

Inlee	McKinney	Sanders
Istook	McNulty	Sanford
Jackson-Lee	Meehan	Sawyer
(TX)	Meek (FL)	Saxton
Johnson (CT)	Millender-	Sensenbrenner
Jones (OH)	McDonald	Serrano
Kanjorski	Miller (FL)	Shaw
Kaptur	Miller, George	Shays
Kelly	Moakley	Sherman
Kennedy	Moran (VA)	Sherwood
Kildee	Murtha	Shuster
Kilpatrick	Nadler	Slaughter
King (NY)	Napolitano	Smith (NJ)
Klink	Neal	Stark
Kucinich	Norwood	Stearns
LaFalce	Oberstar	Sununu
Lantos	Olver	Sweeney
Larson	Owens	Tancredo
Lazio	Pallone	Tauscher
Lee	Pascrell	Taylor (MS)
Lewis (GA)	Paul	Thurman
Lipinski	Payne	Tierney
LoBiondo	Pelosi	Toomey
Lofgren	Peterson (MN)	Udall (CO)
Lowe	Peterson (PA)	Upton
Luther	Pitts	Velazquez
Maloney (CT)	Quinn	Vento
Maloney (NY)	Rangel	Visclosky
Markey	Reynolds	Vitter
Martinez	Rivers	Walsh
Mascara	Rohrabacher	Waters
Matsui	Rothman	Weiner
McCarthy (NY)	Roukema	Weldon (PA)
McDermott	Roybal-Allard	Weygand
McGovern	Royce	Woolsey
McHugh	Salmon	Wynn

NOT VOTING—18

Berman	Hinojosa	Scarborough
Boucher	Hooley	Stupak
Carson	Jefferson	Taylor (NC)
Chenoweth	Levin	Waxman
Clay	Meeks (NY)	Weldon (FL)
Ford	Rush	Wu

□ 1315

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD and Mrs. MALONEY of New York changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY changed her vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to cast a vote on the Agriculture Appropriations Conference Report due to a family emergency. However, had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to vote on several items today, the 1st of October.

Had I been present, I would have voted: "Yea" on rollcall No. 466; "no" on rollcall No. 467; "yea" on rollcall No. 468; "yea" on rollcall No. 469.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BOYD. Mr. Speaker, yesterday during the vote on H.R. 2910, the National Transportation Safety Board Amendments Act of 1999, I was unavoidably detained. If I had been present and voting, I would have voted "aye" on rollcall vote 462.

TRIBUTE TO LILLIE DRAYTON ON HER RETIREMENT FROM THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

(Mr. INSLEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, I would ask Members in the Chamber to join me for just a moment in honoring a very important American who is in the gallery to my left today, Lillie Drayton, who for the last 39 years has served the American public and us running the elevators in our office buildings. I want to recognize her on her day of retirement. I do not know anyone who has epitomized public service as much as Lillie. When Americans have come to their Capitol, she has been the one to let them know that people care about them and they are doing a fine job of them.

I would like to recognize and respect her for all her fine work, Lillie Drayton.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Regrettably, Members are reminded not to introduce guests in the gallery.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, OCTOBER 4, 1999

Mr. PICKERING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Monday next for morning hour debates.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. PICKERING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. PALLONE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

THE RIGHT TO SUE AN HMO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. NORWOOD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. NORWOOD. Mr. Speaker, in a few days this House is going to vote on an issue that will impact the health of every family in this country. The managed care lobby will do their best to confuse the Members of this body as to the real effect of the Bipartisan Consensus Managed Care Improvement Act that I introduced along with the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL).

I urge all Members to simply read the bill. The HMO lobby is telling Members that employers can be sued for simply offering a health plan, for their choice of a health plan, for the actions of that health plan. But yesterday Members heard in this Chamber the truth, the actual language of the bill, that dispels every one of these falsehoods.

The managed care lobby has also tried to tell Members that employers and insurers can be sued for not buying or providing a specific benefit, and that this bill would mandate all kinds of new coverage. Read the bill, page 61 beginning on line 24. Read the bill. Employers and insurance companies cannot be sued for, and I would like to quote:

"The decision to include or exclude from the plan any specific benefit.

How can we be any clearer than that?

The managed care lobby has told Members that this bill opens the door for unlimited punitive damages against health plans with jury awards soaring into the hundreds of millions of dollars.

To begin with, 30 of our States have already capped punitive damages. In my home State of Georgia, if the consensus bill becomes law, when it becomes law, there will be no punitive damages allowed regardless of the circumstances.

It is for precisely this reason that the consensus bill puts these court remedies back into the hands of the States, where tort reforms have been far more effective than here at the Federal level.

Read the bill. We have left a way for insurance companies to remain shielded from any punitive damages. Not a penny. If there is a dispute and the health plan agrees to settle it fairly with external appeals, they remain shielded from all punitive damages. Read the bill, on page 60 beginning line 3. I quote again:

The plan is not liable for any punitive, exemplary or similar damages if the plan or the issuer complied with the determination of the external appeal entity.

How can we be any simpler than that? As a matter of fact, read the whole section of this bill of who can sue for what. It is just three pages. But those simple three pages overturn 25 years of injustice, and they close the door on unscrupulous health plans using this loophole in the law to breach