

would have voted "yea." Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained for rollcall No. 580, on ordering a vote on the previous question. Had I been present I would have voted "yea." Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained for rollcall No. 581, on passage of a bill providing for consideration of certain joint resolutions making further continuing appropriations for FY 2001. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

ANNOUNCEMENT OF INTENTION TO OFFER MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 4577, DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT 2001

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 7(c) of rule XXII, I hereby notify the House of my intention to offer the following motion to instruct House conferees on H.R. 4577, a bill making appropriations for fiscal year 2001 for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education.

The form of the motion is as follows:

Mrs. HOEKSTRA 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 bill H.R. 4577 be instructed to choose a level of funding for the Inspector General of the Department of Education that reflects a requirement on the Inspector General of the Department of Education, as authorized by section 211 of the Department of Education Organization Act, to use all funds appropriated to the Office of Inspector General of such Department to comply with the Inspector General Act of 1978, with priority given to section 4 of such Act.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF INTENTION TO OFFER MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 4577, DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT 2001

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 7(c) of rule XXII, I hereby serve notice to the House of my intention tomorrow to offer the following motion to instruct House conferees on H.R. 4577, a bill making appropriations for fiscal year 2001 for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services and Education.

The form of the motion is as follows:

Mr. SCHAFFER 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 bill H.R. 4577 be instructed to insist on those provisions that—

(1) maintain the utmost flexibility possible for the grant program under title VI of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965; and

(2) provide local educational agencies the maximum discretion within the scope of conference to spend Federal education funds to improve the education of their students.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF S. 2485, SAINT CROIX ISLAND HERITAGE ACT

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 663 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 663

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (S. 2485) to direct the Secretary of the Interior to provide assistance in planning and constructing a regional heritage center in Calais, Maine. The bill shall be considered as read for amendment. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Resources; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 2. A concurrent resolution consisting of the text printed in section 3 is hereby adopted.

SEC. 3. The text specified in section 2 is as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That, in the enrollment of the bill (H.R. 2614) to amend the Small Business Investment Act to make improvements to the certified development company program, and for other purposes, the Clerk of the House of Representatives shall make the following corrections:

"(1) In section 1, insert before 'are hereby enacted into law' the following: ', as modified in accordance with section 3,'.

"(2) In section 2, insert before the period at the end the following: ', modified in accordance with section 3'.

"(3) Add at the end the following new section:

"SEC. 3. MODIFICATION TO TEXT OF BILL ENACTED BY REFERENCE.

"The modification referred to in sections 1 and 2 is to the text of the bill H.R. 5538, as referred to in section 1(1), and is as follows: the quoted matter in the amendment proposed to be made by section 2 of such bill is modified by striking "June 30, 2000" and inserting "December 31, 2000"."

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 663 is a closed rule providing for the consideration of S. 2485 to direct the Secretary of the Interior to provide assistance in planning and constructing a Regional Heritage Center in Calais, Maine. The rule also provides for the adoption of a concurrent resolution directing the Clerk of the House of Representatives to make certain corrections in the enrollment of the bill, H.R. 2614, to amend the Small Business Investment Act to make improvements to the certified development company, House Report 106-1016.

I want to make it clear that we are considering S. 2485. The text of the re-

port that the Committee on Rules filed to accompany this resolution incorrectly states in the summary of the resolution that the resolution provides for the consideration of H. 2485 when in fact it was meant to state that the rule provides for the consideration of S. 2485.

The rule provides 1 hour of debate in the House divided equally between the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Resources. Further, the rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill and provides for one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Finally, the rule provides that a concurrent resolution directing the Clerk to make certain corrections to the enrollment of H.R. 2614 is adopted.

Mr. Speaker, in essence what this two-part rule will accomplish is the following: the first part provides for the consideration of S. 2485, which directs the Secretary of the Interior to work with Federal, State, and local agencies, historical societies and not-for-profit organizations to facilitate the development of a Regional Heritage Center in downtown Calais, Maine, before the 400th anniversary of the settlement of the Saint Croix Islands.

Saint Croix Island is located in the Saint Croix River, which forms the boundary between Canada and the United States and the State of Maine. Now, in 1604 and 1605, Pierre Dugua Sieur de Mons, with his company, established a French settlement on the island predating the English settlement at Jamestown, Virginia, in 1607. Saint Croix Island International Historic Site is administered by the National Park Service, preserving the site as a monument to the beginning of the United States and of Canada.

S. 2485 directs the Secretary of the Interior to work with Federal, State and local agencies, historical societies and nonprofits to provide assistance in planning, constructing and operating a Regional Heritage Center in downtown Calais. The bill authorizes the Secretary to enter into cooperative agreements, the appropriation of \$2 million for design and construction of the facility, and such sums as are necessary to maintain and operate interpretive exhibits.

The Congressional Budget Office estimates that implementing S. 2485 would cost \$2 million over the next 3 fiscal years. Additional annual expenses to help operate and maintain the center once it is completed in 2004 would not be significant.

The bill was introduced by Senators COLLINS and SNOWE of Maine on April 27, 2000, and passed the Senate by unanimous consent on October 5.

The second part of the rule dealing with the tax bill's enrollment and the minimum wage, is necessary because the Democratic leadership would not grant unanimous consent for the House to make this correction, which in essence helps to preserve the minimum wage. When drafting H.R. 5538, the portion of the tax relief bill providing for

increases in the minimum wage, there was an error which could have the unintended result of eliminating the minimum wage for a 6-month period. As a supporter of the minimum wage, I find it very difficult to believe but nevertheless recognize that the leadership on the other side of the aisle is playing politics with this issue. By opposing a unanimous consent request to make this technical yet critically important correction, the minority leadership is creating another roadblock to increasing the minimum wage and is actually serving in this situation to eliminate the minimum wage.

The rule, Mr. Speaker, self-executes the adoption of a concurrent resolution which otherwise would not be privileged to make this technical correction so that the minimum wage will continue to exist while orderly increases in that wage take place from \$5.15 an hour to \$5.65 and then to \$6.15 beginning January of 2002. So let no one be confused. The vote on the previous question and the vote on the rule is a vote on the minimum wage.

I would like to repeat that, Mr. Speaker, if I may. The vote on the previous question and the vote on the rule is a vote on the minimum wage. I strongly support this rule and urge my colleagues to support it as well.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART), for yielding me the customary half hour, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the concurrent resolution for which this rule provides consideration will correct one of the mistakes in the tax bill that we passed last week. The way the bill was written, rather than raising the minimum wage, it really would have eliminated it from July 1, 2000, to December 31, 2000. So this concurrent resolution attempts to fix that. The problem, Mr. Speaker, is that is all this attempts to fix.

Mr. Speaker, if my Republican colleagues are able to make changes to this bill to fix a 6-month minimum wage hiatus, I would recommend that they not stop there. This partisan tax package includes a tax break for special interests to the tune of \$28 billion at the expense of the average American people. It does not include \$25 million in interest-free financing for school construction supported by a bipartisan group of 230 Members of Congress. That bill the President said he would sign, and it would enable 6,000 American schools to be modernized.

Furthermore, the tax bill does not include funding for 100,000 new teachers, emergency school repairs, teacher training or after-school programs. Instead, Mr. Speaker, it contains tax relief for big businesses, HMOs, and insurance companies. It also does not do enough for hospitals that were hurt and hurt very badly by the balanced budget cuts in Medicare. Instead, Mr.

Speaker, it directs a disproportionate amount of funds to the HMOs, who only serve 15 percent of the Medicare enrollees but get 40 percent of the funding.

Despite a few good points, Mr. Speaker, the overall tax package is really a disaster, and I urge my colleagues to insist that it be changed by opposing the previous question. If the previous question is defeated, I will offer an amendment to fix the minimum wage and the Balanced Budget Act so they can be signed into law.

My amendment, Mr. Speaker, would also raise the national minimum wage from \$5.15 an hour to \$6.15 an hour over the next year. It will also repair some of the damage done to the hospitals by Medicare and Medicaid cuts in the Republican Balanced Budget Act by providing a full hospital and hospice inflation update for 2 years. In contrast, Mr. Speaker, the Republican bill has only a 1-year update, then it makes cuts in the second year.

Mr. Speaker, the President has made it abundantly clear that a vote for the previous question is a vote against the minimum wage. A vote for the previous question is also a vote against fixing the Medicare and Medicaid cuts made by the Republican Balanced budget amendment. So I urge my colleagues to raise the minimum wage. I urge my colleagues to strengthen Medicare and Medicaid by defeating the previous question.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1245

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT).

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I am not so sure we are talking about the same bill, with all due respect to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY). The original minimum wage bill that was included in the tax package was \$1 spread out over 3 years. The President of the United States wanted \$1 over 2 years. I worked hard with Republican leaders to look at that aspect; and included in the tax package is a minimum wage increase of \$1 over 2 years, that the President had asked for, and it is noninflationary due to the following reason, and I support the tax provisions in the bill, and I urge the President to sign this bill.

Mr. Speaker, if that boss does not get a helping hand, he will grant that minimum wage by law, but he will lay off some of those very people we are trying to help at the bottom end of the ladder due to the constraints that may be placed upon him. I think there is fairness in this bill.

I have been listening to all of this talk about HMOs and hospitals. I want someone to tell me what hospital association or group opposes this bill? They all support the bill. But let us look now at managed care, which is really man-

aged costs. This did not just happen in the last 6 years. We have seen these dynamics in the last 20 years; and they were not fixed by either party so the private sector gave us the cold turkey. The private sector started making decisions based on dollars. I have to give credit to the bill that has been passed that is going to be sent to the President. It does make some good changes in the right direction.

Let us talk about the minimum wage. If we vote against this rule, we are voting against the minimum wage, because all it was was a technical error in the drafting that says the following: not less than \$5.15 an hour during the period ending June 30, and that was a technical error. The language should have been, during the period ending December 31 of the year 2000. We have pension reform in this bill.

Let us now talk about the school concerns my colleagues have. I support my colleagues on those school concerns, and there is a Labor-HHS bill to deal with that. It is not and should not be in a tax bill. The tax bill is specific. This particular rule makes that clerical change, the technical correction that is needed. I want to thank the leadership for doing it. I think the Democrat party should have done this on unanimous consent, and should have done it wholeheartedly. The President's \$1 over 2 years is in this tax bill, and the President should take a very good look at the tax provisions. They are good for America, they are good for workers, they are good for retirees, they are good for investment, they are good for the boss, and they are good for the workers.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM).

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I am constantly amazed at the rhetoric on this floor. The vote on the rule and the previous question has nothing to do with minimum wage, but it has everything to do with correcting another mistake. It has been acknowledged that a mistake was made. Quite frankly, there are a lot of mistakes being made the way we are legislating around here, but this is an honest mistake that was made that is being corrected, and there is no disagreement from anyone on correcting that mistake.

By defeating the previous question, it will allow us to correct another mistake. The vote on this rule is a vote about allowing the House to work in a bipartisan way to provide our rural and urban hospitals, teaching hospitals, home health providers, nursing homes and beneficiaries that they get the assistance and the relief that they need. By voting against the previous question, we can vote on a responsible package that corrects the shortcomings of the Medicare package that the Republican leadership put together last week, a mistake.

Let me remind everyone, the same people that have been eloquently defending their package of what they are doing are the same people that wrote the Balanced Budget Agreement of 1997. That ought to bother some of my friends on this side. The same people.

Now, we should have a full hospital prospective payment system update for 2 years, not just 1. Our rural hospitals need certainty. They do not need the continued uncertainty. They have had themselves dug into a hole by the cuts of the Balanced Budget Agreement that the same people that wrote believe now is a new solution.

It provides improving the formula for rural disproportionate share of hospitals. In addition, the provisions in the Republican-passed bill, the proposal that we can vote on in a moment, what we are trying to offer, would provide for a higher level of reimbursement for hospitals serving low-income individuals. All of us that represent those constituents know that is needed.

It provides a 10 percent bonus for rural home health agencies to compensate for the high cost of travel, lower volume of patients seen per hour, and we know that is needed. It provides a 2-year delay in the 15 percent cut in payments for home health agencies instead of the Republicans' 1-year delay. Surely we can reach a bipartisan compromise on this.

A mistake was made. A mistake was made. We can correct this mistake by voting down the previous question.

Again, we keep talking about how do we resolve this? Why did the leadership not accept the President's offer to meet yesterday to discuss an agreement of responsible tax relief in a Medicare package that provides assistance to health care providers as well as beneficiaries instead of providing over 40 percent of the funding for HMOs? Why did we not? We keep blaming, talking about world series games and all of this. That is history. Yesterday, the President was there.

Let me repeat what I said during the previous debate so our leaders can hear clearly, because they have failed to hear previously equally blunt statements. We will not have a final agreement that allows us to leave here without making sure we have given our health care providers the relief that they must have. We can do this in a bipartisan way. We can get over this anger, we can get over all of whatever it is that we are talking about. That is what this vote is on the previous question. Vote down the previous question and allow us to correct a mistake in Medicare and Medicaid for our hospitals and providers and nursing homes.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM).

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

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I think this resolution speaks to the rea-

sons that we are here today. We could come together on a lot of things, and we have over this Congress and previous Congresses, but there is a lot at stake, and that is the election of 2000. I think there has been partisanship on both sides of the aisle, and I would say that the majority of both Republicans and Democrats detest what we have to go through here on this House floor.

I want to tell my colleagues that there are things like Medicare and the health care package that the gentleman from Texas just spoke about. Is it perfect? No. California has probably more health care providers than any other State. It was put there to cut and reduce the expanding cost of health care, but yet still give quality health care. Medicare was going to go bankrupt. I heard about Medicare cuts. Even when the President signed the Medicare bill, Republicans tried to expand, and did expand Medicare from going bankrupt over 27 years.

There is rhetoric from that side of the aisle time and time and time again. The unions put over \$100 million against our proposal to save Medicare. Even as the President signed it and now AL GORE takes credit for it, the expansion of Medicare, the leadership on that side fought against it. The Balanced Budget Agreement that I just heard about, Alan Greenspan said it is one of the key issues in why the economy is good today.

Welfare reform. We have billions of dollars coming into the government from working Americans instead of billions of dollars going out.

Capital gains reductions. My colleagues said, oh, that is just a tax break for the rich. But again, Alan Greenspan said it is one of the key factors that not only created jobs and expanded the economy, but it paid for itself.

Listen to the debate over here. Everything that expanded the economy, the Democrat leadership fought against. As a matter of fact, not a single Clinton-Gore budget ever passed the House or the Senate from 1994 through now, but yet they claim the responsibility for the economy. And in 1993, we call it a tax increase, they call it an economic package. They increased the tax on Social Security, and we did away with that. They took every dime out of the Social Security Medicare trust fund; we put it into a lockbox, but yet they fought that.

For a year the ranking minority member said, we want a tax cut for the middle class. First of all, I would ask my colleagues not to use the term "middle class." There are no middle class citizens in this country. There is middle income, but not middle class. But yet, even in that package, they increase the tax on the middle income, and we are talking about the extremism of the leadership on that side. I think after November 7, they may have a new ranking minority member on the Democrat side, because the extreme measures that the Democrats have

gone through have not served them well.

Mr. Speaker, if my colleagues on the other side want this to come together with a package that is supported by the people that we are trying to help, because the hospitals support it; the National Hospital Association supports this package. It gives them the money they needed. I have hospitals in my district, many, and because of illegals, Irish illegal immigrants, if you want, are going to emergency services, driving up the cost of health care, and the overhead and the legal liability is killing our hospitals, and they need the additional funds. The nursing homes and the rest that my colleagues quoted, those organizations support the bill. But yet, my colleagues would fight us on that side.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask that yes, we will have campaign finance reform, but it will also deal with the unions, which JOHN MCCAIN supports, by the way, but he knows that the President would veto it. Yes, I think in the new President, I think if it is Governor Bush, that we will have meaningful and workable, and you will enjoy it, non-partisanship.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), the ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

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

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from California gave a lot of answers to questions that never were asked, but if we are going to get out of this Congress, and he represents the moderate view on the other side, we have far more difficulties that I expected.

All we are asking is that we vote down the previous question to give us an opportunity to create a rule that can deal with some of the problems that keep us here locked into the Congress. I would like to believe on the question of minimum wage that there are just as many Republicans that would like to get a vote on this as there are Democrats. This would give us an opportunity not only to correct the mistake that obviously has been made by the Republicans, but to give us once again an opportunity to go to the table and work out something that we can conclude is good for the American people and go home.

□ 1300

Clearly, we have a bill before us, the St. Croix Island Heritage Act; and Republicans now are trying to put the minimum wage repeal correction on it, which means they want to correct the mistake that they have made.

We want to correct both of these mistakes by having a better rule that gives us an opportunity to have a balanced budget giveback bill that really helps the hospitals in the rural areas and the inner-cities. And, certainly,

this would give us an opportunity to get out of Washington and get back home and get into our districts.

It makes no difference how much we lock into what we honestly believe. The only way we can succeed is by coming together in some type of an agreement. We all may not get all of the things that we want, but certainly there is some basic things that we think that should be included in a bill for us to get home. The rural disproportionate share hospitals, in addition to provisions in the Republican-passed bill, provides for higher level of reimbursement for rural hospitals that are serving low-income individuals.

My colleagues are not going to tell me that any national, State, or regional hospital association would not believe that hospitals are really having fiscal problems, whether in the rural areas or whether in the inner-cities, because low-income people or working people with no insurance have an inability to pay. This is something that we should want to fix, not as Democrats, not as Republicans, but as Members of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, so as Republicans have made mistakes with the minimum wage in not wanting to repeal it in its entirety, why not come back, revisit it, and give a minimum wage for all the American people to have, and also include with that a decent tax cut for small business employers. Let us try to work together and get out of here and go home and try to earn reelection, at least for the Democrats.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the remaining time on each side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART) has 15½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY) has 20½ minutes remaining.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Maine (Mr. BALDACCI), the House sponsor of the St. Croix Island Heritage Act with the center being established in Calais, Maine.

Mr. BALDACCI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY), the ranking member, for yielding me this time and for his leadership on the Committee on Rules.

Mr. Speaker, as the sponsor of the legislation on the House side, H.R. 4815, that was a companion bill to the Senate bill that was introduced by Senator COLLINS and Senator SNOWE, I would like to just speak to that portion that deals with the St. Croix Island Heritage Act, which is located in Calais, Maine, on the border between Maine and New Brunswick. It has been referred to as St. Croix Island River, which is the international boundary between the United States and Canada, the only international historic site in the National Parks system located 8 miles down river from Calais, Maine.

St. Croix Island is the site of one of the first French attempts in 1604 to colonize the territory they called Acadia. It is one of the first locations of the earliest European settlements in North America. The island lies west of the international border and can be seen from a National Park Service sighting on the main shore of the St. Croix River. The island can also be seen from a Parks Canada facility on the New Brunswick shore of the St. Croix River.

The Down East Heritage Center, which this legislation seeks to authorize, seeks to preserve, interpret, and develop the historical, cultural, and natural resources of Maine's most eastern region, Washington County. Through the interpretation and preservation of the rich resources in this vast and rural area, the Down East Heritage Center will promote economic development, support educational programs, and become a leading destination for heritage tourism.

The Down East Heritage Center is a project of the St. Croix Economic Alliance and the Sunrise Economic Council. Historically, it has been a hub of shipping commerce on the St. Croix River. The Calais waterfront is being revitalized as part of a comprehensive waterfront development plan. In eastern Maine, a remnant of quiet wilderness flourishes. The watershed of Passamaquoddy Bay reaches from forested uplands fed by pristine brooks and rivers and dotted with ancient bog lands to tidal shores at the Bay of Fundy's mouth in the Gulf of Maine.

It is a region of enormous tides, rocky island cliffs, and seabirds colonies, rafts of seals, pods of whales, salmon runs and fishing eagles. The St. Croix River connects a wide variety of habitat that, in turn, supports a diversity of plant and animal species. It is also a place of diverse cultures from the Passamaquoddy, the "People of the Dawn," to the first European settlers on the Island of St. Croix in 1604.

I support this legislation. It is supported by the Parks Service. It is supported by the administration.

Mr. Speaker, I also would like to have entered into the RECORD the statement by the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. POMEROY), who is a frequent visitor of Calais, Maine, and has numerous friends and would like to have that entered into the RECORD.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. We have, at this point, no other speakers. We may have another.

Mr. Speaker, I was shown a copy of the previous question amendment that the minority is proposing. They propose to strike H.R. 5543, which is the Medicare giveback bill, which by the way is supported by all providers. Now, the handout that the other side has given their Members talks about HMOs and HMOs and HMOs.

No, no, no. All providers support the increase in Medicare which we have achieved, and this legislation provides

for \$31.5 billion over 5 years. Now they want to substitute it with a bill that we are still waiting for. We have not even seen a copy.

So I have learned a lot in my 8 years here, but I have to admit this is one of the most amazing things I have seen, coming to the floor and opposing legislation in the context of a technical correction with which we are seeking to keep the minimum wage on the books, and in the context of opposing that technical correction, seeking to strike legislation that provides for over \$30 billion for providers for Medicare, and not even having shown us, the other side of the aisle, a copy of the legislation.

Well, I never cease to learn in this process. But that is what the other side, our friends on the other side of the aisle, are proposing to do at this time. So it is amazing.

Mr. Speaker, what we are doing, and I want to reiterate, what we are doing is a technical correction to make sure that the minimum wage stays on the books. And so opposing the rule at this point, and opposing the previous question, I reiterate, is opposing what we are seeking to do today, which is to make sure that the minimum wage stays on the books.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume just to tell the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART) that ours does the same thing to the minimum wage as theirs does, but we just go a little further in other matters.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE).

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I ask that we defeat the previous question and allow the Democrats to bring up an initiative which the gentleman from Florida is very much aware of. It basically seeks, among other things, to correct a lot of the health care inequities that the Republicans have refused to address in this Congress.

Now, we know that what the Republican tax bill did was to basically give all the money to the HMOs, or most of the money to the HMOs because they are their special-interest friends. The Republicans refuse to bring up the Patients' Bill of Rights. They refuse to bring up a prescription drug program.

The Democrats are saying simply that we want to correct this situation and make sure if the HMOs are going to get more money that they have to provide a 3-year guarantee that they are going to continue with the program with the seniors who sign up and that they get the same level of benefits, including prescription drugs. That makes sense for the average person.

Mr. Speaker, we are worried about the average person and how they are going to benefit from these health care initiatives.

At the same time what we are saying too is that we are going to try to address the Patients' Bill of Rights in a

small way by improving the appeals provisions for Medicare beneficiaries in this bill. The other thing we have been saying is that too much money is going to the HMOs and not enough to the hospitals and the home health care agencies and the nursing homes that need more money, because a lot of them are closing or not able to provide a sufficient quality health care. So we correct that as well.

Finally, what we have been saying is that the Republicans refuse to do anything to improve the problem for the uninsured. There are 42 million Americans that have no health insurance. We passed a bill a few years ago that expanded health care insurance for children, the CHIPS program, and we have had a number of other ideas. But the Republicans instead, they come up with this above-line tax deduction in their tax bill that does not help anybody but people who already have health insurance.

Mr. Speaker, what we are doing in this motion, if we are allowed to bring it up, is we are saying we want to expand the kids health care initiative, the CHIPS program. We want to enroll more children. We are trying in a small way with our initiative here today to make sure that the HMOs have to provide the same level of benefits for 3 years. They have to make sure that there is some way to deal with the Patients' Bill of Rights and try to enroll more children. It is a small measure, but at least something for the average guy.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), vice chair of the Democratic Caucus.

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

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Florida, my dear friend, says he is amazed at what he sees on the floor. So am I.

The title of this legislation is the St. Croix Island Heritage Act. But Republicans have to use this legislation in order to fix their sloppy, inefficient, incompetent form of legislating that has been brought to the floor.

It is Republicans ramming through legislation, and I am so glad to hear Governor Bush talk about bipartisanship. He needs to make a phone call to the majority of his party here to talk to them about creating bipartisanship, because it is ramming through the legislation without even talking to Democrats that caused, in part, a major mistake, leaving minimum wage workers without protection for 6 months.

Mr. Speaker, thank God for Democrats who pointed out to the Republican majority the error which today they seek to fix. It is Democrats who fought for the minimum wage increase, bringing Republicans kicking and screaming to this issue. And who, in fact, are here today fighting once again

not only for the working men and women to fix that mistake, but also to fix the mistake they have made on our hospitals, urban, rural, and teaching hospitals, to ensure that all in the community will have the access to the services they provide.

Mr. Speaker, we deserve to fix the mistakes not only on the minimum wage, but we also deserve to fix the mistakes that Republicans have made in reference to our hospitals. They allowed, through their errors, through their process, and through ramming it through, to leave the lowest wage earners subject to the corporate excesses of the marketplace. Now they would leave our hospitals to be ravaged by the corporate excesses of the HMO.

That is something we cannot tolerate. It is not something working men and women can accept. And that is why we must defeat the previous question.

Give us an opportunity to save our hospitals, and, yes, to save the working men and women of this country who were left exposed.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, what we are doing in this legislation, and it was brought up previously by speakers on the other side of the aisle, technical mistakes are common. Unfortunately, they occur. They are scrivener errors, and they are resolved with unanimous consent requests. But what is amazing is that the unanimous consent request to fix the minimum wage, so it stays on the books for the 6 months that it would have been taken off the books if we would not have fixed it today, that fixing it would not have been agreed to by the Democrats by unanimous consent.

Mr. Speaker, that is really amazing. So we are fixing that scrivener mistake with this rule so the minimum wage will stay on the books. Again, I repeat, a vote on the previous question and a vote on the rule is a vote on the minimum wage.

In addition to that, we have legislation that the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) and others have worked on for months to provide over \$30 million to the providers, to the medical providers in this country. It is supported by the medical providers across the board. \$31.5 billion over 5 years in increases in Medicare and providers throughout the United States are supporting that measure.

□ 1315

Yet, the other side now comes with a stealth bill, a secret bill that still we are waiting to see, saying that they want to fix other issues. No, no. We have a public bill, \$31.5 billion for providers, supported by all medical providers, and we are hit, then, with a stealth bill.

So we would like to see the stealth bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, may I request the amount of time remaining for both sides.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY) has 13 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART) has 11½ minutes remaining.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER).

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, I think it is somewhat disingenuous for our friends on the Republican side to advocate their Medicare give-back bill just claiming providers support it. The truth is, if one asks any of the Medicare providers and any of the hospitals if they prefer the version that they put on the floor or the version that we are trying to offer, I can assure my colleagues they will support that which we are trying to offer.

I want to read to my colleagues a letter I have from my hospital administrator from Jasper, Texas. I am trying to help many of my rural hospitals. Here is what he has to say: "We are extremely concerned because as the present language reads in the Bill, one-third to one-half of BBA relief over 10 years would go to the HMOs, leaving less for providers and beneficiaries in East Texas."

The truth of the matter is only 16 percent of the Medicare beneficiaries in this country are enrolled in HMO Medicare+Choice plans. Under the Republican version of this bill, 40 percent of the money goes to those HMOs. That is just not right. It is not going to save our rural hospitals. We can do better.

Mr. Speaker, I include the letter from the Christus Jasper Memorial Hospital Administrator for the RECORD, as follows:

CHRISTUS JASPER
MEMORIAL HOSPITAL,
Jasper, TX, October 18, 2000.

Congressman JIM TURNER
Cannon House Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN TURNER: I am writing to you as CEO/Administrator of CHRISTUS Jasper Memorial Hospital in Jasper, Texas, a small and rural Catholic hospital serving the citizens of Southeast Texas. We are still reeling from the devastating cuts of the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 and are seeking relief at your hands. We are asking for a full market basket update from Medicare inpatient services in 2001 and 2002 and also expand health care coverage from legal immigrants.

We are extremely concerned because as the present language reads in the Bill, one-third to one-half of BBA relief over 10 years would go to HMOs, leaving less for provider and beneficiaries in East Texas, such as CHRISTUS Jasper Memorial Hospital. Further, the Bill does not prohibit HMOs from dropping benefits or leaving the community as they have done here in Texas and left many of our patients without HMO coverage. We need your help.

Also rural hospitals need additional help by passing re-basing of sole community provider status and also Medicare dependent hospital status, as we are both.

I will be glad to discuss this with you at any time concerning this very vital issue. If

you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

GEORGE N. MILLER, JR.,
CEO/Administrator.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS). Perhaps he has a copy of the stealth bill.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding me this time.

I do not have a copy of the bill that was introduced today. But if anyone wants to know what it contains, it would be a little bit like going to an editing room of a movie producer and picking up all the pieces that have been cut out of the movie on the floor and then stitching it together and calling it a movie, for example.

It is my understanding that, for hospitals, instead of the negotiated agreement, which was more generous for hospitals than was contained, for example, in the Committee on Ways and Means Subcommittee on Health bill in which all of the Democrats on the subcommittee voted unanimously, it says that hospitals should get a 2-year market basket update. Does that sound fair? Let them have a 2-year market basket update.

However, if one reviews the history of financing of hospitals, one will discover this, and I apologize for doing this, because, apparently, facts in history are supposed to be checked at the cloakroom door as we come to the floor of the House and simply make up whatever moves someone about dollar amounts or percentage payments. But for what it is worth, the last time hospitals got a 1-year market basket update was in 1985. The average over the last decade for market basket updates have been market basket minus 1.7.

So what is being provided in the bill that passed the floor is market basket the 1st year, so for the first time since 1985, and then an adjustment from current law, which is market basket 1.1. That is six-tenths of a point better than what they have averaged over the last decade. We cut that in half. So it is twice as good as current law in terms of the percentage adjustment. We continue that for 2 more years. The hospitals have said that is fine. They are comfortable.

Now, what I hear is one of the most amazing arguments one will ever hear anywhere. Well, but the providers would like our bill better. Well, if they thought it had a chance of becoming reality, they would. Who would turn down more money? The question that one really has to put to the providers: Do you want the bird in hand, or do you want try to get the bird in the bush? The answer is the providers are more than happy with what we have done.

However, what one really needs to do is take a look at the bill, when and if we get a copy in legislative language. I know it was introduced about 20 min-

utes ago. What one will find is, for example, our friends on the other side using arguments like a 2-year freeze on the graduate medical education. The phrase they use is from their notes: Provides help to the Nation's premier teaching and research hospitals.

Read that in New York City. New York City has ripped off the graduate medical education program for more than a decade, funding their basic welfare costs out of the Federal taxpayers. Last year, with the agreements of the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) and the Senator from New York, Mr. MOYNIHAN, that we would in the 1999 refinement bill make these modest adjustments to begin to create a more level playing field between all of our fine teaching hospitals; and this attempts to undo that agreement.

But when one reads on, one finds that, in fact, just last night, we defeated a motion to instruct to require Medicare+Choice programs to stay in an area for 3 years. Of course all the arguments made were the correct ones. But here we go. They lost last night, and guess what? Off of the cutting room floor is another little snippet picked up and folded back in, exactly the same thing.

But when one begins to read the fine print in terms of their reaching out to assist various groups, especially in the area of disabled children, who does not want to help disabled children? But while AL GORE points to Governor Bush and says he has a tax cut for the wealthiest 1 percent, what we have in this bill is a benefit for disabled children whose families, whose families have a 600 percent of poverty level. How ironic. The same 1 percent that AL GORE says are being benefited by George Bush's tax provision, they want to provide disabled children assistance, 600 percent of poverty. That is the kind of fine tuning they want for these government programs.

When one takes a look at this package, it is all of the snippets from the cutting room floor. There really is not anything about patient protections. There is not anything about prescription drugs. It is a clear attempt to run through programs that were brought up, voted down in committee, but desired nonetheless to produce a package that is conservatively in the \$50 billion to \$60 billion range. But of course we do not know for sure. We have not seen the language of the bill itself. Of course, the Congressional Budget Office has not scored it.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN).

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

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, there is no mystery. There is nothing stealth about what we are doing. We are taking a bill that my colleagues put together, putting accountability into it for HMOs, and adding the provisions that many of us have been working for

and the President laid out clearly in his veto message or the message which indicated he might veto it. There is nothing secretive about it.

The reason hospitals are in difficult shape the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) talks about since the mid-1980s, is because, in 1997, behind closed doors, talking about a stealth procedure, there were cuts made in reimbursement provisions way beyond what anyone imagined. The impact of those cuts is way beyond, way beyond what anyone expected.

Let me just mention the provisions that we are working for. The gentleman from California (Mr. ROHR-ABACHER), an hour ago, came to this floor in vain against illegal immigrants. I think he misshaped that argument saying we were trying to totally open the doors. No, we wanted equity for people who are here under the same circumstances as we granted amnesty to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART) for those people that he represents.

Now we are arguing that legal immigrants, legal immigrants should be able, under State option, to receive Medicaid benefits. There is a letter here from three Governors urging that my colleagues grant it, including the Governor of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART). He just gives it the back of his hand, no the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART) personally. Because we stood out on the grass here a month ago, or whenever it was, urging that the gentleman's party grant the States the right to cover children and pregnant women legal immigrants. His party says no to it.

Now, in terms of hospitals, look, all we are suggesting is, in the 2nd year, my colleagues not cut, because of the impact of the 1997 balanced budget agreement. There is nothing revolutionary. I know where my hospitals, the ones that I represent and in the metropolitan area are. They want something other than my colleagues have provided in this bill.

People with Lou Gehrig's Disease, they will not act. People who have other needs, other preventative conditions, they act on some, but they will not act on others. So we have been pleading with them to do so.

We have also asked, in terms of the Children's Health Initiative Program, for some assistance to the States so they will do better than Texas in terms of covering uninsured kids.

There is nothing stealth about this. It is very much in the open. We want a better bill than my colleagues have provided, a considerably better bill. Give us the chance. Their fear is, if we can bring it up, so many Members on their side will vote with us, we will pass it.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I have no doubt that the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) has knowledge, has personal

knowledge of a number of the items that he is pushing and that he is proposing, and some of which I very much agree with. I have no doubt.

What I am saying when I say stealth legislation is that we do not have a copy, and it was filed 20 minutes ago. That is what I am saying. That cannot be denied.

So the reality of the matter is that we are debating here with regard to large figures and significant pieces of legislation which are included in a bill that has just been filed.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS).

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I want just to briefly indicate, and I know the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) feels strongly about the issue, he referenced the current law of the land as having been written behind closed doors. Perhaps he was not in the room when I indicated that the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) and the Senator from New York, Mr. MOYNIHAN, were in the room when we dealt with the issues in the Refinement Act of 1999.

I believe the closed door session he was referring to was the one that produced the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 on which was voted on in the Committee on Ways and Means, passed 34 to 1, came to the floor, was passed overwhelmingly, and which the administration negotiated and requested reductions, further reductions in payments to hospitals and other health care providers.

In fact, the President's budget at that time said that the Medicare providers should be reduced by more than \$125 billion over the 10 years. We fought the President. We thought it should not have been cut that much.

Yet, here we are being criticized for making sure that they were not cut as much as their President wanted to cut them, and it was not behind closed doors. In fact, it was participated in by the administration. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) should be pleased that Republicans fought back against the President's \$125 billion additional cuts so that the adjustments that we are making now are modest ones referred to both in the 1999 bill and in this one as refinements instead of massive needs to infuse if, in fact, the President's program had been agreed to.

We did not think it was right then. We do not think it is right now. The idea of a balanced modest refinement of about \$30 billion is appropriate. This particular bill we believe is about \$50 billion to \$60 billion, consisting of all the items that were left on the cutting room floor when a reasonable and appropriate package were put together.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, may I again inquire as to the time remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 8½

minutes remaining. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART) has 3½ minutes remaining.

□ 1330

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN).

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, I come to the House floor today to urge a "no" vote on the previous question in order that we may bring up a clean minimum wage increase bill and a clean Medicare giveback bill. The resolution that we have before us today does not give us the opportunity to focus on what is one of the most important pieces of legislation before this Congress.

For 2 years, we have been hearing from constituents in the health care community about the dire need to restore funding cuts made in the Medicare program in 1997. The Medicare funding is vital to rural and teaching hospitals, home health agencies and others who were put in financial distress by those Medicare cuts of 1997 and literally could mean the difference between staying open and having to shut their doors.

In my southern Wisconsin district, the additional payments are badly needed for providers like St. Clare Hospital in Baraboo and the Monroe Hospital and Clinics. It is time to stop playing politics with these vital issues that so strongly impact the lives and health of the people that we represent.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. LUTHER).

Mr. LUTHER. Mr. Speaker, I am here to highlight certain language that is in the Democratic alternative. The language I refer to was language that was introduced earlier this year by the gentleman from New Mexico (Mrs. WILSON) and myself. We introduced the legislation back in July of this year, and it was also included in the Medicare giveback bill that was reported out of the House Committee on Commerce. The language recognizes the great disparity that exists today between the costs and benefits of what seniors in States like Minnesota and New Mexico receive compared to what seniors in other States receive.

Our language will establish new minimum floor payments and provide relief to Minnesota seniors who are unfairly treated under the Medicare+Choice program. Unfortunately, health plans have been rapidly withdrawing from Medicare+Choice in Minnesota. Those that have remained in the program offer Minnesota seniors only minimal health care coverage, along with high premiums and copayments. However, in other States with high reimbursement rates, seniors enjoy Medicare benefits such as prescription drug coverage at no additional cost. This is unfair. Our legislation takes an important first step in rectifying that problem and in creating the right kind of incentives for an efficient health care delivery system in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the sponsors of the Democratic alternative for including this language in the alternative.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the previous question, because only if the previous question is defeated will the House be permitted to correct the minimum wage and the Medicare giveback measures in a way that they can be enacted into law.

Mr. Speaker, if the previous question is defeated, I will offer a germane amendment to the rule to fix the small business bill so that the President will sign it.

Mr. Speaker, the text of my amendment is as follows:

PREVIOUS QUESTION AMENDMENT CONFERENCE REPORT ON THE SAINT CROIX ISLAND HERITAGE ACT

In the resolution, strike section 3 and insert the following:

"SEC. 3. The text specified in section 2 is as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring). That in the enrollment of the bill (H.R. 2614), to amend the Small Business Investment Act to make improvements to the certified development company program, and for other purposes, the Clerk of the House of Representatives shall make the following corrections:

(1) In section 1, insert before "are hereby enacted into law" the following: "as modified in accordance with section 3".

(2) In section 2, insert before the period at the end the following: ", modified in accordance with section 3".

(3) Add at the end the following new section:

SEC. 3. MODIFICATION TO TEXT OF BILL ENACTED BY REFERENCE AND MODIFICATION OF A REFERENCE.

The modification referred to in sections 1 and 2 is to the text of the bill H.R. 5538, as referred to in section 1(I), and is as follows: The text of such bill is modified by striking all after the enacting clause and inserting the following:

"SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

"This Act may be cited as the 'Minimum Wage Act of 2000'.

"SEC. 2. MINIMUM WAGE INCREASE.

"Paragraph (1) of section 6(a) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 206(a)) is amended to read as follows:

"(1) except as otherwise provided in this section. Not less than \$5.15 an hour during the period ending December 31, 2000, not less than \$5.65 an hour during the year beginning January 1, 2001, and not less than \$6.15 an hour beginning January 1, 2002;".

SEC. 2. CHANGE OF BILL NUMBER REFERRED TO IN CONFERENCE REPORT.

In the enrollment of the bill referred to in the first section of this resolution, the Clerk shall make the following correction: in section 1(3), strike "H.R. 5543, as introduced on October 25, 2000" and insert "H.R. 5601, as introduced on October 30, 2000".

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

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) for a point he wants to make.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding me this time.

I just want to remind all my colleagues on the other side of the aisle

that if they do want to support this legislation, they must understand that with the \$20-plus billion they are putting in both for graduate medical education, for hospitals, and for the other payment increases, that it in fact increases the Medicare+Choice amount as well.

For all of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle who have been indicating they do not want money to go to the Medicare+Choice programs, I just do believe as a matter of honesty that they need to know that if they support the language in their bill, the Medicare+Choice payments will go up significantly, perhaps as much as \$10 billion to \$15 billion.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to urge adoption of the rule and remind my colleagues that this is a vote on the minimum wage. It is a vote on the previous question and then the vote on the rule, but they are votes on the minimum wage.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, today, Representative DINGELL and I introduced a bill, H.R. 5601, to improve greatly the Medicare and Medicaid bill currently pending before the House and Senate.

The following outline describes how we would have significantly improved the nation's health care programs.

We saw an opportunity this morning to offer this bill as an amendment to other legislation today, so it was assembled quickly, and I apologize for any technical errors or oversights. Basically, the bill takes the Republican-passed Medicare and Medicaid give-backs bill, cleans up some problems in their coverage and appeals area, and adds in the various items included in the Administration's letter explaining how the bill should be changed to avoid a veto (the Shalala-Lew letter).

Mr. Speaker, Democrats will keep trying to improve the Republican Medicare and Medicaid bill. We ask that the majority stop the stonewalling and negotiate with us so that we can mutually deliver a comprehensive improvement in these key social programs.

DEFEAT THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: ALLOW DEMOCRATS TO OFFER THE FOLLOWING AMENDMENT
DEMOCRATS TAKE REPUBLICAN-PASSED MEDICARE/MEDICAID GIVE-BACKS BILL AND MAKE MAJOR IMPROVEMENTS

The alternative includes all the provisions which passed the House Thursday in HR 2614, and makes the following changes and additions:

Full hospital Prospective Payment System update for two years; The Republican bill had only a one year update, and cuts in the next two years. Hospitals reeling from BBA cuts need two years of full inflation adjustment.

Graduate Medical Education Payments, 2 year freeze at the 6.5 percent, compared to Republican-passed one year freeze, and a cut in the second year. Provides help to nation's premier teaching and research hospitals.

Rural Disproportionate Share Hospitals: in addition to the provisions in the Republican-passed bill, provides for a higher level of reimbursement for rural hospitals serving low income individuals.

Nursing Home staffing and quality: includes bipartisan proposals to provide an additional \$1 billion/5 years to assist nursing homes on improving staffing. Recent studies show that many homes need to make major improvements in staffing levels.

Home health agencies: provides a 2 year delay in the 15 percent cut in payments instead of the Republicans 1-year delay.

Rural home health agencies, provide a 10 percent bonus for service in rural areas to compensate for the high cost of travel, lower volume of patients seen per hour.

Hospice, full two year update, in lieu of the Republicans one-year update. Hospices need increased payments to deal with soaring cost of pharmaceuticals.

Puerto Rico Hospitals, improved payments. The Democratic bill includes the Ways and Means Health Subcommittee and Senate Finance Committee proposal to increase Puerto Rican hospital payments, which was dropped in the Republican-only negotiations.

Medicare+Choice program: Retains the payment improvements in the Republican-passed bill, but provides increases only if the plan commits to stay in a community with a defined package of benefits for a three year period.

Medicare Coverage for Individuals with ALS (Lou Gherig's disease): Waives 24-month waiting period for individuals diagnosed with ALS so that they can become eligible for coverage under Medicare immediately. Because of the speed with which ALS progresses, these individuals would likely otherwise be dead before ever getting Medicare coverage. Capps bill cosponsored by 282 House Members.

Medicare Appeals provision: makes the provision in the Republican-passed bill workable and similar to the Patient Bill of Rights protections for Medicare beneficiaries.

Needlestick safety for workers in public hospitals.

Hospital-based SNF and Home Health Agency geographic reclassification (provision from Commerce Committee-reported bill).

MEDICAID AND CHIP PROVISIONS—FROM COMMERCE-PASSED BIPARTISAN PACKAGE

Medicaid Disproportionate Share Hospital (DSH) Increased Payments: Freeze Medicaid DSH cuts at 2000 levels. Annual update of DSH allotment for inflation beginning in 2001 and thereafter, and eliminates the "cliff" in FY 2003 allotments that was in the Republican bill.

Optional Coverage of Legal Immigrant Children and Pregnant Women in Medicaid and CHIP: States may extend coverage to legal immigrant children and pregnant women who have lawfully resided in the U.S. for 2 years. Sponsors of immigrants would not incur a debt for cost of Medicaid benefits provided and not asked to repay the value of medical care after the 2-year period had been met.

Improved/Expanded Outreach Sites for enrollment in Medicaid and CHIP: State option to allow additional entities to determine children "presumptively eligible" for health insurance in Medicaid or CHIP.

Improving Welfare to Work Transition: Extends Transitional Medicaid Assistance (TMA) program for one additional year. (This program provides Medicaid health insurance for up to one year for families [up to 185 percent of poverty] who are transitioning from welfare to work.) Gives states the option to simplify requirements for reporting eligibility. Gives states that already cover individuals up to 185 percent the option to be exempt from TMA requirement.

Improved Outreach/Enrollment in Cost-Sharing Assistance Programs for Low-Income Medicare Beneficiaries: Secretary of HHS to consult with states, beneficiary groups to develop a simplified application form for applying for Qualified Medicare Beneficiary (QMB) and Specified Low-Income Medicare Beneficiary (SLMB) programs. Sec-

retary would make form available in all Social Security offices, as well as other sites frequented by seniors within one year of enactment.

Health Insurance for Disabled Children: Democrats include the Family Opportunity Act which allows working families with incomes above the Social Security limit to buy-in to Medicaid coverage.

Medicaid recognition of physician assistant (PA) services.

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 2485, an act to develop a regional heritage center for the St. Croix Island International Historic Site in Calais, Maine.

As we prepare to celebrate the bicentennial of the historic Lewis and Clark expedition opening up the West, it is also important to note that the 400th anniversary of the first European settlements established in North America—including the St. Croix Island settlement established 396 years ago.

This site—the St. Croix Island—is a strikingly beautiful site in the St. Croix River, the river which forms the border between the United States and Canada. As such, it is a jointly operated site by the United States and Canada—the only internationally operated historic site in the entire park system.

I have been to the areas in each of the last 5 years and have found it to be a fascinating area to explore and learn about its rich history.

With the approaching anniversary, it is important to move now to get the infrastructure in place to facilitate those who will come to the area in the years ahead.

I am pleased to see the bill providing for the construction of a heritage center at Calais, Maine as part of this infrastructure. Calais is a delightful town in wonderful Washington County and is close to the island while being a crossroads for international traffic and tourism. It will enhance and increase tourist interest in this important historic site. I have become well acquainted with the people of Calais over the last several summers and have found them to be friendly and helpful to those visiting the area. They will be a great host for the center.

I commend Representative JOHN BALDACCI for his leadership in getting this matter brought to the floor for our action today. He is a great ambassador for his district and, as our legislative action on this matter represents, a very effective representative of the region in Congress.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Democratic amendment to be offered by Mr. MOAKLEY if the vote on the previous question is defeated. This amendment would make vast improvements over the legislation offered by the Republican leadership.

In my home state of Michigan and in every other state across the country, Medicare and Medicaid beneficiaries and providers are looking to Congress to address the program cuts enacted in 1997. The Republican leadership offered a bill last week that was woefully inadequate—it omitted key beneficiary protections, shortchanged providers, and dumped billions of dollars to HMOs without requiring any accountability.

The Democratic alternative includes the good provisions of the Republican bill, but makes up the difference where the Republican bill fell short. The Democratic amendment includes program improvements for seniors, the disabled, working families, pregnant women, and children. The bill improves outreach and enrollment for low-income seniors in cost-sharing assistance programs; allows families to

keep health insurance coverage as the transition from welfare to work; allows states the option to provide health insurance coverage to legal immigrant children and pregnant women; and provides working families the opportunity to buy-in to Medicaid coverage for their disabled child.

The Democratic amendment also includes additional assistance to providers who are still reeling from the cuts they took in the 1997 Balanced Budget Act—providers like home health agencies, nursing homes, and hospitals that serve a disproportionate share of the low-income and uninsured.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this amendment. Our providers and beneficiaries back home are counting on it.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

Mr. MOAKLEY. 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.

Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device, if ordered, will be taken on the question of agreeing to the resolution.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 189, nays 169, not voting 74, as follows:

[Roll No. 582]

YEAS—189

Aderholt	Cubin	Hayes
Army	Cunningham	Hayworth
Bachus	Davis (VA)	Herger
Baker	Deal	Hill (MT)
Baldacci	DeLay	Hilleary
Ballenger	DeMint	Hobson
Barrett (NE)	Diaz-Balart	Hoekstra
Bartlett	Doolittle	Horn
Barton	Dreier	Hostettler
Bass	Duncan	Houghton
Bereuter	Dunn	Hunter
Biggert	Ehlers	Hutchinson
Bilbray	Ehrlich	Hyde
Bilirakis	Emerson	Isakson
Bliley	English	Istook
Blunt	Ewing	Jenkins
Boehlert	Fletcher	Johnson (CT)
Boehner	Foley	Johnson, Sam
Bonilla	Fossella	Jones (NC)
Bono	Frelinghuysen	Kelly
Bryant	Gallegly	Kingston
Burr	Ganske	Knollenberg
Burton	Gekas	Kuykendall
Buyer	Gibbons	LaHood
Callahan	Gilchrest	Largent
Calvert	Gillmor	Latham
Camp	Gilman	LaTourette
Canady	Goode	Leach
Cannon	Goodlatte	Lewis (CA)
Castle	Goodling	Lewis (KY)
Chabot	Goss	Linder
Chambliss	Graham	LoBiondo
Chenoweth-Hage	Granger	Lucas (OK)
Coble	Green (WI)	Manzullo
Coburn	Greenwood	McCreery
Collins	Gutknecht	McHugh
Combest	Hall (TX)	McKeon
Cook	Hansen	Miller (FL)
Cox	Hastings (WA)	Miller, Gary

Moran (KS)	Rogan
Morella	Rogers
Myrick	Rohrabacher
Nethercutt	Ros-Lehtinen
Ney	Roukema
Northup	Royce
Norwood	Ryan (WI)
Nussle	Ryun (KS)
Packard	Salmon
Paul	Sanford
Pease	Saxton
Peterson (MN)	Schaffer
Peterson (PA)	Sensenbrenner
Petri	Sessions
Pickering	Shadegg
Pitts	Sherwood
Pombo	Shimkus
Porter	Simpson
Portman	Skeen
Pryce (OH)	Smith (MI)
Quinn	Smith (NJ)
Ramstad	Smith (TX)
Regula	Souder
Reynolds	Spence

NAYS—169

Andrews	Gutierrez
Baca	Hall (OH)
Baird	Hill (IN)
Baldwin	Hinchee
Barcia	Hinojosa
Barrett (WI)	Hoeffel
Becerra	Holden
Bentsen	Holt
Berkley	Hooley
Berman	Hoyer
Berry	Inslee
Bishop	Jackson (IL)
Blagojevich	Jackson-Lee
Blumenauer	(TX)
Bonior	Jefferson
Borski	John
Boswell	Kennedy
Boyd	Kildee
Brady (PA)	Kilpatrick
Capps	Kind (WI)
Capuano	Klecicka
Cardin	Kucinich
Carson	Lampson
Clay	Larson
Clayton	Lee
Clement	Levin
Clyburn	Lewis (GA)
Condit	Lofgren
Costello	Lowey
Coyne	Lucas (KY)
Cramer	Luther
Cummings	Maloney (CT)
Davis (FL)	Markey
DeFazio	Matsui
DeGette	McCarthy (NY)
DeLauro	McDermott
Deutsch	McGovern
Dicks	McIntyre
Dingell	McKinney
Dixon	McNulty
Doggett	Meehan
Doolittle	Meek (FL)
Doyle	Meeke (NY)
Edwards	Menendez
Engel	Millender-
Eshoo	McDonald
Etheridge	Miller, George
Evans	Minge
Farr	Mink
Filner	Moakley
Ford	Mollohan
Frost	Moore
Gedjenson	Moran (VA)
Gephardt	Murtha
Gonzalez	Nadler
Gordon	Napolitano
Green (TX)	Oberstar

NOT VOTING—74

Abercrombie	Danner
Ackerman	Davis (IL)
Allen	Delahunt
Archer	Dickey
Barr	Everett
Boucher	Fattah
Brady (TX)	Forbes
Brown (FL)	Fowler
Brown (OH)	Frank (MA)
Campbell	Frank (NJ)
Conyers	Hastings (FL)
Cooksey	Hefley
Crane	Hilliard
Crowley	Hulshof

Stump	Mascara
Sununu	McCarthy (MO)
Sweeney	McCollum
Tancredo	McInnis
Tauzin	McIntosh
Terry	Metcalfe
Thomas	Mica
Thornberry	Neal
Thune	Ose
Tiahrt	Oxley
Toomey	Pascrell
Traficant	Payne
Upton	Pickett
Vitter	Radanovich
Walden	Riley
Walsh	Sawyer
Wamp	Scarborough
Watts (OK)	Shaw
Weldon (PA)	Shays
Weller	Shuster
Wicker	Snyder
Wilson	Spratt
Young (AK)	
Young (FL)	

Payne	Stark
Pickett	Stearns
Radanovich	Talent
Riley	Taylor (NC)
Sawyer	Watkins
Scarborough	Weldon (FL)
Shaw	Weyand
Shays	Whitfield
Shuster	Wise
Snyder	Wolf
Spratt	

□ 1356

Mr. OWENS, Mr. FARR of California, and Ms. BERKLEY changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. SALMON changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:
Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 582, I was unable to vote. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

Stated against:
Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 582, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The question is on the resolution.

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered. The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 348, noes 0, answered “present” 1, not voting 83, as follows:

[Roll No. 583]

AYES—348

Aderholt	Callahan	Dingell
Andrews	Calvert	Dixon
Army	Camp	Doggett
Baca	Canady	Dooley
Bachus	Cannon	Doolittle
Baird	Capps	Doyle
Baker	Capuano	Dreier
Baldacci	Cardin	Duncan
Baldwin	Carson	Dunn
Balenger	Castle	Edwards
Barrett (NE)	Chabot	Ehlers
Barrett (WI)	Chambliss	Ehrlich
Bartlett	Chenoweth-Hage	Emerson
Bass	Clay	Engel
Becerra	Clayton	English
Bentsen	Clement	Eshoo
Bereuter	Clyburn	Etheridge
Berkley	Coble	Evans
Berman	Coburn	Ewing
Berry	Collins	Farr
Biggert	Combest	Filner
Bilbray	Condit	Fletcher
Bilirakis	Cook	Foley
Blagojevich	Costello	Ford
Bliley	Cox	Fossella
Blumenauer	Coyne	Frelinghuysen
Blunt	Cramer	Frost
Boehlert	Cubin	Gallegly
Boehner	Cummings	Ganske
Bonilla	Davis (FL)	Gedjenson
Bonior	Davis (VA)	Gekas
Bono	Deal	Gephardt
Borski	DeFazio	Gibbons
Boswell	DeGette	Gilchrest
Boyd	DeLauro	Gillmor
Brady (PA)	DeLay	Gonzalez
Bryant	DeMint	Goode
Burr	Deutsch	Goodlatte
Burton	Diaz-Balart	Goodling
Buyer	Dicks	Gordon

Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hinchee
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inlee
Isakson
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kelly
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
Kingston
Klecza
Knollenberg
Kucinich
Kuykendall
LaHood
Lampson
Largent
Larson
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Manzullo
Markey
Matsui

McCarthy (NY)
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Millender-
McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Packard
Pallone
Pastor
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Rahall
Ramstad
Regula
Reyes
Reynolds
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo

Salmon
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sanford
Saxton
Schaffer
Schakowsky
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Soudier
Spence
Stabenow
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tierney
Toomey
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Velazquez
Visclosky
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

McInnis
McIntosh
Metcalfe
Mica
Neal
Ose
Oxley
Pascrell
Payne
Pickett
Price (NC)

Radanovich
Rangel
Riley
Sawyer
Scarborough
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Snyder
Spratt
Stark

Stearns
Stenholm
Talent
Taylor (NC)
Waters
Watkins
Weldon (FL)
Weygand
Whitfield
Wise

the bill H.R. 2614, the Certified Development Company Program Improvements Act of 2000—"yea"; rollcall No. 583, on agreeing to H. Res. 663—"aye".

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent today when the House debated and voted "On Approving the Journal", H.J. Res. 120 "Further Continuing Appropriations for FY 2001", "On a Motion on the Hour of Meeting", on "Ordering the Previous Question on H. Res. 662 Providing for consideration of certain joint resolutions making further continuing appropriations for FY 2001", on H. Res. 662 "Providing for consideration of certain joint resolutions making further continuing appropriations for FY 2001", on "Ordering the Previous Question on H. Res. 663 Providing for consideration of S. 2485; and Corrections in the enrollment of H.R. 2614", and on H. Res. 662, "Providing for consideration of S. 2485; and Corrections in the enrollment of H.R. 2614."

Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on "Approving the Journal" (rollcall vote 577), "aye" on H.J. Res. 120 (rollcall vote 578), "aye" on a "Motion on the Hour of Meeting" (rollcall vote 579), "aye" on "Ordering the Previous Question on H. Res. 662" (rollcall vote 580), "aye" on H. Res. 662 (rollcall vote 581), "aye" on "Ordering the Previous Question on H. Res. 663" (rollcall vote 582), and "aye" on H. Res. 663 (rollcall vote 583).

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained and could not vote on rollcalls No. 582 and 583. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" for each of these measures.

SAINT CROIX ISLAND HERITAGE ACT

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 663, I call up the Senate bill (S. 2485) to direct the Secretary of the Interior to provide assistance in planning and constructing a regional heritage center in Calais, Maine, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The text of S. 2485 is as follows:
S. 2485

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Saint Croix Island Heritage Act".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS AND PURPOSES.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) Saint Croix Island is located in the Saint Croix River, a river that is the boundary between the State of Maine and Canada;

(2) the Island is the only international historic site in the National Park System;

(3) in 1604, French nobleman Pierre Dugua Sieur de Mons, accompanied by a courageous group of adventurers that included Samuel Champlain, landed on the Island and began the construction of a settlement;

(4) the French settlement on the Island in 1604 and 1605 was the initial site of the first permanent settlement in the New World, predating the English settlement of 1607 at Jamestown, Virginia;

□ 1404
So the resolution was agreed to.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:
Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 583, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."
Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 583, I was not unable to vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Pursuant to House Resolution 663, House Concurrent Resolution 439 is hereby adopted.

The text of House Concurrent Resolution 439 is as follows:

"Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That, in the enrollment of the bill (H.R. 2614) to amend the Small Business Investment Act to make improvements to the certified development company program, and for other purposes, the Clerk of the House of Representatives shall make the following corrections:

"(1) In section 1, insert before 'are hereby enacted into law' the following: ', as modified in accordance with section 3,'.

"(2) In section 2, insert before the period at the end the following: ', modified in accordance with section 3'.

"(3) Add at the end the following new section:

"SEC. 3. MODIFICATION TO TEXT OF BILL ENACTED BY REFERENCE.

"The modification referred to in sections 1 and 2 is to the text of the bill H.R. 5538, as referred to in section 1(1), and is as follows: the quoted matter in the amendment proposed to be made by section 2 of such bill is modified by striking "June 30, 2000" and inserting "December 31, 2000"."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, on October 30, due to the need to be with my wife during her surgery, I was unable to cast my vote during the following rollcall votes. Had I been present, I would have voted as indicated below.

Rollcall No. 577, on approving the Journal—"yea"; rollcall No. 578, on passage of H.J. Res. 120: making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2001, and for other purposes—"yea"; rollcall No. 579, on setting the Hour of Meeting—"yea"; rollcall No. 580, on ordering the previous question. H. Res. 662: providing for consideration of certain joint resolutions making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2001, and for other purposes—"yea"; rollcall No. 581, on agreeing to H. Res. 662—"yea"; rollcall No. 582, on ordering the previous question, H. Res. 663: providing for consideration of S. 2485, the St. Croix Island Heritage Act, and providing for the adoption of a concurrent resolution to make certain corrections in the enrollment of

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Paul

NOT VOTING—83

Abercrombie	Cunningham	Johnson, E. B.
Ackerman	Danner	Jones (OH)
Allen	Davis (IL)	Kanjorski
Archer	Delahunt	Kaptur
Barcia	Dickey	Kasich
Barr	Everett	King (NY)
Barton	Fattah	Klink
Bishop	Forbes	Kolbe
Boucher	Fowler	LaFalce
Brady (TX)	Frank (MA)	Lantos
Brown (FL)	Franks (NJ)	Lazio
Brown (OH)	Gilman	Lipinski
Campbell	Green (TX)	Maloney (NY)
Conyers	Hastings (FL)	Martinez
Cooksey	Hefley	Mascara
Crane	Hilliard	McCarthy (MO)
Crowley	Hulshof	McCollum