year after year, have raised their premiums, raised their copays, and raised their deductibles, all while slashing their benefits.

They don’t trust Medicare HMOs any farther than they can throw them. Our seniors don’t want HMOs, and this Congress shouldn’t force them.

Now on the government fallback provision, you don’t need to be an insurance expert to know that insurers aren’t going to sell a policy that everyone is going to make claims against.

And we know that 86 percent of seniors have prescription drug costs. So we know that individuals buying these policies are going to use them.

The risks of individual claims far outweigh any potential profits from these policies. Insurers know that, seniors know that and I think even my colleagues on the other side of the aisle know that.

But if they admit that, than I guess they’d have to admit that the private market just does not work for Medicare beneficiaries.

So they’re refused to allow for even the possibility that private insurers won’t participate in this plan.

But I would argue that, if the private market really works for this population, than they shouldn’t have any objection to a government fallback plan—because—they’re right—they’re never going to need it.

Mr. Speaker, when it comes down to it, fixing these two provisions would clear the way for these two provisions would clear the way for the government fallback provision, which will never force insurers, all while slashing their benefits.

Mr. Speaker, when it comes down to it, fixing these two provisions would clear the way for these two provisions would clear the way for the government fallback provision, which will never force insurers, all while slashing their benefits.

Mr. Speaker, when it comes down to it, fixing these two provisions would clear the way for these two provisions would clear the way for the government fallback provision, which will never force insurers, all while slashing their benefits.
changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to instruct was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair has postponed further proceedings.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFERENCE ON H.R. 1308, TAX RELIEF, SIMPLIFICATION, AND EQUITY ACT OF 2003

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question on the motion to instruct conferees on the bill, H.R. 1308.

The Clerk will designate the motion.

Mr. SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct conferees on the bill, H.R. 1308.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington) (during the electronic vote): Members are advised that 2 minutes remain in the vote.

So the motion to instruct was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFERENCE ON H.R. 1, MEDICARE PRESCRIPTION DRUG AND MODERNIZATION ACT OF 2003

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the vote on the motion to instruct conferees on the bill, H.R. 1.

The Clerk will designate the motion.

Mr. SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk redesignated the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct conferees offered by the gentleman from Maine (Mr. MICHAUD) on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 189, nays 220, not voting 25, as follows:

[Roll No. 502]