metcalf
Meyers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Molinari
Montgomery
Moorhead
Morella
Myers
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Oxley
Packard
Parker
Paxon
Petri
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce
Quillen
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Riggs
Roberts
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Roukema
Royce
Salmon
Sanford
Scarborough
Schaefer
Schiff
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stockman
Stump
Talent
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Upton
Vucanovich
Waldholtz
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff

NAYS—201

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews
Baesler
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentsen
Berman
Bevill
Bishop
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant (TX)
Cardin
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Danner
de la Garza
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Durbin
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hayes
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Holden
Hoyer
Jackson-Lee
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Klink
LaFalce
Lantos
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lightfoot
Lincoln
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McDermott
McHale
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moran
Murtha
Nadler
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Pallone
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pomeroy
Poshard
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Richardson
Rivers
Roemer
Rose
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sawyer
Saxton
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Studds
Stupak
Tanner
Taylor (MS)
Tejeda
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torkildsen
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Ward
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—1

Tucker

□ 1822

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2492, LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

Mrs. WALDHOLTZ, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104–283) on the resolution (H. Res. 239) providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2492), making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.