

gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS].

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

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, well, I guess we are not going to talk about the motion to instruct. Obviously, that was not the reason you offered what purportedly is a motion to instruct conferees.

The factual information in the motion to instruct is simply wrong. There is no instruction in the motion to instruct. It simply says that you want to talk about what is going on in this year's budget process. That is what the motion to instruct says.

So, if you do not want to talk about your motion to instruct, and I am quite sure you do not expect it to pass because it would be rather bizarre to pass a motion to instruct that has no instructions to the conferees, so what you really want to do is talk about the issue of Medicare, and you want to talk about the issue of Medicare in terms of what Republicans are trying to do to make sure that the Medicare trust fund does not go bankrupt.

I think you need to remember that in April the trustees of the health insurance trust fund, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, Donna Shalala, the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Rubin, Secretary of Labor, all President Clinton's appointees to the Board of Trustees, said if we do nothing, if we do nothing, Medicare goes bankrupt in 2002.

What Republicans are proposing to do is take the \$4,700 that is spent on each senior today and grow that to \$6,400 in 2002. If we can do that, if we can accomplish an increase in the program at that rate, we save Medicare from bankruptcy.

The Democrats have had some difficulty in understanding that concept. I want to commend the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. KENNELLY] because the gentlewoman from Connecticut said it right. What we are talking about is reducing the increase. The job for all of us is to create a Medicare which has more choice for seniors, which grows in the amount that is available, but that fundamentally makes sure the program does not go bankrupt.

You have heard the word "cut" over here from virtually every speaker. It is a word that is somewhat pejorative, that is loaded, that is a political term that they want to use. They cannot deny themselves the use of the term "cut." The gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. KENNELLY], to her commendable credit, did not say "cut," because she knows it is not a cut. It is a reduction in the increase, and, frankly, when you have increases going up at 10.5 and 11 percent a year in an old 1960's bill-paying structure, when today's marketplace is half that, taxpayers should want us to make sure that we get the savings from the marketplace in the Medicare Program. That is what we propose to do.

And we are looking for people to join us in the effort to save Medicare. I did not hear one person on this floor today talk about joining in the effort to save Medicare.

But I want this voice to be heard on the floor. I want my Democrat colleagues and friends to listen carefully to the words of this individual. This is what he said: "Today, Medicaid and Medicare are going up at 3 times the rate of inflation. We propose to let it go up at 2 times the rate of inflation. That is not a Medicare or Medicaid cut." Repeat, "That is not a Medicare or Medicaid cut."

So when you hear all of this business about cuts, let me caution you that is not what is going on. Who said that? William Jefferson Clinton, President of the United States and a Democrat. He believes we have to reduce the rate of increase, just as the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. KENNELLY] said. We have to reduce the rate of increase.

What we are proposing is to reduce the rate of increase. What President Clinton has said must be done, what he believes should be done is to reduce the rate of increase. How we do that is going to be a very, very positive exercise as we open up a 1960's fee-for-service bill-paying bureaucracy to all of the exciting changes that are going on out there in the health care world, one very small, modest change that has been a pilot program for 3 years, called Medicare Select, that has almost a half million folks in that program, with only nine complaints to date.

It is a program that we want to continue for a 5-year period. We have told the Secretary of Health and Human Services, "Keep an eye on that program. If it does not do what it is supposed to do, that is, increase choice and save money, we will sunset the program. We will come up with another idea." Right now what we need are new ideas, not the same old arguments, new ideas.

Medicare Select is a promising new idea. We want to send the program to the 50 States who want to join it. The States voluntarily take up the program. It is not imposed upon them. People voluntarily buy their insurance. It is not imposed upon them. It is a slightly different way of doing business in the insurance and health care area. We want to see if it has some promise.

We are going to try some other ideas. We are going to bring the sunshine from the outside, the positive reduction in expenses from the outside, into this archaic system, by choice. Republicans are going to do that. We would really love to have our Democratic colleagues join their President in reducing the increase in positive ways.

Instead, what you hear is pure political propaganda. They do not want to talk about Medicare Select.

I will tell you, you just heard a number of Democrats come to the microphone, the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. KENNELLY], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOGGETT], the

gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY], the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KLINK], they all voted for the Medicare Select measure when it left here, 408 to 14.

This is a good idea. What you have here today on the part of the Democrats is an exercise largely in futility. They are now the minority party. They do not get to ram proposals down people's throats by pure quantitative measures because they have more votes than someone else. We are asking them to come to the table with your ideas. Let us hear them.

Over the next several months there is going to be a feeding frenzy of ideas in the Health Subcommittee of Ways and Means and Health Subcommittee of Commerce. We are going to put together a proposal that will make sure the Medicare trust fund will not go broke, that seniors will have a better choice, we will grow the Medicare Program from today's \$4,700 to \$6,400 for every American. We will save the program.

This is a modest beginning. Vote down the motion to instruct, which instructs nothing, and let us get on with change.

#### REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1561, AMERICAN OVERSEAS INTERESTS ACT OF 1995

Mr. GOSS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104-130) on the resolution (H. Res. 156) providing for further consideration of the bill (H.R. 1561), to consolidate the foreign affairs agencies of the United States; to authorize appropriations for the Department of State and related agencies for fiscal years 1996 and 1997; to responsibly reduce the authorizations of appropriations for U.S. foreign assistance programs for fiscal years 1996 and 1997, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

#### APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 483, MEDICARE SELECT EXPANSION

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL], the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the facts from this debate are clear. The Democrats want to see that the discussions in the conference will address the proposed cuts in Medicare benefits. That is all we want.

The hard fact is that senior citizens of this country are going to take a \$300 billion hit on their Medicare costs and

that \$300 billion hit is going to be used to finance a tax cut for the well-to-do.

Now, I can understand how my Republican colleagues get outraged about this. One of my colleagues from California quoted the President telling that Medicare is in trouble. Everybody has known Medicare was in trouble. The President tried to do something about it last year, and his comments of last year, quoted on this floor by the previous Member who addressed this body, simply said Medicare is in trouble unless you pass his universal health care coverage program. Every single Republican opposed that. Everybody knows health care in this country is in trouble. Everybody knows health care costs in this country are escalating at an excessive rate. Everybody knows that availability of insurance and the affordability of insurance is declining.

We can talk about innovation and innovativeness and everything else, and a feeding frenzy of innovation that is supposed to take place. In the health care subcommittee, run by the gentleman from California, there has been no excessive innovation or anything of that kind going on in his committee and certainly nothing vaguely resembling a feeding frenzy of innovation, certainly no sign of innovation in his committee, nothing except cuts for the senior citizens, give a tax break to the rich and talk about how the Democrats are responsible for the problem.

The real problem began last year in this Congress and the year before when the Republicans refused to a man to consider any reform in health care overall which would not only have addressed the problem of Medicare and its viability but also every other health care program in this country which would have made health care available to every American and which would have seen to it that the costs of health care for business, for industry, for government, and for the ordinary citizen would have gone back.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, we have been told that this is a debate about MediGap, and indeed it is. It is a debate about whether or not these conferees will consider the realities of what has occurred on this House floor with reference to the cuts and the increases in out-of-pocket costs to Medicare recipients across this country. There is a giant MediGap, because another 30 minutes later all we have is a blank page from the Republican Party with reference to what they are going to do to seniors across this country.

They refuse to come to this floor and tell the people of America what the journalists have found, what the American Association of Retired Persons has found, that when a senior anywhere in this country reaches for their wallet to pay for the same level of health care, they are going to reach in and find it does not stretch as far as it used to, because their premiums, their deductible has been doubled, their premiums have

been raised, new out-of-pocket costs face them, and instead of MediGap, the kind of insurance we are going to need is medigorge, because a giant gorge is being created that will not be filled unless this instruction is approved.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOGGETT].

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

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 197, nays 224, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 355]

YEAS—197

Abercrombie	Ford	Meek
Ackerman	Frank (MA)	Menendez
Andrews	Frost	Mfume
Baessler	Furse	Miller (CA)
Baldacci	Gejdenson	Mineta
Barcia	Gephardt	Minge
Barrett (WI)	Geren	Mink
Beilenson	Gibbons	Moakley
Bentsen	Gonzalez	Mollohan
Berman	Gordon	Montgomery
Bevill	Green	Moran
Bishop	Gutierrez	Murtha
Bonior	Hall (OH)	Nadler
Borski	Hall (TX)	Neal
Boucher	Hamilton	Oberstar
Brewster	Harman	Obey
Browder	Hastings (FL)	Oliver
Brown (CA)	Hayes	Ortiz
Brown (FL)	Hefner	Orton
Brown (OH)	Hilliard	Owens
Bryant (TX)	Hinchey	Pallone
Cardin	Holden	Pastor
Chapman	Hoyer	Payne (NJ)
Clayton	Jackson-Lee	Payne (VA)
Clement	Jacobs	Pelosi
Clyburn	Jefferson	Peterson (MN)
Coleman	Johnson (SD)	Pickett
Collins (IL)	Johnson, E.B.	Pomeroy
Collins (MI)	Johnston	Poshard
Condit	Kanjorski	Rahall
Conyers	Kaptur	Rangel
Costello	Kennedy (MA)	Reed
Coyne	Kennedy (RI)	Reynolds
Cramer	Kennelly	Richardson
Danner	Kildee	Rivers
de la Garza	Klink	Roemer
DeFazio	LaFalce	Rose
DeLauro	Lantos	Roybal-Allard
Dellums	Laughlin	Rush
Deutsch	Levin	Sabo
Dicks	Lewis (GA)	Sanders
Dingell	Lincoln	Sawyer
Dixon	Lofgren	Schroeder
Doggett	Lowe	Schumer
Dooley	Luther	Scott
Doyle	Maloney	Serrano
Durbin	Manton	Sisisky
Edwards	Markey	Skaggs
Engel	Martinez	Skelton
Eshoo	Mascara	Slaughter
Evans	Matsui	Spratt
Farr	McCarthy	Stark
Fattah	McDermott	Stenholm
Fields (LA)	McHale	Stokes
Filner	McKinney	Studds
Flake	McNulty	Stupak
Foglietta	Meehan	Tanner

Tauzin  
Taylor (MS)  
Tejeda  
Thompson  
Thornton  
Thurman  
Torres  
Torrice  
Towns

Traficant  
Tucker  
Velázquez  
Vento  
Visclosky  
Volkmer  
Ward  
Waters  
Watt (NC)

Waxman  
Williams  
Wilson  
Wise  
Woolsey  
Wyden  
Wynn  
Yates

NAYS—224

Allard  
Archer  
Armey  
Bachus  
Baker (CA)  
Baker (LA)  
Ballenger  
Barr  
Barrett (NE)  
Bartlett  
Barton  
Bass  
Bateman  
Bereuter  
Billbray  
Bilirakis  
Bliley  
Blute  
Boehlert  
Boehner  
Bonilla  
Bono  
Brownback  
Bryant (TN)  
Bunn  
Bunning  
Burr  
Burton  
Buyer  
Callahan  
Camp  
Canady  
Castle  
Chabot  
Chambliss  
Chenoweth  
Christensen  
Chrysler  
Clinger  
Coble  
Coburn  
Collins (GA)  
Combest  
Cooley  
Cox  
Crane  
Crapo  
Creameans  
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  
Ganske  
Gekas  
Gilchrest  
Gillmor  
Gilman  
Goodlatte  
Goodling  
Goss  
Graham  
Greenwood  
Gunderson  
Gutknecht  
Hancock  
Hastert  
Hastings (WA)  
Hayworth  
Hefley  
Heineman  
Herger  
Hilleary  
Hobson  
Hoekstra  
Hoke  
Horn  
Hostettler  
Houghton  
Hunter  
Hutchinson  
Hyde  
Inglis  
Johnson (CT)  
Johnson, Sam  
Jones  
Kasich  
Kelly  
Kim  
King  
Kingston  
Klug  
Knollenberg  
Kolbe  
LaHood  
Largent  
Latham  
LaTourette  
Lazio  
Leach  
Lewis (CA)  
Lewis (KY)  
Lightfoot  
Linder  
Lipinski  
LoBiondo  
Longley  
Lucas  
Manzullo  
Martini  
McCollum  
McCrery  
McDade  
McHugh  
McInnis  
McIntosh  
McKeon  
Metcalfe  
Mica  
Miller (FL)  
Molinaro  
Moorhead  
Morella  
Myers  
Myrick

Nethercutt  
Neumann  
Ney  
Norwood  
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  
Saxton  
Scarborough  
Schaefer  
Schiff  
Seastrand  
Sensenbrenner  
Shadegg  
Shaw  
Shays  
Shuster  
Skeen  
Smith (MI)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Smith (WA)  
Solomon  
Soudon  
Spence  
Stearns  
Stockman  
Stump  
Talent  
Tate  
Taylor (NC)  
Thomas  
Thornberry  
Tiahrt  
Torkildsen  
Upton  
Vucanovich  
Waldholtz  
Walker  
Walsh  
Wamp  
Watts (OK)  
Weldon (FL)  
Weldon (PA)  
Weller  
White  
Whitfield  
Wicker  
Wolf  
Young (AK)  
Young (FL)  
Zeliff  
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—13

Becerra  
Calvert  
Clay  
Cubin  
Fazio

Gallegly  
Hansen  
Istook  
Klecza  
Livingston

□ 1135

The Clerk announced the following pair: On this vote:

Mr. BECERRA for, with Mrs. CUBIN against.

Mr. COBURN and Mr. KIM changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Ms. WATERS and Mr. SCHUMER changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the motion to instruct was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHAYS). Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees: Messrs. BLILEY, BILIRAKIS, HASTERT, ARCHER, and THOMAS, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, and Messrs. DINGELL, WAXMAN, GIBBONS, and STARK.

There was no objection.

#### REMOVAL OF NAMES OF MEMBERS AS COSPONSORS OF H.R. 571

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER], the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. TORRICELLI], and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BARRETT] be removed as cosponsors of H.R. 571. The gentlemen misunderstood the substance of that bill, and we have agreed to remove them as cosponsors.

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

There was no objection.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT REGARDING PRE-FILING REQUIREMENT FOR AMENDMENTS TO H.R. 1530, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1996

(Mr. SOLOMON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Committee on National Security ordered reported H.R. 1530, the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 1996. The Rules Committee plans to meet during the week of June 5 to grant a rule for the bill which is scheduled for floor consideration during the week of June 12.

The Rules Committee expects to report the traditional structured rule making in order only amendments prefiled with our committee.

Members who wish to offer amendments to the bill should submit 55 copies of their amendments, together with and a brief explanation, to the Rules Committee office at H-312 of the Capitol, no later than 5 p.m. on Tuesday, June 6.

Amendments should be drafted to the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the National Security Committee. Copies of the committee substitute will be available for examination by Members and staff in the offices of the committee at 2120 Rayburn House Office Building.

Members are advised to use the Office of Legislative Counsel to draft their amendments.

If Members or their staff have any questions regarding this procedure, they should contact David Lonie of our staff at extension 5-7985. We appreciate the cooperation of all Members in submitting their amendments by the 5 p.m., June 6 deadline in properly drafted form.

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON RULES  
*Washington, DC, May 25, 1995.*

#### PRE-FILING REQUIREMENT FOR AMENDMENTS TO DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION BILL (H.R. 1530)

DEAR COLLEAGUE: The Rules Committee plans to meet during the week of June 5th to grant a rule for the National Defense Authorization Act (H.R. 1530) which is scheduled for floor consideration during the week of June 12th.

The Rules Committee expects to report the traditional structured rule making in order only amendments pre-filed with our Committee. Members who wish to offer amendments to the bill should submit 55 copies of their amendments, together with a brief explanation, to the Rules Committee office at H-312 of the Capitol, no later than 5 p.m. on Tuesday, June 6th.

Amendments should be drafted to the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the National Security Committee. Copies of the Committee substitute will be available for examination by Members and staff in the offices of the Committee at 2120 Rayburn House Office Building. Members are requested to use the Office of Legislative Counsel to draft their amendments.

If Members or their staff have any questions regarding this procedure, they should contact David Lonie of our staff at Extension 5-7985. We appreciate the cooperation of all Members in submitting their amendments by the 5 p.m., June 6th deadline in properly drafted form.

Sincerely,

GERALD B. SOLOMON,  
*Chairman.*

#### ANNOUNCEMENT REGARDING ADDITIONAL TIME FOR DEBATE ON AMENDMENTS TO H.R. 1561, THE AMERICAN OVERSEAS INTERESTS ACT OF 1995

(Mr. GILMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I want my colleagues to be absolutely clear why we are providing additional time after the recess to consider H.R. 1561 the American Overseas Interests Act. It is because so many amendments are still pending and because our colleagues on the other side of the aisle requested additional time for them.

The rule accompanying H.R. 1561 provided for 2 hours of general debate and 10 for amendments that were preprinted in the RECORD. Any remaining amendments would be considered under a 10-minute time limit, with all debate to conclude by 2:30 this afternoon.

As of last night—100 amendments had been filed—58 by Republicans and 42 Democrats. When the Committee rose yesterday, we had consumed 9 of the 10

hours of debate and had disposed of nine amendments—six Republican and three Democrat.

Of the 91 amendments remaining—51 are Republican and 39 are Democratic amendments. It is to accommodate those Members with remaining amendments that we are proposing an additional 6 hours of debate when we return from the recess.

Reports that we yanked H.R. 1561 because the bill is in trouble are just plain wrong. We are acting to provide more time to consider this very important measure that deals with our foreign policy agencies and programs.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I think it makes sense. We have a large number of amendments pending, and I think it makes sense to have some modicum of debate. Am I to assume that the committee will be recommending to the Committee on Rules when we come back in a week-and-a-half a time limit on these amendments, or will it be staying under the 5-minute rule?

Mr. GILMAN. I will yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. SOLOMON. I will say to my good friend, the gentleman from California, that we have already reported a rule about an hour ago which does provide for 6 hours of additional time under the 5-minute rule, yes.

Mr. BERMAN. So essentially there is no time limit on any individual amendment.

Mr. SOLOMON. I would just say to the chairman of the Committee on International Relations that if there were going to be any time limitations on amendments, it would have to be negotiated between both sides of the aisle. That is to be expected.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield for one further question, is the plan to bring this rule to the floor on Wednesday, June 7?

Mr. GILMAN. That is correct.

Mr. BERMAN. Is it the plan to then move, assuming that rule passes, to the 6 hours remaining of debate on Wednesday, June 7?

Mr. GILMAN. It is my understanding we would be able to then move to consider the 6 hours of remaining debate.

Mr. BERMAN. Are the amendments limited to the amendments that have been printed in the RECORD as of today?

Mr. GILMAN. That is my understanding. Only the amendments that have been printed in the RECORD as of yesterday.

Mr. BERMAN. Does it include a managers' amendment?

Mr. GILMAN. Yes it would be included.