

California [Mr. WAXMAN]. If he will recall, the advisory group met on March 20 of this year to consider five bills for the Corrections Calendar. While no members of the minority were present at that meeting, all members of the advisory group are allowed, and were allowed following that meeting, to participate by expressing their views even though they may not be able to attend our meetings.

Following our March 20 meeting, we reviewed the input from all our members and a consensus was reached to recommend H.R. 2909 to the Speaker for placement on the Corrections Day Calendar when reported out of the committee of jurisdiction, in this case the Resources Committee. Once recommended, all corrections day legislation must travel through the regular legislative process and be reported.

I recognize that the corrections day process is new to many and that we all have demanding schedules. However, being a member of a panel such as the Corrections Day Advisory Group requires members' attendance in order that we may be able to carry out its purpose.

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. STUDDS. I have no further requests for time.

I want to close by commending the gentlewoman from Connecticut on the eloquence of her lesson in civic responsibility.

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

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

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.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and (three-fifths having voted in favor thereof) the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 2909, the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1100

#### THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WALKER). Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I, the pending business is the question of agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal of the last day's proceedings.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

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

Mr. STUDDS. 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 347, nays 50, not voting 37, as follows:

[Roll No. 225]

YEAS—347

Ackerman	Dellums	Johnson, E. B.
Allard	Deutsch	Johnston
Archer	Diaz-Balart	Kanjorski
Armey	Dickey	Kaptur
Bachus	Dicks	Kasich
Baesler	Dingell	Kelly
Baker (CA)	Dixon	Kennedy (MA)
Baldacci	Doggett	Kennedy (RI)
Ballenger	Dooley	Kennelly
Barcia	Doolittle	Kildee
Barr	Doyle	Kim
Barrett (NE)	Dreier	King
Barrett (WI)	Duncan	Kingston
Bartlett	Dunn	Klink
Barton	Edwards	Klug
Bass	Ehlers	Knollenberg
Becerra	Ehrlich	Kolbe
Beilenson	Emerson	LaHood
Bentsen	Eshoo	Lantos
Bereuter	Evans	Latham
Berman	Ewing	LaTourette
Bevill	Farr	Laughlin
Bilbray	Fawell	Lazio
Bilirakis	Fields (LA)	Leach
Bishop	Fields (TX)	Levin
Bliley	Flake	Lewis (CA)
Blumenauer	Foley	Lewis (KY)
Blute	Forbes	Lightfoot
Boehlert	Fowler	Linder
Boehner	Frank (MA)	Lipinski
Bonilla	Franks (CT)	Livingston
Bonior	Franks (NJ)	LoBiondo
Bono	Frelinghuysen	Lofgren
Boucher	Frisa	Longley
Brewster	Frost	Lowey
Browder	Furse	Lucas
Brown (OH)	Galleghy	Luther
Brownback	Ganske	Maloney
Bryant (TN)	Gejdenson	Manton
Bryant (TX)	Gekas	Manzullo
Burr	Gilchrest	Martinez
Burton	Gilman	Mascara
Buyer	Gonzalez	Matsui
Callahan	Goodlatte	McCarthy
Camp	Goodling	McCollum
Campbell	Gordon	McHale
Canady	Goss	McHugh
Cardin	Graham	McInnis
Castle	Green (TX)	McIntosh
Chabot	Greene (UT)	McKeon
Chambliss	Greenwood	McKinney
Chenoweth	Gunderson	McNulty
Christensen	Gutierrez	Meek
Chrysler	Hall (OH)	Metcalf
Clayton	Hall (TX)	Meyers
Clement	Hamilton	Mica
Clinger	Hancock	Millender-
Coble	Hansen	McDonald
Coburn	Hastert	Miller (CA)
Coleman	Hastings (WA)	Miller (FL)
Collins (GA)	Hayworth	Minge
Collins (MI)	Hefner	Mink
Combest	Herger	Moakley
Condit	Hinchey	Mollohan
Conyers	Hobson	Montgomery
Cooley	Hoekstra	Moorhead
Cox	Hoke	Morella
Coyne	Holden	Murtha
Cramer	Horn	Myers
Crane	Hostettler	Myrick
Crapo	Houghton	Nadler
Creameans	Hunter	Neal
Cubin	Hyde	Neumann
Cummings	Inglis	Ney
Cunningham	Istook	Norwood
Danner	Jackson (IL)	Nussle
Davis	Jackson-Lee	Oberstar
de la Garza	(TX)	Obey
Deal	Jefferson	Olver
DeLauro	Johnson (CT)	Ortiz
DeLay	Johnson (SD)	Orton

Owens	Sanders	Tauzin
Oxley	Sawyer	Taylor (NC)
Packard	Saxton	Tejeda
Pallone	Scarborough	Thomas
Parker	Schaefer	Thornberry
Pastor	Scott	Thornnton
Paxon	Seastrand	Thurman
Payne (NJ)	Sensenbrenner	Tiahrt
Payne (VA)	Serrano	Torres
Pelosi	Shadegg	Trafficant
Peterson (MN)	Shaw	Upton
Petri	Shays	Velazquez
Pomeroy	Shuster	Vento
Porter	Sisisky	Vucanovich
Portman	Skaggs	Walker
Poshard	Skeen	Walsh
Quillen	Skelton	Wamp
Quinn	Slaughter	Ward
Radanovich	Smith (NJ)	Watt (NC)
Rahall	Smith (TX)	Watts (OK)
Ramstad	Smith (WA)	Waxman
Rangel	Solomon	Weldon (FL)
Reed	Souder	Weldon (PA)
Regula	Spence	White
Richardson	Spratt	Whitfield
Rivers	Stark	Wicker
Roberts	Stearns	Williams
Roemer	Stenholm	Wilson
Rogers	Stockman	Wise
Rohrabacher	Stokes	Wolf
Ros-Lehtinen	Studds	Woolsey
Rose	Stump	Wynn
Roth	Stupak	Young (AK)
Roybal-Allard	Talent	Young (FL)
Royce	Tanner	
Salmon	Tate	

NAYS—50

Abercrombie	Gephardt	Pickett
Borski	Geren	Pombo
Bunn	Gillmor	Rush
Clay	Gutknecht	Sabo
Collins (IL)	Hefley	Sanford
Costello	Heineman	Schroeder
DeFazio	Hilleary	Smith (MI)
Durbin	Hilliard	Taylor (MS)
Engel	Hutchinson	Thompson
English	Jacobs	Towns
Everett	Jones	Visclosky
Fazio	LaFalce	Volkmer
Filner	Lewis (GA)	Waters
Flanagan	Markey	Weller
Foglietta	Martini	Yates
Fox	McDermott	Zimmer
Funderburk	Menendez	

NOT VOTING—37

Andrews	Gibbons	Moran
Baker (LA)	Harman	Nethercutt
Bateman	Hastings (FL)	Peterson (FL)
Brown (CA)	Hayes	Pryce
Brown (FL)	Hoyer	Riggs
Bunning	Johnson, Sam	Roukema
Calvert	Klecza	Schiff
Chapman	Largent	Schumer
Clyburn	Lincoln	Torkildsen
Dornan	McCrery	Torricelli
Ensign	McDade	Zeliff
Fattah	Meehan	
Ford	Molinari	

□ 1120

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 3103, HEALTH COVERAGE AVAILABILITY AND AFFORDABILITY ACT OF 1996

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1 of rule XX and by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means, I move to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 3103) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to improve portability and continuity of health insurance coverage in the group and individual markets, to combat

waste, fraud, and abuse in health insurance and health care delivery, to promote the use of medical savings accounts, to improve access to long-term care services and coverage, to simplify the administration of health insurance, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and request a conference with the Senate thereon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WALKER). The gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this is the customary motion to go to conference. I believe the minority has a motion to instruct conferees.

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

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

The motion was agreed to.

#### MOTION TO INSTRUCT OFFERED BY MR. DINGELL

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct conferees.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. DINGELL moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the Senate amendment to the House bill H.R. 3103 be instructed—

(1) to recede to the Senate amendment except with respect to section 305 of the Senate amendment; and

(2) with respect to such section (A) to consider whether the enactment of such section would result in an increase in premiums for private health plans and (B) if so, to provide for concurring with such section with an amendment that adjusts such section to provide for the maximum coverage of mental health services under health plans without increasing such premiums.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] will be recognized for 30 minutes in favor of his motion. Does the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER] wish to be recognized in opposition to the motion?

Mr. ARCHER. I do, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER] will be recognized for 30 minutes in opposition to the motion.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

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

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, here we go again. Once again our friends and colleagues on the Republican side have spent days and weeks behind closed doors. Our colleagues have been negotiating with themselves. They have been excluding Members on this side of the aisle. They have been excluding the President. They have been using their usual highly partisan style, strategy and technique.

They have stuck a controversial and objectionable medical savings account provision in their bill to serve the Dole for President campaign and to assist special interest friends in the health insurance industry.

Mr. Speaker, our motion to instruct is simple: It tells the House conferees, "Do not reinvent the wheel." We have before us a good bill which came from the Senate. It was totally non-controversial. It properly rejected a broad medical savings account provision as unwise and fiscally irresponsible. The instruction tells House conferees that with the exception of one provision on which further analysis may be needed, simply recede to the Senate.

On that one provision, an important bipartisan amendment to provide mental health parity offered by our friends and colleagues, Mr. DOMENICI and Mr. WELLSTONE, it instructs the conferees to study the issue and to consider whether the provision would raise health insurance premiums. If the provision is found to raise premiums, the motion tells the conferees to do their best to adjust it to provide for the maximum possible mental health coverage without raising premiums and within the scope of the conference.

Make no mistake, my colleagues: The conference committee is about to be appointed, but it is one which already has its decisions made. All the important decisions are in place. Once more, the extremist Republican majority has told the American people and the President of the United States, "It's our way or the highway."

The Congress has an opportunity this year to enact a noncontroversial, a bipartisan, a consensus health insurance reform bill, a small one but an important one, a bill that would make health insurance more widely available to the American people. Some 28 million people will benefit from the enactment of this legislation. It is a bill which would assure portability, guaranteed access and renewal. It would limit preexisting condition exclusions, and set up purchasing pools for small business.

This is a bill which was so broadly supported that it passed the Senate of the United States 100 to nothing. The Republican majority is not content, however, to stop here with a good bill. They could not resist playing politics with the health and security of the American people. And in spite of the President's good faith offer to negotiate a carefully constructed pilot program on MSA's, they just could not resist sending a bill that will have to be vetoed.

The beneficiaries of this will be the health insurance industry, and then only a part of it. The people who will suffer from this choice are the American people. Some 28 million Americans will not get the benefits of this legislation.

My Republican colleagues locked the doors. They locked out the American people. They ignored the will of the

other body, which voted against MSA's, and they crowbarred this curious provision into the bill.

As they have done over and over again in this Congress, they bent the rules and, quite frankly, they are in the process of making a mockery of the conference structure of the two bodies.

Mr. Speaker, who is going to pay in the end for this partisanship? It is going to be the American people, 28 million of whom will be denied the benefits of significant improvements in health insurance and major reform.

Let us have a real conference with genuine bipartisan dialog and negotiation. Bring the President into the process in good faith, not by distorting the process by making the agreement beforehand and then telling the President to fly off.

A Presidential signature is going to be difficult. Let us get the Presidential signature. Let us enact the legislation. Let us support the motion to instruct.

□ 1130

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS], the respected chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Ways and Means.

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

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure and a certain amount of pride that I take the floor this morning, finally, as we appoint the conferees to meet with the Senate on our health insurance package.

I find it somewhat ironic that this package passed the House some time ago, passed the Senate on April 16, but it is not until June 11 that we are naming conferees. That is simply because the Senate stalled. The Senate would not go forward. The Senate Democrats wanted to play politics with health care once more.

We discovered, Mr. Speaker, that the President's mediscare tactics over the last year cost the American people more than \$100 billion when we compare the 1995 Medicare trustees report with the 1996 Medicare trustees report. If we follow the wishes of the former chairman of the Committee on Commerce and pass this motion to instruct, we are once again going to be part of an operation that delays and obfuscates.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman said that the negotiations that we have been carrying on with the Senate tried to crowbar provisions into the package. One man's crowbar is another's compromise and accommodation, and I just find it totally ironic that the gentleman from Michigan, given his history of rather cavalier and arrogant management of conference reports, would, in fact, make such a comment.

He alluded to the fact that the Senate package passed the floor 100 to 0. If that is the case, why is the motion to instruct not to go with the Senate program? Oh no, he knows there were