Waxman	Wexler	Woolsey
Weiner	Wilson	Wu

NOES—183

Armey	Goodlatte	Pickering
Bachus	Goodling	Pitts
Baker	Goss	Pombo
Ballenger	Graham	Porter
Barrett (NE)	Granger	Portman
Bartlett	Green (WI)	Pryce (OH)
Barton	Greenwood	Quinn
Bass	Gutknecht	Radanovich
Biggert	Hansen	Ramstad
Bilirakis	Hastings (WA)	Regula
Bliley	Hayes	Reynolds
Blunt	Hayworth	Rogan
Boehlert	Herger	Rogers
Boehner	Hill (MT)	Rohrabacher
Bonilla	Hilleary	Ros-Lehtinen
Bono	Hobson	Royce
Brady (TX)	Hoekstra	Ryan (WI)
Bryant	Hostettler	Ryun (KS)
Burr	Houghton	Sabo
Burton	Hunter	Salmon
Buyer	Hutchinson	Sanford
Callahan	Isakson	Scarborough
Calvert	Istook	Schaffer
Camp	Jenkins	Sensenbrenner
Canady	Johnson (CT)	Sessions
Cannon	Johnson, Sam	Shadegg
Castle	Kelly	Sherwood
Chabot	King (NY)	Shimkus
Chambliss	Kingston	Simpson
Chenoweth-Hage	Knollenberg	Skeen
Coble	Kuykendall	Smith (MI)
Coburn	LaHood	Smith (TX)
Collins	Largent	Smith (WA)
Combest	Latham	Souder
Cook	Lewis (CA)	Spence
Cox	Lewis (KY)	Stearns
Cubin	Linder	Stump
Cunningham	Lucas (OK)	Sununu
Davis (VA)	Manzullo	Sweeney
Deal	McCrery	Tauzin
DeLay	McHugh	Taylor (NC)
DeMint	McKeon	Terry
Diaz-Balart	Mica	Thomas
Doolittle	Miller (FL)	Thornberry
Dreier	Miller, Gary	Thune
Duncan	Minge	Tiahrt
Dunn	Moran (KS)	Toomey
Ehlers	Myrick	Traficant
Ehrlich	Nethercutt	Upton
English	Ney	Vitter
Everett	Northup	Walden
Ewing	Norwood	Walsh
Fletcher	Nussle	Wamp
Foley	Oberstar	Weldon (FL)
Fossella	Ose	Weldon (PA)
Frelinghuysen	Packard	Weller
Gallegly	Paul	Whitfield
Gekas	Pease	Wicker
Gibbons	Peterson (MN)	Wolf
Gilchrest	Peterson (PA)	Young (AK)
Goode	Petri	Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—79

Abercrombie	Gordon	Metcalf
Allen	Gutierrez	Moran (VA)
Archer	Hastings (FL)	Murtha
Barr	Hefley	Owens
Becerra	Hilliard	Oxley
Bereuter	Hulshof	Pascrell
Bishop	Hyde	Pickett
Boucher	Kanjorski	Riley
Brady (PA)	Kaptur	Sanchez
Brown (FL)	Kasich	Shaw
Campbell	Kennedy	Shays
Clay	Kilpatrick	Shuster
Clayton	Klink	Snyder
Conyers	Kolbe	Spratt
Cooksey	LaFalce	Stark
Crane	Lantos	Stupak
Crowley	LaTourette	Talent
Danner	Lazio	Tancredo
Davis (IL)	Lipinski	Thompson (MS)
Delahunt	Martinez	Visclosky
Dickey	McCollum	Watkins
Dooley	McInnis	Watts (OK)
Forbes	McIntosh	Weygand
Fowler	McIntyre	Wise
Frank (MA)	Meehan	Wynn
Franks (NJ)	Meek (FL)	
Gillmor	Menendez	

2055

Messrs. CANADY of Florida, ISTOOK and MINGE and Mrs. CHENOWETH-HAGE and Mrs. KELLY changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the motion to instruct was not agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOUR OF MEETING ON MONDAY, OCTOBER 30, 2000

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I move that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow for morning hour debate, and 10 a.m. for legislative business.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate from Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H.J. Res. 119. Joint Resolution making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2001, and for other purposes.

HOW MUCH IS ENOUGH?

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

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, there is a simple question we confront tonight as we have moved in this common sense Congress to reach compromise and consensus in a bipartisan fashion. That is, after agreeing to many provisions on both sides of the aisle, with what some would call reasonable and others would call overly generous spending packages, Mr. Speaker, we are facing this question: How much is enough?

I would turn to the legislation we passed at midweek last week in this 106th Congress, reasonable plans that offered tax relief, but more importantly, ordered a Medicare refinement and restoration plan needed for our hospitals, needed for our home health care, needed for our nursing homes, and other provisions actually requested by the President of the United States who came to Arizona to embrace a new markets initiative, part and parcel of the bill we passed last week, and yet sadly so many people on the other side voted against it.

Mr. Speaker, how much is enough?

HOW MUCH MORE DOES THE PRESIDENT WANT?

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

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, I think a lot of the American people are surprised that the Congress is still in session. I think a lot of people back in my district cannot believe that we have not resolved our differences. This chart is a little hard to read, but it follows on with what the gentleman from Arizona was talking about. What it shows in red is what the President requested in each of his budget requests per category.

On Education, Labor, HHS, the chart is about the same. Agriculture, right on down the line. In fact, in one of the areas in the Defense budget we are actually giving more than he requested. By the time we are done with this bill that we debated so hotly tonight, at least the motion to instruct, we are going to give the President significantly more than he originally requested, which leads to the real question that not only we in Congress but the American people, and frankly, members of the working press, ought to be asking the President of the United States: How much is enough?

2100

Now, we have been willing to meet with the President to negotiate in good faith. We have met him more than halfway. But we should not be in session today. How much is enough, Mr. President?

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, October 29, 2000, I was unavoidably detained and missed two rollcall votes, Nos. 572 and 573. I would like the RECORD to reflect that I would have voted ''yes'' on rollcall No. 572 and ''yes'' on rollcall No. 573.

CONGRESS FIGHTING BATTLE OVER BUDGET

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

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to be here this evening. This is an historic event. We have never met this late in our legislative season since World War II. But perhaps this is not all bad. We are fighting a battle here, too; and that battle is to keep the budget down.

Over the past few years, when we approached this point, the President demanded more spending. In order to wrap up this session and get home for elections, we capitulated.

This year we are not going to do that. The President is trying to shanghai us by saying, we will only let you go for 24 hours. You have to be here every day, even though there is nothing to do, because they are not negotiating.

I think it is rather unique. But we are here. We are willing to work. We are eager to work. Unfortunately, the President has been out on the West Coast raising money. But as soon as he gets back and as soon as he is willing to negotiate with us, we are ready and

willing to negotiate. But we are not going to give the ship away. We are going to restrain the budget and do the best we can to keep the budget balanced.

ISSUE IS NOT HOW MUCH MONEY

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

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, the issue is not how much money. The majority voted last week to increase the caps to $645 billion in spending. That is $13 billion more than the President requested. The Blue Dog Democrats suggested a compromise of $633 billion a long time ago. The majority refused to talk to us.

I hope we will stop talking about money. Money is no longer the issue. Because if we exceed $645 billion cap for 2001, there will be sequestration and we will bring all the spending back to $645 billion, which is what the majority has set for the caps, which is way too much spending.

So I hope we will stop this misdirected rhetoric tonight. Because that sign there ''how much is enough?'' has no relevance whatsoever to any of the issues that we are talking about because we all agree now that $645 billion is the cap.

PRESIDENT HAS DEMANDED BLANKET AMNESTY FOR ILLEGAL ALIENS

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

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman may or may not be correct in terms of what the issue is. The President always is pushing us to spend a little more on health care, a little more on education. But the fact is what is the real issue that is keeping us here?

The real issue is the President has demanded a blanket amnesty for millions of illegal aliens in our society. So all this money that he is talking about, a little more for education, a little more for health care, will be totally negated even if we give in to the President because we will be then adding millions of more people into eligibility for these same government programs.

The President is keeping us here in order to pressure Congress to issue a blanket amnesty for millions of illegal aliens and then thus making them eligible for every government benefit that supposedly should be going to the American people.

This is a noble cause for us to stand our ground here in Congress to protect the American people, not to let the President bring in millions of illegal aliens in order to consume the scarce resources available for them in health care, Social Security, and education.

ISSUE IS WHAT ARE WE SPENDING MONEY ON?

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

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, I think it is apparent to all of us that the question is not how much is enough. We are already spending more than we ought to be. The majority voted to spend $645 billion when you raise the caps. The President did not ask us but for $637 billion.

The issue is what are we spending the money on? That is why we are here. That is what we are arguing about.

The truth of the matter is most of us on this side of the aisle want to spend more money on our rural hospitals and our health care providers and less money on the insurance company HMOs than the Republicans have put in the bill. And the truth of the matter, even Senator JOHN MCCAIN pointed out that there is $21 billion in this legislation that is just pure pork.

Every newspaper in the country has been editorializing on the fact that the majority has stuffed this bill with pork for partisan purposes to help folks that are in tough races.

So let us get the pork out, and let us save our rural hospitals that are about to close in my district. Let us increase the reimbursements to our health care providers. And let us not give the lion's share to the big insurance companies.

REIMBURSEMENTS TO HMO'S AND MANAGED CARE

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

Mr. HILL of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I want to bring some clarity to the issue that we just debated and voted on, and that is this issue of reimbursements to HMOs and managed care.

I no longer have a managed care institution in Montana. The one that was there was forced to close down a year ago. I sat down with HCFA, the Clinton administration, and that HMO to try to keep it alive a year ago. And one of the things that I discovered is that when the Clinton administration forced the closure of that HMO, it knew that it was going to cost more to provide health care to those seniors under the fee-for-service Medicare than it would under the HMO. And this was a provider-based HMO.

I thought to myself, why in the world would they do that, would they force people into poor coverage, no prescription drug coverage, and higher deductibles when they knew it was going to cost more? Then it dawned on me. The Clinton administration wants to destroy managed care, Medicare+Choice.

What we have here is Democrats coming to this floor pretending that they want to keep those seniors who have that program covered, when the reality is they want to destroy that program because they do not want seniors to have a choice, but they want to blame Republicans for doing it. And it is wrong, and they are wrong for doing it. We did the right thing by voting that resolution down.

CONGRESS HAS MORE TIME THAN MONEY

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

Mr. THUNE. Mr. Speaker, we are still here this evening because we have more time than we have money. And when it comes right down do it, the question of the day is ''how much is enough?'' We have passed appropriations bills through this House. We have passed appropriation bills that met our budget. As we went into the conference negotiations with the Senate, the numbers got bid up.

The President now has gotten almost everything I think he had asked for originally as far as the dollars included in his original budget. But he is demanding more. And that is why we are still here, because we have more time than we have money and more time than the American people have in their tax dollars to continue shoveling into Washington, D.C.

We have an opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to pass a Medicare package, to pass a tax relief package. And all those things are going down to the President, and he is insisting on a veto. I think that is a wrong thing to do. It is the wrong thing to do for the people of this country, for the people of South Dakota, to the rural hospitals, the home health care agencies, the nursing homes, those who need this assistance. We do the right thing.

Let us pass this legislation, and let us get the President to sign it, and then we can go home.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday morning I was detained at a meeting on class size reduction and got here too late to cast my vote on rollcall No. 570, approval of the Journal. I ask unanimous consent that my statement be put in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

REPUBLICANS ARE PROTECTING SOCIAL SECURITY AND SURPLUS

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

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, the Republicans in the House have passed domestic discretionary spending that has kept within our budget. In fact, as a