



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 111th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 155

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 17, 2009

No. 132

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, offered the following prayer: Sent here, Lord, by the people of this Nation to accomplish the work of government for the people, Members of Congress rightly feel endowed with a mantle of justice. Divine Providence has brought them together to honestly face the diversity and complexity of the times in the light of constitutional obligations.

Humbled by the sacred trust placed within them, they also realize their own limitations as well as the great expectations thrust upon them.

This House of Representatives for this great Nation stands before You, almighty and ever-powerful Lord, seeking Your wisdom and guidance to sort out confusion with the clarity of truth, to expose hidden greed and corruption to the light of goodness, and to seek ways of peace by regulating laws and policies as the bedrock of equal justice.

May all the Members of this Chamber and citizens across this Nation drown out arguments, advertisements, and anger with the depth of personal prayer for their government so they find their way, the truth, and life in You, in Whom we place all our trust.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House her approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BERRY) come for-

ward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. BERRY led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed bills of the following titles in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1494. An act the authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2010 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes.

S. 1677. An act the reauthorize the Defense Production Act of 1950, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that pursuant to section 194(a) of title 14, United States Code, as amended by Public Law 101-595, and upon the recommendation of the Chairman of the Committee on Commerce, Science and Transportation, the Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, appoints the following Senators to the Board of Visitors of the United States Coast Guard Academy:

The Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER), ex officio, as Chairman of the Committee on Commerce, Science and Transportation;

The Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL), Committee on Commerce, Science and Transportation.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will now entertain up to five 1-minute requests on each side of the aisle.

HONORING DR. NORMAN BORLAUG

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

Mr. BERRY. Madam Speaker, I rise today to express my great sorrow at the passing of Dr. Norman Borlaug, and to honor his great contributions to biotechnology and battling famine around the globe.

Dr. Borlaug's development of high-yield wheat varieties and his introduction of modern production techniques in Mexico, Pakistan, and India led to the "green revolution," a worldwide movement that greatly increased food security and improved the lives of millions of impoverished and hungry people on every continent.

For his efforts, Dr. Borlaug was awarded the Presidential Medal of Freedom, the Congressional Gold Medal, and the Nobel Peace Prize. To this day, farmers and elected leaders alike look to Dr. Borlaug's accomplishments both as a matter of practice and inspiration. While his work has shown us how to better feed ourselves, his life has shown us that one man can improve the lives of millions more vulnerable.

I thank you for this time, Madam Speaker, and I thank Dr. Borlaug for his services to our Nation and to our world.

DO NOT ABANDON POLAND MISSILE SHIELD

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

Mr. KIRK. History is not kind to leaders who sacrifice our Polish allies. News reports indicate that our administration will end plans to build the long-planned American missile defense site for Poland. That site, carefully picked by the Pentagon, is directly

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H9673

under the flight path an Iranian missile would take if shot at the American people.

The U.N. reports that Iran has accelerated its production of uranium. And last February, Iran became the first new nation to orbit a satellite when its newest and most powerful missile worked. Iran, a state sponsor of terror, now makes the longest range missile of the terrorist world.

The administration's decision is particularly ironic because Poland just announced it would be sending more troops to serve alongside Americans in Afghanistan. America is going to let Poland down, sending a message of weakness to our Polish allies and the people building Iran's new missile arsenal.

CONSTITUTION DAY

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

Mr. YARMUTH. Madam Speaker, today marks the 222nd anniversary of the ratification of the Constitution of the United States of America, one of the most important documents ever written. This historic day coincides with the historic debate now taking place in this Chamber and in communities across the Nation over how we can solve our health care crisis.

So I thought it might be useful to reference the sections of our Nation's foundational document that empower this legislature and this government to act in the best interests of the Nation rather than sit idly by while our health care system spirals out of control.

From the preamble in which "We the people of the United States" established the Constitution to, among other purposes, "promote the general welfare," to article I, which gives Congress all of the legislative powers granted in the Constitution, the legislators—rightly elected by the people of the Republic—have the ability to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying out our enumerated powers. Among those are providing for the common defense and general welfare, the promotion of the progress of science and the arts, and the regulation of commerce, each of these directly pertaining to our health care crisis.

It is time for us to act pursuant to the Constitution.

HEALTH CARE POLLS

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Madam Speaker, following President Obama's address to a joint session of Congress about health care, the national media touted polls showing a bump in public approval of the President's health care plan, but the media failed to point out that the polls vastly oversampled

Democrats. For example, a CBS poll last week trumpeted "a 12-point improvement" in the President's approval rating on health care following his speech. CBS failed to mention that Democrats outnumbered Republicans in the poll sample by 15 percentage points, far greater than the actual party identification gap.

Worse, a CNN poll touted a "double-digit post-speech jump" for the President, but the poll oversampled Democrats by more than a 2-1 margin.

When questioning far more Democrats than Republicans, it should come as no surprise that poll results favor a liberal Democratic agenda. The media should be objective and not intentionally slant their polling data.

NATIONAL DIRECT STUDENT LOAN PROGRAM

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Madam Speaker, there was a lot of bloviating on the Republican side yesterday about the government takeover of the student loan business. What nonsense. I mean, what we are going to do is stop subsidizing the banks. That's what the Republicans are really upset about here.

Today, for every dollar in student loans, the taxpayers are dinged 15 cents—subsidies to the banks. If we convert to a National Direct Student Loan Program—the minority of the loans today go through that—for every dollar we lend to a student we will get back \$1.03.

Now, they want to run government like a business, but their idea of a business is shoveling subsidies to the private sector. I want to run government like a business. I want to give more loans to students, more effectively, at lower cost to the taxpayers. That's the National Direct Student Loan Program. This is a reform that's long overdue. Stop crying about the subsidies to the banks.

□ 1015

MANDATES ARE NOT THE ANSWER TO HEALTH CARE REFORM

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

Mr. PENCE. Yesterday, Democrats in the Senate unveiled a much anticipated new compromise on health care reform, and as my late father used to say, "Here comes the new guy. He looks a lot like the old guy."

The compromise for government-run insurance is more government-run insurance, but I rise this morning to draw particular attention to a proposal in the compromise that would force Americans who don't have health insurance to buy it. Under the proposal, everybody would be forced to buy government-approved policies, and if you

don't, families could face tax penalties of \$3,800 per year and, individuals, \$950 if they don't comply. Well, none other than candidate for President, now President, Barack Obama opposed such mandates.

He said in a primary debate in January of '08 that you can mandate it, but there are still going to be people who can't afford it, and if they can't afford it, the question is: What are you going to do about it?

More memorably, the President said on CNN's American Morning in February of '08 that if a mandate were the solution, we could try to solve homelessness by mandating everybody to buy a house.

Mr. President, I couldn't have said it better myself. The President was right. Mandates are not the answer. Let's scrap this government-run insurance plan and work in a bipartisan way to lower costs without more government, more mandates and more taxes.

THE STUDENT AID AND FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY ACT WILL HELP AMERICA MOVE FORWARD

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

Mr. COHEN. Today, the House will vote on the Student Aid and Fiscal Responsibility Act. It's an important bill to help education in our country.

It will give higher Pell Grant amounts to students who need more money to make it through college. It will put moneys in the community colleges for fiscal improvements and also into K-12s for fiscal improvements. It will help Historically Black Colleges and Universities, which are suffering a great deal at this time and need that help.

There is so much that this bill will do to help us move forward and save \$10 billion towards the deficit. It will take moneys from the private sector, which has been making money off of student loans, and it will provide opportunities for students and education. It will repeal a draconian provision that particularly hurts minorities and others who can't get student loans because of Federal laws for simple possession violations of criminal laws. That shouldn't happen, and those students should have the opportunity to get college grants and loans and to go on and improve themselves and to make more of themselves.

I look forward to voting for this bill which will help America move forward.

CZARS

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

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, since being sworn in, the President has appointed 34 czars—the health czar, the car czar, an urban czar, a Great Lakes czar. These are just to

name a few. In 300 years, czarist Russia just had 18 czars. Why do we need 34? We have an energy czar and a Secretary of Energy. We have a health czar and a Secretary of Health. Worse, 27 of the 34 czars have not even been confirmed by the Senate despite a constitutional requirement. These czars make \$172,000 yearly, and that doesn't include expensive, unchecked staff with zero accountability.

I backed legislation that would withhold funding from any czar not confirmed by the Senate. Americans want, need and deserve transparency and accountability. Let's rein in the czars.

THE STUDENT AID AND FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY ACT WILL KEEP AMERICA ECONOMICALLY COMPETITIVE

(Ms. SCHWARTZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SCHWARTZ. Mr. Speaker, today, the House will vote to save taxpayers nearly \$90 billion in making the Federal college loan system more efficient. This action, the Student Aid and Fiscal Responsibility Act, is the greatest investment in higher education ever.

This bill increases Pell Grants for students; it enables States to improve their early education system, and it reduces the Federal deficit by \$10 billion. It improves our Nation's education system for all children.

The Early Learning Challenge Fund supports safe efforts to invest in high-quality, integrated early education and to care for children birth through 5. Early education pays huge fiscal and social dividends in the long run, and this is an important step forward.

The College Access and Completion Innovation Fund promotes innovative strategies to improve student success in college, and this bill provides funding for much-needed school modernization and repair, which will be done in an environmentally energy-efficient manner by including legislation we approved earlier this year.

The Democratic majority is committed to stabilizing the economy, to lowering our deficit and to ensuring that America is economically competitive in the future. This plan helps us achieve these key goals.

HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, over the recent district work period I traveled to each county in my district, listening to constituents' ideas and concerns and answering questions. I heard overwhelmingly that a government-run public option was not a viable answer to the problems Americans are facing.

The President gave a well-delivered speech last week, but left many ques-

tions in the minds of the American people: How do we pay for such a bill? How can you cut funding for Medicare without impacting the millions of seniors who receive the benefits? How will individuals who are happy with their coverage get to keep the care they have?

Everyone agrees on the need for improvement. However, we must move toward changes that make health care more affordable, more accessible and of higher quality. We have an opportunity to work together to improve the lives of all Americans by crafting a bipartisan, commonsense solution that our country can afford.

PERMISSION TO REDUCE TIME FOR ELECTRONIC VOTING DURING PROCEEDINGS TODAY

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, during the proceedings today in the House and in the Committee of the Whole, the Chair be authorized to reduce to 2 minutes the minimum time for electronic voting on any question that otherwise could be subjected to 5-minute voting under clause 8 or 9 of rule XX or under clause 6 of rule XVIII.

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

There was no objection.

STUDENT AID AND FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY ACT OF 2009

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 746 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 3221.

□ 1021

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 3221) to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965, and for other purposes, with Ms. DEGETTE (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole House rose on Wednesday, September 16, 2009, a request for a recorded vote on amendment No. 7, printed in House Report 111-256, offered by the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOX), had been postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. REYES

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 8 printed in House Report 111-256.

Mr. REYES. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 8 offered by Mr. REYES:

Page 191, line 15, after "students" insert "including students who are veterans or members of the National Guard or Reserves."

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 746, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. REYES. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

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

Mr. REYES. Madam Chair, the men and women who have made enormous sacrifices to serve our country deserve every opportunity to get a good education, and my amendment will help them do just that.

My amendment will encourage community colleges to use the funding provided through the new grant program to increase the level of training for our veterans and for our members of the National Guard and Reserves. This amendment will help community colleges do outreach to our veterans and to our National Guardsmen and Reservists who may be looking to obtain new skills and training in these difficult economic times.

This funding is also now intended to help our veterans realize the benefits of the post-9/11 GI Bill that Congress passed last year. The post-9/11 GI Bill was created by landmark legislation that makes good on America's promise to take care of those who have proudly served our Nation. It offers unprecedented benefits that will make college affordable to our Nation's veterans.

However, the legislation will not meet its full potential if eligible veterans are not aware or if they do not take advantage of the opportunities available in their communities. This amendment will help to promote a more veteran-friendly environment at our Nation's community colleges by encouraging this generation of American heroes to use the benefits that they have so rightly earned.

Community colleges provide the first postsecondary experience for many students, and are critical in providing them with the education and training that is required for the high-demand jobs that are needed to keep the United States competitive.

I am pleased that my colleague, Representative ADLER, has a similar amendment that will assist veterans who are seeking to attend 4-year colleges or universities. Making sure that veterans want to pursue an advanced degree and that they are able to do so is the right thing to do for our local economies and for our competitive future. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER).

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I thank him for offering this amendment.

Madam Chair, we would strongly support this amendment. As he is well aware of—and as, I think, most of the Nation is—the young men and women who have joined the Armed Forces over the last 8 or 9 years left this country to serve in Iraq and Afghanistan and elsewhere in the trouble spots of the world. Many of them left as high school graduates, some of them not high school graduates. They even left an economy that is very different today than it was when they left their homes to serve this Nation. Clearly, we want to make sure that they have the opportunities to integrate back into the economy after leaving the service on terms that are helpful to them, to their families and to their local communities.

So thank you very much for offering this amendment.

Mr. REYES. I thank the chairman.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KLINE of Minnesota. Madam Chair, I rise to claim time, although I do not oppose this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. KLINE of Minnesota. In fact, I rise to say that we are going to support this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. REYES. Thank you, Madam Chair, and I thank my colleague.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MR. ETHERIDGE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 9 printed in House Report 111-256.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 9 offered by Mr. ETHERIDGE:

Page 24, after line 24, insert the following:“(iii) providing loan counseling, loan delinquency, and default aversion assistance to student loan borrowers and institutions of higher education;

Page 25, line 1, redesignate clause (iii) as clause (iv).

Page 25, line 4, redesignate clause (iv) as clause (v).

Page 76, line 15, strike “and”.

Page 76, after line 15, insert the following:

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in the subsection header, by striking “ORIGINATION, SERVICING, AND DATA SYSTEMS” and inserting “ORIGINATION, SERVICING, DELINQUENCY PREVENTION AND DEFAULT AVERSION SERVICES, DEFAULT COLLECTIONS, OUTREACH, AND DATA SYSTEMS”;

(B) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “The Secretary may” and inserting “(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may”;

(C) by redesignating paragraphs (1) through (4) as subparagraphs (A) through (D), and moving such subparagraphs two ems to the right;

(D) in subparagraph (C) (as redesignated by subparagraph (C) of this paragraph), by striking “and” after the semicolon;

(E) by redesignating subparagraph (D) (as redesignated by subparagraph (C) of this paragraph) as subparagraph (E);

(F) by inserting after subparagraph (C) (as so redesignated) the following new subparagraph:

“(D) delinquency prevention and default aversion services, default collections, financial aid counseling, career and education counseling, financial literacy, guidance counselor and financial aid officer training services, and other outreach services; and”;

and

(G) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) LIMITATION.—The Secretary may enter into contracts for the services described in paragraph (1)(D) with—

“(A) agencies with agreements with the Secretary under subsections (b) and (c) of section 428 on the date of enactment of the Student Aid and Fiscal Responsibility Act of 2009, that are providing such services on such date and that meet the qualifications determined by the Secretary; or

“(B) nonprofit subsidiaries of agencies described in subparagraph (A), if such subsidiaries were established, pursuant to State law, on or before January 1, 1998, and meet the qualifications determined by the Secretary.”; and

Page 76, line 16, redesignate paragraph (2) as paragraph (3).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 746, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. I yield myself 2 minutes.

I want to thank Chairman MILLER for his support on this amendment and for his work to expand educational opportunities for all of America's students.

Madam Chair, as we work to make our student loan system work better for taxpayers, we must also make sure that the system still works for students and for families who seek to improve their futures through education.

My amendment makes sure that the benefits that help students and that expands access to college, including loan counseling, outreach and education default prevention services, continue to be available. It clarifies that these services, targeted to local needs by State educational authorities and nonprofit agencies, are eligible for funding under H.R. 3221.

Guarantee agencies, such as the North Carolina Education Assistance Authority in my State, have developed customized services to help students learn to manage their debt and to avoid default. As an example, in 2007, they helped students with more than \$52 billion in debt recovery from delinquent loans, saving both students and taxpayers their money.

Guarantors and affiliated nonprofits, like the College Foundation of North Carolina, help families plan for college and help them navigate these financial aid and loan options. Every day, nearly 10,000 students and families turn to the CFNC to get help and information.

We need to make sure that these services continue to be available, and my amendment ensures that they are.

Higher education is still a key to the American Dream, and this will help make it even more so.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ETHERIDGE. I would be happy to yield.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I thank the gentleman for offering this amendment. It's a good amendment and it's important.

These agencies have a track record in helping students and in helping the taxpayers with default diversion activities; but also, we look forward to their having an expanded role in financial literacy and in helping students as they contemplate going to college and, while they're in college, helping them manage their debt and helping them make decisions about whether they need all of that debt or not and also as they leave, because this Congress, on a bipartisan basis, has passed a number of loan forgiveness programs and the income determinant repayment program.

□ 1030

So the students really can start to see how they can manage the debt and make career choices at the same time. Unfortunately, many students don't realize it until they graduate; they really would have liked to have done something else, but they didn't think they could have that career and manage their debt. So these agencies are going to take on an even more important role for young people as they start and progress through college.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KLINE of Minnesota. Madam Chair, I rise to claim time in opposition to the amendment, although at this time I do not expect to oppose it.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. KLINE of Minnesota. Madam Chair, this amendment kind of attempts to cobble together a new system that will provide students, families and colleges the types of delinquency prevention, default aversion and financial literacy services available today under the FFEL Program.

I do not oppose these types of activities; I support them. But the existence of this amendment, it seems to me, is proof that we are eliminating these important benefits by eliminating the FFEL Program.

Rather than figuring out a better way to keep the FFEL Program, to keep the private sector involved, the majority is attempting to wedge some of its components into the direct loan program. I am concerned that the net result will mean fewer students served with more red tape for those who do wish to obtain these services.

As I said, Madam Chair, I am not going to oppose this amendment, but

Members should know there is a much easier way to preserve the value-added elements of FFEL. Rather than destroying the program and working to recreate it, we can work to preserve and improve the FFEL Program.

Madam Chair, I yield back.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to my colleague from Vermont, a cosponsor of this amendment, Mr. WELCH.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. ETHERIDGE, I thank you for your work. Mr. MILLER, I thank you for your work.

I am in strong support of this amendment. The bill is terrific because what it does is take taxpayer assistance and give it to kids and parents rather than to big bailed-out banks.

Secondly, what this amendment does is allow those institutions like the Vermont Student Assistance Corporation, a nonprofit dedicated to getting kids to go to college, to help them navigate the process of financing college and then to contend with the challenges of repaying the loan. It has had an incredible success rate. So this benefit gives the benefit to those local institutions that are nonprofit, student-centered, parent-centered, family-centered, to be able to continue to do that work at the local level.

Thank you for your leadership on this, Mr. ETHERIDGE. It will make a big difference for folks in Vermont.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to my colleague and cosponsor, and someone who has been working on this issue for a long time, the gentleman from North Carolina, Congressman PRICE.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Madam Chair, I thank my colleague, and I want to thank the chairman of the committee and the entire committee for their work on this bill, making historic investments in America's education and economic prosperity.

In particular, I want to thank the committee for including provisions in the bill that would allow guaranty agencies, such as the North Carolina State Education Assistance Authority, to provide value-added outreach services via contracts with the Department of Education. These services play a vital role at both ends of the student loan process by informing borrowers about their education financing options before college and helping them successfully repay their loans after graduation.

Our proposed amendment simply clarifies that several of the key borrower services guaranty agencies currently provide, such as delinquency prevention, default aversion, and delinquency collections, also would be eligible for contract arrangements with the Department.

The work of these agencies pays real dividends for students and taxpayers alike. In North Carolina, default rates have been consistently among the Nation's lowest and about half the national average for the last few years. In 2007, these services helped prevent an

estimated \$52 billion in loans from going into default, according to the National Council of Higher Education Loan Programs.

So I thank my colleague from North Carolina and our other cosponsors for their collaborative work in putting forth this amendment, and urge Members to give it their support.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to my friend and colleague from North Dakota (Mr. POMEROY) who is a cosponsor also.

Mr. POMEROY. I thank the gentleman for yielding and his work on this amendment. I rise in strong support of this amendment.

It will impact entities like the Bank of North Dakota, the only State-owned bank in the country. This bank provides for the students of our State the lending and servicing functions for the Federal student loan program, and it is uniquely positioned in this regard in the country.

It has provided students and families the tools and techniques to deal with their student loan debt. It has worked to maintain low default rates through one-on-one repayment default counseling, on-campus presentations and other outreach efforts.

As a result, we have had very low default rates in North Dakota. I am pleased with the service they have provided to their students.

I am delighted that this amendment, unlike the underlying bill, would allow that to continue. I know the chairman has given his approval to this amendment and urge its adoption.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Madam Chair, I thank the chairman and ranking member for their work on this bill to help members of the committee, and I encourage my colleagues to vote for the amendment and the underlying bill.

I yield back the balance of my time. The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MR. DRIEHAUS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 10 printed in House Report 111-256.

Mr. DRIEHAUS. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 10 offered by Mr. DRIEHAUS:

Page 21, after line 9, insert the following:

(iii) encourages State policies that are designed to improve rates of enrollment and re-enrollment of dislocated workers in postsecondary education;

Page 21, line 10, redesignate clause (iii) as clause (iv).

Page 21, line 14, redesignate clause (iv) as clause (v).

Page 26, after line 19, insert the following:

(1) DISLOCATED WORKER.—The term "dislocated worker" has the meaning given such term in section 101(9) of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2801(9)).

Page 26, line 20, redesignate paragraph (1) as paragraph (2).

Page 27, line 18, redesignate paragraph (2) as paragraph (3).

Page 27, line 22, redesignate paragraph (3) as paragraph (4).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 746, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. DRIEHAUS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. DRIEHAUS. Madam Chair, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Madam Chair, as we discuss H.R. 3221, I would like to draw attention to a critical component of the bill, and that is the College Completion and Innovation Fund.

This amendment, Madam Chair, impacts one portion of the College Completion and Innovation Fund, and that specifically is the State Innovation and Completion Grants. About 50 percent of the College Completion and Innovation Fund goes to State Innovation and Completion Grants. These are targeted at low-income and disadvantaged populations in each of our States, and they are meant to incentivize States to engage in creative efforts with low-income communities, working with nonprofits, working with universities, to provide grants for these populations.

With that, the State has to provide to the Department of Education a plan describing how they will utilize the funds. This amendment is quite simple in that it states that in that plan we must target and we must include dislocated workers.

And I think you will agree, Madam Chair, and I think most of the Members will agree, that in this economy, with the number of employees that are currently unemployed, we need to be targeting and looking at the skill sets of dislocated workers. Because when we talk about innovation and education, when we talk about reeducating our workforce, there is no more important population than those that are recently unemployed. And as we move toward a new technology economy, it's critical that although we have tremendous workers across the United States, we appreciate the fact that they need more education, that they need retooling in order to make them competitive for the jobs of the 21st century in order for us to compete in a global marketplace.

So this is a simple amendment, Madam Chair, and it simply says to the States that we need to be focusing on those dislocated workers.

I yield to the distinguished chair of the committee, Mr. MILLER.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I want to thank the gentleman for yielding and thank the gentleman from Ohio. This is obviously a very important component of this legislation.

His amendment substantially improves it, because the whole Nation is aware of the needs of dislocated workers, and certainly in the Midwest,

where workers are leaving one generation of technology and seeking jobs in communities or seeking the next generation of manufacturing and technology. This is very important that they be included in these State plans.

Mr. DRIEHAUS. Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KLINE of Minnesota. Madam Chair, I rise to claim time in opposition, although I do not plan to oppose it.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Minnesota is recognized.

There was no objection.

Mr. KLINE of Minnesota. The purpose of this amendment is indeed laudable. It's to ensure that dislocated workers are considered in each State's postsecondary education planning. It's a reasonable goal. I support the goal. We should all support that goal.

But there is a rich irony here in that the underlying bill itself is going to create thousands of these dislocated workers. We have seen estimates of 30,000 or 35,000.

So if we are serious about helping dislocated workers, and I believe we are, we should scrap this underlying job-killing bill and find a better way to stabilize student lending for the long term.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DRIEHAUS. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. DRIEHAUS).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MR. CUELLAR

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 11 printed in House Report 111-256.

Mr. CUELLAR. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 11 offered by Mr. CUELLAR: Page 80, after line 22, insert the following new section (and conform the table of contents accordingly):

SEC. 216. OUTREACH EFFORTS.

(a) **OUTREACH ACTIVITIES REQUIRED.**—The Secretary of Education shall conduct outreach activities in accordance with this section to inform and educate students and their families about the transition to Federal Direct lending under the amendments made by this title to title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965.

(b) **REQUIRED COMPONENTS OF OUTREACH.**—The Secretary shall provide for the broad dissemination of information on such amendments and shall—

(1) operate and maintain an Internet website through which individuals may obtain information on changes made to the Federal Family Education Loan programs and the Federal Direct Loan programs;

(2) develop and disseminate information to high school seniors and their parents concerning student loans and student aid;

(3) provide assistance to institutions of higher education to educate students on the repayment of Federal Direct loans; and

(4) ensure that all outreach efforts are developed using plain language and are culturally- and language-appropriate.

(c) **USE OF OTHER ENTITIES.**—In carrying out this subsection, the Secretary may work with other appropriate entities to facilitate the dissemination of information under this section and to provide assistance as described in this section.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 746, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CUELLAR) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CUELLAR. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

Madam Chair, I rise today in support of my amendment to the Student Aid and Fiscal Responsibility Act of 2009, which I believe is acceptable to the chairman, Chairman MILLER.

I surely want to thank Chairman MILLER for the leadership that he has provided, and the ranking member, Mr. KLINE, for the work that he has been doing in the committee.

Madam Chair, at a time when our Nation's students need it the most, this legislation makes significant changes to student lending, one of the biggest changes that we have seen in years and years. While this bill makes tremendous investments in education, too many potential college students may be unaware of it.

Unfortunately, today, there are many students, especially those who may be first in their families to apply to college or who may come from disadvantaged communities, who are ill-informed about Federal student loans. Many students aren't aware of the opportunities available to them or of the responsibilities that follow from taking out a loan. This lack of information will range from students deciding that college is too expensive to those who default on their loans after graduation.

When you look at some of the States that have been impacted, this particular amendment will call on the Secretary to work with colleges and universities to educate students about the repayment of Federal direct loans, and this amendment will help cut excessive default rates that threaten the eligibility of some of the schools from participating in this student aid program.

My home State of Texas has one of the highest student loan default rates in the country, and financial aid directors in my district have cited a lack of information and outreach as a primary cause. As we make college more accessible to all Americans, we need to make sure that students and their families have the information so they can make reasoned and informed decisions.

This simple but important amendment will lead to increased student awareness, financial aid opportunities, help prevent student loan defaults and increase our country's production of talented graduates. I urge all my colleagues to support it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KLINE of Minnesota. Madam Chair, I rise to claim time in opposi-

tion, although I don't plan to vote against it.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Minnesota is recognized.

There was no objection.

Mr. KLINE of Minnesota. Madam Chair, this amendment, it seems to me, is a little bit like putting a bandaid on what has proven to be a gaping wound. I don't think it's going to make many things worse, and it might even stop a little bit of the bleeding, but it certainly won't heal the damage.

H.R. 3221 eliminates a program that over 70 percent of colleges and universities have consistently chosen. This amendment is an acknowledgment that the breakneck pace of this transition by next summer will be a problem for students, families and schools.

While I share the concern about this radical change to our financial aid system, I fear this amendment may not do as much good as the gentleman from Texas hopes. The Department of Education already maintains a Web site on Federal aid programs and regularly disseminates information to high schools about the availability of Federal student aid.

In spite of information about the direct loan program, most schools still choose the FFEL Program. That tells me it's not a lack of information but a genuine preference for the choice, innovation and competition of the FFEL Program.

Informing students and families is important, but it's no substitute for simply maintaining the program they already know and they already like.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CUELLAR. I yield as much time as he may consume to Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey.

□ 1045

Mr. ANDREWS. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I rise to express the committee's strong support for his amendment. It is important to reflect on what Mr. CUELLAR's amendment does, and what the bill does not do.

Mr. CUELLAR's amendment answers questions for students and families and financial aid officers and universities and colleges about how best to access student loans. Mr. CUELLAR's amendment, I think, very wisely recognizes there is a whole different kind of person who is achieving a higher education in our country today.

It is not simply the person fresh out of high school. It is people who are in the middle of a career change, either voluntarily or involuntarily because of a layoff or a plant closing. It is a person who is a bit further along in life who wants to build his or her career by going to college. It is a nonconventional student. It might be a person very new to America, or it might be a person who has been here for a very long time. It is people facing language, cultural, or other kinds of issues.

What Mr. CUELLAR's amendment is doing is making sure that the Department of Education is a constructive

and active partner in answering the questions that our constituents have. We enthusiastically embrace and support his amendment.

His amendment improves on a bill that doesn't really do any of the things that with all due respect the minority said. The minority discusses this as some sort of radical shift. It is not radical at all. Right now a student goes to a financial aid office and applies for a Pell Grant. It is a common process done throughout college and university campuses around the country. The only change between applying for a Pell Grant and applying for a student loan is you sign a document that is a note to pay the loan back. That is the only additional step that takes place. As a matter of fact, it is far less bureaucratic and far less complicated for a student accessing such a loan.

This bill saves the taxpayers \$10 billion over time off the deficit. It stops the practice of rewarding people for taking risks with taxpayers' money. It understands, as the Congressional Budget Office has said, that the savings generated from this are \$87 billion over time. The bill promotes efficiency. It will generate economic development.

With respect to the gentleman's point about lost jobs, Mr. ETHERIDGE's amendment very much speaks to that. It makes sure that loan originators are now eligible to become loan processors and collectors, and much of the work done by those who originate in the private sector will now be done in the private sector by those who process and service these loans.

So the underlying bill saves the taxpayers money, significantly expands educational opportunity, and reduces the deficit by \$20 billion over time. Mr. CUELLAR's amendment significantly adds to the value of this bill. The committee strongly supports his amendment.

Mr. KLINE of Minnesota. Madam Chair, clearly there is continuing disagreement over money that this bill saves or costs. The Congressional Budget Office provided an original score of a so-called savings of \$87 billion. That same Congressional Budget Office has provided additional information which would indicate that this bill is going to put us further into deficit, further into debt by perhaps as much as \$50 billion.

This is not a money-saving bill. This is, indeed, a government takeover of an industry. This will cost jobs despite the Etheridge amendment. This is a bad piece of legislation. I am going to support this amendment because it is at least a Band-Aid.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CUELLAR. I yield back.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CUELLAR).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MR. MURPHY OF CONNECTICUT

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 12 printed in House Report 111-256.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk made in order under the rule.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 12 offered by Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut:

Page 163, line 22, insert "(which may include establishing or supporting partnerships with institutions of higher education (as such term is defined in section 101 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001) to support such education and training)" after "providers".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 746, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. Madam Chair, I yield myself for such time as I may consume.

I would like to first thank Chairman MILLER, Representative ANDREWS, Representative HINOJOSA, the ranking member for their work on the underlying legislation. We are debating right now landmark legislation that is going to bring more access, affordable access, to hundreds of thousands, if not millions, of college students across this country.

Therefore, it is only fitting that as a component to this legislation, the Student Aid and Fiscal Responsibility Act also heavily invests in birth-to-5 education. We know investing in early childhood education creates a pathway to later success in our educational spectrum.

Madam Chair, I have spent the last several months touring around my district talking with the people who make our early childhood education system work. I have hosted round table discussions in cities like Torrington and Danbury and listened to parents and providers and administrators; and there is one message I have heard loud and clear, and that is the lack of early education degree programs in Connecticut and across the country often makes it difficult to find highly qualified early learning teachers in Connecticut and across the Nation.

My amendment simply seeks to clarify that the very important Early Learning Challenge Fund included in this bill would allow for States to use some of that grant money to partner with local colleges and universities to create or to expand effective education and training programs for early learning providers.

I was a very strong supporter of our Head Start and School Readiness Act in 2007. That bill requires that Head Start teachers by 2011 have associate's degrees; and by 2013, 50 percent of Head Start teachers be required to have a bachelor's or master's degree. I think it is important to make sure that our Nation's kids have teachers and educators who have that academic background and education. But we need to

make sure that our educational system feeds our early learning centers with those trained professionals.

I appreciate the chairman's help on this bill and appreciate Representative ANDREWS' support, and I urge the Chamber's support.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KLINE of Minnesota. Madam Chair, once again I rise to claim time in opposition, although once again I am not going to oppose the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. KLINE of Minnesota. The purpose of this amendment is to allow States to provide education and training for early learning providers by entering into partnerships with higher education institutions. I don't oppose these partnerships at all, but I am concerned with the underlying language here.

What we are doing in the bill, we are diverting \$8 billion to fund and impose requirements on State early childhood systems. In 2005 the GAO reported there were already 69 Federal early childhood programs spread out over 10 Federal agencies with no coordinated or comprehensive strategy.

It is not the partnerships to improve early learning provider training that cause my concern. It is the entire notion that the Federal Government is inserting itself yet again into pre-K education and other areas, especially when we have not yet met our obligation to very important programs like IDEA, creating new programs that once again will be underfunded, once again will compete with special ed. We ought not be adding new programs when we haven't met our basic obligations.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

Mr. ANDREWS. I thank my friend for yielding, and the committee congratulates and thanks him for this very excellent work he has done on this amendment.

Mr. MURPHY's amendment recognizes that some of the most important teaching in America is going on right now by people who have had some of the least access to high-quality education for themselves. And it is not because they are not competent; it is not because they don't want it. It is because the resources have not been there.

The research is very clear that children in the early years of their lives develop much of their learning patterns and their skills. The country needs a significant investment in high-quality teacher education for the men and women who are teaching preschools across the country.

Mr. MURPHY's amendment, I think, embraces that concept in a very wise

way by encouraging the States that will receive early learning funding under this bill to consider using some of that funding in partnerships with higher education institutions so that the quality of teaching may improve.

This, I think, is an amendment that will pay dividends for years to come because better education for our pre-K students will lead to better achievement in the classroom which will yield better results throughout the lives of these students when they become taxpayers and workers and productive citizens of this country.

I think this is an effort that will bear fruit for many years to come. The committee would urge a "yes" vote.

Mr. KLINE of Minnesota. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman for his support.

There are thousands of early childhood educators in my district, and I am sure similar numbers across the country who want to go back to school and get that advanced degree. Right now the problem is there aren't slots for them to do this. This early learning challenge grant provides the opportunity to expand on programs that exist today and helps to create new ones. I would urge support for this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time. The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. CHILDERS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 13 printed in House Report 111-256.

Mr. CHILDERS. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 13 offered by Mr. CHILDERS:

Page 43, beginning on line 17, amend section 106 (and conform the Table of Contents accordingly) to read as follows:

SEC. 106. VETERANS RESOURCE OFFICER GRANTS.

Section 873 (20 U.S.C. 1161t) is amended—

(1) by amending the header to read as follows: "**MODEL PROGRAMS FOR CENTERS OF EXCELLENCE FOR VETERAN STUDENT SUCCESS; VETERANS RESOURCE OFFICERS**";

(2) in subsection (a), by inserting ", or Veterans Resource Officers," after "model programs";

(3) by amending subsection (b) to read as follows:

"(b) GRANT AUTHORIZED.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to the availability of appropriations under subsection (f), the Secretary shall award grants to institutions of higher education to—

"(A) develop model programs to support veteran student success in postsecondary education; or

"(B) hire a Veterans Resource Officer to increase the college completion rates for veteran students enrolled at such institutions of higher education.

"(2) GRANT PERIOD.—A grant awarded under this section shall be awarded for a period of 3 years."; and

(4) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by amending the header to read as follows: "MODEL PROGRAM REQUIRED ACTIVITIES"; and

(ii) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking "under this section" and inserting "for the purpose described in subsection (b)(1)(A)";

(B) by redesignating paragraph (2) as paragraph (3); and

(C) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following:

"(2) VETERANS RESOURCE OFFICER REQUIRED ACTIVITIES.—An institution of higher education receiving a grant for the purpose described in subsection (b)(1)(B) shall use such grant to hire a Veterans Resource Officer whose duties shall include—

"(A) serving as a liaison between—

"(i) veteran students;

"(ii) the faculty and staff of the institution;

"(iii) local facilities of the Department of Veterans Affairs; and

"(iv) mental healthcare providers at the Department of Veterans Affairs to ensure that veteran students are referred to such providers if needed; and

"(B) organizing and advising veteran student organizations and hosting veterans-oriented group functions on campus;

"(C) distributing news and information to all veteran students, including through maintaining newsletters and listserves; and

"(D) assisting in the training of Department of Veterans Affairs certifying officials, when applicable.".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 746, the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. CHILDERS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. CHILDERS. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chair, I rise today in support of H.R. 3221, and I ask my colleagues for their support of my amendment to H.R. 3221 and our Nation's veterans. I want to thank the chairman and the committee for making my amendment in order today.

This amendment would require campus veterans resource officers to act as a link between student veterans and mental health care providers at the Department of Veterans Affairs. With the support of veterans resource officers on university and college campuses, student veterans will be better connected to vital services provided by the Department of Veterans Affairs and will be better prepared to complete their studies.

With the recent implementation of the post-9/11 GI Bill, veterans have greater affordability and access to higher education and training. My amendment would help ensure that student veterans are able to complete their degree and graduate.

When the recently deployed National Guard Members from my district in Mississippi return, I want to see these education benefits accessed by veterans, and help those veterans to succeed in their college careers. I would

like to especially commend the unprecedented investments in community colleges included in H.R. 3221. Community colleges in Mississippi are some of the best in the Nation. They play an important role in preparing students for tomorrow's workforce. A community college education is one of the best investments a student can make.

I thank our veterans for their service to our Nation, and I encourage them to access the training and education benefits they have earned. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this important amendment.

I reserve my time.

Mr. KLINE of Minnesota. Madam Chair, I rise to claim the time in opposition to the amendment, although again I do not intend to oppose the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. KLINE of Minnesota. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This is a very worthy goal, and I applaud the gentleman's efforts in putting this amendment together. We should be doing things in all of our legislation that will strengthen the support that we provide for our men and women in uniform while they are in uniform, while they are overseas, when they come back, and when they take the uniform off. I applaud the gentleman and support the amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CHILDERS. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

Mr. ANDREWS. I thank my friend for yielding, and I join my friend from Minnesota in supporting this amendment. I know that my friend from Minnesota speaks as a father and as a veteran when he speaks in favor of this amendment. We salute his service.

This amendment is part of a series of amendments that carry forth a bipartisan tradition of this House that says that we don't want to simply welcome our troops home with welcoming ceremonies; we want to really welcome them home with services and respect and resources that they so richly deserve.

□ 1100

This amendment carries forth that tradition by emphasizing that our veterans who choose to pursue a higher education and who would benefit from the full range of health services that are available to veterans need to have those services.

The amendment requires an active liaison process between the veteran service officer on a campus and the health care people at the Veterans Administration so that veterans can have the full range of services and, frankly, try to make as much one-stop shopping as we can. So a veteran who is trying to balance his or her family obligations and work obligations and school obligations, who has some health care

issues, is able to get services in one place, maybe, instead of two or three.

It makes a lot of sense for people. I think the author has reflected the views of his constituents not only in his district, but veterans around our country.

The majority on the committee is strongly in favor of this proposal because it recognizes not only the service that our veterans have given us, but the needs they have. And we would urge a "yes" vote.

Mr. CHILDERS. I thank the gentleman for his remarks. I would also like to thank the gentleman from across the aisle for his kind remarks and support of our veterans as well.

Madam Chair, this is simple: This is good for veterans; it's good for universities and community colleges, and this is one way that this body can honor our commitment to our men and women who have worn the uniform so proudly.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Mississippi has the right to close.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. KLINE of Minnesota. It was the gentleman's amendment. Parliamentary inquiry, Madam Chair. Doesn't the opposite side have the right to close on these amendments as offered?

The Acting CHAIR. Only a manager in true opposition has the right to close. When the gentleman claims the time in opposition by unanimous consent, not actually opposing the amendment, then the proponent of the amendment has the right to close.

Mr. KLINE of Minnesota. Thank you, Madam Chair.

I support this amendment. I support the comments of my colleagues from New Jersey and Mississippi, the author of the bill.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. CHILDERS. I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. CHILDERS).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 14 OFFERED BY MR. ADLER OF NEW JERSEY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 14 printed in House Report 111-256.

Mr. ADLER of New Jersey, Madam Chairwoman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 14 offered by Mr. ADLER of New Jersey:

Page 31, line 10, redesignate subparagraph (D) as subparagraph (E).

Page 31, line 17, redesignate subparagraph (E) as subparagraph (F).

Page 31, after line 9, insert the following:

(D) include activities to increase degree or certificate completion for students who are veterans;

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House resolution 746, the gentleman

from New Jersey (Mr. ADLER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. ADLER of New Jersey. Thank you, Madam Chairwoman. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I'd like to start by thanking Chairman MILLER, Chairman ANDREWS, and Ranking Member KLINE for their leadership on this important matter.

The legislation we're discussing today provides funding to schools, non-profits, and other educational-related organizations that assist students in the completion of college and associate degrees.

My amendment, along with that earlier amendment offered by Mr. REYES, will take this bill to the next level and prioritize grants to schools and organizations that have shown a dedication to ensure student veterans have the support and resources they need to complete their degrees.

Our veterans have served our country to keep our country safe and free, and they deserve every opportunity to succeed as they return home. We should make every effort to ensure that their transition from service to civilian life is smooth and successful.

To that end, my amendment will prioritize schools and organizations that support our student veterans and help them apply the skills learned in military service to the classroom.

I thank the schools and organizations who already take steps to increase education opportunities for our veterans and hope that my amendment will support their efforts and provide an incentive for others to join them.

Rutgers University, the State University of New Jersey, has been on the forefront in my home State, providing much needed education opportunities to our servicemembers. Most recently, Rutgers created veterans' services offices, mentoring programs, special orientations, and advisory boards to better assist our State's veterans obtain the college degrees and certifications they deserve.

I hope that this bill pushes more colleges and universities across the country to support our veterans in the future.

Judge Washington said it best: "The willingness with which our young people are likely to serve in any war, no matter how justified, shall be directly proportional as to how they perceive the veterans of earlier wars were treated and appreciated by their country."

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CASTLE. I rise not in opposition, but to claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Delaware is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. CASTLE. Let me first address Mr. ADLER's amendment. I think this is actually a very good purpose, and I'm supportive of it. We actually have done something similar to this in the Higher

Education Act, in putting people in colleges to help with veterans. I think its purpose is well intended.

I also have examined this legislation carefully. It's gone through our committee, on which I served several times. I think there are some very good aspects to the bill, if you just isolate that and you believe all the numbers that are in there—increasing the Pell Grant limit, simplifying the financial aid process, supporting minority-serving institutions, supporting early childhood education programs, expanding services for veterans, and supporting community colleges and putting money towards deficit reduction. All that is well and good, but I have a couple problems with this legislation.

One is I'm not a hundred percent sure that I believe all the numbers which are being thrown around in terms of the savings. Secondly, I have examined the way student loans are done now, and I have examined the Federal Family Education Loan program, the FFEL program, which is the federally backed student loan program, and I have found that that program serves 4,421 colleges and universities nationally, and close to \$68 billion in student loans during the past year, according to the Congressional Research Service; whereas, the Direct Loan Program, which we're shifting to, only serves 1,500 colleges versus the 4,421, and \$19 billion versus the \$68 billion.

In other words, there's been a decision made by most colleges and universities in this country to go with the existing program, the FFEL program, over the Direct Loan Program, and I worry about what that shift might encounter.

One of the things that's going to happen at a time in which unemployment in this country is 10 percent is there's going to be a loss of jobs in the private sector. The Consumer Bankers Association indicates that this bill threatens approximately 30,000 people's jobs nationwide, and that's all over the country, because various banks make this kind of servicing dollars available and, therefore, have employment in that area. So you're talking about potentially a huge job loss in that area.

I had introduced an amendment before the Rules Committee with TOM PRICE from Georgia which would have indicated that we should hold this up until we can get a study of the job loss, but that, unfortunately, is not before us today.

But the problem still remains. We're just not certain, Madam Chairwoman, exactly what this will entail. If everything we hear about the bill is absolutely correct and all that money can be saved and the Federal Government is not going to hire a lot more people or mess it up in some other way in terms of the cost savings, there may be a very valid argument for the bill. I think it makes some very good points. But if those things do not prove out—and many things that we talk about here on the floor don't prove out in

practice—I think that would be problematic.

Part of the problem is that you're looking at 30,000 jobs, all of which are at risk. And you can argue about whether its origination or servicing and that kind of thing, but the bottom line is some percentage of those jobs would be at risk.

So I'm supportive of the amendment, to get back to the heart of why we're speaking right now, but I have some serious reservations about where we're going with this legislation at this time for the reasons which I stated.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ADLER of New Jersey. I thank the gentleman for his supporting the amendment.

May I inquire as to how much time I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. ADLER of New Jersey. I yield 2 minutes to my colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

Mr. ANDREWS. I thank my friend for yielding, and the committee expresses its strong support and appreciation for your good work. We support it and would urge a "yes" vote. Again, this follows in the tradition of doing things for our veterans, not just talking about them.

With respect to the underlying bill and addressing the two points made by my friend from Delaware, first, with respect to job loss. The concern that we all share about job loss is one of the reasons why. This bill makes provisions for loan providers, private loan providers who presently originate and service loans to continue to have a robust role in the servicing and processing and collection of loans. We believe that the record will show as the years go through on this that the opportunities will, in fact, expand for those in that field.

Second, with respect to the issue of the cost of this bill, as the Members know, under our rules, we have an agreement that the Congressional Budget Office is the authoritative source, and the Congressional Budget Office has given an authoritative analysis of this bill. That authoritative analysis says that the change that's made, which is the cessation of the process of rewarding private institutions to take risk with taxpayers' money, a very logical change, that that change generates gross savings of \$87 billion over the years that are subject to the analysis, and that in this bill \$10 billion of that is dedicated to deficit reduction.

So I think the issue is clear. The bill provides for a continuing robust role for private sector firms and workers, and the Congressional Budget Office has authoritatively stated the savings generated by this bill are \$87 billion.

The underlying bill is strong. The gentleman from New Jersey's amendment strengthens the bill. We would urge a "yes" vote on his amendment.

Mr. CASTLE. Madam Chairwoman, how much time do we have left on this side?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman has 1½ minutes left.

Mr. CASTLE. I yield myself the remaining time.

I understand well the second speaker, the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. ANDREWS, and I think he's right. As I said at the beginning, there are many good aspects to this bill if we can believe all those things are going to come together. As a matter of fact, it's been a little difficult for me to oppose it for that reason, because if these things do happen, that's advantageous.

With all due respect to the authoritative analysis from CBO, I don't always believe everything I hear from CBO. Not that they don't do a good job, but they are anticipating behavior as far as the future is concerned. So I'm not sure if we're going to have \$87 billion of savings to spread over all these other things. My hunch is there's going to be a lot of hiring that's going to have to go on to do the origination and servicing which is there.

I'm also very concerned if we take away the origination, which is really what the bill does, as far as the private lenders are concerned, you're going to get left with the servicing, and that's going to mean a substantial reduction in jobs. I'm not suggesting 30,000 jobs. We're going to lose a substantial number, I think, of private sector jobs. I'm just reticent about that for that reason. I would have hoped that we could have had some delay before we go full thrust in this and find out 5 years from now it isn't quite as has been promised.

Again, I do support the amendment, but I have some underlying concerns about the legislation. I respect all that's being stated and, frankly, I hope it's correct, because it could be in the best interest of the future of our government.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ADLER of New Jersey. They fought for our freedom. They fought for our safety. They fought for an ever greater America as a beacon of hope for freedom for the world. We can do something for them today by supporting this amendment. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ADLER).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 15 OFFERED BY MR. HIMES

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 15 printed in House Report 111-256.

Mr. HIMES. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 15 offered by Mr. HIMES:

Page 21, after line 9, insert the following:

(iii) encourages the full use of State resources in support of financial literacy programs;

Page 21, line 10, redesignate clause (iii) as clause (iv).

Page 21, line 14, redesignate clause (iv) as clause (v).

Page 21, line 20, redesignate clause (v) as clause (vi).

Page 25, line 3, strike "and".

Page 25, after line 5, insert the following:

"(v) programs to provide financial literacy education and counseling to elementary, secondary, and postsecondary students that include an examination of how financial planning may impact a student's ability to pursue postsecondary education; and".

Page 31, after line 9, insert the following:

"(D) include activities that enhance the financial literacy and awareness of students who are potentially eligible for assistance under this Act, especially those students from groups that are traditionally underrepresented in postsecondary education;"

Page 31, line 10, redesignate subparagraph (D) as subparagraph (E).

Page 31, line 17, redesignate subparagraph (E) as subparagraph (F).

Page 77, line 7, insert "including financial literacy programs," before "(if any)".

Page 80, beginning on line 1, amend subparagraph (B) to read as follows:

"(B) deliver a wide range of financial literacy and counseling tools to equip students with the information necessary to make prudent decisions concerning their educational success and financial well-being."

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 746, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. HIMES) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. HIMES. Thank you, Madam Chair. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I'd like to begin by thanking Chairman MILLER and Ranking Member KLINE for their leadership on this very important bill.

Madam Chair, the next century belongs to the Nation which best educates its citizens today. If America wants to compete in the world economy, we need an educated workforce; yet, the single greatest barrier to higher education can be summed up in one word: cost.

College tuition has gone up more than any other good or service in the last 20 years. The Department of Education tells us that students hold a staggering \$714 billion in outstanding student loan debt. If we want students to succeed in the classroom, we need to help them manage the financial commitments that got them there.

And so as Congress acts today to bring higher education within reach for millions more Americans, we must promote access to the financial education that students need to make what is usually the most important financial decision of their young lives.

The need to enhance our outreach here is enormous. Recent reports estimate that between 30 and 40 percent of first- and second-year students will be put into default at some point during the life of their loans.

□ 1115

At the same time, a financial literacy survey taken by Harris International in 2009 said that 47 percent of

Americans between the ages of 18 and 34 give themselves C's, D's or F's on their knowledge of personal finance.

The amendment I offer today with my colleagues, Congresswomen MCCARTHY and SCHWARTZ, makes several technical changes to the underlying bill which, at no additional cost, will help to ensure that States, nonprofits and private loan servicers who benefit from the new investments in college attainment and completion made by this bill do their utmost to include high-quality financial literacy training in their efforts to help keep more of our kids in school and in the postsecondary degree of their choice.

The Himes-McCarthy-Schwartz amendment enjoys the support of the National Association of College Admissions Counseling, the National Foundation for Credit Counseling, the Corporation for Enterprise and Development, and the Institute for Financial Literacy. I encourage my colleagues to vote in support of this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KLINE of Minnesota. Madam Chair, I rise to claim the time in opposition to this amendment, although, in fact, I'm going to support the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. KLINE of Minnesota. Thank you, Madam Chair.

This is a good, laudable goal. I certainly hope it works. Financial literacy is in dire straits at every stage of our development. I don't know that this will do the job, but I certainly like the direction it's going.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HIMES. Madam Chair, I first yield 1 minute to my colleague and fellow sponsor, the distinguished gentlelady from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY).

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Thank you, Mr. HIMES. I appreciate working with you and Congresswoman SCHWARTZ in working to bring this important amendment to the floor. I want to also thank Chairman MILLER, Ranking Member KLINE and the committee staff for their hard work on H.R. 3221 which will make landmark investments in education and will provide \$10 billion in deficit reduction. I also want to thank the chairman for working with me to include several positions in the bill related to school safety, classroom noise, child care facilities and increasing college access for low-income and minority students.

The amendment before us would make five technical changes to the bill to strengthen the financial literacy components. It has become apparent that the lack of education among students and consumers about financial systems and products is one of the key elements of our Nation's current economic crisis. In many cases, consumers were preyed on by financial institutions and sold into debts that they were not capable of fulfilling. This has

been a defining factor of the current economic crisis.

This amendment seeks to better educate students and arm them with the knowledge that will help them navigate the rough waters of our economy. It's more important than ever that Americans become informed consumers in order to prevent our economy from weakening further. I believe it is never too early or too late to learn about consumer, economic and personal finance concepts. This amendment is a good step that will hopefully put Americans on a track toward fiscal responsibility and make a new generation of informed consumers.

I urge all of my colleagues to support the amendment and the underlying bill.

Mr. HIMES. I next yield 1 minute to my colleague and fellow sponsor, the distinguished gentlelady from Pennsylvania (Ms. SCHWARTZ).

Ms. SCHWARTZ. Thank you.

I rise today in support of the Himes-McCarthy-Schwartz amendment which strengthens the financial literacy provisions in the Student Aid and Fiscal Responsibility Act.

As our country emerges from a recession that has starkly exposed the need for good financial planning and fiscal responsibility for individuals, for corporations and for the Nation, supporting financial literacy education is more important than ever. That is why I'm proud to work with my colleagues, Mr. HIMES and Mrs. MCCARTHY, on this amendment before us.

The amendment makes several commonsense additions that will encourage financial literacy education for students; and importantly, it will reach students early, well before they enter college so that early financial planning and counseling can positively impact students' views that college is possible, that it is financially accessible. And it will enable students to develop sound financial habits that they will carry with them through college and beyond.

The Student Aid and Fiscal Responsibility Act addresses important issues of college affordability, including how students and their families plan, save and borrow for college. This amendment will strengthen the financial literacy provisions, and I am very pleased to see its inclusion in this bill.

Mr. HIMES. Finally I yield 1 minute to my colleague and a great leader in the area of financial literacy, the distinguished gentlelady from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON).

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Thank you very much.

I rise in support of the Student Aid and Fiscal Responsibility Act and the Himes-McCarthy-Schwartz amendment on financial literacy.

Statistics from my State show that there is a staggering 50 percent drop between the number of persons that are high school graduates and persons that have a bachelor's degree or higher. This is below the national trend.

I represent a district with a large percent of underrepresented groups in

postsecondary education. Preparation for a postsecondary education starts far in advance of a student's enrollment in college. In fact, it is this preparation that got them accepted into college. The same should be said for student financial literacy in preparation for higher education.

Our people as well as our country are benefactors of broad-based financial literacy initiatives. We are only as rich as our poorest citizens. Enactment of this bill will go a long way toward ensuring that our young people do not fall into the current adult financial trends, including delinquency in paying bills, maintaining high credit card debt, as well as not establishing budgeting priorities for the most needs basic, including housing and food.

I encourage my colleagues to vote for this legislation and this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. All time having expired, the question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. HIMES).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. HIMES. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 16 OFFERED BY MS. KILROY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 16 printed in House Report 111-256.

Ms. KILROY. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 16 offered by Ms. KILROY: Page 185, beginning on line 21, strike paragraph (2) and insert the following:

(2) are institutions of higher education eligible for assistance under title III or V of the Higher Education Act of 1965, or consortia that include such an institution; or

(3) are focused on serving low-income, non-traditional students (as defined in section 803(j) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1161c(j))), or students who are dislocated workers, who do not have a bachelor's degree.

Page 196, beginning on line 21, strike subsection (c) and all that follows through page 197, line 5, and insert the following:

(c) GRANT DURATION; RENEWAL.—A grant awarded under this section shall be awarded to an eligible State for a 6-year period, except that if the Secretary determines that the eligible State has not made demonstrable progress in achieving the benchmarks developed pursuant to subsection (h) by the end of the third year of the grant period, non further grant funds shall be made available to the entity after the date of such determination.

(d) PRIORITY.—In awarding grants under this section, the Secretary shall give priority to applications focused on serving low-income, nontraditional students (as defined in section 803(j) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1161c(j))), or students who are dislocated workers, who do not have a bachelor's degree.

(e) FEDERAL AND NON-FEDERAL SHARE; SUPPLEMENT, NOT SUPPLANT.—

Ms. KILROY. Madam Chair, I ask unanimous consent to bring up the amendment as modified by the form placed at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the modification.

The Clerk read as follows:

Modification to amendment No. 16 offered by Ms. KILROY:

Page 185, beginning on line 21, strike paragraph (2) and insert the following:

(2) are institutions of higher education eligible for assistance under title III or V of the Higher Education Act of 1965, or consortia that include such an institution; or

(3) are focused on serving low-income, non-traditional students (as defined in section 803(j) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1161c(j))), students who are dislocated workers, or students who are veterans, who do not have a bachelor's degree.

Page 196, beginning on line 21, strike subsection (c) and all that follows through page 197, line 5, and insert the following:

(c) GRANT DURATION; RENEWAL.—A grant awarded under this section shall be awarded to an eligible State for a 6-year period, except that if the Secretary determines that the eligible State has not made demonstrable progress in achieving the benchmarks developed pursuant to subsection (h) by the end of the third year of the grant period, no further grant funds shall be made available to the entity after the date of such determination.

(d) PRIORITY.—In awarding grants under this section, the Secretary shall give priority to applications focused on serving low-income, nontraditional students (as defined in section 803(j) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1161c(j))), students who are dislocated workers, or students who are veterans, who do not have a bachelor's degree.

(e) FEDERAL AND NON-FEDERAL SHARE; SUPPLEMENT, NOT SUPPLANT.—

Ms. KILROY (during the reading). Madam Chair, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the reading is dispensed with.

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the amendment is modified.

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 746, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KILROY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Ms. KILROY. Thank you, Madam Chair. I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

My amendment will help Americans looking for jobs. My amendment will focus on getting the 55,000 unemployed central Ohioans in my district back working and also help veterans get the training that they and millions of unemployed Americans need to get that job, a job that will support a family and increase their wages. My amendment is possible because of the strong work of Chairman MILLER and his committee, and I thank him for that.

For many, finding a new job will mean enrolling in school at a time when the costs of higher education have been steadily increasing. Community colleges often represent the best

and most affordable opportunity for individuals who need to obtain new skills but do not have the means to pay the tuition. Columbus State Community College in my district has been a source of pride because of the outstanding job they have done in these tough economic times to improve workforce training. On their own, they have created a special scholarship program that gives workers over the age of 25 without degrees up to \$3,500 for re-training.

My amendment would ensure that Columbus State can continue their program and will encourage community colleges across the country to focus on dislocated workers and veterans. My amendment would help all of our out-of-work constituents, like the program at Columbus State has already helped my constituent Ryan. Raising a family of five, he was laid off from his job at a GM auto parts plant. But the scholarship program allowed him to retrain and pursue a passion to become a chef, get a full-time job and support his family. Not only did he receive a full-time job at a local restaurant, but he was also encouraged to open a catering business. His first job was a graduation party this summer that led to 14 new catering opportunities.

Madam Chair, this bill will be historic because of the opportunities it creates for education for our children. My amendment will ensure that this historic bill will also assist out-of-work Americans and veterans by getting them out of dead ends and into successful career paths.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time

Mr. KLINE of Minnesota. Madam Chair, I rise to claim time in opposition to the amendment, although, once again, I do not plan to oppose the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. KLINE of Minnesota. Thank you, Madam Chair.

Our higher education system should be focused on serving low-income and nontraditional students along with dislocated workers and veterans. In fact, some parts of the system are already working and working well. Community colleges and proprietary institutions, for example, are addressing this need. I do not oppose prioritizing these populations if we're providing grants for education and job training. But again, this amendment proves that H.R. 3221 was crafted hastily, failing to adequately address the needs of students and job seekers. It creates a new program that duplicates many of the purposes of the existing job training system under the Workforce Investment Act which is long overdue for reauthorization, I might add. Those populations are receiving assistance today under WIA.

I would also point out the perverse consequences of this bill coupled with

this amendment. Under H.R. 3221, we will likely see significant job losses, creating those dislocated workers. Rather than adding to the number of dislocated workers, we should simply abandon this job-killing bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. KILROY. May I inquire, Madam Chair, how much time I have?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Ohio has 2½ minutes remaining.

Ms. KILROY. I yield such time as he may consume to Representative ANDREWS from New Jersey.

Mr. ANDREWS. I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

The committee expresses its strong support for the gentlelady's amendment. The amendment is very much about a person who's not simply seeking a new job, like the story the gentlelady told about Ryan, but who is seeking a new career. And frankly, this is the difference between the issues raised in the Workforce Investment Act, which we should reauthorize, and this bill. The Workforce Investment Act really focuses on switching from job to job and helping someone do that.

The gentlelady's amendment and this bill focus on building a whole new life and a whole new career, which is necessary for many of our people. They have to do it involuntarily, but it also makes that available for the person who perhaps is doing it voluntarily.

The gentlelady's amendment properly focuses on the 55,000 people in her district and the millions of people across this country who find themselves involuntarily in a position where they must build a new career and a new life. Her amendment rewards institutions that are most innovative and creative in achieving that goal. For these reasons, we enthusiastically support the gentlelady's amendment and would urge a "yes" vote.

Mr. KLINE of Minnesota. Madam Chair, we're going to support this amendment. I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. KILROY. Madam Chair, I appreciate the support from my colleagues and my colleagues from across the aisle. It is time that we come together to address this issue of the unemployed in our country. This amendment is about them. It's about getting them the education, the jobs and the training that will help them contribute to our economy and support their families.

I thank you very much and ask for support from my colleagues for the amendment and for this bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KILROY), as modified.

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 17 OFFERED BY MR. MINNICK

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 17 printed in House Report 111-256.

Mr. MINNICK. I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 17 offered by Mr. MINNICK:
Page 193, line 8, amend clause (iv) to read as follows:

(iv) transfer of general education credits, including education credits earned while serving in the Armed Forces, between institutions of higher education, as applicable;

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 746, the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. MINNICK) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. MINNICK. Madam Chair, no group better exemplifies the power of what a college education can accomplish in building on practical life experiences than that of our Nation's servicemen and -women. So many of my State's and our Nation's leaders grew into adulthood through the military and then, with the benefit of a quality college education, went on to serve their communities and countries in positions of significant leadership in all walks of life.

□ 1130

It is critical that members of the Armed Forces who thirst for further formal education and show the extra initiative to earn college credit while in the service have the opportunity later to count those credits toward an advanced degree.

I'm proud to say that my amendment to the Student Aid and Fiscal Responsibility Act will enhance that opportunity by allowing servicemen and women to transfer academic credits earned while serving in the Armed Forces between institutions of higher education so as to benefit not only themselves but their families and their country.

My amendment has been endorsed by the Iraq and Afghanistan Veterans of America, the Idaho Division of Veteran Services, and the Idaho American Legion.

I would like to thank Chairman MILLER and members of the Education and Labor Committee for their hard work on this legislation.

I urge my colleagues to support the Minnick amendment.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Madam Chair, I rise to claim time in opposition though I do not oppose the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Madam Chair, this amendment is important, I think, because I have some military experience and I have a lot of friends with military experience, and as we send our young men and women across the world to defend us, they do take advantage of college opportunities that so many people

and so many institutions do offer our military. And when they come home, we should expect that their efforts should count towards their degrees.

I think this is a very good thing to do, and I appreciate the gentleman from Idaho for bringing this forward.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MINNICK. I thank the gentleman, and I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

Mr. ANDREWS. I thank the author of the amendment for yielding.

The committee strongly supports his amendment and commends him for his excellent work.

No student should pay twice for the same course. If someone takes an English course and excels in it and learns a certain set of skills, he or she should then not have to pay again and consume his or her time again a second time around at a different institution. This is even more true for the men and women who volunteer to serve this country in the Armed Forces. I think it's very important that the House understands the benefits of Mr. MINNICK's very wise amendment.

If a young American today who's serving in Afghanistan is able to access college credits whether online or in person and then he or she returns to his or her hometown and wants to transfer those credits so he or she can then build on their education, what Mr. MINNICK says is that's one of the standards that we're going to hold these institutions to to see how well they cooperate with that veteran who has returned home. What it really does is make sure that the veteran has extra leverage, that if the course meets reasonable academic requirements and if the student really learns what he or she should, they're going to get the credit; so the veteran is not going to pay twice, nor is he or she going to have to spend as much time on their course. This is a very important to a lot of our returning veterans.

The committee enthusiastically embraces and supports this amendment by Mr. MINNICK.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Again I just want to say I agree. When our military men and women travel, they're temporary. When they travel, they're away from their homes and they move around quite often. And the military has done an outstanding job of encouraging people to advance their degrees, advance in the ranks; noncommissioned officers as well as commissioned officers now require education and degrees. And I think it's very important that we do this, as they may be in Afghanistan for a year and then back in Fort Campbell, Kentucky, for a year or two, and they're picking up different courses. Then when they get home and want to get on with their life and get back into the civilian sector, they ought to put all that together into a clear path towards a degree.

Again I appreciate the gentleman bringing this forward.

Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MINNICK. I thank the gentleman from Kentucky, and I appreciate the bipartisan support for this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. MINNICK).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. MINNICK. Madam Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Idaho will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 18 OFFERED BY MR. PERRIELLO

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 18 printed in House Report 111-256.

Mr. PERRIELLO. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 18 offered by Mr. PERRIELLO:

Page 161, line 21, redesignate paragraph (14) as paragraph (15).

Page 161, after line 20, insert the following:

(14) A description of any disparity by geographic area (urban and rural) of available high quality early learning programs for low-income children and the steps the State will take to decrease such disparity, if applicable.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 746, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. PERRIELLO) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. PERRIELLO. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Today I rise in support of my amendment to H.R. 3221, the Student Financial Assistance and Fiscal Responsibility Act of 2009.

Simply stated, a well-educated citizenry is the bedrock of democracy. H.R. 3221 will help to renew America's global leadership in education. The bill will accomplish this important goal by making college more accessible, reforming quality early education opportunities, and by strengthening community colleges and training programs to help build a highly skilled and innovative 21st century workforce that is ready for the rigors of a global economy.

Study after study has validated the important role that early childhood education plays in a student's future educational success. U.S. Secretary of Health and Human Services, Kathleen Sebelius, recently testified before Congress, noting that "too many children are entering school without the basic skills they need to succeed in kindergarten and beyond." The Secretary went on to say what many of us already know: "Children who start off

school behind their peers are more likely to stay behind throughout their school lives and into adulthood, meaning they never reach their full potential."

As a representative of a rural district, I know all too well the myriad of challenges faced by our rural public schools, many of which are faced with the evolving responsibility of providing our children with a first-class education while operating on less than adequate resources. In light of these disparities and the critical nexus between quality early childhood education and future educational success, I believe that affirmative steps must be taken to ensure that all public schools, regardless of geographic location, receive equal treatment in Federal education reform initiatives.

To that end the amendment I offer today would require that those States participating in the U.S. Department of Education's Quality Pathways Grant Program will evaluate and report to the Secretary of Education a description of any disparity by geographic area, rural and urban, that exists in ongoing high-quality, early learning programs for low-income children. The amendment would also require that participating States outline the steps the State will take to address any such disparities. The Congressional Budget Office has determined this amendment would have no direct effect on Federal direct spending or revenues and thus would have no PAYGO impact.

The key here is to do two things: First, to focus on the vital issue of early childhood development and education; and, second, not to punish those rural areas where disparity exists but rather to reward those areas that have identified that problem and laid out a plan for moving forward. This is not about punishing but about rewarding success, rewarding innovation, and moving forward, particularly in those crucial rural areas where it's so important that our children, our young people, get these same opportunities. As a Nation, we have a responsibility to ensure that all of our children have access to a high-quality education and the American Dream.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this amendment and the underlying legislation so that we may move forward with our commitment to America's future.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Madam Chair, I rise to claim time in opposition though I'm not opposed to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Madam Chair, as I understand it, the purpose of this amendment is to ensure States applying for this new pre-K funding understand any geographic disparity between early learning programs for low-income children and consider steps to reduce the

disparity. This amendment's a positive step. It may even move us closer to ensuring more low-income children are served by this program, something that's really not clearly spelled out in the bill.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PERRIELLO. I thank the gentleman for his remarks, and I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. ANDREWS. I thank my friend for yielding and express the committee's strong support for his well-thought-out amendment.

The amendment reflects embracing three principles. The first is deficit reduction, because the underlying bill reduces the deficit by \$10 billion. The second is the value of high-quality pre-kindergarten education for the children of this country. And the third is the principle of fairness. The quality of a child's education should not depend on his or her zip code. What Mr. PERRIELLO's amendment does is to say that States who receive these early learning grants will have to pay attention to that fact, to discern any patterns of inequality that exist and talk about what they're going to do to fix them. We think that's a very important point, and we commend Mr. PERRIELLO for listening to people in his district. I know he represents a lot of very small counties and local subdivisions, but I know that he doesn't treat anyone's concerns as small. And by raising this amendment, he is raising the concerns of those constituents.

The committee enthusiastically supports this amendment.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PERRIELLO. Madam Chair, I ask that my colleagues support this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. PERRIELLO).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 19 OFFERED BY MR. SCHAUER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 19 printed in House Report 111-256.

Mr. SCHAUER. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 19 offered by Mr. SCHAUER: Page 31, line 10, redesignate subparagraph (D) as subparagraph (E).

Page 31, line 17, redesignate subparagraph (E) as subparagraph (F).

Page 31, after line 9, insert the following:

(D) include activities to encourage dislocated workers (as such term is defined in section 101(9) of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2801(9)) to complete postsecondary education opportunities;

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 746, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SCHAUER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. SCHAUER. Madam Chair, my amendment gives priority in awarding Federal grants to schools, States, and nonprofits to encourage dislocated workers to complete their degrees.

In the last 2 years, 6.5 million Americans have lost their jobs, and many of them remain dislocated workers. These individuals are in need of retraining in a new field that will help them transition in the new economy. And nowhere is this more true than in my home State of Michigan.

I want to tell you about Ray Roddy in Hillsdale, Michigan. His home county, by the way, has an unemployment rate of 20 percent. Mr. Roddy was laid off from his job making engine components and realized he would need further education to find another job. He enrolled at Jackson Community College and is working hard to become a nurse. Many like Ray need retraining to regain employment in a new field but are unable to find it.

Now, within the Access and Completion Innovation Fund, my amendment will give priority to degree completion, something that matters to people like Ray Roddy. H.R. 3221 will make key investments in providing Americans with affordable and accessible education. My amendment will ensure that those who have been hurt the most in this tough economy, like Ray, aren't lost and are provided with opportunities for retraining to get back on their feet.

Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE).

Mr. ETHERIDGE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Chair, I rise to engage in a colloquy with the gentleman from California, the distinguished chairman of the Education and Labor Committee.

Yesterday we voted to accept an amendment to ensure that local educational agencies that contain a military installation selected for closure under the BRAC process would qualify for access to reserved funds for distressed areas.

Mr. Chairman, not only do base closures under the BRAC process significantly affect local communities but also do rapid expansions due to realignment. The significant influx of military families, while welcomed in our communities, results in immediate and significant enrollment increases in our local schools and community colleges. These rapid population shifts put a strain on local budgets already distressed by the economic downturn.

Mr. Chairman, I am hopeful that as we move to conference, we can contemplate how we might assist these communities as well.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SCHAUER. I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ETHERIDGE. I yield to the chairman.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I realize that the BRAC process has a multitude of consequences for local communities, both those facing base closures and those dealing with base expansions. As we move forward, we can take a look at how we might assist these communities under existing avenues as well as in conference on this legislation.

□ 1145

Mr. ETHERIDGE. I thank the gentleman from California for his work on this issue and for this legislation.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Madam Chairman, I rise to claim time in opposition, although I do not oppose the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Kentucky is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. GUTHRIE. The purpose of this amendment is to ensure dislocated workers are encouraged to compete through the grant process, and we think that's a worthwhile goal.

Also, since I have time, I want to complement what Chairman MILLER just said on BRAC. I actually represent Fort Knox, which is a big winner in the BRAC. I know a lot of communities were distressed before, but Fort Knox is going to be expanding and putting a lot of strain on our local schools.

I look forward to seeing what comes out of conference and being an opportunity to be supportive of that. I really appreciate that very much.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHAUER. Madam Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

Mr. ANDREWS. I thank the author for yielding, and the committee strongly supports his amendment.

This is another example of making sure that the educational opportunities in this bill are focused on American workers who most need the help, those who find themselves with their lives disrupted, their finances in tatters, and in a lot of trouble. The author just told a very moving story about one of his constituents who fit that description. What we want the House to do is move his legislation to success today and move forward so we can help the kind of individuals that the author of the amendment talked about. We thank him for offering it and express our support.

Mr. SCHAUER. Madam Chair, I ask my colleagues to support this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SCHAUER).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. SCHAUER. Madam Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 20 OFFERED BY MR. TEAGUE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 20 printed in House Report 111-256.

Mr. TEAGUE. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 20 offered by Mr. TEAGUE:

Page 182, after line 20, insert the following:

(7) Are students who are veterans.

Page 192, after line 2, insert the following:

(8) Expanding, enhancing, or creating academic programs or training programs that focus on preparing students for skilled occupations in energy-related fields, which may be carried out in partnership with employers and may include other relevant partners, that provide relevant job-skill training (including apprenticeships and worksite learning and training opportunities) for skilled occupations in high-demand industries.

(9) Expanding, enhancing, or creating academic programs or training programs that prepare students for occupations critical to serving veterans, including occupations within the Department of Veterans Affairs health care system.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 746, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. TEAGUE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. TEAGUE. Madam Chairwoman, I rise today to offer the first of two amendments I have to H.R. 3221, the Student Aid and Fiscal Responsibility Act of 2009. I would like to thank Chairwoman SLAUGHTER and Chairman MILLER for allowing the House to debate my proposals.

Madam Chairman, this amendment makes three commonsense changes to the American Graduation Initiative and the Student Aid and Fiscal Responsibility Act. The American Graduation Initiative makes a historic investment in our community colleges.

In my home State of New Mexico, community colleges enroll over 51,000 students. These institutions of higher education provide critical pathways for many nontraditional students to receive an education, and they provide training for workers looking to get hired on in a local industry.

My amendments will help the community colleges in my district access resources to serve the many veterans across New Mexico and help my constituents get training for energy jobs, which represent most of the good-paying jobs available in southern New Mexico.

My first amendment makes sure that the programs geared toward helping our veterans be successful in school are given priority in receiving grants. I consider one of my most important responsibilities in Congress to be looking out for the interests of our veterans. That's why I work for and earned a seat on the Veterans' Affairs Committee, and that's why I introduced this amendment and other legislation on their behalf.

By adopting this amendment, we will make sure that our veterans are at the front of the line in receiving the benefits of the bill. And after the service they have so selflessly given to our country, they deserve to be at the front of the line.

I encourage my colleagues to vote "yes" on this amendment and show our veterans that they are a priority by giving them priority under the American Graduation Initiative.

The next change makes sure that schools can use grant funds to establish, enhance, or expand programs that are geared towards training personnel who can serve our veterans. This change will allow schools to use money from this bill to train workers to serve our veterans in VA hospitals, clinics, and centers across America. And it could mean that we will be training the mental health professionals we need to address the growing problem of post-traumatic stress disorder.

The return of the soldiers from Afghanistan and Iraq is putting a tremendous strain on our already understaffed Veterans' Administration. We must start training workers to fill in these positions. This cannot happen overnight, and we must start making investments in solving this problem today.

The last part of my amendment will help schools in my district train students for energy jobs. In the northeast part of my district, they are looking for wind turbine technicians, and in the southeast we need skilled hands in the oilfield. No matter which part of the energy industry somebody wants to work in, they should be able to get the training they need at the community college in their town.

So my amendment aims to make it easier for schools to use grant funds to establish, enhance, or expand programs that train workers for careers in energy-related fields. A trained energy workforce will help us produce more energy in America, and producing more energy in America is the only way we can end our dependence on foreign oil and make our Nation secure.

I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Madam Chair, I rise to claim time in opposition, although I am not opposed to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Kentucky is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Madam Chairwoman, the purpose of this amendment is twofold: it gives priority for applicants for the Community College Grant Program serving students who are veterans, and it also will allow to expand in energy-related fields.

We do not oppose the amendment, and I yield back my time.

Mr. TEAGUE. Madam Chairwoman, I am happy to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

Mr. ANDREWS. I thank the gentleman from New Mexico, the author of the amendment, for yielding.

The committee strongly supports his very well-thought-out amendment.

Madam Chair, one of the things that I think we need to highlight about this amendment is its wisdom in understanding that perhaps the people who are best suited to work in our VA system are those who served the country themselves in the Armed Forces.

The gentleman talked about the fact that perhaps some of our returning veterans will be trained to work in mental health services for work in VA clinics and VA hospitals. And who would better understand the challenges and issues that one of our returning vets is facing than someone who has walked in his or her shoes?

So we think that among the many good ideas in this amendment, that focus on training people for the VA system makes an awful lot of sense. Obviously, as well, the energy component of the gentleman's amendment makes a great deal of sense.

So the committee thanks the gentleman for offering this amendment and would urge people in both parties to vote "yes" and support it.

Mr. TEAGUE. I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for his comments, and I urge all of my colleagues to vote "yes" on this bill.

Madam Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. TEAGUE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 21 OFFERED BY MR. TEAGUE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 21 printed in House Report 111-256.

Mr. TEAGUE. Madam Chairwoman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 21 offered by Mr. TEAGUE: Page 5, after line 7, insert the following new section (and conform the table of contents accordingly):

SEC. 4. USE OF SAVINGS FOR DEBT REDUCTION.

All savings in Federal expenditures not otherwise expended as a result of the enactment of this Act shall be made available for the reduction of the Federal deficit.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 746, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. TEAGUE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. TEAGUE. Madam Chairwoman, I rise today to offer and speak in support of my deficit reduction amendment to H.R. 3221, the Student Aid and Fiscal Responsibility Act of 2009.

First of all, I would like to thank Chairwoman SLAUGHTER and Chairman MILLER for allowing the amendment to come to the floor today.

My amendment is simple; and like a lot of simple, commonsense legislation,

it's not long either. Here's what it says:

All savings and Federal expenditures not otherwise expended as a result of enactment of this act shall be made available for the reduction of the Federal deficit. In other words, where we don't spend a dollar, we save a dollar.

Madam Chairwoman, America is drowning in debt. On the day that I was sworn in, the national debt was about \$10.6 billion. And this year alone, the Congressional Budget Office expects that we will add another \$1.4 trillion in deficit. This is clearly an unsustainable course. Our government must start practicing some fiscal responsibility. Businessmen like me have to balance their books; government needs to try and do the same.

This bill will put \$10 billion toward reducing the deficit. But if we're going to completely close our annual deficits, we need a sustained solution. That is why I am also a strong supporter of statutory pay-as-you-go legislation, which says that Congress can't spend a dollar without saving a dollar.

Today, with the passage of this legislation, we save \$10 billion of taxpayer money. With the passage of my amendment, we take that \$10 billion and we lock it away for the purpose of deficit reduction. We lock it away to make sure our children and grandchildren don't have to pay a dollar.

So let's save this \$10 billion, but let's also find a sustainable solution to reducing our deficit. That means tightening our belts when we need to, and of course passing statutory PAYGO into law.

Madam Chairwoman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Madam Chairman, I rise to claim time in opposition, although I am not opposed to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Kentucky is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. GUTHRIE. I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

When we're talking about the \$10 billion savings to the deficit and using CBO numbers, the number that we like to talk about, if you look at the overall cost of the budget, CBO numbers in the discretionary side, what this bill would do to the discretionary side, they're transferring money out of the mandatory into the discretionary side for administration.

And, also, as we expand Pell Grants, with this bill we will expand Pell Grants, on the mandatory side, which this bill scores, it doesn't score what will happen in the discretionary side. Part of Pell Grants are discretionary, so if you expand Pell Grant applicants in the mandatory side, it is also going to require additional appropriations. And we believe that the admin in the discretionary side plus the expansion of Pell Grants from CBO numbers is \$13.5 billion cost to the system, which is more than the \$10 billion that we're

putting in the deficit reduction now. So we will have to increase more than we're putting in the deficit reduction.

The other thing is, these numbers were scored by CBO in March, and the most up-to-date numbers of people participating in the Pell Grants as of August—now that we're here in September—the August numbers believe that it will be \$11.4 billion in added Pell Grant costs when using the most up-to-date numbers. And so I think those are real numbers that we can talk about. We are already up to—I guess it's \$25 billion of costs that this will have when we're talking about \$10 billion in savings.

The one thing that wasn't taken into account either—and these are numbers that could come to pass or not, but those first two numbers I think are real. The other is the \$33 billion that CBO says hasn't been identified that are market risk to the program. Now, that's market risk: so you could have them, you could not have them, I'll cede that. But I do believe that the discretionary side of Pell and the most up-to-date numbers of Pell do show that it's about a \$25 billion cost of the bill.

Madam Chairwoman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TEAGUE. Madam Chairwoman, I am happy to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

Mr. ANDREWS. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding. We are in strong support of his amendment.

Since his very first day in the House, the gentleman has worked diligently on the issue of addressing our deficit and reducing our debt. By supporting this amendment and by supporting this bill, he is following that course in a couple of ways. First, he is understanding that reducing entitlements is a key to reducing the deficit. And this bill has a net reduction of \$10 billion in mandatory spending, as validated by the Congressional Budget Office. It is one of the single most significant entitlement reductions in several years, and the gentleman is to be commended for supporting it.

Second, the amendment shows understanding that economic growth is a powerful way to reduce our deficit and, therefore, our debt. And by supporting the investment in the education of the American people, we are supporting more jobs and more economic growth.

Finally, I would commend the gentleman for making sure that every dollar of that \$10 billion in entitlement reduction will in fact be dedicated to deficit reduction.

The gentleman has offered a very good amendment. The committee strongly supports it and urges a "yes" vote.

□ 1200

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Chairman, if we disagree with the CBO numbers from the March score, instead of using the

most up-to-date ones, if you take \$10 billion and save it from a mandatory program, I applaud that, and I applaud the amendment because we should save toward deficit reduction. Yet, if the bill allows you to take \$10 billion and to save it for deficit reduction but on the discretionary side of the counter a tax dollar is a tax dollar and it requires you to spend \$13.5 billion on transferring administrative costs from the program to discretionary, then the additional Pell Grants are going to have to be spent by the discretionary side through the appropriations process. So when you save \$10 billion here but you spend \$13.5 billion there, then you're raising the deficit \$3.5 billion. I don't know any other way to look at it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Chairman, the CBO says that this bill will generate savings, and my amendment says that these savings will go to paying off the deficit.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GUTHRIE. I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. HOLDEN). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. TEAGUE).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Mexico will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 22 OFFERED BY MR. SOUDER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 22 printed in House Report 111-256.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of turn for 2 minutes.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, it is now time, as the Chair has noted, to move to amendment No. 22 by Mr. SOUDER. My understanding is that Mr. SOUDER will not be offering that amendment and that he and the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. PERLMUTTER) have had discussions around this amendment, and they have agreed that we should work this out in the conference committee. I have agreed to their discussions, and they are pursuing those at this time.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Thank you, Mr. MILLER.

Mr. Chairman, Mr. SOUDER and I have had a conversation. I think we're going to reach a good compromise that will be good for the bill. I have committed, as have you, to work with Mr. SOUDER

in a conference committee to get that done.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I thank the gentleman.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

AMENDMENT NO. 23 OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 23 printed in House Report 111-256.

Mr. FLAKE. I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 23 offered by Mr. FLAKE:

Page 5, after line 7, insert the following new section (and conform the table of contents accordingly):

SEC. 4. PROHIBITION ON EARMARKS.

None of the funds appropriated pursuant to this Act may be used for a Congressional earmark as defined in clause 9(d) of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 746, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chair, this amendment, I believe, is noncontroversial. It simply ensures that the funds within the new grant programs created in this bill are not earmarked but, rather, that they are awarded on a competitive or on a formula basis.

It is important that we add prohibitive language here. There is prohibitive language in one of the sections of the bill, but it does not apply to the entire bill, so we need to ensure that the entire bill with these new grant programs isn't earmarked.

As we have seen in the past, unfortunately, even when Congress says we have no intention of earmarking these accounts or this bill, we do. The best example, perhaps, is the Homeland Security bill. When the Homeland Security legislation came through first and we created the department, we were told that we wouldn't be earmarking these funds. Well, it just took us a few years, and now there are literally hundreds of earmarks in the Homeland Security bill.

Many of the accounts that should be awarded on a competitive basis—disaster mitigation and other things—are now earmarked, so when communities and organizations apply for this funding, it's already earmarked, and they can't even compete. We don't want this to happen in other areas as well, so it's important that this amendment is accepted. I believe that it will be.

It is consistent with legislation that I've offered before to the BEACH Act a couple of years ago. That was voted on with a roll call vote and was approved. Later, when the Paycheck Fairness Act passed last year, this amendment was accepted by a voice vote. Most recently, it was accepted by voice vote on H.R. 1262, the Water Quality Invest-

ment Act, and on H.R. 2200, the TSA authorization bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ANDREWS. I rise to claim time in opposition, although I will not oppose the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, the committee supports the amendment. The clear intention of the underlying spending bill is that the funds be awarded on the formula and competitive basis stated in the bill. There is no intention that any be earmarked.

For the record, I would just say that our support of the amendment should not be read to imply that we do not support congressionally sponsored projects in other contexts, but on this one, I agree with the gentleman's amendment and would urge its acceptance.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FLAKE. I thank the gentleman.

I wish the gentleman would make that statement, but I don't expect that here, certainly, and I am pleased that this amendment will be accepted.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ANDREWS. I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 24 OFFERED BY MR. GUTHRIE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 24 printed in House Report 111-256.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 24 offered by Mr. GUTHRIE:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SEC. 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Ensuring Student Choice and Competition Act of 2009".

SEC. 2. EXTENSION OF ENSURING CONTINUED ACCESS AND STUDENT LOANS ACT.

Section 459A of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1087i-1) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1), by striking "July 1, 2010" and inserting "July 1, 2014";

(2) in subsection (e)—

(A) in paragraph (1)(A), by striking "September 30, 2010" and inserting "September 30, 2014";

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by striking "February 15, 2011" and inserting "February 15, 2015"; and

(ii) by striking "September 30, 2010" and inserting "September 30, 2014"; and

(C) in paragraph (3), by striking "2010, and 2011" and inserting "2010, 2011, 2012, 2013, 2014, and 2015";

(3) in subsection (f), by striking "July 1, 2010" and inserting "July 1, 2014"; and

(4) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(g) SPECIAL RULE.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), in carrying out the program under this section, the Secretary shall continue, until

June 30, 2014, to carry out the 3 programs described in the Federal Register notices published pursuant to subsection (a)(2) of this section, as such programs were in effect on the day before the date of enactment of the Ensuring Student Choice and Competition Act of 2009.

“(2) LOAN PARTICIPATION PURCHASE PROGRAM.—Notwithstanding any provision of law to the contrary or the terms and conditions of the programs described in the Federal Register notices published pursuant to subsection (a)(2), an eligible lender participating in the loan participation purchase program shall not, prior to July 1, 2014, be required to—

“(A) make a redemption payment with respect to each eligible loan purchased by the Secretary; or

“(B) exercise the put option with respect to each such loan.

“(3) DEFINITIONS.—The terms ‘redemption payment’ and ‘put option’ refer to the redemption payment and put option described in the summary of the terms and conditions of the loan participation purchase program (73 Federal Register 127, July 1, 2008).”.

SEC. 3. STUDY OF FFEL PROGRAM ALTERNATIVES.

(a) STUDY REQUIRED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Comptroller General of the United States, the Secretary of Education, and the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the study group described in paragraph (2), shall conduct a study to identify and make recommendations for the development of a Federal student loan program that incorporates a strong public-private partnership between the Federal Government and the private sector.

(2) STUDY GROUP.—The Comptroller General of the United States, the Secretary of Education, and the Secretary of the Treasury shall convene a study group which shall include—

(A) the Director of the Office of Management and Budget;

(B) the Director of the Congressional Budget Office;

(C) representatives of entities making loans under part B of title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1071 et seq.);

(D) representatives of other entities in the financial services community;

(E) representatives of other participants in the student loan programs; and

(F) such other individuals as the Comptroller General of the United States, the Secretary of Education, and the Secretary of the Treasury may designate.

(b) DESIGN OF THE STUDY.—The study conducted under this section shall identify recommendations for a new model for maintaining a strong public-private partnership for student lending. Such model shall be designed to achieve the following objectives:

(1) Use private capital in loan origination.

(2) Produce sufficient market competition among loan providers to ensure that students and families have choices in Federal student loans.

(3) Avoid waste, fraud, and abuse.

(c) FACTORS.—The study group shall consider the following factors in developing recommendations for a model that meets the objectives described in subsection (b):

(1) The ability of lenders, guaranty agencies, and loan servicers to provide top-quality customer service, default aversion activities, and financial literacy activities.

(2) The use of in-school subsidies or flexible repayment options to ensure that borrowers are able to successfully repay their loans.

(3) The ability of the program to be streamlined for ease of administration and understanding by institutions of higher education, students, and families.

(4) The stability of the program during times of economic disruption by uncontrollable market forces.

(5) The use of market mechanisms in determining lender return on student loans, while continuing to meet the other objectives of the programs under parts B and D of title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1071 et seq; 1087a et seq.), including the provision of loans to all eligible students.

(6) The feasibility of requiring borrowers to repay loans through income tax withholding.

(d) PRELIMINARY REPORT AND PUBLICATION OF STUDY.—

(1) PRELIMINARY REPORT.—Not later than July 1, 2012, the study group shall prepare a preliminary report on the recommendations of the study conducted under this section, including any additional or dissenting views with respect to the findings, available to the public with a 60-day request for public comment. The study group shall review the public comments.

(2) FINAL REPORT.—Not later than January 1, 2013, the Comptroller General of the United States, the Secretary of Education, and Secretary of the Treasury shall submit a final report on the recommendations of the study, including any additional or dissenting views, to the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate.

SEC. 4. REVISED SPECIAL ALLOWANCE CALCULATION.

(a) REVISED CALCULATION RULE.—Section 438(b)(2)(I) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1087-1(b)(2)(I)) is amended by adding at the end the following new clause:

“(vii) REVISED CALCULATION RULE TO REFLECT FINANCIAL MARKET CONDITIONS.—

“(I) CALCULATION BASED ON LIBOR.—For the calendar quarter beginning on October 1, 2009, and each subsequent calendar quarter, in computing the special allowance paid pursuant to this subsection with respect to loans described in subclause (II), clause (i)(I) of this subparagraph shall be applied by substituting ‘of the 1-month London Inter Bank Offered Rate (LIBOR) for United States dollars in effect for each of the days in such quarter as compiled and released by the British Bankers Association’ for ‘of the quotes of the 3-month commercial paper (financial) rates in effect for each of the days in such quarter as reported by the Federal Reserve in Publication H-15 (or its successor) for such 3-month period’.

“(II) LOANS ELIGIBLE FOR LIBOR-BASED CALCULATION.—The special allowance paid pursuant to this subsection shall be calculated as described in subclause (I) with respect to special allowance payments for the 3-month period ending December 31, 2009, and each succeeding 3-month period, on loans for which the first disbursement is made—

“(aa) on or after the date of enactment of the Student Aid and Fiscal Responsibility Act of 2009, and before July 1, 2010; and

“(bb) on or after January 1, 2000, and before the date of enactment of the Student Aid and Fiscal Responsibility Act of 2009, if, not later than the last day of the second full fiscal quarter after the date of enactment of such Act, the holder of the loan affirmatively and permanently waives all contractual, statutory or other legal rights to a special allowance paid pursuant to this subsection that is calculated using the formula in effect at the time the loans were first disbursed.

“(III) TERMS OF WAIVER.—A waiver pursuant to subclause (II)(bb) shall—

“(aa) be applicable to all loans described in such subclause that are held under any lender identification number associated with the holder (pursuant to section 487B); and

“(bb) apply with respect to all future calculations of the special allowance on loans described in such subclause that are held on the date of such waiver or that are acquired by the holder after such date.

“(IV) PARTICIPANT’S YIELD.—For the calendar quarter beginning on October 1, 2009, and each subsequent calendar quarter, the Secretary’s participant yield in any loan for which the first disbursement is made on or after January 1, 2000, and before October 1, 2009, and that is held by a lender that has sold any participation interest in such loan to the Secretary shall be determined by using the LIBOR-based rate described in subclause (I) as the substitute rate (for the commercial paper rate) referred to in the participation agreement between the Secretary and such lender.”;

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 438(b)(2)(I) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1087-1(b)(2)(I)) is further amended—

(1) in clause (i)(II), by striking “such average bond equivalent rate” and inserting “the rate determined under subclause (I)”; and

(2) in clause (v)(III) by striking “(iv), and (vi)” and inserting “(iv), (vi), and (vii)”.

SEC. 5. AUTHORIZATION AND APPROPRIATION OF FUNDS.

Section 401A(e)(1)(E) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (U.S.C. 1070a-1(e)(1)(E)) is amended by striking “\$1,010,000,000” and inserting “\$250,000,000”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 746, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. GUTHRIE) and a Member opposed each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

I am pleased to join Ranking Member KLINE in offering this amendment. Our amendment accomplishes key goals for student loan stabilization and reform without gutting a successful public-private partnership.

First, this amendment preserves the FFEL program—the Federal Family Education Loan Program. It ensures stability and continuity for both students and schools by extending the Ensuring Continued Access for Student Loans Act, or ECASLA, through 2014, which aligns it with the rest of the Higher Education Act, which Congress reauthorized last year.

As long as we’re facing a global credit shortage, ECASLA provides a Federal backstop to ensure there is no interruption in funding for students and families. As the market recovers, ECASLA offers the flexibility for private capital to return. In fact, even in today’s weakened economy, a substantial portion of loans originated in the FFEL program are made with private capital.

We know the ECASLA programs are working on campuses all around the country. We have heard from a group of financial aid administrators who have made it clear that ECASLA is working. You just don’t have to talk to financial administrators. I would submit that 4,400 colleges and universities still participate in the FFEL program, and they voted with their feet. If they felt

that ECASLA had not been working, they would have joined the Direct Loan Program by now, but they haven't.

I've heard from colleges and universities across my district—from large public, State universities to small, independent, private colleges, and they've all shared with me how the FFEL program benefits their students by offering the services of flexibility and choice with additional services. Let's not forget about how this helps students.

Second, our amendment will drive down the deficit. ECASLA proves that you can save taxpayer money while preserving an effective program. In fact, we expect to generate \$13 billion in savings over the next 5 years. Poll after poll shows that the American people are deeply concerned about the deficit. We should invest in future generations by putting the savings toward deficit reduction.

Third, we chart a path for the future by pursuing a comprehensive renewal of student lending. By extending ECASLA through 2014, consistent with other financial aid programs, we create a vital window of opportunity to pursue real student loan reform. Our amendment would create a commission to study the student lending system and would propose a new framework for stable, cost-effective financing.

We will remove politics from the discussion and focus on what matters: preserving choice and competition for borrowers; preventing waste, fraud and abuse; maintaining value-added benefits like financial literacy and counseling; ensuring stability even in a weak economy; and retaining private capital, avoiding a massive infliction of debt on future generations.

Finally, I would like to point out that our amendment does not create the same long-term entitlement expansions that have been called for in this bill. The issues addressed in the majority's bill are all important. Republicans care about the condition of our schools, about pre-K education, about community colleges, and about their role in developing our workforce, but this is the wrong place and the wrong way to address these challenges. We can invest in students without crippling them with runaway entitlement spending. This is a straightforward amendment based on extending a bipartisan solution. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I will oppose the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment recognizes the need for substantial reform in the Federal student loan program. It recognizes that the practice of using taxpayer money to reward private institutions that take risks, not with their own money but with taxpayer money, doesn't

make any sense. So there is recognition of this problem, and that recognition is shared by the underlying bill, but here is where the underlying bill parts company from the amendment, and it's why we oppose it.

There is a huge difference between these two approaches on what to do. The approach that the minority favors saves about \$17 billion less than the approach that the underlying bill favors. It's a reform that continues, unwisely in my judgment, the practice of using taxpayer money to subsidize private institutions that take a risk with taxpayer money. So, rather than continue those subsidies, the underlying bill makes some very different choices, and here is the difference on what the choices are in the \$17 billion difference.

The underlying bill says let's spend that money so returning veterans could get Pell Grants in addition to their GI benefits and continue their educations. They would spend the \$17 billion on bank subsidies.

Our bill recognizes the fact that community colleges are burgeoning with new enrollees who need an education because of the tumultuous circumstances in our economy. Our bill says let's spend the \$17 billion to strengthen those community colleges. The amendment says let's spend it on bank subsidies.

There are students, as we speak, who are attending schools. They're taking classes in broom closets, in former boiler rooms because their schools don't have adequate places to teach children. There are schools that are more than 100 years old where children are learning about the Civil War in buildings that were built at the time of the Civil War. Our bill says let's invest some of that \$17 billion in upgrading the quality of those schools and in putting Americans back to work. The amendment says, no, let's spend it on bank subsidies.

Finally, there is a choice about early childhood. Our bill says that we value and want to invest in the reading and math skills of a 4-year-old or a 5-year-old so he or she can excel as a student, can climb the ladder as a student and can succeed as a worker and as a taxpayer. So it makes an historic investment in quality early childhood education around this country. Their bill favors bank subsidies. We think our approach is right.

At this time, I yield to the chairman of the full committee to continue the argument, the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER).

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, my colleague on the other side of the aisle said that this legislation is the wrong way and the wrong place to make this investment. He has got it exactly backwards. This is the exact way to make this investment—to take the savings by cutting the subsidies to the lenders and recycling those on behalf of families, students and our community institutions

so that we can expand the educational opportunities in this country.

We cannot continue just to wring our hands about our competitive place in the world, about the need for new engineers, new scientists, new mathematicians, a skilled and technologically fit workforce in this country. We must do something about it.

What the Obama administration has said under the leadership of the President and the Secretary of Education is that we're going to do something about it now, and we're going to provide additional money for Pell Grants, that we're going to provide additional money for community colleges, that we're going to provide additional money for early childhood education, and that we're going to provide additional opportunities for access and completion of that educational opportunity. It's not enough that young people start college. It's important that they finish college.

We've got to do better at that, and we're going to do it in a fiscally sound manner. We're going to pay for it, because there is enough money in those exorbitant subsidies that we pay decade after decade that were first raised to the consciousness of this Congress by President Bush's Office of Management and Budget. They kept showing us the comparison. If you ran the Direct Loan Program, you would save a huge amount of money for the taxpayers.

Finally, this Congress, under this administration, is taking the leadership to take that money and to recycle it on behalf of our families and students.

□ 1215

I just want to say, this is the right time, the right place, and the right way to do this. I thank him for his support in opposition to this amendment.

Mr. ANDREWS. We reserve the balance of our time.

Mr. GUTHRIE. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KLINE).

Mr. KLINE of Minnesota. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

We clearly have some differences of opinion on this legislation, as often happens in this body. I want to underscore a couple of things that the underlying bill, by mandating the public option, mandating a government takeover of an industry, does to expand the government's role. It creates new programs, it creates new expenses. It will cost jobs in the private sector.

And when you remove the budget gimmicks, and you look at the latest numbers from the Congressional Budget Office, it is clear that it will add to the deficit. It will add to our debt.

And so we are looking at an underlying bill here that says it's better if we turn over to the Department of Education and the Treasury the responsibilities of lending \$100 billion a year to students and getting the interest back from those loans.

Of course, we don't have the \$100 billion. We are running a deficit this year

of \$1.6 trillion, and we are looking at a debt in 10 years of \$21 trillion. So in order for the government, now this huge bank, to have the money to lend, the government is going to have to go somewhere, China perhaps, and borrow that money so that it can lend the money. This seems to be a strange time to be doing this.

I think the underlying bill is flawed. I think it is a rush to a government takeover. It is going to add to our deficit.

So I rise in strong support of this amendment, which says let's take advantage of the private sector. Let's see if there is a way that we can strengthen it, encourage it. Let's take some time and continue with the bipartisan agreement ECASLA and look at the program before we push precipitously the entire industry into the hands of the government.

Mr. ANDREWS. I would inquire of the Chair how much time we have remaining on our side?

The Acting CHAIR. Both sides have 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. ANDREWS. Before I yield to the gentleman from New York, it is very important for the Members to understand the alternative proposal substitute guts the early childhood investment, guts the increase in Pell Grant, guts the aid to community college and guts the other investments in education, the historically black colleges, the Hispanic-serving institutions, it takes away that investment. We think that is very unwise.

At this time I would yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. BISHOP).

Mr. BISHOP of New York. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise in opposition to the amendment, and I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this amendment.

Frankly, I am surprised. Over the last 2 days we have heard a great deal from our friends on the other side of the aisle about the deficit, about which we should all quite correctly be concerned. And, frankly, I thought that their substitute amendment would address that issue in a very forceful way.

This amendment does not. This amendment leaves in place a program that is wasteful and expensive. It leaves in place a program that costs approximately \$8 billion to \$9 billion more per year than that which we are proposing to take its place, the Direct Loan Program.

What this amendment essentially says is that over the next 5 years, the Federal Government gets to do the heavy lifting of this loan program. The Federal Government gets to do the heavy lifting of providing the capital, it gets to do the heavy lifting of guaranteeing the amounts that are loaned, and the private lenders get to walk away with the profits. I don't see how any reasonable person can think that that is a situation that we can allow to stand.

What the amendment also says is, it says to needy students, Hope you can

get by, hope you can make it as you try to pay your bills. We would love to help, but we have got these lenders that are counting on huge profits, and we have got to make sure that we provide for them.

Our proposal, the underlying bill, says quite the opposite. Our proposal says that we are going to pay, take Federal tax dollars and put them to their highest possible use in this circumstance, and that is helping needy students go to college.

Every one of us, virtually every one of us that has the privilege of serving in this Chamber, is here because we had the opportunity to seek a higher education. What our bill does, the underlying bill does, is it says to everyone else that's out there, that has aspirations of their own, that we are going to help you get your slice of the American dream.

In doing so, we build a stronger Nation, because we build a Nation that can compete on equal footing with the rest of the world.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Chairman, the 2014 numbers, when the Higher Education Act is reauthorized—and we feel it would be appropriate to do it—when we have ECASLA in place, when the markets are turning around, when the markets do turn around, the heavy lifting—we were at a unique time last year. I wasn't in the Congress last year when the bipartisan group came together to do ECASLA to preserve, and worked, both Republicans and Democrats together, and should be commended for that.

All we are asking is that we continue that until the higher education is authorized, during that time have the commission study and see exactly with what program we should go. We did talk a lot about deficit reduction because, quite frankly, I think that's the most important thing in the country.

If we look at CBO numbers, when you say \$10 billion in a mandatory spending program, but spend \$13.5 billion in a discretionary spending program using CBO numbers, then you are not putting \$10 billion to the deficit if you are spending \$13.5 billion in discretionary spending, because as the Pell Grants expand on the mandatory side of the aisle, they also expand on the discretionary side. So when a taxpayer sends their dollar to Washington D.C., they don't mark it for discretionary or mandatory, it comes here and it's spent.

So the underlying bill, using CBO numbers, I am not going to bring in the market risk, because we can argue that. Some people have asked for \$33 billion, we could argue that. But just in real hard numbers, spending, transferring administration in the Pell Grant, discretionary side, says that the underlying bill is a \$3.5 billion addition to the deficit.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ANDREWS. We would respectfully ask that the House disapprove this amendment, vote against it.

I did want to return to one of the fiscal arguments we heard from my friend

from Minnesota, that he is right, that the idea of borrowing money from central banks around the world is not desirable to anyone here. And he is right that we should embark on an effort to reduce our deficit and eventually reduce that debt.

But I would respectfully say he is wrong with his further characterization of this issue.

What the status quo does is to borrow that very same money, which none of us wants to borrow, and then turn around and use it to reward private lending institutions who are taking risks with taxpayer money. The issue is not whether the taxpayers are at risk, the issue is how they will be at risk.

The existing status quo, which I believe the minority, through this amendment, shows that it understands needs change, puts the taxpayers' money at risk and then rewards private institutions for putting the taxpayers' money at risk. That simply makes no sense.

With respect to the fiscal argument about the \$87 billion and the cost in discretionary spending, there is one that is something that is clearly known, and something that is subject to dispute. What's clearly known is that the Congressional Budget Office has said there will be \$87 billion in gross savings under this bill. What happens each year under the discretionary side is for this House to work its will and decide.

So we would urge defeat of this amendment. If you believe in investment in early childhood education, in Pell Grants, in community colleges, in our Historically Black Colleges and Universities, and in our Hispanic-serving institutions and other minority-serving institutions, and if you believe in \$10 billion of deficit reduction, the right course is to vote against this substitute, vote for the underlying bill.

We yield back the balance of our time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. GUTHRIE).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky will be postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in House Report 111-256 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 2 by Mr. HOEKSTRA of Michigan.

Amendment No. 4 by Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS of Washington.

Amendment No. 7 by Ms. FOXX of North Carolina.

Amendment No. 15 by Mr. HIMES of Connecticut.

Amendment No. 17 by Mr. MINNICK of Idaho.

Amendment No. 19 by Mr. SCHAUER of Michigan.

Amendment No. 21 by Mr. TEAGUE of New Mexico.

Amendment No. 24 by Mr. GUTHRIE of Kentucky.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. HOEKSTRA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 2 offered by Mr. HOEKSTRA:

Strike title III of the Bill, and redesignate titles IV and V as titles III and IV, respectively.

Redesignate sections 401 through 409 as sections 301 through 309, respectively.

Redesignate sections 501 through 505 as sections 401 through 405, respectively.

Page 144, line 23, strike "section 403" and insert "section 303".

Page 145, line 1, strike "section 404" and insert "section 304".

Page 145, line 4, and page 174, lines 3 and 14, strike "section 403(c)(3)" and insert "section 303(c)(3)".

Page 145, line 17, and page 174, line 5, strike "section 405" and insert "section 305".

Page 147, line 4, strike "404" and insert "304".

Page 148, line 10, strike "section 403(f)" and insert "section 303(f)".

Page 150, line 15, strike "section 405(2)" and insert "section 305(f)".

Page 151, lines 4 and 25, page 153, lines 8 and 12, page 162, lines 2 and 17, page 163, line 1, page 166, lines 18 and 23, page 168, line 4 and 19, and page 175, line 25, strike "section 402(a)" and insert "section 302(a)".

Page 151, line 21, strike "section 405(1)" and insert "section 305(1)".

Page 153, line 13, and page 162, line 6, strike "section 402(d)" and insert "section 302(d)".

Page 168, line 10, 15, and 21, page 169, line 2, and page 170, line 7, strike "section 402(b)" and insert "section 302(b)".

Page 168, line 17, strike "section 402(c)(3)" and insert "section 302(c)(3)".

Page 170, line 11, strike "section 402(c)(1)" and insert "section 302(c)(1)".

Page 178, line 9, strike "503" and insert "403".

Page 178, line 12, strike "504" and insert "404".

Page 178, lines 15 and 18, strike "section 505" and insert "section 405".

Page 178, beginning on line 20, strike "sections 503 and 504" and insert "sections 403 and 404".

Page 179, line 3, strike "sections 503 and 504" and insert "sections 403 and 404".

Page 183, line 8, strike "section 502(a)(3)" and insert "section 402(a)(3)".

Page 184, line 6, and page 194, line 10, strike "section 501(b)(1)" and insert "section 401(b)(1)".

Page 188, line 15, strike "section 505(b)" and insert "section 405(b)".

Page 189, line 6, and page 191, lines 5, 13, and 20, strike "section 502(a)(3)" and insert "section 402(a)(3)".

Page 196, line 2, and page 200, line 1, strike "503(i)" and insert "403(i)".

Page 200, line 8, strike "section 503(f)(1)" and insert "section 403(f)(1)".

Conform the table of contents accordingly.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 161, noes, 262, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 710]

AYES—161

Aderholt	Forbes	Moran (KS)
Akin	Fortenberry	Murphy (NY)
Alexander	Fox	Murphy, Tim
Austria	Franks (AZ)	Myrick
Bachmann	Frelinghuysen	Neugebauer
Bachus	Gallely	Olson
Bartlett	Garrett (NJ)	Paulsen
Barton (TX)	Gingrey (GA)	Pence
Bean	Gohmert	Peters
Biggart	Goodlatte	Peterson
Bilbray	Granger	Petri
Bilirakis	Graves	Pitts
Blackburn	Guthrie	Poe (TX)
Blunt	Hall (TX)	Price (GA)
Boehner	Harper	Putnam
Bonner	Hastings (WA)	Rehberg
Bono Mack	Heller	Roe (TN)
Boozman	Hensarling	Rogers (AL)
Boustany	Herger	Rogers (KY)
Brady (TX)	Hoekstra	Rogers (MI)
Broun (GA)	Hunter	Rohrabacher
Brown (SC)	Inglis	Rooney
Brown-Waite,	Issa	Roskam
Ginny	Jenkins	Royce
Buchanan	Johnson (IL)	Ryan (WI)
Burgess	Johnson, Sam	Scalise
Burton (IN)	Jones	Schmidt
Buyer	Jordan (OH)	Schock
Calvert	King (IA)	Sensenbrenner
Camp	Kingston	Sessions
Campbell	Kline (MN)	Shadegg
Cantor	Lamborn	Shimkus
Capito	Lance	Shuster
Carter	Latham	Smith (NE)
Cassidy	Latta	Smith (TX)
Castle	Lee (NY)	Souder
Chaffetz	Lewis (CA)	Stearns
Coble	Linder	Sullivan
Coffman (CO)	Lucas	Terry
Cole	Luetkemeyer	Thompson (PA)
Conaway	Lungren, Daniel	Thornberry
Crenshaw	E.	Tiahrt
Culberson	Mack	Tiberi
Davis (KY)	Manzullo	Turner
Deal (GA)	McCarthy (CA)	Upton
Delahunt	McClintock	Walden
Dent	McCotter	Wamp
Doggett	McHenry	Westmoreland
Dreier	McKeon	Whitfield
Duncan	McMorris	Wilson (SC)
Ehlers	Rodgers	Wittman
Emerson	Mica	Wolf
Fallin	Miller (FL)	Young (AK)
Flake	Miller (MI)	Young (FL)
Fleming	Miller, Gary	

NOES—262

Etheridge	LoBiondo	Ros-Lehtinen
Farr	Loeb	Ross
Fattah	Lofgren, Zoe	Rothman (NJ)
Filner	Lowey	Roybal-Allard
Foster	Lujan	Ruppersberger
Frank (MA)	Lynch	Rush
Fudge	Maffei	Ryan (OH)
Gerlach	Maloney	Sabian
Giffords	Markey (CO)	Salazar
Gonzalez	Markey (MA)	Sánchez, Linda
Gordon (TN)	Marshall	T.
Grayson	Massa	Sanchez, Loretta
Green, Al	Matheson	Sarbanes
Green, Gene	Matsui	Schakowsky
Griffith	McCarthy (NY)	Schauer
Grijalva	McCaul	Schiff
Gutierrez	McCollum	Schrader
Hall (NY)	McDermott	Schwartz
Halvorson	McGovern	Scott (GA)
Hare	McHugh	Scott (VA)
Harman	McIntyre	Serrano
Hastings (FL)	McMahon	Sestak
Heinrich	McNerney	Shea-Porter
Hereth Sandlin	Meek (FL)	Sherman
Higgins	Meeks (NY)	Shuler
Hill	Melancon	Simpson
Himes	Michaud	Sires
Hinchee	Miller (NC)	Skelton
Hinojosa	Miller, George	Slaughter
Hirono	Minnick	Smith (NJ)
Hodes	Mitchell	Smith (WA)
Holden	Mollohan	Snyder
Holt	Moore (WI)	Space
Honda	Moran (VA)	Speier
Hoyer	Murphy (CT)	Spratt
Inlee	Murphy, Patrick	Stark
Israel	Murtha	Stupak
Jackson (IL)	Nadler (NY)	Taylor
Jackson-Lee	Napolitano	Teague
(TX)	Neal (MA)	Thompson (CA)
Johnson, E. B.	Norton	Thompson (MS)
Kagen	Nye	Tierney
Kanjorski	Oberstar	Titus
Kaptur	Obey	Tonko
Kennedy	Olver	Towns
Kildee	Ortiz	Tsongas
Kilpatrick (MI)	Pallone	Pascrell
Kilroy	Pascrell	Pastor (AZ)
Kind	Pastor (AZ)	Payne
King (NY)	Payne	Perlmutter
Kirk	Perlmutter	Perriello
Kirkpatrick (AZ)	Perriello	Pierluisi
Kissell	Pierluisi	Pingree (ME)
Klein (FL)	Pingree (ME)	Platts
Kosmas	Platts	Polis (CO)
Kratovil	Polis (CO)	Pomeroy
Kucinich	Pomeroy	Posey
Langevin	Price (NC)	Price (NC)
Larsen (WA)	Price (NC)	Quigley
Larson (CT)	Quigley	Rangel
LaTourette	Rangel	Reichert
Lee (CA)	Reichert	Reyes
Levin	Reyes	Richardson
Lewis (GA)	Richardson	Rodriguez
Lipinski	Rodriguez	

NOT VOTING—16

□ 1250

Mrs. CAPPS, Messrs. ENGEL, POSEY, HOYER, ADLER of New Jersey, HASTINGS of Florida, LARSON of Connecticut, WEINER, CAO, RUSH, CAPUANO, and WEXLER changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan and Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MRS. MCMORRIS RODGERS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS) on which further

proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote. The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 4 offered by Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS:

Page 118, beginning on line 8, strike section 331 and insert the following:

SEC. 331. IMPERMISSIBLE USES OF FUNDS AND CONCURRENT FUNDING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—No funds received under this subtitle may be used for—

(1) payment of maintenance costs, including routine repairs classified as current expenditures under State or local law;

(2) stadiums or other facilities primarily used for athletic contests or exhibitions or other events for which admission is charged to the general public;

(3) improvement or construction of facilities the purpose of which is not the education of children, including central office administration or operations or logistical support facilities; or

(4) purchasing carbon offsets.

(b) FUNDING UNDER OTHER ACTS.—Funds made available under this title shall not be used to assist any local educational agency that receives funding for the construction, modernization, renovation, and repair of facilities under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009.

Conform the table of contents accordingly.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 167, noes 251, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 711]

AYES—167

Aderholt	Crenshaw	King (NY)
Akin	Davis (KY)	Kingston
Alexander	Deal (GA)	Kline (MN)
Austria	Dent	Lamborn
Bachmann	Doggett	Lance
Bachus	Dreier	Latham
Bartlett	Duncan	LaTourette
Barton (TX)	Ehlers	Latta
Biggert	Emerson	Lee (NY)
Bilbray	Fallin	Lewis (CA)
Bilirakis	Flake	Linder
Bishop (UT)	Fleming	LoBiondo
Blackburn	Forbes	Lucas
Blunt	Fortenberry	Luetkemeyer
Boehner	Fox	Lummis
Bonner	Frelinghuysen	Lungren, Daniel
Bono Mack	Galleghy	E.
Boozman	Garrett (NJ)	Mack
Boustany	Gerlach	Manzullo
Brady (TX)	Gingrey (GA)	Marchant
Bright	Gohmert	McCarthy (CA)
Broun (GA)	Goodlatte	McCaul
Brown (SC)	Granger	McClintock
Brown-Waite,	Graves	McCotter
Ginny	Guthrie	McHenry
Buchanan	Hall (TX)	McKeon
Burgess	Harper	McMorris
Burton (IN)	Hastings (WA)	Rodgers
Buyer	Heller	Mica
Calvert	Hensarling	Miller (FL)
Camp	Hersher	Miller (MI)
Campbell	Himes	Miller, Gary
Cao	Hoekstra	Moran (KS)
Capito	Hunter	Murphy, Tim
Carter	Inglis	Myrick
Cassidy	Issa	Neugebauer
Castle	Jenkins	Olson
Chaffetz	Johnson (IL)	Paulsen
Coble	Johnson, Sam	Pence
Coffman (CO)	Jones	Petri
Cole	Jordan (OH)	Pitts
Conaway	King (IA)	Platts

Poe (TX)	Schmidt
Posey	Schock
Price (GA)	Sensenbrenner
Rehberg	Sessions
Reichert	Shadegg
Roe (TN)	Shimkus
Rogers (AL)	Shuster
Rogers (KY)	Smith (NE)
Rogers (MI)	Smith (NJ)
Rohrabacher	Smith (TX)
Rooney	Souder
Roskam	Stearns
Royce	Sullivan
Ryan (WI)	Terry
Scalise	Thompson (PA)

NOES—251

Ackerman	Grayson
Adler (NJ)	Green, Al
Altmire	Green, Gene
Andrews	Griffith
Arcuri	Grijalva
Baca	Gutierrez
Baird	Hall (NY)
Baldwin	Halvorson
Barrow	Hare
Bean	Harman
Becerra	Hastings (FL)
Berkley	Heinrich
Berman	Herseth Sandlin
Berry	Higgins
Bishop (GA)	Hill
Bishop (NY)	Hinchev
Blumenauer	Hinojosa
Bocieri	Hirono
Bordallo	Hodes
Boren	Holden
Boswell	Holt
Boucher	Honda
Boyd	Hoyer
Brady (PA)	Jackson (IL)
Brown, Corrine	Jackson-Lee
Butterfield	(TX)
Capps	Johnson (GA)
Capuano	Johnson, E. B.
Cardoza	Kagen
Carnahan	Kanjorski
Carney	Kaptur
Carson (IN)	Kildee
Castor (FL)	Kilpatrick (MI)
Chandler	Kilroy
Childers	Kind
Christensen	Kirk
Chu	Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Clarke	Kissell
Cleaver	Klein (FL)
Clyburn	Kosmas
Cohen	Kratovil
Connolly (VA)	Kucinich
Conyers	Langevin
Cooper	Larsen (WA)
Costello	Larson (CT)
Courtney	Lee (CA)
Crowley	Levin
Cuellar	Lewis (GA)
Cummings	Lipinski
Dahlkemper	Loebsack
Davis (AL)	Lofgren, Zoe
Davis (CA)	Lowey
Davis (IL)	Lujan
Davis (TN)	Lynch
DeFazio	Maffei
DeGette	Maloney
Delahunt	Markey (CO)
DeLauro	Markey (MA)
Diaz-Balart, L.	Marshall
Diaz-Balart, M.	Massa
Dicks	Matheson
Donnelly (IN)	Matsui
Doyle	McCarthy (NY)
Driehaus	McCollum
Edwards (MD)	McDermott
Edwards (TX)	McGovern
Ellison	McIntyre
Ellsworth	McMahon
Engel	McNerney
Eshoo	Meek (FL)
Etheridge	Meeks (NY)
Faleomavaega	Melancon
Farr	Miller (NC)
Fattah	Miller, George
Filner	Minnick
Foster	Mitchell
Frank (MA)	Mollohan
Fudge	Moore (KS)
Giffords	Moore (WI)
Gonzalez	Moran (VA)
Gordon (TN)	Murphy (CT)

Thornberry	Watson
Tiahrt	Waxman
Tiberi	Weiner
Turner	
Upton	
Walden	
Wamp	
Westmoreland	
Whitfield	
Wilson (SC)	
Wittman	
Wolf	
Young (AK)	
Young (FL)	

Welch	Wu
Wilson (OH)	Yarmuth
Woolsey	

NOT VOTING—21

Abercrombie	Franks (AZ)	Perlmutter
Barrett (SC)	Inlee	Radanovich
Braley (IA)	Israel	Rangel
Cantor	Kennedy	Ryan (OH)
Costa	McHugh	Tanner
Culberson	Nunes	Watt
Dingell	Paul	Wexler

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1257

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 711 I inadvertently missed the vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chair, on rollcall 711 I was unable to record my vote. I intended to vote "aye" on that question.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 711 I was detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MS. FOXX

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 7 offered by Ms. FOXX:

Page 27, beginning on line 20, strike "has the meaning given" and all that follows through "2009" and insert "refers to a State public employment service established under the Wagner-Peyser Act (29 U.S.C. 49 et seq.)".

Page 27, line 25, strike "have the meanings given" and all that follows through page 28, line 2, and insert "refer to a State workforce investment board established under section 111 of the Workforce Investment Act (29 U.S.C. 2821) and a local workforce investment board established under section 117 of such Act (29 U.S.C. 2832), respectively."

Amend title V of the Bill to read as follows:

TITLE V—PRIVACY AND ACCESS TO DATA

SEC. 501. PRIVACY AND ACCESS TO DATA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Each State or consortia that receives a grant under any provision of this Act shall implement measures to—

(1) ensure that the statewide longitudinal data system under this subsection and any other data system the State or consortia is operating for the purposes of this Act meet the requirements of section 444 of the General Education Provisions Act (20 U.S.C. 1232g) (commonly known as the "Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974");

(2) limit the use of information in any such data system by governmental agencies in the State, including State agencies, State educational authorities, local educational agencies, community colleges, and institutions of higher education, to education and workforce related activities under this Act or education and workforce related activities otherwise permitted by Federal or State law;

(3) prohibit the disclosure of personally identifiable information except as permitted under section 444 of the General Education Provisions Act and any additional limitations set forth in State law;

(4) keep an accurate accounting of the date, nature, and purpose of each disclosure of personally identifiable information in any such data system, a description of the information disclosed, and the name and address of the person, agency, institution, or entity to whom the disclosure is made, which accounting shall be made available on request to parents of any student whose information has been disclosed;

(5) notwithstanding section 444 of the General Education Provisions Act, require any non-governmental party obtaining personally identifiable information to sign a data use agreement prior to disclosure that—

(A) prohibits the party from further disclosing the information;

(B) prohibits the party from using the information for any purpose other than the purpose specified in the agreement; and

(C) requires the party to destroy the information when the purpose for which the disclosure was made is accomplished;

(6) maintain adequate security measures to ensure the confidentiality and integrity of any such data system, such as protecting a student record from identification by a unique identifier;

(7) where rights are provided to parents under this clause, provide those rights to the student instead of the parent if the student has reached the age of 18 or is enrolled in a postsecondary educational institution; and

(8) ensure adequate enforcement of the requirements of this paragraph.

(b) USE OF UNIQUE IDENTIFIERS.—It shall be unlawful for any Federal, State, or local governmental agency to—

(1) use the unique identifiers employed in such data systems for any purpose other than as authorized by Federal or State law; or

(2) deny any individual any right, benefit, or privilege provided by law because of such individual's refusal to disclose the individual's unique identifier.

Conform the table of contents accordingly.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 126, noes 301, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 712]

AYES—126

Aderholt	Cantor	Gohmert
Akin	Capito	Goodlatte
Alexander	Carter	Granger
Austria	Cassidy	Graves
Bachmann	Chaffetz	Harper
Bachus	Coble	Hastings (WA)
Bartlett	Coffman (CO)	Hersarling
Barton (TX)	Cole	Herger
Bishop (UT)	Conaway	Hunter
Blackburn	Crenshaw	Inglis
Boehner	Culberson	Issa
Bonner	Deal (GA)	Jenkins
Boustany	Diaz-Balart, L.	Johnson (IL)
Brady (TX)	Diaz-Balart, M.	Johnson, Sam
Broun (GA)	Duncan	Jones
Brown (SC)	Emerson	Jordan (OH)
Brown-Waite,	Flake (IA)	King (IA)
Ginny	Fleming	Kingston
Buchanan	Foxx	Kline (MN)
Burton (IN)	Franks (AZ)	Lamborn
Buyer	Frelinghuysen	Lance
Calvert	Galleghy	Latta
Camp	Garrett (NJ)	Lewis (CA)
Campbell	Gingrey (GA)	Linder

Lucas	Neugebauer	Sessions
Luetkemeyer	Olson	Shadegg
Lummis	Pence	Shimkus
Lungren, Daniel	Petri	Shuster
E.	Pitts	Simpson
Mack	Poe (TX)	Smith (NE)
Manzullo	Posey	Smith (TX)
Marchant	Price (GA)	Souder
McCaul	Putnam	Stearns
McClintock	Rehberg	Sullivan
McHenry	Roe (TN)	Thompson (PA)
McKeon	Rogers (AL)	Thornberry
McMorris	Rohrabacher	Tiahrt
Rodgers	Royce	Tiberi
Mica	Ryan (WI)	Walden
Miller (FL)	Scalise	Wamp
Miller, Gary	Schmidt	Westmoreland
Moran (KS)	Schock	Wilson (SC)
Myrick	Sensenbrenner	Young (FL)

NOES—301

Ackerman	Edwards (TX)	Levin
Adler (NJ)	Ehlers	Lewis (GA)
Altmire	Ellison	Lipinski
Andrews	Ellsworth	LoBiondo
Arcuri	Engel	Loeb
Baca	Eshoo	Lofgren, Zoe
Baird	Etheridge	Lowey
Baldwin	Faleomavaega	Lujan
Barrow	Farr	Lynch
Bean	Fattah	Maffei
Becerra	Filner	Maloney
Berkley	Forbes	Markey (CO)
Berman	Fortenberry	Markey (MA)
Berry	Poster	Marshall
Biggert	Frank (MA)	Massa
Bilirakis	Fudge	Matheson
Bishop (GA)	Gerlach	Matsui
Bishop (NY)	Giffords	McCarthy (CA)
Blumenauer	Gonzalez	McCarthy (NY)
Blunt	Gordon (TN)	McCollum
Bocieri	Hatch	McCotter
Bono Mack	Green, Al	McDermott
Boozman	Green, Gene	McGovern
Bordallo	Griffith	McIntyre
Boren	Grijalva	McMahon
Boswell	Guthrie	McNerney
Boucher	Gutierrez	Meek (FL)
Boyd	Hall (NY)	Meeks (NY)
Brady (PA)	Hall (TX)	Melancon
Brale (IA)	Halvorson	Michaud
Bright	Hare	Miller (MI)
Brown, Corrine	Harman	Miller (NC)
Burgess	Hastings (FL)	Miller, George
Butterfield	Heinrich	Minnick
Cao	Heller	Mitchell
Capps	Herseth Sandlin	Mollohan
Capuano	Higgin	Moore (KS)
Cardoza	Hill	Moore (WI)
Carnahan	Himes	Moran (VA)
Carney	Hinche	Murphy (CT)
Carson (IN)	Hinojosa	Murphy (NY)
Castle	Hirono	Murphy, Patrick
Castor (FL)	Hodes	Murphy, Tim
Chandler	Hoekstra	Murtha
Childers	Holden	Nadler (NY)
Christensen	Holt	Napolitano
Chu	Honda	Neal (MA)
Clarke	Hoyer	Norton
Clay	Inslee	Nye
Cleaver	Israel	Oberstar
Clyburn	Jackson (IL)	Obey
Cohen	Jackson-Lee	Olver
Connolly (VA)	(TX)	Ortiz
Conyers	Johnson (GA)	Pallone
Cooper	Johnson, E. B.	Pascarella
Costello	Kagen	Pastor (AZ)
Costney	Kanjorski	Paulsen
Crowley	Kaptur	Payne
Cuellar	Kennedy	Perriello
Cummings	Kildee	Peters
Dahlkemper	Kilpatrick (MI)	Peterson
Davis (AL)	Kilroy	Pierluisi
Davis (CA)	Kind	Pingree (ME)
Davis (IL)	King (NY)	Platts
Davis (KY)	Kirk	Polis (CO)
Davis (TN)	Kirkpatrick (AZ)	Pomeroy
DeFazio	Kissell	Price (NC)
DeGette	Klein (FL)	Quigley
Delahunt	Kosmas	Rahall
DeLauro	Kratovil	Rangel
Dent	Kucinich	Reichert
Dicks	Langevin	Reyes
Doggett	Larsen (WA)	Richardson
Donnelly (IN)	Larson (CT)	Rodriguez
Doyle	Latham	Rogers (KY)
Dreier	LaTourette	Rogers (MI)
Driehaus	Lee (CA)	Rooney
Edwards (MD)	Lee (NY)	Ros-Lehtinen

Roskam	Shuler	Upton
Ross	Sires	Van Hollen
Rothman (NJ)	Skelton	Velázquez
Roybal-Allard	Slaughter	Visclosky
Ruppersberger	Smith (NJ)	Walz
Rush	Smith (WA)	Wasserman
Ryan (OH)	Snyder	Schultz
Sablan	Space	Waters
Salazar	Speler	Watson
Sánchez, Linda	Spratt	Watt
T.	Stark	Waxman
Sanchez, Loretta	Stupak	Weiner
Sarbanes	Sutton	Welch
Schakowsky	Taylor	Wexler
Schauer	Teague	Whitfield
Schiff	Terry	Wilson (OH)
Schrader	Thompson (CA)	Wittman
Schwartz	Thompson (MS)	Wolf
Scott (GA)	Tierney	Woolsey
Scott (VA)	Titus	Wu
Serrano	Tonko	Yarmuth
Sestak	Towns	Young (AK)
Shea-Porter	Tsongas	
Sherman	Turner	

NOT VOTING—12

Abercrombie	Dingell	Paul
Barrett (SC)	Fallin	Perlmutter
Bilbray	McHugh	Radanovich
Costa	Nunes	Tanner

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1304

Mr. ADLER of New Jersey changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 15 OFFERED BY MR. HIMES

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. HIMES) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 428, noes 2, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 713]

AYES—428

Ackerman	Bilirakis	Brown, Corrine
Aderholt	Bishop (GA)	Brown-Waite,
Adler (NJ)	Bishop (NY)	Ginny
Akin	Bishop (UT)	Buchanan
Alexander	Blackburn	Burgess
Altmire	Blumenauer	Burton (IN)
Andrews	Blunt	Butterfield
Arcuri	Bocieri	Buyer
Austria	Boehner	Calvert
Baca	Bonner	Camp
Bachmann	Bono Mack	Campbell
Bachus	Boozman	Cantor
Baird	Bordallo	Cao
Baldwin	Boren	Capito
Barrow	Boswell	Capps
Bartlett	Boucher	Capuano
Barton (TX)	Boustany	Cardoza
Bean	Boyd	Carnahan
Becerra	Brady (PA)	Carney
Berkley	Brady (TX)	Carson (IN)
Berman	Brale (IA)	Carter
Berry	Bright	Cassidy
Biggert	Broun (GA)	Castle
Bilbray	Brown (SC)	Castor (FL)

Chaffetz	Hergert	Meek (FL)	Sestak	Sullivan	Wamp	Childers	Higgins	Melancon
Chandler	Herseth Sandlin	Meeks (NY)	Shadegg	Sutton	Wasserman	Christensen	Hill	Mica
Childers	Higgins	Melancon	Shea-Porter	Taylor	Schultz	Chu	Himes	Michaud
Christensen	Hill	Mica	Sherman	Teague	Waters	Clarke	Hinchee	Miller (FL)
Chu	Himes	Michaud	Shimkus	Terry	Watson	Clay	Hinojosa	Miller (MI)
Clarke	Hinchee	Miller (FL)	Shuler	Thompson (CA)	Watt	Cleaver	Hirono	Miller (NC)
Clay	Hinojosa	Miller (MI)	Shuster	Thompson (MS)	Waxman	Clyburn	Hodes	Miller, Gary
Cleaver	Hirono	Miller (NC)	Simpson	Thompson (PA)	Weiner	Coble	Hoekstra	Miller, George
Clyburn	Hodes	Miller, Gary	Sires	Thornberry	Welch	Coffman (CO)	Holden	Minnick
Coble	Hoekstra	Miller, George	Skeltton	Tiahrt	Westmoreland	Cohen	Holt	Mitchell
Coffman (CO)	Holden	Minnick	Slaughter	Tierney	Wexler	Cole	Honda	Mollohan
Cohen	Holt	Mitchell	Smith (NE)	Titus	Wilson (OH)	Conaway	Hoyer	Moore (KS)
Cole	Honda	Mollohan	Smith (NJ)	Tonko	Wilson (SC)	Connolly (VA)	Hunter	Moore (WI)
Conaway	Hoyer	Moore (KS)	Smith (TX)	Towns	Wittman	Conyers	Inglis	Moran (KS)
Connolly (VA)	Hunter	Moore (WI)	Snyder	Tsongas	Wolf	Cooper	Inslee	Moran (VA)
Conyers	Inglis	Moran (KS)	Souder	Turner	Woolsey	Costello	Israel	Murphy (CT)
Cooper	Inslee	Moran (VA)	Space	Upton	Wu	Courtney	Issa	Murphy (NY)
Costello	Israel	Murphy (CT)	Speier	Van Hollen	Yarmuth	Crenshaw	Jackson (IL)	Murphy, Patrick
Courtney	Issa	Murphy (NY)	Spratt	Velázquez	Young (AK)	Crowley	Jackson-Lee	Murphy, Tim
Crenshaw	Jackson (IL)	Murphy, Patrick	Stark	Visclosky	Young (FL)	Cuellar	(TX)	Murtha
Crowley	Jackson-Lee	Murphy, Tim	Stearns	Walden		Culberson	Jenkins	Myrick
Cuellar	(TX)	Murtha	Stupak	Walz		Cummings	Johnson (GA)	Nadler (NY)
Culberson	Jenkins	Myrick				Dahlkemper	Johnson (IL)	Napolitano
Cummings	Johnson (GA)	Nadler (NY)				Davis (AL)	Johnson, E. B.	Neal (MA)
Dahlkemper	Johnson (IL)	Napolitano				Davis (CA)	Johnson, Sam	Neugebauer
Davis (AL)	Johnson, E. B.	Neal (MA)				Davis (IL)	Jones	Norton
Davis (CA)	Jones	Neugebauer				Davis (KY)	Jordan (OH)	Nye
Davis (IL)	Jordan (OH)	Norton				Davis (TN)	Kagen	Oberstar
Davis (KY)	Kagen	Nye				Deal (GA)	Kanjorski	Obey
Davis (TN)	Kanjorski	Oberstar				DeFazio	Kaptur	Olson
Deal (GA)	Kaptur	Obey				DeGette	Kennedy	Olver
DeFazio	Kennedy	Olson				Delahunt	Kildee	Ortiz
DeGette	Kildee	Olver				DeLauro	Kilpatrick (MI)	Pallone
Delahunt	Kilpatrick (MI)	Ortiz				Dent	Kilroy	Pascarell
DeLauro	Kilroy	Pallone				Diaz-Balart, L.	Kind	Pastor (AZ)
Dent	Kind	Pascarell				Diaz-Balart, M.	King (IA)	Paulsen
Diaz-Balart, L.	King (IA)	Pastor (AZ)				Dicks	King (NY)	Payne
Diaz-Balart, M.	King (NY)	Paulsen				Dingell	Kingston	Pence
Dicks	Kingston	Payne				Doggett	Kirk	Perlmutter
Dingell	Kirk	Pence				Donnelly (IN)	Kirkpatrick (AZ)	Perriello
Doggett	Kirkpatrick (AZ)	Perlmutter				Doyle	Kissell	Peters
Donnelly (IN)	Kissell	Perriello				Dreier	Klein (FL)	Peterson
Doyle	Klein (FL)	Peters				Driehaus	Kline (MN)	Petri
Dreier	Kline (MN)	Peterson				Duncan	Kosmas	Pierluisi
Driehaus	Kosmas	Petri				Edwards (MD)	Kratovil	Pingree (ME)
Duncan	Kratovil	Pierluisi				Edwards (TX)	Kucinich	Pitts
Edwards (MD)	Kucinich	Pingree (ME)				Ehlers	Lamborn	Platts
Edwards (TX)	Lamborn	Pitts				Ellison	Lance	Poe (TX)
Ehlers	Lance	Platts				Ellsworth	Langevin	Polis (CO)
Ellison	Langevin	Poe (TX)				Emerson	Larsen (WA)	Pomeroy
Ellsworth	Larsen (WA)	Polis (CO)				Engel	Larson (CT)	Posey
Emerson	Larson (CT)	Pomeroy				Eshoo	Latham	Price (GA)
Engel	Latham	Posey				Etheridge	LaTourette	Price (NC)
Eshoo	LaTourette	Price (GA)				Faleomavaega	Latta	Putnam
Etheridge	Latta	Price (NC)				Fallin	Lee (CA)	Quigley
Faleomavaega	Lee (CA)	Putnam				Farr	Lee (NY)	Rahall
Fallin	Lee (NY)	Quigley				Fattah	Levin	Rangel
Farr	Levin	Rahall				Filner	Lewis (CA)	Rahall
Fattah	Lewis (CA)	Rangel				Flake	Lewis (GA)	Rehberg
Filner	Lewis (GA)	Rehberg				Fleming	Linder	Reichert
Flake	Linder	Reichert				Forbes	Lipinski	Reyes
Fleming	Lipinski	Reyes				Fortenberry	LoBiondo	Richardson
Forbes	LoBiondo	Richardson				Foster	Loeb sack	Rodriguez
Fortenberry	Loeb sack	Rodriguez				Fox	Lofgren, Zoe	Roe (TN)
Foster	Lofgren, Zoe	Roe (TN)				Fox	Lowey	Rogers (AL)
Fox	Lowey	Rogers (AL)				Frank (MA)	Lucas	Rogers (KY)
Frank (MA)	Lucas	Rogers (KY)				Franks (AZ)	Luetkemeyer	Rogers (MI)
Franks (AZ)	Luetkemeyer	Rogers (MI)				Frelinghuysen	Lujan	Rohrabacher
Frelinghuysen	Lujan	Rohrabacher				Fudge	Lummis	Rooney
Fudge	Lummis	Rooney				Gallegly	Lungren, Daniel	Ros-Lehtinen
Gallegly	Lungren, Daniel	Ros-Lehtinen				Garrett (NJ)	E.	Roskam
Garrett (NJ)	E.	Roskam				Gerlach	Lynch	Ross
Gerlach	Lynch	Ross				Giffords	Mack	Rothman (NJ)
Giffords	Mack	Rothman (NJ)				Gingrey (GA)	Maffei	Roybal-Allard
Gingrey (GA)	Maffei	Roybal-Allard				Gohmert	Maloney	Royce
Gohmert	Maloney	Royce				Gonzalez	Manzullo	Ruppersberger
Gonzalez	Manzullo	Ruppersberger				Goodlatte	Marchant	Rush
Goodlatte	Marchant	Rush				Gordon (TN)	Markey (CO)	Ryan (OH)
Gordon (TN)	Markey (CO)	Ryan (OH)				Granger	Markey (MA)	Ryan (WI)
Granger	Markey (MA)	Ryan (WI)				Graves	Marshall	Sablan
Graves	Marshall	Sablan				Grayson	Massa	Salazar
Grayson	Massa	Sablan				Green, Al	Matheson	Sánchez, Linda
Green, Al	Matheson	Salazar				Green, Gene	Matsui	T.
Green, Gene	Matsui	Salazar				Griffith	McCarthy (CA)	Sanchez, Loretta
Griffith	McCarthy (CA)	Sánchez, Linda				Grijalva	McCarthy (NY)	Sarbanes
Grijalva	McCarthy (NY)	T.				Guthrie	McCaul	Scalise
Guthrie	McCaul	Sanchez, Loretta				Gutierrez	McClintock	Schakowsky
Gutierrez	McClintock	Sarbanes				Hall (NY)	McCollum	Schauer
Hall (NY)	McCollum	Scalise				Hall (TX)	McCotter	Schiff
Hall (TX)	McCotter	Schakowsky				Halvorson	McDermott	Schmidt
Halvorson	McDermott	Schauer				Hare	McGovern	Schock
Hare	McGovern	Schiff				Harman	Schmidt	Schrader
Harman	McHenry	Schock				Harper	Schradler	Schwartz
Harper	McHenry	Schrader				Hastings (FL)	McIntyre	Scott (GA)
Hastings (FL)	McIntyre	Schwartz				Hastings (WA)	McKeon	Scott (VA)
Hastings (WA)	McKeon	Schradler				Heller	McMahon	Sensenbrenner
Heinrich	McMahon	Sensenbrenner				Heller	McMorris	Serrano
Heller	McMorris	Serrano				Hensarling	Rodgers	Sessions
Hensarling	Rodgers	Serrano				Herseth Sandlin	McNerney	Sestak
	McNerney	Sessions					Meeks (NY)	Shadegg

NOES—2

Johnson, Sam Smith (WA)

NOT VOTING—9

Abercrombie McHugh Radanovich
Barrett (SC) Nunes Tanner
Costa Paul Tiberi

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1311

Mr. SHADEGG changed his vote from
“no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 17 OFFERED BY MR. MINNICK

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
business is the demand for a recorded
vote on the amendment offered by the
gentleman from Idaho (Mr. MINNICK) on
which further proceedings were post-
poned and on which the ayes prevailed
by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the
amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-
ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote
has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 5-
minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-
vice, and there were—ayes 428, noes 0,
not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 714]

AYES—428

Ackerman	Bishop (GA)	Brown-Waite,
Aderholt	Bishop (NY)	Ginny
Adler (NJ)	Bishop (UT)	Buchanan
Akin	Blackburn	Burgess
Alexander	Blumenauer	Burton (IN)
Altmire	Blunt	Butterfield
Andrews	Boccheri	Buyer
Arcuri	Boehner	Calvert
Austria	Bonner	Camp
Baca	Bono Mack	Campbell
Bachmann	Boozman	Cantor
Bachus	Bordallo	Cao
Baird	Boren	Capito
Baldwin	Boswell	Capps
Barrow	Boucher	Capuano
Bartlett	Boustany	Cardoza
Barton (TX)	Boyd	Carney
Bean	Brady (PA)	Carson (IN)
Becerra	Brady (TX)	Carter
Berkley	Braley (IA)	Cassidy
Berman	Bright	Castle
Berry	Broun (GA)	Castor (FL)
Biggert	Brown (SC)	Chaffetz
Bilirakis	Brown, Corrine	Chandler

Shea-Porter	Sutton	Wamp	Conyers	Inslee	Murphy (CT)	Space	Tierney	Watt
Sherman	Taylor	Wasserman	Cooper	Israel	Murphy (NY)	Speier	Titus	Waxman
Shimkus	Teague	Schultz	Costello	Issa	Murphy, Patrick	Spratt	Tonko	Weiner
Shuler	Terry	Waters	Courtney	Jackson (IL)	Murphy, Tim	Stark	Towns	Welch
Shuster	Thompson (CA)	Watson	Crenshaw	Jackson-Lee	Murtha	Stearns	Tsongas	Westmoreland
Simpson	Thompson (MS)	Watt	Crowley	(TX)	Myrick	Stupak	Turner	Wexler
Sires	Thompson (PA)	Waxman	Cuellar	Jenkins	Nadler (NY)	Sullivan	Upton	Whitfield
Skelton	Thornberry	Weiner	Culberson	Johnson (GA)	Napolitano	Sutton	Van Hollen	Whitson (OH)
Slaughter	Tiahrt	Welch	Cummings	Johnson (IL)	Neal (MA)	Taylor	Velázquez	Wilson (SC)
Smith (NE)	Tiberi	Westmoreland	Dahlkemper	Johnson, E. B.	Neugebauer	Teague	Visclosky	Wittman
Smith (NJ)	Tierney	Wexler	Davis (AL)	Jones	Norton	Terry	Walden	Wolf
Smith (TX)	Titus	Whitfield	Davis (CA)	Jordan (OH)	Nye	Thompson (CA)	Walz	Woolsey
Smith (WA)	Tonko	Wilson (OH)	Davis (IL)	Kagen	Oberstar	Thompson (MS)	Wamp	Wu
Snyder	Towns	Wilson (SC)	Davis (KY)	Kanjorski	Obey	Thompson (PA)	Wasserman	Yarmuth
Souder	Tsongas	Wittman	Davis (TN)	Kaptur	Olson	Thornberry	Schultz	Young (AK)
Space	Turner	Wolf	Deal (GA)	Kennedy	Olver	Tiahrt	Waters	Young (FL)
Speier	Upton	Woolsey	DeFazio	Kildee	Ortiz	Tiberi	Watson	
Spratt	Van Hollen	Wu	DeGette	Kilpatrick (MI)	Pallone			
Stark	Velázquez	Yarmuth	Delahunt	Kilroy	Pascrell			
Stearns	Visclosky	Young (AK)	DeLauro	Kind	Pastor (AZ)			
Stupak	Walden	Young (FL)	Dent	King (IA)	Paulsen	Bishop (UT)	Flake	McClintock
Sullivan	Walz		Diaz-Balart, L.	King (NY)	Payne	Broun (GA)	Johnson, Sam	
			Diaz-Balart, M.	Kingston	Pence			
			Dicks	Kirk	Perlmutter			
			Dingell	Kirkpatrick (AZ)	Perriello			
			Doggett	Kissell	Peters			
			Donnelly (IN)	Klein (FL)	Peterson			
			Doyle	Kline (MN)	Petri			
			Dreier	Kosmas	Pierluisi			
			Driehaus	Kratovil	Pingree (ME)			
			Duncan	Kucinich	Pitts			
			Edwards (MD)	Lamborn	Platts			
			Edwards (TX)	Lance	Poe (TX)			
			Ehlers	Langevin	Polis (CO)			
			Ellison	Larsen (WA)	Pomeroy			
			Ellsworth	Larson (CT)	Posey			
			Emerson	Latham	Price (GA)			
			Engel	LaTourette	Price (NC)			
			Eshoo	Latta	Putnam			
			Etheridge	Lee (CA)	Quigley			
			Faleomavaega	Lee (NY)	Rahall			
			Fallin	Levin	Rangel			
			Farr	Lewis (CA)	Rehberg			
			Fattah	Lewis (GA)	Reichert			
			Filner	Linder	Reyes			
			Fleming	Lipinski	Richardson			
			Forbes	LoBiondo	Rodriguez			
			Fortenberry	Loebsack	Roe (TN)			
			Foster	Lofgren, Zoe	Rogers (AL)			
			Fox	Lowe	Rogers (KY)			
			Frank (MA)	Lucas	Rogers (MD)			
			Franks (AZ)	Luetkemeyer	Rohrabacher			
			Frelinghuysen	Lujan	Rooney			
			Fudge	Lummis	Ros-Lehtinen			
			Gallegly	Lungren, Daniel	Roskam			
			Garrett (NJ)	E.	Ross			
			Gerlach	Lynch	Rothman (NJ)			
			Giffords	Mack	Roybal-Allard			
			Gingrey (GA)	Maffei	Royce			
			Gohmert	Maloney	Ruppersberger			
			Gonzalez	Manzullo	Rush			
			Goodlatte	Marchant	Ryan (OH)			
			Gordon (TN)	Markey (CO)	Ryan (WI)			
			Granger	Markey (MA)	Sablan			
			Graves	Marshall	Salazar			
			Grayson	Massa	Sánchez, Linda			
			Green, Al	Matheson	T.			
			Green, Gene	Matsui	Sanchez, Loretta			
			Griffith	McCarthy (CA)	Sarbanes			
			Grijalva	McCarthy (NY)	Scalise			
			Guthrie	McCaul	Schakowsky			
			Gutierrez	McCollum	Schauer			
			Hall (NY)	McCotter	Schiff			
			Hall (TX)	McDermott	Schmidt			
			Halvorson	McGovern	Schock			
			Hare	McHenry	Schrader			
			Harman	McIntyre	Schwartz			
			Harper	McKeon	Scott (GA)			
			Hastings (FL)	McMahon	Scott (VA)			
			Hastings (WA)	McMorris	Sensenbrenner			
			Heinrich	Rodgers	Serrano			
			Heller	McNerney	Sessions			
			Hensarling	Meek (FL)	Sestak			
			Herser	Meeke (NY)	Shadegg			
			Herse	Melancon	Shea-Porter			
			Herseth Sandlin	Mica	Sherman			
			Higgins	Michaud	Shimkus			
			Hill	Miller (FL)	Shuler			
			Himes	Miller (MI)	Shuster			
			Hinchee	Miller (NC)	Simpson			
			Hinojosa	Miller, Gary	Sires			
			Hirono	Miller, George	Skelton			
			Hodes	Minnick	Slaughter			
			Hoekstra	Mitchell	Smith (NE)			
			Holden	Mollohan	Smith (NJ)			
			Holt	Moore (KS)	Smith (TX)			
			Honda	Moore (WI)	Smith (WA)			
			Hoyer	Moran (KS)	Snyder			
			Hunter	Moran (VA)	Souder			
			Inglis					

NOT VOTING—11

Abercrombie	Costa	Paul
Barrett (SC)	Kingston	Radanovich
Bilbray	McHugh	Tanner
Carnahan	Nunes	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1317

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 19 OFFERED BY MR. SCHAUER

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SCHAUER) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 425, noes 5, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 715]

AYES—425

Ackerman	Blumenauer	Campbell
Aderholt	Blunt	Cantor
Adler (NJ)	Bocchieri	Cao
Akin	Boehner	Capito
Alexander	Bonner	Capps
Altmire	Bono Mack	Capuano
Andrews	Boozman	Cardoza
Arcuri	Bordallo	Carney
Austria	Boren	Carson (IN)
Baca	Boswell	Carter
Bachmann	Boucher	Cassidy
Bachus	Boustany	Castle
Baird	Boyd	Castor (FL)
Baldwin	Brady (PA)	Chaffetz
Barrow	Brady (TX)	Chandler
Bartlett	Braley (IA)	Childers
Barton (TX)	Bright	Christensen
Bean	Brown (SC)	Chu
Becerra	Brown, Corrine	Clarke
Berkley	Brown-Waite,	Clay
Berman	Ginny	Cleaver
Berry	Buchanan	Clyburn
Biggert	Burgess	Coble
Bilbray	Burton (IN)	Coffman (CO)
Bilirakis	Butterfield	Cohen
Bishop (GA)	Buyer	Cole
Bishop (NY)	Calvert	Conaway
Blackburn	Camp	Connolly (VA)

Dicks	Dingell	Doggett
Donnelly (IN)	Doyle	Dreier
Driehaus	Duncan	Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)	Ehlers	Ellison
Ellsworth	Emerson	Engel
Eshoo	Etheridge	Faleomavaega
Fallin	Farr	Fattah
Filner	Fleming	Forbes
Fortenberry	Foster	Fox
Frank (MA)	Franks (AZ)	Frelinghuysen
Fudge	Gallegly	Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach	Giffords	Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert	Gonzalez	Goodlatte
Gordon (TN)	Granger	Graves
Grayson	Green, Al	Green, Gene
Griffith	Grijalva	Guthrie
Gutierrez	McCaul	McCollum
Hall (NY)	Hall (TX)	Halvorson
Hare	Harman	Harper
Hastings (FL)	Hastings (WA)	Heinrich
Heller	Hensarling	Herser
Herseth Sandlin	Higgins	Hill
Himes	Hinchee	Hinojosa
Hirono	Hodes	Hoekstra
Holden	Holt	Honda
Hoyer	Hunter	Inglis
Inslee	Israel	Issa
Jackson (IL)	Jackson-Lee	(TX)
Jenkins	Johnson (GA)	Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.	Jones	Jordan (OH)
Kagen	Kanjorski	Kaptur
Kennedy	Kildee	Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy	Kind	King (IA)
King (NY)	Kingston	Kirk
Kirkpatrick (AZ)	Kissell	Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)	Kosmas	Kratovil
Kucinich	Lamborn	Lance
Langevin	Larsen (WA)	Larson (CT)
Latham	LaTourette	Latta
Lee (CA)	Lee (NY)	Levin
Lewis (CA)	Lewis (GA)	Linder
Lipinski	LoBiondo	Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe	Lowe	Lucas
Luetkemeyer	Lujan	Lummis
Lungren, Daniel	E.	Lynch
Mack	Maffei	Maloney
Manzullo	Marchant	Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)	Marshall	Massa
Matheson	Matsui	McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)	McCaul	McCollum
McCotter	McDermott	McGovern
McHenry	McIntyre	McKeon
McMahon	McMorris	Rodgers
McNerney	Meek (FL)	Meeke (NY)
Melancon	Mica	Michaud
Miller (FL)	Miller (MI)	Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary	Miller, George	Minnick
Mitchell	Mollohan	Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)	Moran (KS)	Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)	Murphy (NY)	Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim	Murtha	Myrick
Nadler (NY)	Napolitano	Neal (MA)
Neugebauer	Norton	Nye
Oberstar	Obey	Olson
Olver	Ortiz	Pallone
Pascrell	Pastor (AZ)	Paulsen
Payne	Pence	Perlmutter
Perriello	Peters	Peterson
Petri	Pierluisi	Pingree (ME)
Pitts	Platts	Poe (TX)
Polis (CO)	Pomeroy	Posey
Price (GA)	Price (NC)	Putnam
Quigley	Rahall	Rangel
Rehberg	Reichert	Reyes
Richardson	Rodriguez	Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)	Rogers (KY)	Rogers (MD)
Rohrabacher	Rooney	Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam	Ross	Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard	Royce	Ruppersberger
Rush	Ryan (OH)	Ryan (WI)
Sablan	Salazar	Sánchez, Linda
Sanchez, Loretta	Sarbanes	Scalise
Schakowsky	Schauer	Schiff
Schmidt	Schock	Schrader
Schwartz	Scott (GA)	Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner	Serrano	Sessions
Sestak	Shadegg	Shea-Porter
Sherman	Shimkus	Shuler
Shuster	Simpson	Sires
Skelton	Slaughter	Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)	Smith (TX)	Smith (WA)
Snyder	Souder	Space
Speier	Spratt	Stark
Stearns	Stupak	Sullivan
Sutton	Taylor	Teague
Terry	Thompson (CA)	Thompson (MS)
Thornberry	Thornberry	Tiahrt
Tiberi	Tierney	Titus
Tonko	Towns	Tsongas
Turner	Upton	Van Hollen
Upton	Velázquez	Visclosky
Walden	Walz	Wamp
Wasserman	Schultz	Waters
Watson		

NOES—5

Bishop (UT)	Flake	McClintock
Broun (GA)	Johnson, Sam	

NOT VOTING—9

Abercrombie	Costa	Paul</
-------------	-------	--------

Cuellar	Jenkins	Murtha	Stupak	Towns	Weiner	Marchant	Posey	Smith (NE)
Culberson	Johnson (GA)	Myrick	Sullivan	Tsongas	Welch	McCarthy (CA)	Putnam	Smith (NJ)
Cummings	Johnson (IL)	Nadler (NY)	Sutton	Turner	Westmoreland	McCaul	Rehberg	Smith (TX)
Dahlkemper	Johnson, E. B.	Napolitano	Taylor	Upton	Wexler	McClintock	Reichert	Souder
Davis (AL)	Johnson, Sam	Neal (MA)	Teague	Van Hollen	Whitfield	McCotter	Roe (TN)	Stearns
Davis (CA)	Jones	Neugebauer	Terry	Visclosky	Wilson (OH)	McHenry	Rogers (AL)	Sullivan
Davis (IL)	Jordan (OH)	Norton	Thompson (CA)	Walden	Wilson (SC)	McKeon	Rogers (KY)	Terry
Davis (KY)	Kagen	Nye	Thompson (MS)	Walz	Wittman	McMorris	Rogers (MI)	Thompson (PA)
Davis (TN)	Kanjorski	Oberstar	Thompson (PA)	Wamp	Wolf	Rodgers	Rohrabacher	Thornberry
Deal (GA)	Kaptur	Obey	Thornberry	Wasserman	Woolsey	Mica	Rooney	Tiahrt
DeFazio	Kennedy	Olson	Tiahrt	Schultz	Wu	Miller (FL)	Roskam	Tiberi
DeGette	Kildee	Olver	Tiberi	Waters	Yarmuth	Miller (MI)	Royce	Turner
Delahunt	Kilpatrick (MI)	Ortiz	Tierney	Watson	Young (AK)	Miller, Gary	Ryan (WI)	Upton
DeLauro	Kilroy	Pallone	Titus	Watt	Young (FL)	Moran (KS)	Scalise	Walden
Dent	Kind	Pascrell	Tonko	Waxman		Murphy, Tim	Schmidt	Wamp
Diaz-Balart, L.	King (IA)	Pastor (AZ)				Myrick	Schock	Westmoreland
Diaz-Balart, M.	King (NY)	Paulsen				Neugebauer	Sensenbrenner	Whitfield
Dicks	Kingston	Payne	Abercrombie	Costa	Radanovich	Olson	Sessions	Wilson (SC)
Dingell	Kirk	Pence	Bachmann	Emerson	Scott (VA)	Paulsen	Shadegg	Wittman
Doggett	Kirkpatrick (AZ)	Perlmutter	Barrett (SC)	McHugh	Tanner	Pence	Shimkus	Wolf
Donnelly (IN)	Kissell	Perriello	Berman	Nunes	Velázquez	Pitts	Shuster	Young (AK)
Doyle	Klein (FL)	Peters	Bishop (GA)	Paul		Poe (TX)	Simpson	Young (FL)
Dreier	Kline (MN)	Peterson						
Driehaus	Kosmas	Petri						
Duncan	Kratovil	Pierluisi						
Edwards (MD)	Kucinich	Pingree (ME)						
Edwards (TX)	Lamborn	Pitts						
Ehlers	Lance	Platts						
Ellison	Langevin	Poe (TX)						
Ellsworth	Larsen (WA)	Polis (CO)						
Engel	Larson (CT)	Pomeroy						
Eshoo	Latham	Posey						
Etheridge	LaTourette	Price (GA)						
Faleomavaega	Latta	Price (NC)						
Fallin	Lee (CA)	Putnam						
Farr	Lee (NY)	Quigley						
Fattah	Levin	Rahall						
Filner	Lewis (CA)	Rangel						
Flake	Lewis (GA)	Rehberg						
Fleming	Linder	Reichert						
Forbes	Lipinski	Reyes						
Fortenberry	LoBiondo	Richardson						
Foster	Loeb sack	Rodriguez						
Fox	Lofgren, Zoe	Roe (TN)						
Frank (MA)	Lowey	Rogers (AL)						
Franks (AZ)	Lucas	Rogers (KY)						
Frelinghuysen	Luetkemeyer	Rogers (MI)						
Fudge	Lujan	Rohrabacher						
Gallegly	Lummis	Rooney						
Garrett (NJ)	Lungren, Daniel	Ros-Lehtinen						
Gerlach	E.	Roskam						
Giffords	Lynch	Ross						
Gingrey (GA)	Mack	Rothman (NJ)						
Gohmert	Maffei	Roybal-Allard						
Gonzalez	Maloney	Royce						
Goodlatte	Manzullo	Ruppersberger						
Gordon (TN)	Marchant	Rush						
Granger	Markey (CO)	Ryan (OH)						
Graves	Markey (MA)	Ryan (WI)						
Grayson	Marshall	Sablan						
Green, Al	Massa	Salazar						
Green, Gene	Matheson	Sánchez, Linda						
Griffith	Matsui	T.						
Grijalva	McCarthy (CA)	Sanchez, Loretta						
Guthrie	McCarthy (NY)	Sarbanes						
Gutierrez	McCaul	Scalise						
Hall (NY)	McClintock	Schakowsky						
Hall (TX)	McCollum	Schauer						
Halvorson	McCotter	Schiff						
Hare	McDermott	Schmidt						
Harman	McGovern	Schock						
Harper	McHenry	Schrader						
Hastings (FL)	McIntyre	Schwartz						
Hastings (WA)	McKeon	Scott (GA)						
Heinrich	McMahon	Sensenbrenner						
Heller	McMorris	Serrano						
Hensarling	Rodgers	Sessions						
Herger	McNerney	Sestak						
Herseth Sandlin	Meek (FL)	Shadegg						
Higgins	Meeks (NY)	Shea-Porter						
Hill	Melancon	Sherman						
Himes	Mica	Shimkus						
Hinchee	Michaud	Shuler						
Hinojosa	Miller (FL)	Shuster						
Hirono	Miller (MI)	Simpson						
Hodes	Miller (NC)	Sires						
Hoekstra	Miller, Gary	Skelton						
Holden	Miller, George	Slaughter						
Holt	Minnick	Smith (NE)						
Honda	Mitchell	Smith (NJ)						
Hoyer	Mollohan	Smith (TX)						
Hunter	Moore (KS)	Smith (WA)						
Inglis	Moore (WI)	Snyder						
Insole	Moran (KS)	Souder						
Israel	Moran (VA)	Space						
Issa	Murphy (CT)	Speier						
Jackson (IL)	Murphy (NY)	Spratt						
Jackson-Lee	Murphy, Patrick	Stark						
(TX)	Murphy, Tim	Stearns						

NOT VOTING—14

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR
The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1329

So the amendment was agreed to.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 24 OFFERED BY MR. GUTHRIE
The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. GUTHRIE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.
The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 165, noes 265, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 717]

AYES—165

Aderholt	Cassidy	Hall (TX)
Akin	Castle	Harper
Alexander	Chaffetz	Hastings (WA)
Austria	Coble	Heller
Bachmann	Coffman (CO)	Hensarling
Bachus	Cole	Herger
Bartlett	Conaway	Hoekstra
Barton (TX)	Crenshaw	Hunter
Biggert	Culberson	Inglis
Bilbray	Davis (KY)	Issa
Bilirakis	Deal (GA)	Jenkins
Bishop (UT)	Dent	Johnson (IL)
Blackburn	Diaz-Balart, L.	Johnson, Sam
Blunt	Diaz-Balart, M.	Jones
Boehner	Dreier	Jordan (OH)
Bonner	Duncan	King (IA)
Bono Mack	Ehlers	King (NY)
Boozman	Emerson	Kingston
Boustany	Fallin	Kline (MN)
Brady (TX)	Flake	Lamborn
Brown (GA)	Fleming	Lance
Brown (SC)	Forbes	Latham
Brown-Waite,	Fortenberry	LaTourette
Ginny	Franks (AZ)	Latta
Buchanan	Frelinghuysen	Lee (NY)
Burgess	Gallegly	Lewis (CA)
Burton (IN)	Garrett (NJ)	LoBiondo
Buyer	Gerlach	Lucas
Calvert	Gingrey (GA)	Luetkemeyer
Camp	Gohmert	Lummis
Campbell	Goodlatte	Lungren, Daniel
Cantor	Granger	E.
Capito	Graves	Mack
Carter	Guthrie	Manzullo

NOES—265

Ackerman	Faleomavaega	Massa
Adler (NJ)	Farr	Matheson
Altmire	Fattah	Matsui
Andrews	Filner	McCarthy (NY)
Arcuri	Foster	McCollum
Baca	Fox	McDermott
Baird	Frank (MA)	McGovern
Baldwin	Fudge	McIntyre
Barrow	Giffords	McMahon
Bean	Gonzalez	McNerney
Becerra	Gordon (TN)	Meek (FL)
Berkley	Grayson	Melancon
Berman	Green, Al	Michaud
Berry	Green, Gene	Miller (NE)
Bishop (GA)	Griffith	Miller, George
Bishop (NY)	Grijalva	Minnick
Blumenauer	Gutierrez	Mitchell
Boccheri	Hall (NY)	Mollohan
Bordallo	Halvorson	Moore (KS)
Boren	Hare	Moore (WI)
Boswell	Harman	Moran (VA)
Boucher	Hastings (FL)	Murphy (CT)
Boyd	Heinrich	Murphy (NY)
Brady (PA)	Herseth Sandlin	Murphy, Patrick
Braley (IA)	Higgins	Murtha
Bright	Hill	Nadler (NY)
Brown, Corrine	Himes	Napolitano
Butterfield	Hinchee	Neal (MA)
Cao	Hinojosa	Norton
Capps	Hirono	Nye
Capuano	Hodes	Oberstar
Cardoza	Holden	Obey
Carnahan	Holt	Olver
Carney	Honda	Ortiz
Carson (IN)	Hoyer	Pallone
Castor (FL)	Insole	Pascrell
Chandler	Israel	Pastor (AZ)
Childers	Jackson (IL)	Payne
Christensen	Jackson-Lee	Perlmutter
Chu	(TX)	Perriello
Clarke	Johnson (GA)	Peters
Clay	Johnson, E. B.	Peterson
Cleaver	Kagen	Petri
Clyburn	Kanjorski	Pierluisi
Cohen	Kaptur	Pingree (ME)
Connolly (VA)	Kennedy	Platts
Conyers	Kildee	Polis (CO)
Cooler	Kilpatrick (MI)	Pomeroy
Costello	Kilroy	Price (GA)
Courtney	Kind	Price (NC)
Crowley	Kirk	Quigley
Cuellar	Kirkpatrick (AZ)	Rahall
Cummings	Kissell	Rangel
Dahlkemper	Klein (FL)	Reyes
Davis (AL)	Kosmas	Richardson
Davis (CA)	Kratovil	Rodriguez
Davis (IL)	Kucinich	Ros-Lehtinen
Davis (TN)	Langevin	Ross
DeFazio	Larsen (WA)	Rothman (NJ)
DeGette	Larson (CT)	Roybal-Allard
Delahunt	Lee (CA)	Ruppersberger
DeLauro	Levin	Rush
Dicks	Lewis (GA)	Ryan (OH)
Dingell	Linder	Sablan
Doggett	Lipinski	Salazar
Donnelly (IN)	Loeb sack	Sánchez, Linda
Doyle	Lofgren, Zoe	T.
Driehaus	Lowey	Sanchez, Loretta
Edwards (MD)	Lujan	Sarbanes
Edwards (TX)	Lynch	Schakowsky
Ellison	Maffei	Schauer
Ellsworth	Maloney	Schiff
Engel	Markey (CO)	Schrader
Eshoo	Markey (MA)	Schwartz
Etheridge	Marshall	Scott (GA)

Scott (VA)	Stupak	Wasserman
Serrano	Sutton	Schultz
Sestak	Taylor	Waters
Shea-Porter	Teague	Watson
Sherman	Thompson (CA)	Watt
Shuler	Thompson (MS)	Waxman
Sires	Tierney	Weiner
Skelton	Titus	Welch
Slaughter	Tonko	Wexler
Smith (WA)	Towns	Wilson (OH)
Snyder	Tsongas	Woolsey
Space	Van Hollen	Wu
Speier	Velázquez	Yarmuth
Spratt	Visclosky	
Stark	Walz	

NOT VOTING—

Abercrombie	McHugh	Paul
Barrett (SC)	Meeks (NY)	Radanovich
Costa	Nunes	Tanner

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1337

Mr. SCHRADER changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. Accordingly, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SERRANO) having assumed the chair, Mr. HOLDEN, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3221) to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 746, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

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

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. ISSA. I am, in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Issa moves to recommit the bill H.R. 3221 to the Committee on Education and Labor with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment:

Add at the end the following new title (and conform the table of contents accordingly):

TITLE VI—DEFUND ACORN ACT**SECTION 601. SHORT TITLE.**

This title may be cited as the “Defund ACORN Act”.

SEC. 602. PROHIBITIONS ON FEDERAL FUNDS AND OTHER ACTIVITIES WITH RESPECT TO CERTAIN INDICTED ORGANIZATIONS.

(a) PROHIBITIONS.—With respect to any covered organization, the following prohibitions apply:

(1) No Federal contract, grant, cooperative agreement, or any other form of agreement (including a memorandum of understanding) may be awarded to or entered into with the organization.

(2) No Federal funds in any other form may be provided to the organization.

(3) No Federal employee or contractor may promote in any way (including recommending to a person or referring to a person for any purpose) the organization.

(b) COVERED ORGANIZATION.—In this section, the term “covered organization” means any of the following:

(1) Any organization that has been indicted for a violation under any Federal or State law governing the financing of a campaign for election for public office or any law governing the administration of an election for public office, including a law relating to voter registration.

(2) Any organization that had its State corporate charter terminated due to its failure to comply with Federal or State lobbying disclosure requirements.

(3) Any organization that has filed a fraudulent form with any Federal or State regulatory agency.

(4) Any organization that—

(A) employs any applicable individual, in a permanent or temporary capacity;

(B) has under contract or retains any applicable individual; or

(C) has any applicable individual acting on the organization’s behalf or with the express or apparent authority of the organization.

(c) ADDITIONAL DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term “organization” includes the Association of Community Organizations for Reform Now (in this subsection referred to as “ACORN”) and any ACORN-related affiliate.

(2) The term “ACORN-related affiliate” means any of the following:

(A) Any State chapter of ACORN registered with the Secretary of State’s office in that State.

(B) Any organization that shares directors, employees, or independent contractors with ACORN.

(C) Any organization that has a financial stake in ACORN.

(D) Any organization whose finances, whether federally funded, donor-funded, or raised through organizational goods and services, are shared or controlled by ACORN.

(3) The term “applicable individual” means an individual who has been indicted for a violation under Federal or State law relating to an election for Federal or State office.

(d) REVISION OF FEDERAL ACQUISITION REGULATION.—The Federal Acquisition Regulation shall be revised to carry out the provisions of this title relating to contracts.

Mr. ISSA (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for waiving the reading of the remainder of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, this motion to recommit is critical at this time. As many people in this body realize, the

scandals surrounding the criminal activities of ACORN have called into question their role in all aspects of government, including aspects covered in this bill. The funding they’ve received under Health and Human Services, title IV, which is covered in this bill, and other areas make it extremely important that we consider it at this time.

ACORN, as our committee had previously reported, is an organization with a long history of criminal indictments and activities, so much so that in fact the Census Bureau has, on its own, removed its funding. The Senate has voted 83-7 to remove funding; we must do the same thing.

This motion to recommit deliberately is here because in fact this is a funding-related activity. This is one in which we understand that the very fundamental of taxpayer dollars being properly used and supported is at stake.

There is no question as to where ACORN stands, where the administration and multiple Governors, including my own Governor, Arnold Schwarzenegger, have called for this investigation; 130 Members of this body have called on the President in fact to defund.

So the motion to recommit, narrow in scope, simply makes the defunding of ACORN a portion of this bill, makes it clear that the Members of this House do not support ACORN’s activities, including child trafficking, prostitution, and in fact a great many other criminal activities, including voter fraud. This is timely, it is targeted, and it is time that this House act.

I move the motion, and ask for it to be voted positively.

Mr. Speaker, this motion to recommit is simple. It’s about protecting students and taxpayers.

Earlier this week, more than 130 House Republicans wrote to President Obama requesting that he take immediate action to cut off all federal funding of the Association of Community Organizations for Reform Now, or ACORN.

ACORN has been linked to multiple instances of voter registration fraud and other illicit activity. In recent days, media accounts have detailed ACORN employees’ alleged complicity in illegal schemes too unseemly to discuss in this chamber. To continue funding this organization would not just be indefensible—it would be an outrage.

An analysis of federal data shows that ACORN has received more than \$53 million in direct funding from the Federal Government since 1994, and has likely received substantially more indirectly through States and localities that receive Federal block grants.

The Census Bureau recently decided to sever all ties with ACORN to ensure the integrity of their operations. This was the right decision. Unfortunately, ACORN’s links to the Federal Government do not stop with the Census Bureau. This organization has infiltrated a host of federal programs, consuming taxpayer dollars even as it has repeatedly been found to engage in criminal activity.

To fully protect taxpayers, we must enact a comprehensive ban on Federal funding for this

corrupt and criminal organization. This motion to recommit will do exactly that.

Republicans have introduced legislation—the Defund ACORN Act—to put an immediate stop to Federal funding for this crooked bunch.

U.S. International Agreements: The iron and steel section states: “This section shall be applied in a manner consistent with United States obligations under international agreements.” This applies government-wide.

Any and all Federal agencies: Section 505(a) is open to other entities the Secretary deems appropriate—an open-ended inclusion that could apply to any Federal agency.

The tentacles of this legislation reach into the economy, our education system, our workforce system, and a host of other areas. It is truly a comprehensive bill—and a comprehensive ban on funding for ACORN, such as that included in this motion, is what is needed.

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

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion, although I will not oppose the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I want to begin by thanking so many Members of the House that have supported this bill today on this floor. The bipartisan support we had for so many of the amendments, the debate and the dialogue that we had, thank you so very much.

When the President talked about the future of the American economy, he made it very clear that if we were going to be competitive in the rest of the world, if we were going to emerge in that top competitive position in the next generation of the globalized economy, where so many more countries are now able to educate young people, provide world-class organizations, universities, research facilities, that we had to change our education system, that we had to make a major investment, that we no longer could just think about how much money we put into education. We had to start thinking about the outcomes and whether we were getting the results for young people all across this country, were we getting the results for businesses across this country, were we getting the results for families.

He made that very clear with the Race to the Top fund that is getting such wide reception and acceptance from Governors all over the country, from school districts, from unions, from families and organizations to see that change. He has extended that to the colleges and universities.

It is not enough that a student enters a college, that he or she is eligible to go to college. The question is, Will they graduate from that college? And what he has put in this legislation is a discussion and a requirement that we understand how many people who enter college obtain that certificate for a career, that AA degree in a 2-year col-

lege, their ability to go on to a 4-year college. That’s the first time we’ve ever asked that question.

But it’s terribly important, when two-thirds of the people going to college today are borrowing money, when they’re borrowing money, we need to know that the colleges are providing the right kind of educational experience and the opportunity to succeed. That’s what you’ve been voting for all day long, and I want to thank you because it will change the direction, it will change the direction in which we are going in this Nation. And I think it will dramatically enhance our possibilities of remaining the top competitive country in the world.

That’s why the Business Roundtable spoke to the issue of the community college provisions in this bill, how important they were so that the community colleges could become a catalyst for economic revitalization, for retooling, for dislocation, so that communities that are welcoming a new industry or communities that are losing an old one and thinking about where to go in the future, to make the community colleges the center of that training and education that so many American workers and families are seeking out today. That’s what you voted to do in this bill.

□ 1345

I want to thank you very much.

Mr. NADLER of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I will not yield. I want to thank you very much.

As to this amendment, ACORN gets, I believe, no money under this bill, but that’s not the issue. The issue is that I will support the gentleman’s motion to instruct. We have a world-class bill here. We have a bill of opportunity for families, for students, for employers, for our country, and for our economy. I hope you will support it. Vote for the motion to instruct. Vote for this bill on final passage.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of passage.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 345, noes 75, answered “present” 2, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 718]

AYES—345

Ackerman	Driehaus	Lofgren, Zoe
Aderholt	Duncan	Lowe
Adler (NJ)	Edwards (TX)	Lucas
Akin	Ehlers	Luetkemeyer
Alexander	Ellsworth	Lujan
Altmire	Emerson	Lummis
Andrews	Eshoo	Lungren, Daniel
Arcuri	Etheridge	E.
Austria	Fallin	Mack
Baca	Farr	Maffei
Bachmann	Flake	Maloney
Bachus	Fleming	Manzullo
Baird	Forbes	Marchant
Barrow	Fortenberry	Markey (CO)
Bartlett	Foster	Marshall
Barton (TX)	Fox	Massa
Bean	Franks (AZ)	Matheson
Berkley	Frelinghuysen	Matsui
Berman	Gallely	McCarthy (CA)
Berry	Garrett (NJ)	McCarthy (NY)
Biggert	Gerlach	McCauley
Bilbray	Giffords	McClintock
Bilirakis	Gingrey (GA)	McCotter
Bishop (GA)	Gohmert	McHenry
Bishop (NY)	Gonzalez	McIntyre
Bishop (UT)	Goodlatte	McKeon
Blackburn	Gordon (TN)	McMahon
Blumenauer	Granger	McMorris
Blunt	Graves	Rodgers
Bocchieri	Grayson	McNerney
Boehner	Green, Gene	Meek (FL)
Bonner	Griffith	Melancon
Bono Mack	Guthrie	Mica
Boozman	Gutierrez	Michaud
Boren	Hall (NY)	Miller (FL)
Boswell	Hall (TX)	Miller (MI)
Boucher	Halvorson	Miller (NC)
Boustany	Hare	Miller, Gary
Boyd	Harman	Miller, George
Brady (TX)	Harper	Minnick
Braley (IA)	Hastings (WA)	Mitchell
Bright	Heinrich	Moore (KS)
Broun (GA)	Heller	Moran (KS)
Brown (SC)	Hensarling	Murphy (CT)
Brown-Waite,	Herger	Murphy (NY)
Ginny	Herseth Sandlin	Murphy, Patrick
Buchanan	Higgins	Murphy, Tim
Burgess	Hill	Murtha
Burton (IN)	Himes	Myrick
Buyer	Hinojosa	Napolitano
Calvert	Hodes	Neugebauer
Camp	Hoekstra	Nye
Campbell	Holden	Oberstar
Cantor	Hoyer	Obey
Cao	Hunter	Olson
Capito	Inglis	Ortiz
Capps	Inslee	Pastor (AZ)
Cardoza	Israel	Paulsen
Carnahan	Issa	Pence
Carney	Jenkins	Perlmutter
Carter	Johnson (GA)	Perriello
Cassidy	Johnson (IL)	Peters
Castle	Johnson, Sam	Peterson
Chaffetz	Jones	Petri
Chandler	Jordan (OH)	Pingree (ME)
Childers	Kagen	Pitts
Chu	Kanjorski	Platts
Clay	Kaptur	Poe (TX)
Coble	Kennedy	Pomeroy
Coffman (CO)	Kildee	Posey
Cohen	Kilroy	Price (GA)
Cole	Kind	Putnam
Conaway	King (IA)	Quigley
Conyers	King (NY)	Rehberg
Cooper	Kingston	Reichert
Costello	Kirk	Reyes
Courtney	Kirkpatrick (AZ)	Richardson
Crenshaw	Kissell	Rodriguez
Cuellar	Klein (FL)	Roe (TN)
Culberson	Kline (MN)	Rogers (AL)
Dahlkemper	Kosmas	Rogers (KY)
Davis (AL)	Kratovil	Rogers (MI)
Davis (CA)	Lamborn	Rohrabacher
Davis (KY)	Lance	Rooney
Davis (TN)	Langevin	Ros-Lehtinen
Deal (GA)	Larson (CT)	Roskam
DeFazio	Latham	Ross
DeLauro	LaTourette	Rothman (NJ)
Dent	Latta	Royce
Diaz-Balart, L.	Lee (NY)	Ruppersberger
Diaz-Balart, M.	Levin	Ryan (OH)
Dicks	Lewis (CA)	Ryan (WI)
Dingell	Linder	Salazar
Doggett	Lipinski	Sanchez, Loretta
Donnelly (IN)	LoBiondo	Sarbanes
Dreier	Loebuck	Scalise

Schauer	Souder	Van Hollen
Schiff	Space	Visclosky
Schmidt	Speier	Walden
Schock	Spratt	Walz
Schrader	Stearns	Wamp
Schwartz	Stupak	Wasserman
Sensenbrenner	Sullivan	Schultz
Sessions	Sutton	Weiner
Sestak	Taylor	Weist
Shadegg	Teague	Westmoreland
Shea-Porter	Terry	Whitfield
Shimkus	Thompson (CA)	Wilson (OH)
Shuler	Thompson (PA)	Wilson (SC)
Shuster	Thornberry	Wittman
Simpson	Tiahrt	Wolf
Skelton	Tiberi	Wu
Smith (NE)	Tierney	Yarmuth
Smith (NJ)	Titus	Young (AK)
Smith (TX)	Tonko	Young (FL)
Smith (WA)	Turner	
Snyder	Upton	

NOES—75

Baldwin	Holt	Polis (CO)
Becerra	Honda	Price (NC)
Brady (PA)	Jackson (IL)	Rahall
Brown, Corrine	Jackson-Lee	Rangel
Butterfield	(TX)	Roybal-Allard
Capuano	Johnson, E.B.	Rush
Carson (IN)	Kilpatrick (MI)	Sánchez, Linda
Castor (FL)	Kucinich	T.
Cleaver	Larsen (WA)	Schakowsky
Clyburn	Lee (CA)	Scott (GA)
Crowley	Lewis (GA)	Scott (VA)
Cummings	Lynch	Serrano
Davis (IL)	Markey (MA)	Sherman
DeGette	McColum	Sires
Delahunt	McDermott	Slaughter
Doyle	McGovern	Stark
Edwards (MD)	Meeks (NY)	Thompson (MS)
Ellison	Mollohan	Towns
Engel	Moore (WI)	Tsongas
Fattah	Moran (VA)	Velázquez
Filner	Nadler (NY)	Waters
Fudge	Neal (MA)	Watson
Green, Al	Oliver	Waxman
Grijalva	Pallone	Wexler
Hinchev	Pascrell	Woolsey
Hirono	Payne	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Hastings (FL) Watt

NOT VOTING—11

Abercrombie	Costa	Paul
Barrett (SC)	Frank (MA)	Radanovich
Clarke	McHugh	Tanner
Connolly (VA)	Nunes	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining on this vote.

□ 1406

Messrs. RAHALL, MOLLOHAN and ENGEL changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Ms. ESHOO, Messrs. WELCH, INS-LEE, FARR, DOGGETT, MINNICK, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Messrs. AKIN, EHLERS and JOHNSON of Georgia changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the motion to recommit was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the instructions of the House in the motion to recommit, I report the bill, H.R. 3221, back to the House with an amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:
Add at the end the following new title (and conform the table of contents accordingly):

TITLE VI—DEFUND ACORN ACT

SECTION 601. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the "Defund ACORN Act".

SEC. 602. PROHIBITIONS ON FEDERAL FUNDS AND OTHER ACTIVITIES WITH RESPECT TO CERTAIN INDICTED ORGANIZATIONS.

(a) PROHIBITIONS.—With respect to any covered organization, the following prohibitions apply:

(1) No Federal contract, grant, cooperative agreement, or any other form of agreement (including a memorandum of understanding) may be awarded to or entered into with the organization.

(2) No Federal funds in any other form may be provided to the organization.

(3) No Federal employee or contractor may promote in any way (including recommending to a person or referring to a person for any purpose) the organization.

(b) COVERED ORGANIZATION.—In this section, the term "covered organization" means any of the following:

(1) Any organization that has been indicted for a violation under any Federal or State law governing the financing of a campaign for election for public office or any law governing the administration of an election for public office, including a law relating to voter registration.

(2) Any organization that had its State corporate charter terminated due to its failure to comply with Federal or State lobbying disclosure requirements.

(3) Any organization that has filed a fraudulent form with any Federal or State regulatory agency.

(4) Any organization that—
(A) employs any applicable individual, in a permanent or temporary capacity;

(B) has under contract or retains any applicable individual; or

(C) has any applicable individual acting on the organization's behalf or with the express or apparent authority of the organization.

(c) ADDITIONAL DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term "organization" includes the Association of Community Organizations for Reform Now (in this subsection referred to as "ACORN") and any ACORN-related affiliate.

(2) The term "ACORN-related affiliate" means any of the following:

(A) Any State chapter of ACORN registered with the Secretary of State's office in that State.

(B) Any organization that shares directors, employees, or independent contractors with ACORN.

(C) Any organization that has a financial stake in ACORN.

(D) Any organization whose finances, whether federally funded, donor-funded, or raised through organizational goods and services, are shared or controlled by ACORN.

(3) The term "applicable individual" means an individual who has been indicted for a violation under Federal or State law relating to an election for Federal or State office.

(d) REVISION OF FEDERAL ACQUISITION REGULATION.—The Federal Acquisition Regulation shall be revised to carry out the provisions of this title relating to contracts.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GEORGE MILLER OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California (during the reading). I ask unanimous consent to suspend with the reading of the amendment.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. 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 253, noes 171, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 719]

AYES—253

Ackerman	Edwards (TX)	Lofgren, Zoe
Adler (NJ)	Ellison	Lowe
Altmire	Ellsworth	Lujan
Andrews	Engel	Lynch
Arcuri	Eshoo	Maffei
Baca	Etheridge	Maloney
Baird	Farr	Markey (CA)
Baldwin	Fattah	Markey (MA)
Barrow	Filner	Marshall
Bean	Foster	Massa
Becerra	Fudge	Matheson
Berkley	Giffords	Matsui
Berman	Gonzalez	McCarthy (NY)
Berry	Gordon (TN)	McColum
Bishop (GA)	Grayson	McDermott
Bishop (NY)	Green, Al	McGovern
Blumenauer	Green, Gene	McIntyre
Bocchieri	Griffith	McNerney
Boren	Grijalva	Meek (FL)
Boswell	Gutierrez	Meeks (NY)
Boucher	Hall (NY)	Melancon
Brady (PA)	Halvorson	Michaud
Braley (IA)	Hare	Miller (NC)
Bright	Harman	Miller, George
Brown, Corrine	Hastings (FL)	Minnick
Buchanan	Heinrich	Mitchell
Butterfield	Higgins	Mollohan
Cao	Hill	Moore (KS)
Capps	Himes	Moore (WI)
Capuano	Hinchev	Moran (VA)
Cardoza	Hinojosa	Murphy (CT)
Carnahan	Hirono	Murphy (NY)
Carney	Hodes	Murphy, Patrick
Carson (IN)	Holden	Murtha
Castor (FL)	Holt	Nadler (NY)
Chandler	Honda	Napolitano
Childers	Hoyer	Neal (MA)
Chu	Inslee	Nye
Clarke	Israel	Oberstar
Clay	Jackson (IL)	Obey
Cleaver	Jackson-Lee	Olver
Clyburn	(TX)	Ortiz
Cohen	Johnson (GA)	Pallone
Connolly (VA)	Johnson (IL)	Pascrell
Cooper	Johnson, E. B.	Pastor (AZ)
Costello	Kagen	Payne
Courtney	Kaptur	Pelosi
Crowley	Kennedy	Perlmutter
Cuellar	Kildee	Perriello
Cummings	Kilpatrick (MI)	Peters
Dahlkemper	Kilroy	Peterson
Davis (AL)	Kind	Petri
Davis (CA)	Kirkpatrick (AZ)	Pingree (ME)
Davis (IL)	Kissell	Platts
Davis (TN)	Klein (FL)	Polis (CO)
DeFazio	Kosmas	Pomeroy
DeGette	Kratovil	Price (NC)
Delahunt	Kucinich	Quigley
DeLauro	Langevin	Rahall
Dicks	Larsen (WA)	Rangel
Dingell	Larson (CT)	Reyes
Doggett	Lee (CA)	Richardson
Donnelly (IN)	Levin	Rodriguez
Doyle	Lewis (GA)	Ros-Lehtinen
Driehaus	Lipinski	Ross
Edwards (MD)	Loeb sack	Rothman (NJ)

Roybal-Allard	Shuler	Tsongas
Ruppersberger	Sires	Van Hollen
Rush	Skelton	Velázquez
Ryan (OH)	Slaughter	Visclosky
Salazar	Smith (WA)	Walz
Sánchez, Linda	Snyder	Wasserman
T.	Space	Schultz
Sanchez, Loretta	Speier	Waters
Sarbanes	Spratt	Watson
Schakowsky	Stark	Watt
Schauer	Stupak	Waxman
Schiff	Sutton	Weiner
Schrader	Taylor	Welch
Schwartz	Teague	Wexler
Scott (GA)	Thompson (CA)	Wilson (OH)
Scott (VA)	Thompson (MS)	Woolsey
Serrano	Tierney	Wu
Sestak	Titus	Yarmuth
Shea-Porter	Tonko	
Sherman	Towns	

NOES—171

Aderholt	Franks (AZ)	Mica
Akin	Frelinghuysen	Miller (FL)
Alexander	Galleghy	Miller (MI)
Austria	Garrett (NJ)	Miller, Gary
Bachmann	Gerlach	Moran (KS)
Bachus	Gingrey (GA)	Murphy, Tim
Bartlett	Gohmert	Myrick
Barton (TX)	Goodlatte	Neugebauer
Biggert	Granger	Olson
Bilbray	Graves	Paulsen
Bilirakis	Guthrie	Pence
Bishop (UT)	Hall (TX)	Pitts
Blackburn	Harper	Poe (TX)
Blunt	Hastings (WA)	Posey
Boehner	Heller	Price (GA)
Bonner	Hensarling	Putnam
Bono Mack	Herger	Rehberg
Boozman	Hereth Sandlin	Reichert
Boustany	Hoekstra	Roe (TN)
Boyd	Hunter	Rogers (AL)
Brady (TX)	Inglis	Rogers (KY)
Broun (GA)	Issa	Rogers (MI)
Brown (SC)	Jenkins	Rohrabacher
Brown-Waite,	Johnson, Sam	Rooney
Ginny	Jones	Roskam
Burgess	Jordan (OH)	Royce
Burton (IN)	Kanjorski	Ryan (WI)
Buyer	King (IA)	Scalise
Calvert	King (NY)	Schmidt
Camp	Kingston	Schock
Campbell	Kirk	Sensenbrenner
Cantor	Kline (MN)	Sessions
Capito	Lamborn	Shadegg
Carter	Lance	Shimkus
Cassidy	Latham	Shuster
Castle	LaTourette	Simpson
Chaffetz	Latta	Smith (NE)
Coble	Lee (NY)	Smith (NJ)
Coffman (CO)	Lewis (CA)	Smith (TX)
Cole	Linder	Souder
Conaway	LoBiondo	Stearns
Crenshaw	Lucas	Sullivan
Culberson	Luetkemeyer	Terry
Davis (KY)	Lummis	Thompson (PA)
Deal (GA)	Lungren, Daniel	Thornberry
Dent	E.	Tiaht
Diaz-Balart, L.	Mack	Tiberi
Diaz-Balart, M.	Manzullo	Turner
Dreier	Marchant	Upton
Duncan	McCarthy (CA)	Walden
Ehlers	McCaul	Wamp
Emerson	McClintock	Westmoreland
Fallin	McCotter	Whitfield
Flake	McHenry	Wilson (SC)
Fleming	McKeon	Wittman
Forbes	McMahon	Wolf
Fortenberry	McMorris	Young (AK)
Fox	Rodgers	Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—10

Abercrombie	Frank (MA)	Radanovich
Barrett (SC)	McHugh	Tanner
Conyers	Nunes	
Costa	Paul	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining on this vote.

□ 1416

Mr. KAGEN changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Speaker, on the legislative day of Thursday, September 17, 2009, I was unavoidably detained and was unable to cast a vote on a number of rollcall votes. Had I been present, I would have voted: Rollcall 710—“aye”; rollcall 711—“aye”; rollcall 712—“aye”; rollcall 713—“aye”; rollcall 714—“aye”; rollcall 715—“aye”; rollcall 716—“aye”; rollcall 717—“aye”; rollcall 718—“aye”; rollcall 719—“no.”

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, today I inadvertently cast a “yea” vote for a motion to recommit on H.R. 3200 and did not vote for final passage. I intended to vote “no” on the motion to recommit and “yea” on final passage of the bill.

□ 1415

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN EN-GROSSMENT OF H.R. 3221, STUDENT AID AND FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY ACT OF 2009

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the staffs of the Education and Labor Committee on both sides of the aisle for all of their hard work, and I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk be authorized to make technical corrections in the engrossment of H.R. 3221, to include corrections in spelling, punctuation, section numbering and cross-referencing, and the assertion of appropriate headings.

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

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 3226

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to make a unanimous consent request because I am very sorry that my office inadvertently put my friend, Mr. WILLIAM CLAY, on a bill which he did not intend to cosponsor. It was our mistake, not Mr. CLAY's. So I ask unanimous consent that we remove the name of Mr. WILLIAM LACY Clay from H.R. 3226.

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

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of inquiring about next week's schedule, and I yield to the gen-

tleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the majority leader, for the purpose of announcing next week's schedule.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the Republican whip for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, on Monday the House will meet at 4 p.m. for pro forma session. On Tuesday, the House will meet at 12:30 p.m. for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business. On Wednesday and Thursday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for legislative business. On Friday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business.

We will consider several bills under suspension of the rules. The complete list of suspension bills will be announced by the close of business tomorrow, as is the custom.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, we will consider H.R. 3548, the Unemployment Compensation Act of 2009; H.R. 324, the Santa Cruz Valley National Heritage Area Act; and a resolution which will make continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2010, and for other purposes.

I yield back.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman indicated, we will be considering several extensions of expiring law next week. I would like to ask, though, with the recent reports of the Senate Finance Committee marking up their health care bill, whether the gentleman could tell us if the House could expect that health care legislation would be moving to the floor either next week or sometime soon.

I yield.

Mr. HOYER. Well, I hope sometime soon, but not next week. That is certainly the case. We will be moving the health care bill as soon as it is ready to be moved. Obviously, as you say, the Senate put a bill on the table. It will be marking that up next week. But our committees are working on bringing three bills that have passed out of committees together. As soon as they are ready to go, and I can't predict when that will be, we will bring the bill to the floor. But I reiterate, it is not going to be next week.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman.

I would like to ask the follow-up, Mr. Speaker, whether the gentleman believes the House will be waiting for the Senate to act prior to a bill coming to the floor of this House.

I yield.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

No, the House will be, as I said, moving the bill to the floor when the House is ready to do so. We don't know what the Senate schedule will be so we are going to proceed on our own schedule. And then obviously at some point in time the bills will have to be conferred and reconciled.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to turn to the question next week surrounding the House's actions regarding issues confronting the assembly of the United Nations in New York next week.

Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman knows, and he and I both traveled to

Israel over the August recess, I know that the gentleman is as concerned as I am about the potential nuclear developments in Iran and the fact, I believe, that both of us feel that Iran poses an existential threat not only to the United States but also to our democratic ally, Israel.

There were some reports today regarding some shifting of that notion, the policy behind that notion, from the administration. We had the Vice President today indicate that somehow because Iran did not have the potential capacity to launch a missile to reach our shores, that somehow we could deal with the threat of Iran. We also have news that indicates a shift in our policy of missile defense in terms of our commitment to our allies in Europe as well as Israel.

Again I would say, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman and I have both worked hard on the issue of trying to stop the development of nuclear weapons in Iran specifically aimed at our only democratic ally, Israel, in the region. I have believed all along and I have spoken to the gentleman about it, that we ought to be moving as quickly as possible on the Iran Refined Petroleum Sanctions Act. I would like to ask the gentleman, with all that having been said, Would it not be appropriate at this point to bring that bill to the floor to give the President some tools at his disposal while he meets with the leader of Iran in New York next week?

I yield.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

As the gentleman correctly pointed out, I believe that a nuclear-armed Iran is dangerous and unacceptable, not only to Israel but to the region which I think will be greatly destabilized and which will start a nuclear arms race in the region.

In addition, as the gentleman knows, there are a quarter of a million Americans right now today as we speak within range of Iranian missiles. So I believe a nuclear-armed Iran, personally I believe it is in fact a danger to the region and to the international community and to the interests of the United States of America.

It is the policy of the United States, expressed by our President, that a nuclear-armed Iran was not an acceptable situation to exist. The administration, as you know, is pursuing attempts to negotiate to an end that there is an abandonment which is verified of Iran's nuclear efforts.

With respect to the bills, there are two bills as the gentleman knows. Chairman FRANK has a bill in his committee, an Iran sanctions enabling act, and Chairman BERMAN has a bill in his committee on the Iran refined petroleum sanctions act. I will tell the gentleman that I am meeting with Mr. BERMAN and Mr. FRANK early next week to discuss the bringing of those bills and the order we ought to bring them to have maximum impact, and I expect to do that in the near future.

When I say "near future," I mean within a matter of weeks. It will not be next week, but whether it is the week after or the week after that. But my expectation is, after talking with Mr. FRANK and Mr. BERMAN, we will be bringing those two sanctions bills to the floor in the near future.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman.

My concern lies in the fact of the reports out of the administration today, and perhaps new intelligence information is being relied upon to result in a swift turnaround in our policy vis-a-vis Iran which is why I raised this question and seek from the gentleman his consistent position that has been up until now that we do face a threat in Iran in its current capacity.

As the gentleman states, we have uniformed armed men and women in Insirlik, in Iraq, in Afghanistan, throughout the region that certainly are in the line of Shahab-3 missiles that could do serious harm to American life and interests. I think out of that concern, I ask the gentleman could we see an expedited push on this bill to demonstrate that this Congress, this House, is not yielding to this notion that somehow Iran is no longer a threat?

I yield.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Now to this concept, I don't want anybody to be confused. I am not sure exactly what the gentleman is saying, I heard him talking about it, the administration position, as far as I know, has not changed with respect to the concept of which the gentleman speaks.

A nuclear-armed Iran, I believe the administration and I believe this Congress, believes is an unacceptable undermining both of the nuclear non-proliferation treaty, but also of the stability of a very unstable region of the world. I want to reiterate that I think that remains the position of the administration. It is certainly my position, and I believe it is the position of the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee and the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, and I think of this Congress.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman. I think I am to take heart in that position because I do know that the administration today had downgraded its alarm, if you will, downgraded the threat that Iran poses.

I yield.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I am not sure exactly what he is referring to other than the perception of how quickly the Iranians may convert to nuclear capability their present capacity, whether there is a longer time than that. But I have not had direct communication with the administration on that issue. I don't want to speak for the administration, but I think what I have already said to this point does in fact reflect certainly all of the communications I have had with the administration to date.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his time.

□ 1430

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY,
SEPTEMBER 21, 2009

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 4 p.m. on Monday next, and further, when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Tuesday, September 22, 2009, for morning-hour debate.

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

There was no objection.

THE CRUSADERS: NATIONAL NETWORK TO END DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, LouAnne is an elementary student in Texas. In the mornings, she eagerly awaits to be picked up by the school bus. After school, she rides the bus home, but sometimes she hesitates and slowly gets off that bus.

Once, she just sat on the bus when it pulled in front of her house. The bus driver walked to her seat and told her, "LouAnne, this is where you get off." LouAnne would not leave her seat, and replied, "Daddy hurts me and Momma."

We should realize, Mr. Speaker, that behind the closed doors of many houses in America, violence is a way of life. It's a bad life, a sad way of life. It affects spouses and children. It affects the physical and mental health of American families.

Domestic violence is a public health issue. One group that helps victims of home violence is the National Network to End Domestic Violence. These crusaders are the leading voice for domestic violence victims and advocates. They are helping to expose violence, support survivors, and change the culture of our communities.

I commend them for their wonderful work. Of all the places on Earth where a person should be safe, it's at home.

And that's just the way it is.

WRONGFUL BILL OF ATTAINDER

(Mr. NADLER of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. NADLER of New York. A little while ago, the House passed an amendment to the bill that we were considering that says no contract for Federal funds may ever go to ACORN, a named organization, or to any individual organization affiliated with ACORN.

Unfortunately, this was done on the spur of the moment and nobody had the opportunity to point out that this

is a flat violation of the Constitution, constituting a bill of attainder. The Constitution says Congress shall pass no bill of attainder.

The Supreme Court has ruled a bill of attainder is a legislative act that, no matter what their form, applies either to named individuals or to easily ascertainable members of a group in such a way as to inflict punishment, and then without a judicial trial. That's exactly what this amendment does.

It may be that ACORN is guilty of various infractions, and if so, it ought to be investigated, maybe sanctioned, whatever, by the appropriate administrative agency or maybe by the judiciary. Congress must not be in the business of punishing individual organizations or people without trial.

That's what this amendment did. It is flatly prohibited by the Constitution. And once confidence in this institution is sapped, when we ignore the Constitution, we ignore constitutional principles, that whatever one may think of the subject matter or the organization here, the Constitution and the ban on bills of attainder is there for the protection of the liberties of all of us.

It's unfortunate that we passed this, and I certainly hope it is removed in the conference committee.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

HONORING PRESTON M. "PETE" GEREN, III

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. EDWARDS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the dedicated public service of our friend and former colleague, Preston M. "Pete" Geren, III. Tomorrow, September 18, will be the last day of Mr. Geren's service as Secretary of the United States Army, but I am confident it will not be his last day of service to the country he has served so well.

Pete Geren's service to country began 26 years ago as an aid to the distinguished Senator from Texas, Lloyd Bentsen. The depth and breadth of Pete's public service since then has been rarely matched in American history.

For 8 years, this native son of Fort Worth served the 12th District of Texas here in the U.S. House of Representatives. As a member of the Armed Services, Science and Technology, and Public Works and Transportation Committees, Congressman Geren earned the respect of Democrats and Republicans alike as an intelligent, hardworking, and effective Member of Congress. He championed, among many others, the

causes of a strong national defense, fiscal responsibility, and bipartisanship.

Pete Geren earned the respect of his constituents in Texas and his colleagues here in Washington because he always treated others with respect. He personified the Golden Rule each and every day, and in doing so, set a standard of public service that we would all be well served to follow.

I will never forget a December day in the late 1990s, standing right on the back row here, when House votes were unexpectedly added for a Friday afternoon. Pete was torn between going back to Texas, where his family was, and seeing his daughter in her school Christmas play or staying in Washington for the unscheduled vote.

This devoted father agonized over that decision and ultimately decided that he had an obligation to cast a vote on behalf of his constituents. It was not long after that that Pete made the decision to retire from Congress. And I will always believe that his love of family and the missed Christmas play that day strongly impacted his decision to retire.

Four years later, his country called on Pete Geren once again. A lifetime Democrat, Pete was called by the George W. Bush administration to serve in the Pentagon. 2001 began a remarkable chapter of service to our Nation's defense.

From 2001 to 2009, during a time of war and a critical time in our Nation's history, Pete Geren served as Special Assistant to the Secretary of Defense in the areas of interagency initiatives, legislative affairs, and special projects. He then was appointed to serve as the Acting Secretary of the Air Force, and later as Acting Secretary of the Army.

In March of 2007, Pete Geren was confirmed as United States Secretary of the Army. In that position, he championed the cause of improving the quality of life for every Army soldier and every Army family. For years to come, because of the dedicated leadership of Secretary Geren, soldiers will live in better housing. They and their families will receive better health care, and they can know that their children will attend quality schools. Pete Geren, as Secretary of the Army, set up covenants between communities and the military installations in which they existed.

Pete Geren's accomplishments are too numerous, Mr. Speaker, to list them all today, but I think one of his greatest legacies will be that he proved that in the rough-and-tumble world of politics in Washington, D.C., one can succeed at the highest levels of public service through hard work, respect for others, solid integrity, and genuine humility.

Pete Geren is living proof that public service can and should be a noble calling. I wish him, his wife, Becky, and their family all the best in the years ahead.

SOUDER AMENDMENT ON STUDENT LOANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SOUDER. I wanted to briefly explain what happened to the Souder amendment in the student loan bill. We had worked out an agreement last night, and then I was occupied over in a border security hearing that was very important on SBInet and didn't make it over to the floor. I appreciate that Chairman MILLER explained the compromise some, but I wanted to go through a little bit of what the history of this is.

First, in existing law, both a possession conviction and a dealing conviction will result in your loss of a student loan. You can get that loan back by going through treatment, drug testing. You can get it back in the second year.

The second time it happens—this is while you have a loan—if you get convicted, then you would be suspended for 2 years, unless you went through treatment and then were drug-tested as clean. The third time and you're out. Now, for dealing, it was two times.

There's been a lot of ruckus about how this law was initially applied, but we fixed that. I had no intention ever of punishing people who at some time in their life had problems, whether it was in high school or in their later life that they had convictions.

I believe in forgiveness. I believe it's important that people get back on the right track. I believe that we need to work in our prison population to get them to move back to school, to get the degrees possible.

The initial debate on this law on the House floor and in committee said: You will lose your loan. You can't lose a loan if you don't have a loan. We had debate about that for many years. We got that fixed. But I believe, overwhelmingly, every poll shows that the American people believe that if you are convicted, which is not easy when you're on a college campus, while you're getting taxpayer funding, you should lose the funding. It doesn't mean you're going to lose school. It doesn't mean you're going to go out. But why should the taxpayers fund you if you're going to be basically drug-addled while you're at school?

The challenge with this debate is that it has become kind of a cause celebre in the marijuana community. As this progressed, as we did the reauthorization on student loans, the so-called Souder amendment was not completely knocked out, but possession was knocked out. We left the law in place for dealing.

So my amendment today would have reinstated possession as a grounds for losing a student loan.

Congressman PERLMUTTER from Colorado came to me and said he had a suggested compromise. He made his compromise, which basically says that conviction of a felony offense of narcotics

for possession, in addition to dealing—dealing is already covered in the Democratic bill—but would make felony conviction for possession also grounds for losing your student loan. Presumably, that's State and Federal felony conviction.

Now, in this, I was faced with several choices. One, I'm a Republican in a Democratic Congress. I was probably going to lose today. This was a practical way. I didn't want to see possession go out of the bill.

It basically means that marijuana won't be covered. If you have that much marijuana in your possession to be a felony, it probably means you're a dealer. You wouldn't have that much if you weren't a dealer. It's far more than individual use.

It basically covers meth, cocaine, and all sorts of other drug convictions for felony possession. It means the United States Government still stands on record saying that both possession and dealing should restrict your ability to get a student loan.

But there are some other practical things here. A lot of States, I believe, falsely and wrongly overrode Federal marijuana laws by decriminalizing marijuana, declaring that it was medical in some States when, in fact, marijuana is not medical. There are ingredients inside of marijuana that can be medical. We have Marinol, for example, that deals with that.

But they affect chaos in marijuana laws across the United States. It's very similar to what we are dealing with in Canada, as I debated up there as they proposed changing laws, and now Mexico has; and that is when different provinces have different laws and there's complete chaos in the laws, the Federal courts are not likely to uphold a law because it would be unequal enforcement.

So how would an Indiana student get denied a loan but a California student wouldn't get denied a loan? What about if it's somebody from Indiana who's in California going to school? What about if you're taking an online course combined with going to class, and the online course is based in California but you're going to school in Indiana? It's chaos. I do not believe, even had I won, the courts would have upheld my provision.

This shows, in fact, Republicans and Democrats can work together. It's very difficult on the major fundamental debate arguments. For example, I felt this was a Federal takeover of private lending and will lead to more Federal takeover and a national bank.

□ 1445

So we weren't going to be able to agree on the loans. But it doesn't mean inside, even on controversial provisions, that we can't work together. So I wanted to explain that, and I want to thank Chairman MILLER and Congressman PERLMUTTER for working with me.

THE PRESIDENT MUST REJECT PLANS TO SEND MORE TROOPS TO AFGHANISTAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, every child and every adult is familiar with the story of Goldilocks. Remember how it goes:

After wandering into the three bears' house, Goldilocks saw three bowls of porridge. One was too hot, one was too cold, but one was the medium temperature, and it was just right. I mention this because The New York Times recently reported that Goldilocks is playing a role in shaping American defense policy. According to the report, General McChrystal is expected to give Secretary of Defense Gates three options for troop increases in Afghanistan. The three options are, first, 15,000 more troops; second, 25,000 more troops; or third, 45,000 more troops. Pentagon officials apparently believe that Gates will choose the medium option of 25,000 troops. According to the Times, they actually call this the "Goldilocks option."

Here's why: Sending 15,000 more troops would be too cold because it wouldn't be enough to satisfy the generals; sending 45,000 more troops would be too hot because it would cause political problems; so sending the medium number of troops, 25,000, is considered "just right."

Of course the problem with this is that Afghanistan is not a children's story. It is a real war where real people are getting killed, and it is rapidly losing the support of the American people. Recent polls show that the American people want to reduce our troop strength in Afghanistan, not increase it. The American people have good reason to oppose the escalation of the conflict. They know that the recent elections in Afghanistan were filled with fraud, and they believe the Kabul Government is more interested in corruption than in improving the lives of the Afghan people.

The American people also know that we have already spent nearly \$225 billion in Afghanistan but have little to show for it. Our troops have performed brilliantly and courageously, but the insurgency is growing, and the war is getting harder to fight every single day. Besides, they believe the money that we have poured into Afghanistan is desperately needed here at home for health care reform and other vital domestic problems. The American people also know that we do not have a clear mission in Afghanistan, there is no exit strategy, and they fear that we run the risk of being considered an occupying force. Since the Afghans have opposed and defeated every single foreign power that has ever tried to occupy their nation, it all seems to be a repeat of past failures.

For all of these reasons, we need to debate, and we need to reconsider what

the U.S. role is in Afghanistan. I am urging the House to support my bill, H. Res. 363, the SMART Security Platform for the 21st century. The SMART Security Platform would change our mission in Afghanistan to emphasize economic development, humanitarian aid, education, jobs, and better governance. It would also help Afghanistan develop its policing and intelligence capacity. Policing and intelligence, you see, are far more effective than massive military invasions when it comes to tracking down violent extremists in the communities where they lurk.

Mr. Speaker, if the administration sends more troops to Afghanistan, the United States will be doubling down on a strategy that has already failed. The Afghan people don't want the United States to occupy their country, and the American people don't want an occupation, either. I urge President Obama to reject any plan to send more troops to Afghanistan because, like Goldilocks who should not have eaten any of the porridge that did not belong to her, Afghanistan does not belong to the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. JONES addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

CZARS—SHADOW GOVERNMENT?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, every President has the right to get advice from anybody he wants to get advice from. That's a good thing. United States Presidents have a tough job. They should have as many advisers as they wish. My dad, in fact, would like to be one of those advisers to this President and wishes he was an adviser to all the past Presidents.

These czars, as they are now called, are not new to the executive branch. But when a person crosses the line from being an adviser to being a policymaker and decision-maker for the government, that person needs to be held accountable to the people of the United States. Someone who gives advice to the President is one thing, but there's a difference between an adviser and someone who sets a policy and implements that policy. Then that person has direct control over the American people. If this occurs, our Constitution requires that person be subject to the oversight of Congress to be legitimate.

The big questions become: are these czars advisers or are they policymakers? If they become policymakers, then transparency is important, accountability is important, and confirmation by the United States Senate

is mandatory. Our Constitution requires it. Without the confirmation process, we don't know who these people are. And are these czars nothing more than a shadow government? We don't know.

The Constitution mandates visibility and oversight by Congress. That's how our government works within the bounds of our law. We don't know how many czars we have or who they are. How much do they get paid, and where does that money come from? What do they do? Who do they report to? Are they in control of the executive branch and its duties? Well, we don't know.

What are the Cabinet secretaries doing? Who reports to whom? Do the czars report to the Cabinet members? Or do the Cabinet members report to these folks? The American public does not know. We don't know because there's no oversight and no accountability, and it doesn't seem like anybody's talking. Czars haven't gone through the Senate confirmation process. Are they a national security risk? We don't know. No one knows.

Now the FBI tells us they go through a background check. But it's the same background check that the FBI does for a White House intern. These czars do not get a security clearance. That's a much more detailed background check for people with more responsibility than a White House intern. The FBI gives the information from the czar-intern background check over to the White House—that's it. And once the FBI hands the information over, they have nothing else to do with the czars. If these czars are decision-makers and policymakers, that's not acceptable. Just like Cabinet secretaries, they need to be vetted. We have to know who the people are that are in control and who controls the levers of our government. This is just common sense. The American people don't want a shadow government controlling America. Just who are the czars? We have the right to know, and Congress has the responsibility to find out.

And that's just the way it is.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

HEALTH CARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GRAYSON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Speaker, every once in a while, I read something that makes me wish I had written it or said it. I had that experience recently, reading Nick Kristof's column in *The New York Times*. It's just like Abraham Lincoln said during the Gettysburg Address, I read something like this and I

say, This is far beyond my poor power to add or detract. So I would like to read it to you, I would like to share it with you and the other Members of the House because it so well captures what's important in the current health care debate.

He wrote as follows:

In the debate over health care, here's an inequity to ponder: Nikki White would have been far better off if only she had been a convicted bank robber. Nikki was a slim and athletic college graduate who had health insurance, had worked in health care and knew the system. But she had systemic lupus erythematosus, a chronic inflammatory disease that was diagnosed when she was 21 and gradually left her too sick to work. And once she lost her job, she lost her health insurance.

In any other rich country, Nikki probably would have been fine, notes T.R. Reid in his important and powerful new book, *"The Healing of America."* Some 80 percent of lupus patients in the United States live a normal life span. Under a doctor's care, lupus should be manageable. Indeed, if Nikki had been a felon, the problem could have been averted, because the courts have ruled that prisoners are entitled to medical care.

As Mr. Reid recounts, Nikki tried everything to get medical care, but no insurance company would accept someone with her preexisting condition. She spent months painfully writing letters to anyone she thought might be able to help. She fought tenaciously for her life.

Finally, Nikki collapsed at her home in Tennessee and was rushed to a hospital emergency room, which was then required to treat her without payment until her condition stabilized. Since money was no longer an issue, the hospital performed 25 emergency surgeries on Nikki, and she spent 6 months in critical care.

"When Nikki showed up at the emergency room, she received the best of care, and the hospital spent hundreds of thousands of dollars on her," her stepfather, Tony Deal, told me. "But that's not when she needed the care."

By then it was too late. In 2006, Nikki White died at age 32. "Nikki didn't die from lupus," her doctor, Amylyn Crawford, told Mr. Reid. "Nikki died from complications of the failing American health care system."

"She fell through the cracks," Nikki's mother, Gail Deal, told me grimly. "When you bury a child, it's the worst thing in the world. You never recover."

We now have a chance to reform this cruel and capricious system. If we let that chance slip away, there will be another Nikki dying every half-hour.

That's how often someone dies in America because of a lack of insurance, according to a study by a branch of the National Academy of Sciences. Over a year, that amounts to 18,000 American deaths.

After al Qaeda killed nearly 3,000 Americans 8 years ago on Friday, we

went to war and spent hundreds of billions of dollars ensuring that this would not happen again. Yet every 2 months, that many people die because of our failure to provide universal insurance—and yet many Members of Congress want us to do nothing?

Mr. Reid's book is a rich tour of health care around the world. Because he has a bum shoulder, he asked doctors in many countries to examine it and make recommendations. His American orthopedist recommended a titanium shoulder replacement that would cost tens of thousands of dollars and might or might not help. Specialists in other countries warned that a sore shoulder didn't justify the risks of such major surgery, although some said it would be available free if Mr. Reid insisted. Instead, they offered physical therapy, acupuncture, and other cheap and noninvasive alternatives, some of which worked pretty well.

That's a window into the flaws in our health care system: we offer titanium shoulder replacements for those who don't really need them, but we let 32-year-old women die if they lose their health insurance. No wonder we spend so much on medical care, and yet have some health care statistics that are worse than Slovenia's.

My suggestion for anyone in Nikki's situation: commit a crime and get locked up. In Washington State, a 20-year-old inmate named Melissa Matthews chose to turn down parole and stay in prison because that was the only way she could get treatment for her cervical cancer. "If I'm out, I'm going to die from this cancer," she told a television station.

This has to end. As Mr. Kristof wrote: Do we wish to be the only rich nation in the world that lets a 32-year-old woman die because she can't get health insurance? Is that really us?

[September 13, 2009]

THE BODY COUNT AT HOME

(By Nicholas D. Kristof)

In the debate over health care, here's an inequity to ponder: Nikki White would have been far better off if only she had been a convicted bank robber.

Nikki was a slim and athletic college graduate who had health insurance, had worked in health care and knew the system. But she had systemic lupus erythematosus, a chronic inflammatory disease that was diagnosed when she was 21 and gradually left her too sick to work. And once she lost her job, she lost her health insurance.

In any other rich country, Nikki probably would have been fine, notes T. R. Reid in his important and powerful new book, *"The Healing of America."* Some 80 percent of lupus patients in the United States live a normal life span. Under a doctor's care, lupus should be manageable. Indeed, if Nikki had been a felon, the problem could have been averted, because courts have ruled that prisoners are entitled to medical care.

As Mr. Reid recounts, Nikki tried everything to get medical care, but no insurance company would accept someone with her preexisting condition. She spent months painfully writing letters to anyone she thought might be able to help. She fought tenaciously for her life.

Finally, Nikki collapsed at her home in Tennessee and was rushed to a hospital

emergency room, which was then required to treat her without payment until her condition stabilized. Since money was no longer an issue, the hospital performed 25 emergency surgeries on Nikki, and she spent six months in critical care.

"When Nikki showed up at the emergency room, she received the best of care, and the hospital spent hundreds of thousands of dollars on her," her step-father, Tony Deal, told me. "But that's not when she needed the care."

By then it was too late. In 2006, Nikki White died at age 32. "Nikki didn't die from lupus," her doctor, Amylyn Crawford, told Mr. Reid. "Nikki died from complications of the failing American health care system."

"She fell through the cracks," Nikki's mother, Gail Deal, told me grimly. "When you bury a child, it's the worst thing in the world. You never recover."

We now have a chance to reform this cruel and capricious system. If we let that chance slip away, there will be another Nikki dying every half-hour.

That's how often someone dies in America because of a lack of insurance, according to a study by a branch of the National Academy of Sciences. Over a year, that amounts to 18,000 American deaths.

After Al Qaeda killed nearly 3,000 Americans, eight years ago on Friday, we went to war and spent hundreds of billions of dollars ensuring that this would not happen again. Yet every two months, that many people die because of our failure to provide universal insurance—and yet many members of Congress want us to do nothing?

Mr. Reid's book is a rich tour of health care around the world. Because he has a bum shoulder, he asked doctors in many countries to examine it and make recommendations. His American orthopedist recommended a titanium shoulder replacement that would cost tens of thousands of dollars and might or might not help. Specialists in other countries warned that a sore shoulder didn't justify the risks of such major surgery, although some said it would be available free if Mr. Reid insisted. Instead, they offered physical therapy, acupuncture and other cheap and noninvasive alternatives, some of which worked pretty well.

That's a window into the flaws in our health care system: we offer titanium shoulder replacements for those who don't really need them, but we let 32-year-old women die if they lose their health insurance. No wonder we spend so much on medical care, and yet have some health care statistics that are worse than Slovenia's.

My suggestion for anyone in Nikki's situation: commit a crime and get locked up. In Washington State, a 20-year-old inmate named Melissa Matthews chose to turn down parole and stay in prison because that was the only way she could get treatment for her cervical cancer. "If I'm out, I'm going to die from this cancer," she told a television station.

Mr. and Mrs. Deal say they are speaking out because Nikki wouldn't want anyone to endure what she did. "Nikki was a college-educated, middle-class woman, and if it could happen to her, it can happen to anyone," Mr. Deal said. "This should not be happening in our country."

Struggling to get out the words, Mrs. Deal added: "The loss of a child is the greatest hurt anyone will ever suffer. Because of the circumstances she endured with the health care system, I lost my daughter."

Complex arguments are being batted around in this health care debate, but the central issue isn't technical but moral. The first question is simply this: Do we wish to be the only rich nation in the world that lets a 32-year-old woman die because she can't get health insurance? Is that really us?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. MORAN of Kansas addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

RECOGNIZING HISPANIC HERITAGE MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HEINRICH. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday we began our Nation's Hispanic Heritage Month. Hispanics comprise over 45 percent of New Mexico's population, and our State's Hispanic community has deep roots and a rich history in our State. I am truly honored to highlight this important community in Congress today.

For a population that is expected to triple in size in our country by 2050, education continues to be an issue of fundamental significance. Preparing our children for the future is the greatest investment that we can make for our long-term economic vitality and for our country's ability to compete in the 21st century. We have many disparities to address in education and a long way to go to ensure the success of our children throughout their elementary and secondary education, particularly our Hispanic students.

But, Mr. Speaker, I am proud to stand here today to highlight an example of a New Mexico institution of higher learning that is doing a tremendous job of serving our Hispanic students.

□ 1500

This month the University of New Mexico was given top rankings by Hispanic Business Magazine's list of top 10 schools in the Nation for Hispanics in the fields of engineering, business, law and medicine.

UNM, which is located in my district, is our State's flagship university. UNM's success at serving the Hispanic community is the result of decades of hard work by the university's administration, their faculty, many organizations, and their students.

UNM's Law School, which the magazine ranked number one in the country for the third year in a row, has an outstanding number of Hispanic faculty and a school-wide emphasis on the engagement of students, faculty, and alumni in the wider community. Organizations like the Mexican American Law Student Association recruit local Hispanic high school students and then mentor them through their undergraduate years and help them to prepare for admission to the law school. It's worth noting that the UNM Chapter of MALSA was just named Law Student Organization of the Year by the Hispanic National Bar Association.

UNM's School of Medicine, which the magazine ranked sixth in the country,

has also formalized a pipeline program called "Joining Communities to Increase Access and Reduce Disparities." There, mentors from the School of Medicine recruit students from underrepresented high schools to consider careers in health care, enroll them in the New Mexico Clinical Education Program for undergraduates, and support students taking the MCAT.

UNM's School of Engineering, which earned a seventh-place ranking, has steadily grown its enrollment of Hispanic students to 32.7 percent this year. Much of that increase is owed to the school's leadership in creating the Hispanic Engineering and Science Organization's Annual Science Extravaganza with more than 500 youths from our State.

And, finally, at the Anderson School of Management, which Hispanic Business Magazine ranked sixth in the Nation, the number of Hispanic students entering their graduate program in the fall of 2009 was double from the previous year. Much of the Anderson School's success is owed to innovative programs such as a regular breakfast that they hold with members of the Albuquerque Hispano Chamber of Commerce to increase interest in the MBA and the master's of accounting programs.

Mr. Speaker, across the University of New Mexico community, there is an ingrained commitment that strives to ensure that the university is representative of our community. That commitment is not just symbolic; it is essential to the service that UNM graduates offer to our congressional district once they graduate.

I want to congratulate the University of New Mexico for its national recognition as a top university by Hispanic Business Magazine, and I wish them continued success in serving our community and our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that when our Hispanic students succeed, New Mexico succeeds and our Nation succeeds.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BISHOP of Utah addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. SCHIFF addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

THE PROGRESSIVE MESSAGE:
HEALTH CARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, welcome to the Progressive hour, the Progressive Message, the 60-minute period of time where the Progressive Caucus comes to the House floor to talk to the American people and our colleagues about critical issues of the day. The Progressive Message.

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, is that we've got a lot to talk about today. The issue of the day is health care. And as we get started, I would like to bring our chairperson right into the conversation in the very beginning to introduce some of her ideas on this issue. Our chairwoman of the Progressive Caucus, Congresswoman LYNN WOOLSEY, has been a stalwart leader on this issue, has been convening meetings, has been keeping us together, has been unrelenting on her insistence for a public option.

I yield to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. WOOLSEY. I thank you again, Congressman ELLISON, for your leadership on these weekly hourly discussions about health care reform and what's going on in our Congress at this particular time.

Things have happened this week. Finally, the Senate has two bills that were written and have been introduced. The second bill, coming out of the Finance Committee, has not passed through the committee yet, but it is the Bachus health care reform bill. And we have gotten a lot of pressure here—I know I have, I know you have, most progressives have—because there's some idea out there that because the Bachus bill that doesn't have any Republican support either, after 3 Democrats and 3 Republicans spent months and months and months writing it, now Senator BAUCUS seems to be almost standing alone with that one. But he'll pass it through his committee, and we'll see what happens.

But what does that mean to our proposal and our absolute commitment for a robust public option to be included in a very strong health care reform bill? As far as I'm concerned, it means nothing. What it does is it shows the opposite of what this country could end up with, and it gives wind beneath our wings for our debate on just why we need a strong, robust public option. And one of those why's in Senator BAUCUS's bill is that it does not provide a public option of any level.

The public option we offer through the Progressive Caucus would have its rates determined based on Medicare plus 5 percent, and do you know that that saves \$110 billion over 5 years? Over 5 years. And the Energy and Commerce Committee has a public option that they have proposed, and their pub-

lic option rates would be based on negotiating with the administration, and their negotiated rates would save \$25 billion.

So we have \$110 billion in savings through the Progressive Caucus plan, \$25 billion in savings through the Energy and Commerce, and we have zero savings through Senator BAUCUS's plan. So that in and of itself is enough for me to know that that is not a bill that I want to be negotiating and compromising with.

Mr. ELLISON. Reclaiming my time, I know the gentlewoman has to take a brief interlude, but let me just say very quickly the fact is that Senator BAUCUS, who has spent many hours trying to pull together a bipartisan bill, comes out of that process without any bipartisan support for his bill, and there may not be many Democrats who want to vote for that bill coming out of the Finance Committee.

The reality is we have had three House committee bills that all produced a public option and we have the Health Committee in the Senate that produced a public option, and now coming out of the Finance Committee there is no public option. I think when you look at the convergence of all these bills, it means that we're going to have a public option. But I think this is a time for grassroots activism, people to let their voices be heard, and people to be very clear on what they want.

Stepping back from a public option, health care reform is really a three-tiered thing. It's a three-legged stool. One is making sure that people who already have insurance have stable insurance, are not discriminated against, and are treated better by the insurance companies with lower costs. The other is covering the uninsured. The third leg is a public option that can compete with private market insurance so that they can hold costs down and can introduce evidence-based medical practices to give Americans the best quality care that's available. The fact is that this three-legged stool is essential in order to have the kind of reform that Americans need today. This reform, we can have it. It is well within our grasp and we can do it, but we have got a little bit more to go. At this point we now know it's on the table and we know that this Finance Committee bill is not adequate and they need to go back to the drawing board.

It's interesting to me that not one Republican said that they would support it after hours and hours of bipartisan effort to get them on the bill anyway. It's time to move forward with a bill that makes sense to all the American people.

The fact is the President is on our side when it comes to the public option. The President made himself clear right on the floor of this House Chamber only a few days ago when he came here and said that he was for a public option. The President said it, and he made himself very clear. In fact, the

President was eloquent when he said that without competition, the price of insurance goes up and the quality goes down, and it makes it easier for insurance companies to treat their customers badly, by cherry-picking the healthiest individuals and trying to drop the sickest, by overcharging small businesses who have no leverage, and by jacking up rates. The reality is the President was right about that, and he is on our side and wants to see reform come forward.

Let's just say that this health care reform that we are talking about needs the support of the American people. Slowly the real facts have been coming forward. Slowly the American people have been coming to a better understanding of what the public option is and what health care reform means in general. The President is on our side, as I've said, and I believe the House should act quickly to pass a bill with a strong public option as it reflects the President's preference for a public option.

The plan will do the following: It will cover preexisting conditions. How many Americans are dropped or have had their insurance go up because of a preexisting condition? The plan will stop the practice of rescission or denying you health care when you need it the most, and the bill will stop bankrupting our businesses and families for the sin of getting sick. A public option, which is an essential part of reform, as I've already mentioned, will offer choice, introduce competition and lower costs for consumers and taxpayers, and bring higher quality health care to all Americans.

Choice: The President stated last week that currently in 34 States, 75 percent of the insurance market is controlled by five or fewer companies. What does that mean? That means that if we don't have a public option, we're going to mandate 49 million new consumers into the insurance companies' arms without any way to make them compete because these markets are monopolized or duopolized or what they call an oligopoly.

□ 1515

What that means is they are highly concentrated. There are not a lot of sellers in the market; there are just a few.

Now, if I say you have to buy insurance and there are only two or three people to buy it from, you can bet those two or three companies that are selling it are going to give you the maximum price unless you have a public option that's going to really compete with them and make them do the right thing. So we've got to be for choice and we've got to have competition.

Let me also say that the President said—and I want to repeat this because I've said it once, but we've got to say it again—the President said without competition, the price of insurance goes up and up and quality goes down.

Now think about it, if you're a resident of the great State of Alabama—Alabama is a wonderful State, I always enjoy going there—but in Alabama, almost 90 percent of the insurance market is controlled by just one insurance company. What does that mean? That means that if you want to buy insurance in Alabama, you're dealing with a monopoly. And if the monopoly says you pay, then you pay whatever it is they say you pay, or you don't get it. There is literally no competition. So given that situation, we know that we need a public option to introduce choice, competition, and real cost control.

I want to talk about this public option because people don't always understand it. Think of the public option this way: we're going to have employer-based health care. That will be one part of this thing. Employer-based health care, you have insurance with your employer, you keep it. The second part is, if you have government health insurance already, like Medicare or the VA, you keep that. We're going to try to subsidize low-income people so that they can get Medicaid and health care like that.

But the third part of it is this: it will be something called an "exchange." Now, what is an exchange? An exchange is like a grocery market. It will be online or it will look like a catalog, like this book; and you go through it and you look for an insurance product. Now, there will be different products. Some will be a basic plan, some will be a middle plan, and some will be a Cadillac plan. And they will tell you what you can get covered for a given price and you will be shopping. And you might be able to do it online, like Craig's List or eBay or something like that, or you can do it on paper. But the fact is it's a market where people are selling different products.

Now, all we're saying is that if you can imagine this health care insurance grocery store, on one aisle there would be a product offered by or administered by the government—actually, it wouldn't be run by the government because it would be private doctors who would be off actually providing the medical care, but it would be administered by a government program the same way Medicare is now.

Now, I know people who said that they've got Medicare, and they don't want the government messing with their Medicare. Well, if you think the government is messing with your Medicare, what you must not know is that the government is Medicare. That is who is administering your Medicare right now. So if you think the VA health care is good or Medicare is good, then you will also see that a public option will be good. Very important for people to understand this.

Let me also say this, and that is, you know, sometimes people on the other side of the aisle—you know, I'm a Democrat—the other guys, they say stuff like, I don't want government-run

health care, and they make it sound like the government's bad. But in a democratic country, who is the government other than you and me? The government is the people—government of the people, by the people, for the people.

In a democratic society, the government is us. And if the government isn't functioning right, then we need to be more engaged to make it function right and we need to insist on lower cost, more efficiency. We need to be active citizens to make sure things go the way we want them to. But we need to get out of this thing that government can't do anything right. Did Lehman Brothers do everything right when their company crashed? That's a private company. What about Enron? What about WorldCom? What about Bear Stearns? Private industry makes a lot of mistakes as well.

The government does good things, though. Think about this: if you or I should have the misfortune of needing emergency medical care, an EMS truck will come up here and hopefully save us. Who's that? That's the government. If you call up because your house is burning, who are you calling? The government yet again. When you start slicing into that steak you might eat tonight, who has made sure that meat is safe for you to eat? A government inspector.

Public schools have made an educational opportunity for every kid in America. Are some of them bad or in need of repair and need to be better? Of course they do. Anything human beings do is going to need more work. But you can't say that public schools in general are a failure. You can say that a public school needs to be improved.

We need to get out of this thing where we say the government can't function and can't produce good results for us. They do every day. You're going to tell me the officers who are putting their lives on the line to keep us safe are not doing a good job? The firefighters are not doing a good job? They are doing a great job.

You have got to understand that part of what's going on here is just plain old government-bashing, government-bashing in a democratic country where government is by, for and of the people.

So I hope people don't let this go by. It's not a good idea to just always run down whatever the government does. If they do, we bear responsibility because it's our government, democratic society.

Let me just say this, too: the public option really means that the government would help to cover the high cost of insurance for Americans while bringing those costs down through competition. The public option means that Americans will be free to seek health care from any doctor they choose at any facility they choose without having to fear that they could not afford or will incur tens of thousands of dollars in medical debt. The public option is a good thing.

Now, you would think, well, who should know the most about whether the public option would be a good thing? I will say I'm not the most well qualified, but I think doctors are. I think doctors are well qualified to know whether or not a public option is a good deal. Doctors who serve patients every day, serve patients day in and day out would have a good opinion that I would trust as to whether it would help the system improve. Doctors are the ones who sit up on the phone and have to argue with insurance companies over whether a procedure is going to be covered or not covered.

I'm lucky enough to have a brother who is a primary care physician in Detroit. How are you doing there, Leonard? The fact is that my brother Leonard has to spend hours away from patients because he's trying to deal with insurance companies. The fact is that we need a public option. We need a public option.

Let me just talk a little bit about this. The graph to my right here says most doctors support public option. Most doctors support public option. Here in the blue section is where doctors were asked, they said, Do we need a public option and a private option? Sixty-three percent of doctors said we need both public and private options. Twenty-seven percent of doctors said private options only and 10 percent of doctors said public options only. Most doctors say we should have both.

I trust the doctors. And you know, this is a whole lot of doctors; 63 percent of them have said that we need both. So this is who I think we should listen to and who has a good opinion as to what's really right and what's really wrong.

A large majority of doctors say that there should be a public option. Sixty-three percent of physicians support a public option. And when polled, nearly three-quarters, 75 percent, of physicians supported some form of a public option, either alone or in combination with other private insurance options. So that means that if you take this 63 with this 10 percent, that's a full 73 percent; that's about three-quarters. So this is overwhelmingly what doctors believe, that we should have a public option; and I think the doctors are right about that.

We've been joined by the gentlelady from California, the chairperson of the Progressive Caucus. What do you think about this? Do you think that doctors know what they're talking about when 63 percent say we should have public and private options and another 10 percent say we need only a public option; 73 percent, does that mean anything to you? Do you think that's an important fact to know?

I yield to the gentlewoman.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Of course it's an important fact to know. I mean, if anybody is close to their patients and to the needs of this country, it is our physicians. They've been very important in inputting to all of the committees that have been writing legislation.

And another thing that will be very important is when the House of Representatives brings all three of our bills—one from Ways and Means, Energy, and the committee we sit on, Congressman, Education and Labor—when we unify those bills and come up with the House bill and we can say to our constituents and to the people of this country, this is the House of Representatives health care reform bill, then we will be able to hear back from them on exactly what that bill is. Right now we keep saying, well, it might be, we think it is. I mean, we're pretty sure about 99 percent of it, but not all of it.

Mr. ELLISON. Well, if the gentlelady yields back, I look forward to that moment as well when we can have a unified House bill. I hope this is something that happens very quickly because I really believe that the public is really dying—oh, excuse me for that bad language—

Ms. WOOLSEY. That was a negative pun.

Mr. ELLISON. The public is really calling for true health care reform.

Ms. WOOLSEY. That's right.

Mr. ELLISON. And we were talking a moment ago about the bill that came out of the Senate Finance Committee, a bill that I don't favor at all. And I just thought that I would share a few basic facts about it.

You should note that if you look at all the House bills together, even though they haven't been unified, if you look at them together, they all call for a public option. The Senate Finance bill does not have a public option; it has a cooperative, which is not nearly—which is no good, which is of no value.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLISON. Yes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Do you think it would be important for our viewers to know why the co-ops are of no value?

Mr. ELLISON. Yes, let's talk about that.

Ms. WOOLSEY. I think we should explain that.

Co-ops could be of value over time, but what we need is a public option that's available the day the exchange goes into effect so that that is one of the options. If we depend on co-ops, right now there are less than 10 in the country. I really know of only one that's totally successful and that took more than 10 years to get up and running. It's not impossible, and it could happen; but that should not be what we consider a public option. It can be an option at another time.

Mr. ELLISON. If the gentlelady would yield, I think you're right. It's not an inherently bad idea, but it's bad for this. And I want to be very clear: you and I aren't loosening up and open to co-ops. I mean, we're clear that co-ops is the wrong thing. And here's one reason why: the Congressional Budget Office, nonpartisan, they report on Senator BAUCUS' bill: "The proposed

co-ops had very little effect on the estimates of total enrollment in the exchanges or Federal costs because, as they are described in the specifications, they seem unlikely to establish a significant market presence in many of the areas of the country or to noticeably affect Federal subsidy payments."

In other words, you mention that there are some successful health care co-ops around the country and how it took them years to build up. Well, the CBO report says that when the exchange opens up, the co-op will be too little, too small to have any market presence and will not be able to really be strong enough to actually impact the market. So the fact is that people will be left for years and years with no real successful option to lower costs. So the co-op is really not a viable option.

I don't want to completely be dismissive of the idea of co-ops in general. Food co-ops are great. There are good co-ops, right? We want to be straight with everybody. But in this case, it's the wrong thing because it will be too small, too weak, too little to compete with these insurance companies that have been in the game for a long, long time. What we need is a public option, that's what we've got to have.

Ms. WOOLSEY. A robust public option.

Mr. ELLISON. A robust public option. I'm talking about a public option with some muscle.

Also, if we compare the Senate Finance bill with the House bills, the Senate Finance bill has no employer mandate. The House bill has an employer mandate to provide health insurance to its employees. So, look, employers—and I'm grateful to the employers that provide health care to their employees, but no employer will be able to say, well, we're just not going to do it because—for whatever reason. The employers are going to have to provide health care for their employees or contribute to a fund which will allow their employees to get health care.

□ 1530

Ms. WOOLSEY. If the gentleman would yield.

Mr. ELLISON. Yes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. That's the only way we can level the playing field so that employers who do provide health insurance for their employees aren't at a disadvantage in competing with like industries.

Mr. ELLISON. If the gentlelady would yield back, absolutely. That's right. We want to level the playing field. You can't go out there and just get a competitive advantage on your competition by dumping your health care insurance, so that's another important part.

The third thing is, under the Senate finance bill, taxes and the pay-fors are a tax on high-end health insurance plans and a tax on medical devices, lab-

oratories, et cetera. Under the House bill, there is an income tax surcharge on high-income earners. At least that's one idea.

Now, I'm going to tell you this: If I am ever fortunate enough to be a wealthy individual—I assure you I am not one now—I would hope that, as an American—

Ms. WOOLSEY. If the gentleman would yield, you're not going to be wealthy staying in this job—

Mr. ELLISON. Yes. Right. You'd better come here already wealthy.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Or you're going to stay the same.

Mr. ELLISON. That's right.

As I was saying, if I ever become a well-to-do person, I would hope that I would have enough patriotic commitment to put other people's bare necessities in front of my own luxuries. Do you understand what I'm saying?

Ms. WOOLSEY. Absolutely.

Mr. ELLISON. I mean, how many boats can I own? If I have to pay a little bit more to make sure that some poor, single mom and her kids have health care, why wouldn't I do that? Why wouldn't I do that? I don't know.

Do you have any thoughts on this? I yield to the gentlelady.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Well, I have a lot of thoughts on that. You see, I represent, probably, not the wealthiest district but the wealthiest county in the Congress, and I have not gotten one letter from one constituent who says, "Woolsey, how dare you think about raising my taxes." I mean this is of the people who would have to pay taxes.

Mr. ELLISON. Right. Right.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Those are not the kinds of people I represent. They are educated and progressive, and they get it. When other people are taken care of, they're better off in the long run. Their employees are. Their kids in school are safer because the other kids are covered and have good health care. They just totally get it, and I think, if there weren't so many fear factors around, most people would understand the concept.

Mr. ELLISON. If the gentlelady would yield back, I mean the fact is that many well-to-do people recognize that this country has been good to them, that many of them went to public schools, and that many of them have police who secure their properties. Many of them really are grateful for all of the bounty that America has given them, and they don't mind doing a little bit more to make sure that low-income, poor Americans have some way to go to a doctor.

I think it's just basic, and I'm always a little shocked when I hear, well, somehow we're punishing well-to-do people by asking them for a little more to help poor Americans. I don't understand that kind of thinking, because you find a lot of extremely generous well-to-do people.

I yield to the gentlelady.

Ms. WOOLSEY. That's absolutely true.

There are many things we ask of our constituents, but mostly there are many things that the government provides for them, like public education, police, fire, roads. We pay for all of that because we use all of that—some more than others. Some benefit more than others from these services, but it's pretty proportionate about how much you pay and your taxes depending on how much you earn, on how much you have and on how much you've actually benefited from this country of ours. So I believe you're right. It's a shared thing.

One of the suggestions is, of the people who have health care benefits, their benefits should be taxed. There are a lot of us who feel that taxing a person's benefits is not the way to go because they've already, probably, in this economy of ours, given up raises in order to keep their benefits in the first place. To tax those benefits on top of that would just be a hit to the middle class of this country.

Mr. ELLISON. If the gentlelady would yield back, does the gentlelady agree that we should go about 10 more minutes and hand it over?

Ms. WOOLSEY. Right.

Mr. ELLISON. I just want to point out that, under the Baucus—or the Senate finance bill, subsidies to the premiums of low-income people would be kept at 13 percent of the max; whereas, in the House bills, the premiums would be kept at 11 percent. So the House bill, again, is doing more to help the middle class person. The Senate Finance Committee is cutting into the middle class even more. This is just premiums. This is not copays. This is not deductible payments, payments you have to make when you have a deductible. This is not other costs associated with health care. This is just premiums. So, again, the Senate Finance Committee's bill is not nearly as good as any of the House bills.

Ms. WOOLSEY. If the gentleman would yield again—

Mr. ELLISON. Certainly.

Ms. WOOLSEY. With just that 2 percent difference, that cuts into middle-income workers.

Mr. ELLISON. Yes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. I don't know what the numbers are, but I think, if they earn \$41,000 a year and have four children, then they wouldn't be eligible for the subsidies. I don't have that in front of me. I'm sorry. I might be off a little bit, but it really cuts into middle-income workers.

Part of what this bill is about is making it secure for all workers who already have coverage, not making it harder for them to have their coverage. Part of that is security. They might love the coverage they have, but they know, in their heart of hearts, that they could lose that.

Mr. ELLISON. That's right.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Their employers could decide they can't afford to cover them anymore, and boom, that's the end of it. They might lose their jobs.

They might want to change jobs and not have insurance going with them.

The truth of it is that, not the Baucus bill particularly, but the House health care reform bill makes it more secure for people who are already covered. They lose nothing. They don't have to leave their coverage unless their employers decide they don't want to cover them anymore. With the House bill, they have a place to land. They have a place to go, and they can get health care coverage without prejudice.

Mr. ELLISON. If the gentlelady will yield back, we're wrapping up now. Yet the fact is, as to the House bills, if you look at them together, insurance companies can only charge different premiums based on age, and then it's like 2-1.

Ms. WOOLSEY. In the House bill, it's 2-1.

Mr. ELLISON. In the House bill.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Tell what it is in the Baucus bill.

Mr. ELLISON. The Baucus bill is 5-1.

Ms. WOOLSEY. 5-1. Can you imagine?

Mr. ELLISON. 5-1. This is wrong. This is very bad. This is very, very bad.

The fact is that this is going to be financially devastating for people who aren't yet elderly but who still are up to 60, 58, 59. It's going to hit them very hard if the insurance companies can discriminate like that, and there are far less stringent insurance reforms in the Baucus bill.

So, when you look at the Baucus bill, it is an inferior product. The Senate Finance Committee is an inferior product. The Senate Finance Committee bill is an inferior product. That's what it is, and it really is a nonstarter. So we're pulling for people on the Senate Health Committee to make a better bill than that which came out of the Senate Finance Committee.

We believe that help is on the way. Health care reform is right around the corner. It's time to raise the voices and to not be shy.

The President is running all over the country, talking to people about health care reform. He was in my own town of Minneapolis last Saturday. He did a phenomenal job. When the President mentioned the public option to a capacity crowd in the Target Center in Minneapolis, Minnesota—my city—the crowd roared for 1 minute 40 seconds. They wouldn't even let him continue with his speech. They were just clapping wildly—a deafening noise. That's how much people want the public option.

Ms. WOOLSEY. That's right.

Mr. ELLISON. So I'll leave the last word to the gentlelady of California.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Well, I'd like to say that the Progressive Caucus believes that it is our responsibility in the House to get our bill united and that it is our responsibility to bring our bill forward and to get it voted on so that we have that as an example of a robust

health care reform package, so that Senator HARKIN's Health Committee can follow suit, and so that we can give him a lot of the strength that comes from this House. We'll be negotiating with them later, but we'll be negotiating two very good bills. We want to go first.

Mr. ELLISON. So that will close us out.

I just want to say thank you, Chairwoman WOOLSEY, for being here and for always being supportive of our special hour and of our progressive message.

The Progressive Caucus is committed to values of shared community, of shared responsibility, of making sure that the least of us are cared for and are looked out for, of making sure that America is a country that supports peace around the world. This is what some of our essential values are: The Progressive Caucus. The progressive message. Thank you very much.

I yield back the balance of my time.

AMERICA'S ECONOMY AND HEALTH CARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank you, and I thank the minority leader, JOHN BOEHNER of Ohio; the minority whip, ERIC CANTOR of Virginia; and the minority conference chairman, MIKE PENCE from Indiana—our leadership—for giving me the opportunity to take this hour this afternoon as the designee of the Republican Party, the minority party.

Like my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, the Democratic majority that you've just heard from concerning health care reform, my hour also will be spent discussing this topic of tremendous importance to the American people. Certainly, we were home during the August recess for almost 5½ weeks, and I think, for each and every Member on both sides of the aisle, if they didn't know health care was the number one issue when they went home to their districts, they found out pretty quickly. I think, Mr. Speaker, you would agree with me on that. Certainly, it was all over the television news—cable news and the networks.

So we are in a time of this 111th Congress where we're dealing with something that is just as important as almost anything that you can think of. There are other issues, of course, that are on people's minds, issues which are equally as concerning. One of those, Mr. Speaker, is the economy. The economy has been pretty rough, and we all know it. For the last year and a half, we've been in a pretty deep recession, and it seems like no matter what we do that we're not able to pull ourselves out of that ditch.

So I would say to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, while the health

care reform issue is important—and it is important that we lower the cost of health insurance so that everybody in this country can have affordable, accessible health insurance plans and can have the opportunity to see physicians when they need to—there are other great concerns. One of those great concerns, of course, is the economy.

I looked at some polls earlier today, and when 1,000 people were asked to list in the order of their own priorities what their greatest concerns were, 44 percent of them said, My greatest concern is the economy.

□ 1545

In second place was reforming health care at 14 percent of the respondents, and our national defense tied in third place when 14 percent also said that was their greatest concern. It is important that we keep this issue as high a priority as it has, and as important as it is to people in this country, that the economy is the number one issue.

Mr. Speaker, I think it was President Clinton that said, It's the economy, stupid. Or maybe somebody said to President Clinton, remember, that it is the economy.

And it is. There is no question about it. When you are looking at an unemployment rate bumping up to 10 percent, and people losing jobs since February, when we passed the economic stimulus act, Mr. Speaker, \$787 billion, I believe, of borrowed money, a third of that money borrowed from the Chinese government. That was going to stem the tide; we were going to make sure that unemployment did not get worse than 8.5 percent, and that we stopped the hemorrhaging of jobs and, indeed, began to grow jobs.

Well, now, here we are, some 6 months later in the process. We haven't spent it all, but appropriated that much money again, \$787 billion, to try to get things going to stimulate the economy. We have lost another 2 million jobs, and the unemployment rate is approaching 10 percent.

I think that one thing that I wanted to share with my colleagues this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, is the revision of our health care system. The revision of our health insurance system, while important, and important to our economy, it's not the number one issue. The number one issue is to get people back to work and start creating some jobs and do something about the homebuilding industry, where sales are down. Prices of homes are down 40 percent, probably, in some parts of the country.

Jobs are lost in that industry, and there are so many things we could be doing, should be doing, to stimulate this economy. Yet the President's attention has been diverted so much that he is going all across the country, doing his own town hall meetings, almost like in a campaign mode, lobbying for this idea of a comprehensive, total reform of our health care system such that the government has more in-

volvement. Maybe not total involvement, but from my perspective, Mr. Speaker, and those of us on the Republican side of the aisle, we have great fear that these plans—my colleagues that spoke in the aisle before were comparing the Senate version versus the House version.

I would say, Mr. Speaker, that I have concern about both versions, about both versions leading to a total takeover of the health care system by our government. Ms. WOOLSEY and Mr. ELLISON are very good people, compassionate Members, as we all know, and you could tell from hearing them speak, that they have good hearts.

But if you ask them, or, and I have heard, actually—I am not going to put words in their mouths, but I have talked to a number of the members of the Progressive Caucus, of which they are a part, Mr. Speaker, and what many of them have said, and don't deny it, is that they are not going to be satisfied until the Federal government completely takes over the health care system in this country. That is similar, if not identical, to the Canadian system, or the UK system, a nationalized, socialized medicine, is actually what we are talking about.

And so we feel, on the Republican side of the aisle, first of all, that's not desirable. The people don't want it. The town hall meetings told us that they don't want it. The recent polling tells us that they don't want it.

They clearly want lower prices for health insurance, they want us to do something about that, and they want to make that opportunity to have health insurance more accessible to each and every one of them and the members of their families. But they don't want a government takeover, Mr. Speaker.

I say to my colleagues, look, the President, in the joint session of the Congress, where our colleagues on the House side, our Chamber, were obviously here. Our colleagues on the other body, United States Senate, were here. Cabinet members, Supreme Court justices were here as the President addressed the Nation in prime time.

You know, you can't have a better bully pulpit than that opportunity for the President to make his case. During that 45-minute speech, another great speech by President Obama, he said one thing that I agreed with, well, probably several things that I agree with, many things that I don't agree with, like a public option, which is a euphemism for a government takeover of our health care system.

But President Obama did say that one thing, one area of reform that he has not yet seen in any bill is medical liability reform, and that he felt that that would bring down the cost and that he was willing to listen, Mr. Speaker, to ideas presented to him. His door was open—I don't know about those three or four levels of gates before you get to the door—but I am really hopeful, Mr. Speaker, that his door

is open to Republicans and Democrats, and rank and file, leadership, to every Member of this body.

In fact, even, it would be great if his doors were open to the citizens of this country that have great ideas and where we get most of our great ideas, if the truth be known. But this, this idea of medical liability reform, I have sent him a letter based on what he said in that speech. He also, Mr. Speaker, said the same thing to the American Medical Association annual meeting in his hometown of Chicago this past June.

Mr. Speaker, I know you know this, but some of my colleagues may not know that in my prior life, before I came to this body 7 years ago—I am now serving in my fourth term—I spent 31 years practicing medicine, 26 as an OB/GYN specialist in my 11th District of Georgia, where I still live and will spend my entire life. It's a wonderful, wonderful community in northwest Georgia.

This issue of health care—I am as compassionate about it as anybody, just as compassionate as my friends on the Democratic side that had the previous hour. This idea of doing something about medical liability reform—I am so glad that the President said to the American Medical Association at that annual meeting, Yes, in response to a question from one of the doctors, We do need to do something, and I will take that into consideration.

Now, he wasn't specific, just like the other night he wasn't specific in regard to what he would be amenable to in regard to liability reform.

Mr. Speaker, tonight, I am going to spend some time talking about a bill that I have introduced every year since 2003, that was the 108th Congress. I have been a Member of the 108th, 109th, 110th and 111th and hope to be a Member, Mr. Speaker, of many more Congresses to come. I love this place. I love this body, I love my colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

But each year I have introduced the bill called the HEALTH Act, and it is about medical liability reform. The bill number, for those of you who would like to look it up—and I hope you will, because I have got about 60 cosponsors right now, Mr. Speaker. I want cosponsors on both sides of the aisle, because I want this to be a bipartisan effort. I think that's the only way we can really accomplish things that the people will be happy with.

But H.R. 1086 is called the HEALTH Act, and it's modeled after a bill that was passed in California. California, with its 35 million people, passed a bill back in 1978. The acronym for the bill is MICRA. The most important aspect of that bill, Mr. Speaker, was to put a cap on awards from a jury to a plaintiff for pain and suffering.

Now, when a medical case is brought before a jury, and there is alleged malpractice, and the patient has been harmed or injured in some way, there is all kinds of evidence given to the jury in regard to what the patient has

lost, how much they are disabled and whether or not they can continue to work, and if they can't continue to work over a lifetime, you know, maybe 25 more years, that they expected to work. How much is that worth? That's called compensatory damages, and those awards can be in the millions of dollars and sometimes are.

In most of those cases, I would say, bravo, Mr. Speaker, that the patient was injured by some physician or some hospital practicing below the standard of care, and they have got just compensation. We call it a redress of their grievances. Maybe it doesn't make them whole, but it helps.

Well, this bill, though, doesn't say anything about that, doesn't take away one scintilla of their right to redress of those grievances. It simply says that if it's a minor situation, a minimal injury or even, in some cases, where the jury says we know, based on 2 weeks of the attorneys, the plaintiff's attorneys and the attorney defending the physician, that the doctor didn't do anything wrong, that this was really just an unfortunate outcome; the doctor followed all of the standard practices, best practices in the community. But, golly, you know, we just feel sorry for the patient and, after all, the doctor is not really going to pay this. He or she pays a high malpractice premium to be insured, but it's that old insurance company, and we are just going to go ahead and award \$4 million for pain and suffering.

Well, that's what drives up the cost of health insurance, Mr. Speaker, for everybody else. And it is estimated that if we limit that kind of opportunity, just out of compassion, not based on any factual evidence, that these sort of runaway jury awards are given, if we limit that, then we could save, in this health care system of ours, Mr. Speaker, up to \$120 billion a year, \$120 billion a year, that estimate by the RAND Corporation.

It just seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that if we go in this direction, that we wouldn't have to say to the American people, we are going to pay for health care reform by taxing the so-called wealthy an additional \$800 billion a year. My friends, we are talking about, well, it's okay if you had a lot of money, why not give to the poor and the downtrodden and follow the Good Book. That's fine. I mean, I understand.

But there is another perspective on that. You teach a man to fish, you feed him for life. You give a man a fish, you just give him one meal. And many of these people, these so-called rich that are going to be taxed in the House bill that they were praising so much, I think the number is H.R. 3200, there's a surtax on people with a combined income, I forget, something like \$250,000.

□ 1600

Well, many of those people, Mr. Speaker, are small business men and women who pay their taxes just like an

individual, like a small business, sole proprietor. And when you add that surtax on top of their marginal rate and on top of their State and local taxes and FICA, they are paying 52 percent, more than half of their income, in taxes.

So many of them will just simply say, you know, this little company that we started years ago, this little roofing company, this sheet metal company, this real estate shop, and we created these 10, 15, 20, 25 jobs, and we have been good to our employees and provided them health insurance, we are now in our fifties and we have been prudent and frugal and saved back and we planned on working another 10-15 years and keeping this company going and maybe turning it over to our children or grandchildren, but this is crazy. We are not working for ourselves or employees, we are working for the Federal Government so they can totally reform health care and turn it into a socialized medicine system. Well, we are just not going to do it and we are going to close the doors, and we are going to have that many more people on the unemployment rolls and that many more people without health insurance.

I have been hearing my colleagues talk about, and I think President Obama, Mr. Speaker, said it just last week in his speech, this is a crisis; 14,000 people every day, 14,000 people every day are losing their health insurance, and we have to do something about it.

Mr. Speaker, 14,000 people are losing their health insurance every day not because of the cost of health insurance. They are losing it because they lost their job, 6 million of them in the last couple of years, 2 million since February when we passed the so-called economic stimulus bill. So we have to put all of these things in proper perspective.

So this bill that my colleagues were praising, H.R. 3200, I am on the committee, I have read the bill, the 1,100 pages. The pay-for of \$1.5 trillion over 10 years, and that is a very conservative estimate as told to us by, as they said, the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, \$1.5 trillion, \$8 billion coming from taxation on those small business men and women, that job-killing taxation and another \$500 billion, Mr. Speaker, taken out of what, the Medicare program.

Do you think, my colleagues, that we can afford to cut Medicare by \$500 billion when we have already been told by the trustees that by 2017 there will be less money coming in from Medicare FICA than is going out in benefits to our 45 million, I think there are, Medicare beneficiaries? And that the long-term unfunded liability of Medicare out to the year 2075 is \$35 trillion, and that is with a "T," \$35 trillion.

So we say, oh, well, we need the money because the President said we are not going to do this bill, either the Senate bill or the House bill, whatever

is the one that is ultimately chosen, we are not going to spend one dime, no, I think he even said one penny, I think he said one penny. We are not going to spend one penny of Federal money; it is all going to be paid for. So that's the pay-for, the \$800 billion worth of taxes and the \$500 billion cut to Medicare.

Mr. Speaker, \$500 billion over 10 years. I heard someone from AARP say that is a small cut. Well, in 2008 we spent \$480 billion on the Medicare program. So if we cut it \$500 billion over 10 years, that, my colleagues, is \$50 billion a year. Divide 500 by 10, \$50 billion a year. Well, \$50 billion as a numerator, I believe that is more than 10 percent a year. Mr. Speaker, cutting Medicare when it is about to go broke by the year 2017, over 10 percent a year for the next 10 years, you tell me that makes sense, so we can guarantee insurance for another 5 percent of our population, many of whom don't want it but yet we are going to force them to take it, to buy it. Certainly it is not going to be free.

But what happens to our Medicare recipients, our moms and dads and grandparents who are let's say on Medicare Advantage. Medicare Advantage is that option that you have under Medicare, you have to pay a little bit more, but it covers prevention and wellness and you get to go to the doctor and have an annual physical and Medicare pays for it. And you have screening for a lot of dreaded diseases, and Medicare pays for it. And a nurse calls you back, maybe a week after your appointment, to make sure that you got your prescriptions filled or that your fever went down or that you checked your blood pressure and it is okay.

All of that is provided under Medicare Advantage that is not available to the 80 percent who get Medicare as traditional fee-for-service. It doesn't pay for a physical except the entry physical to Medicare when you first turn 65, but you need one when you are 68. You need one when you are 72, and then you might need one every year thereafter.

So Medicare Advantage, my colleagues, we may be paying too much and we may need to sharpen our pencil. I'm not saying that we don't look at everything very, very closely. We should do that on everything, every dime. As the President said, Mr. Speaker, every penny of taxpayer dollars that we spend should be well spent, and we should be sure that we are not overpaying the insurance companies that provide the Medicare Advantage option.

But it must be pretty popular, Mr. Speaker, because 11 percent of those seniors pick Medicare Advantage. Well, to pay for that \$500 billion out of Medicare, guess where the biggest chunk comes from? It comes from Medicare Advantage to the tune of about \$170 billion. It literally guts Medicare Advantage. It literally guts Medicare Advantage.

So when the President says, Mr. Speaker, you and I and all of our colleagues have heard him say it many times, if you like what you've got in regard to your health care, nothing will change. If you like what you have, you can keep it.

Well, try to convince those 10–11 million people, senior citizens, precious senior citizens who are on Medicare Advantage. They may want to keep it, but if the providers of the Medicare Advantage are losing money on the programs—and they will if you cut 17 percent of their reimbursement—they will simply say, look, I have other business lines. I sell property and casualty. I sell automobile, homeowners, catastrophic, I sell life insurance; but I'm out of this. There is no way.

So that is 11 million people, potentially, not all of them, but a large number of them who will lose their health insurance, what they like; they wanted to keep it, but they didn't get to. So it is an indirect taking it away from them.

When you talk about, well, this is a way we are going to pay for it and not spend one extra dime, it is very important. It is just very important that people understand what the pay-for is. That is why I say in regard to medical liability reform, the current system of the runaway awards given to patients for pain and suffering, there are a couple of other provisions in my bill, the provision of course that we cap the award for pain and suffering at \$250,000. Several States have done that. Several States have actually done that and expanded that number to \$350,000. And it has worked fine.

My mind is open in regard to some changes because the bill, H.R. 1086 that I am talking about, is based on a California law that was passed 30 years ago. So, you know, to say today, well, \$350,000, I think is a reasonable thing. And I would be willing in a heartbeat to talk to the President about that, to talk to the leadership of the Democratic majority party about that.

Mr. Speaker, there are a couple of other things about medical liability tort law that I think our colleagues need to understand. There is something called joint and several liability. So here's the scenario. A patient suffers an injury and the plaintiff's lawyer names everybody that had anything to do with that patient during a hospital stay. Let's say it is a patient that is scheduled for surgery on Monday, a routine operation. And the doctor who is going to perform the surgery says to her partner, I'm going to be at church Sunday morning with my family. Do you mind when you are making rounds seeing your patients, would you stop in and see Mr. Smith and just make sure that everything is okay and tell him that I will come by this afternoon and check on him and see if he has any last minute questions before the surgery?

So the doctor's partner does that. He kind of sticks his head in the door and says hello, and your doctor will be by this afternoon.

Well, that doctor could, under current law, be just as liable of any adverse outcome of that next day surgery as the operating surgeon. The way the current law says, if that doctor who all he did was say hello, I'm your doctor's partner and I just wanted to stop in and tell you that she will be by this afternoon, if he has the most coverage, maybe he bought a more expensive malpractice policy, Mr. Speaker, and he has—well, you have heard the expression, he has the deepest pockets, then in a lawsuit, he could be liable for everything, although he never even laid a hand on the patient. Well, that's wrong and that ought to be corrected.

That's why we need to eliminate this policy. It is called joint and several liability. In other words, everybody who is named is equally liable. Clearly, as that analogy I just presented shows, that's not the case. It ought to be very specific, and it ought to be proportioned.

I would think, Mr. Speaker, that would be plain as the nose on your face. There is another provision of H.R. 1086, the Health Act. It is called collateral source disclosure. I mentioned earlier, Mr. Speaker, about the evidence that is presented to a jury so they can figure out what award, if any, is appropriate for a patient who is injured by a physician or a hospital, medical facility, that has practiced below the standard of care, and it is a very scientific approach.

If the patient had to come back in the hospital and stay for another 2 weeks or month, if the patient had to have another surgical procedure done, if the patient had to be put to sleep and had to have the services of an anesthesiologist, if the patient went home and had to have a specialized wheelchair, if the patient had to have an assistant to help them with daily living, all of that stuff is—and I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, I use the word "stuff." That is improper. But all of those things, items of cost, are used to calculate what the total amount of a judgment should be if in fact it is determined that what the doctor did led to this terrible, unfortunate outcome.

□ 1615

Well, if the patient has disability income insurance, and when the injury occurred they were 30 years old, that disability income compensates them for 80 percent of their salary for the rest of their life. If the patient has health insurance that covers anything else that had to be done, that information should be known to the jury because, if not, we're looking at a situation we sometimes call double dipping. All of these things, Mr. Speaker, drive up the cost of health care and health insurance for everybody else. For everybody else.

So, Mr. Speaker, that's why I was so pleased to hear the President say that he acknowledges that and something ought to be done about it. His mind is open. And I will say to him and to my

colleagues in this body and in the Senate that my mind is open as well. And we should sit down, if necessary, Mr. Speaker, with a blank sheet of paper and just say, Look, certain things in Representative GINGREY's bill, H.R. 1086, we don't agree with, but here are some other sections that we think are very good. And, by the way, we have some ideas here—the majority certainly, because it would be their bill—and would say, Look, let's put this in and that in, and let's get to a point where we can all agree.

If we take this attitude, Mr. Speaker, on every aspect of health care reform and health insurance reform, I can name, and, in fact, I would like to name, several things that I just know that there would be bipartisan agreement on in regard to how the insurance companies treat their clients.

We, on my side of the aisle, we Republicans absolutely would prohibit insurance companies from canceling or rescinding a person's health insurance coverage after the fact by saying, Oh, you know, 5 years ago when you took out the policy, you didn't answer every question just right. You had a lab test that you didn't tell us about or you had hepatitis when you were 16 years old in playing high school football and you completely recovered, but still, you didn't tell us about it and so now you're 45 and you have to have your gall bladder taken out and, lo and behold, that \$20,000 bill, estimate of benefits that you got, we're not paying a dime of it. You're paying all of it. That's got to stop. That absolutely has to stop.

We are in total agreement that insurance companies should not be allowed to deny coverage for preexisting conditions. We are in agreement that setting up exchanges, insurance exchanges in every State where a person who doesn't have insurance or works for a small company that doesn't offer it can shop. And you've got multiple insurance companies. There are 1,300 of them, I think, across the country, that offer health insurance products that they can compete and that a person could go online and know exactly what is covered, what the deductible is, what the copay is, who the doctors are in the provider network. Even go online and check and find out if the doctors have a good record, if they're cost-effective, and make a decision. If their income is lower than 300 percent of the Federal poverty level—for a family of four, that's about \$65,000 a year—then to supplement them so that they can afford to buy those policies.

We're in agreement with that, Mr. Speaker. My colleagues, we don't disagree. We have compassion, too. The two Democrats who were here earlier may be two of the most compassionate Members of this body, but we have a heart as well, and we want to help people. We want to help the downtrodden. But we don't want to, as I said at the outset, to just simply say we can't solve this problem.

Golly, we put a man on the Moon in 1969. It took us about 8 years to do it. We caught Russia and passed them because we had the determination, the will to do that. And you tell me now, 50 years later, that we can't solve this problem without just saying, Look, we throw up our hands. We can't do it. The Federal Government, you take it over and run our health care system and let's have everybody on Medicare or Medicaid.

No. We have a lot of things that we can work together on, and we need to do that.

This idea of medical liability reform and the savings that it brings, certainly it should be on the table, and heretofore it has not been. There's not one section in any of the three bills that came through the House or the two bills that came through the Senate. We need that, just as we need, Mr. Speaker, a comprehensive electronic medical records system. That's another cost saver of maybe \$150 billion a year.

Yes, there's some upfront costs. Indeed, I think the President put \$19 billion into the economic stimulus package to make sure the government continues its efforts to set the standards so that all these computer systems, hardware, software, for every specialty and every subspecialty, can talk to the Medicare system, can talk to the Medicaid system, can talk to the VA, can talk to the military, can talk to every private insurance company across this country.

So if you go on vacation and if you have a little card about the size of a VISA card or American Express card that's got your identification in there, very secure and encrypted, and you're at the South Pole, for goodness sakes, and you fall and hit your head on the ice and you're in a coma and they take you to the emergency room, somebody can reach in your back pocket, get your wallet out, swipe that card and know exactly what your medical history is, what medications you're on; if you're taking Plavix, not inadvertently give you Coumadin and kill you. So electronic medical records is something that we can, should, and I think do agree on.

Mr. Speaker, I think that if we put the bickering, as the President said, try to put the bickering aside and listen, and the majority party allows the minority party in the room, we can do this. We can do this. And I think the American people would be proud of it.

There's one other thing that I have been proposing and my colleagues on this side of aisle, this idea of why is it that people can only buy health insurance in their own State. Their own State may have passed all kinds of mandates on health insurance that require a test for this, a test for that, coverage for this, coverage for that. All of these things that sound nice when you propose them, but they are part of a basic policy, and so every policy that's sold in the State has to include all those things.

Well, these people can't afford health insurance in that particular State. Maybe it's my own State of Georgia, or Alabama, Louisiana, or Florida, Massachusetts. But yet, they are forced to buy insurance in their own State—and many of them don't because they can't afford it.

Well, let's let them go online and shop in a neighboring State or anywhere in the country that they want to look and see. Just like on Medicare part D, the prescription drug plan, you will see that the competition in the free market will keep those prices down and make them competitive and that an individual can pick a policy that's almost tailor-made for him or her, just as they do in the prescription drug plan.

In the prescription drug plan, part D of Medicare, my mom goes online and she makes a list of the six medications that she's on and she gives her Social Security number, she gives her zip code so that she would know which pharmacies are close to her and what plans are available, and she looks and sees how much the different plans charge for the medications that she's on. She doesn't care what they charge for something that she's not taking. That doesn't matter to her. It's the uniqueness of her that allows her to shop in that way and get the best price.

We can do that with these health plans through these exchanges. We can set up these high-risk pools so that people that have birth defects or they come down early in life with type 1 diabetes or they have osteoporosis or multiple diseases, they can become part of a high-risk pool in each State. And we can say to the insurance companies once again, You have to participate and you can't charge more than 1½ percent—1½ times what the standard rates are.

Again, I started out the hour specifically talking about medical liability reform and the significant savings. I think I even referred to it as a silver bullet worth of savings. And I think that that is something that certainly ought to be—if we pass health reform this year, that certainly should be a major provision; electronic medical records, of course, as well, and many of the things that I mentioned. But to just throw up your hands and say, We can't do it.

We have got 435 of the best and brightest people in this country serving this Congress. All walks of life, all educational levels, all previous professions, and we can't do this? We have to just literally toss up our hands and say, Let's let the Federal Government do it?

There yet is not one word in this Constitution that talks about health care and the requirement of the Federal Government providing health care, not one word, and I look at it often, my colleagues. I look at the glossary often.

I look at things like: Arms, the right to bear; assembly, the right of; counsel, the right to; grievances—we talked

about that earlier, didn't we—redress of; petition the government, the right to; the press, freedom of; religion, freedom of; speech, freedom of. But not one word about health care.

I want to just close by saying to my colleagues, we don't want to let the Federal Government take over our health care system. There's an art to medicine. It's not an exact science, and we don't need bureaucrats getting between our doctors and our patients.

The American people are telling us that. And I say woe be unto us if we turn our back on them and force a government-run health care system down the throats of the American people by some parliamentary trickery. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that my colleagues are smarter than that. I know they are. I know they are.

In the final analysis, we're going to do the right thing, and I hope and pray that we do it in a bipartisan way.

□ 1630

30-SOMETHING WORKING GROUP

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CARSON of Indiana). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, once again it's an honor to come before the House, and I look forward to always coming to the floor. As you know, the 30 Something Working Group, we've been working now not only through the 108th Congress but all the way up through the 111th Congress. We pride ourselves on coming to the floor, talking about issues that are not only facing Americans but the challenge that we have as policymakers here in Washington, D.C., to make sure that we provide the kind of leadership that the constituents in our various districts, the people in our States and, of course, the entire country deserve. To try to achieve that is definitely a hard thing to do at times but very easy to do when we work together.

As I start off every Special Order, Mr. Speaker and Members, I just want us to continue to stay focused on what's going on not only here domestically but also throughout the world, not only our men and women in uniform but those that work in the Diplomatic Corps and the State Department who are deployed throughout the world. We do know that we have individuals who have to clean sand out of their boots and stand up on behalf of our country in the theater of war in two areas.

As of today at 10 a.m., the death toll in Iraq is 4,347 troops and soldiers; those who were wounded in action and have returned to duty is 17,633; also wounded in action, not returning to duty is 3,861. The death toll in Afghanistan, Operation Enduring Freedom, is 830; wounded in action and have returned to duty is 1,506; wounded in action but not returning to duty is 2,390.

I think it's important, Mr. Speaker, that every time we get the opportunity, we definitely appreciate not only those that are enlisted now, but the Reservists, National Guard units, the many veterans out there who have served and also their families. We must show them a great deal of appreciation to allow us to salute one flag. My uncle served in the Korean War and saw a little action in the Vietnam War. He recently passed on. He was not only honored to get medical health care at the end of his life over at Bay Pines Medical Center in Bay Pines, Florida, but he also had the honor, along with many heroes and sheroes, to have his final resting place be over at Arlington National Cemetery.

Mr. Speaker, there has been a lot of discussion about this issue of health care, and I think that it's important that we continue to have not only that discussion but some action. When I first came to the floor last week and we reconvened as a Congress, we talked about a number of the issues that are facing not only Americans, but we have talked about what happened at town hall meetings, and we have talked about that we wondered where the President stands. We had a lot of discussion going back and forth, whether it be members of the Republican Caucus or members of the Democratic Caucus and even our two Independents who are over in the U.S. Senate, a great discussion, a great discourse, a lot of CONGRESSIONAL RECORD statements made. A lot were entered without an official statement on the floor, but just in writing.

And still this debate continues. We know that we have at least four working documents that are out there right now. We know that the chairman of the Finance Committee in the Senate has been working, along with Senators on both sides of the aisle, to be able to come to some sort of resolution where Americans will be able to say that those of us here in Washington are working and that we will get to a final resolution more sooner than later to make sure that the insurance companies are no longer doing what they have been doing to the American people and what they are doing to the American people. That is, pushing up rates, pushing up copays, and denying coverage for some Americans when they have worked very, very hard. Some people pay \$300, \$400 in a paycheck, some personal testimonies, \$1,200 for a 4-week period to insure their families.

Now I'm not going to stand here and tell you that they were able to do that on their own. They are able to keep not only the CEO's benefits at the levels that they are—benefits that an average American would never see or paychecks that the average American would never see. The average American will never be able to live in the type of gated community that some of these insurance executives are living in right now. And the executives will never be

able to understand what it means to visit their doctor and be denied coverage for a procedure that is needed. They would never have that opportunity. But I'm not going to even blame it on the insurance executives, to say that they have set forth the environment in which they are able to stand in judgment of an individual's health care, even when there is a doctor that is recommending that their patient receive a certain procedure or a test that has to be carried out.

The environment would not be what it is today if the Congress was to do its job. If we were to do our job, then we wouldn't have some of the horror stories that we've been hearing over a period of time. We would not have constituents calling their Congressman or Congresswoman saying, I need you to call this 1-800 number for me because I need an operation or my husband needs an operation or my child needs an operation. We cannot operate that way because everyone can't call their Member of Congress or their elected official or the mayor to be able to stand for them. It is important, and I come to the floor today to say that it's imperative—even adding on to important, even more—that we follow through.

Mr. Speaker, I'm speaking here with a bipartisan voice because something that I saw when the President came to speak to us last week—it seems like it was 2 weeks ago but it was last week—he talked about passing a health care package that would not add one red cent to the debt. I think that's important. I think that's a value that this Congress can embrace on both sides of the aisle. He also said that he would not sign a bill that would allow insurance companies to deny people based on preexisting conditions or family history. That's a value. That's something sound that we can both agree with. I was pleased to see my colleague on the Republican side of the aisle in the Republican response after the President's speech say, There are some things that we agree on, and that was one of them—no longer allowing insurance companies to deny individuals on family history or preexisting conditions. That was major, as far as I'm concerned.

I was, once upon a time, a public worker, a State trooper in Florida; and even before I was a student at Florida A&M, I was a skycap at the airport. I used to carry furniture at the Jewish Home for the Aged down in Miami. I have worked in the thrift shop. And even though part of that time I enjoyed being on my mother's health plan, I knew what it meant to kind of be in that area where, "I hope I don't get hurt because I don't have the kind of insurance that I need as a skycap." Now it's important that we take this "no longer being denied on preexisting conditions or family history" and look at that as a bipartisan move from this point on. There should no longer be a debate on whether we agree on that or not. That's a softball.

But I want to say, Mr. Speaker and Members, that it took us decades to get to that point. The reason why Members are now emboldened to say, Well, I agree with that provision, is that the leadership was provided to set the environment for them to say yes to that, for Democrats to say yes to that, for Republicans to say yes to that, and for our two Independents in the Senate to say yes to that, that they agree with that as a principle and a bedrock of this health care reform.

I think something that's also so very, very important—many times here on this floor, we have had discussions of urban versus rural. When you look at this health care debate, and you look at how Members are coming to the table, needing not only the resources to be able to bring about a medical home for individuals that do have insurance—and in this bill we're achieving that, of making sure that a super, super majority, into the high nineties, have an insurance card and that they're able to go in and get preventive care and to also go in and get a procedure that they need and cannot be denied—but to be able to have that, they have to have a medical home. In the legislation, we're talking about community health centers having more capacity to be able to take on everyday Americans, not just indigent, not just individuals that don't have a primary doctor. This is to allow individuals that are in the top 1 percent or the top 2 percent of income gatherers here in this country to be able to go to their medical home, whether it be a community health center or they can go to their own doctor, but they'll at least have the capacity to be able to have that medical home. This is important in rural America and in rural Florida.

Right now as I travel throughout the State of Florida, there are a number of people saying, You know, KENDRICK, I kind of like this health care thing, but I don't have a car, and I have to drive 2 or 3 hours to go see a primary doctor. The reason why that primary doctor is not there is because of the lack of Medicare or Medicaid reimbursement or a constituency that will help keep that practice afloat. So when you have in not only H.R. 3200 but in other work products that are here in Congress these community health centers as a foundation, as a base, as a bedrock of this health care reform package, I think we would look at it from the standpoint of saying that people will have a medical home to go to, but they will no longer have to drive for miles and miles and miles and lose doctors that come in and do their residency but cannot afford to stay in that rural or emerging county as it relates to that population because they don't have the backing and the incentives.

I can tell you in that House product that those incentives are there to be able to not only encourage those doctors and medical professionals to stay there but to provide a medical home.

Now I want to let you know that as we look at the different proposals—and

we know that Members have their own version of what they feel health care reform should be—I can tell you with the proper leadership, I know that Democrats, Republicans and Independents can come together on making sure that we work with a public and private system as we see in both proposals, in both House and Senate, one that has a private exchange along with a public option that will allow those who cannot afford to be a part of the private exchange to no longer find themselves in the ranks of the uninsured.

Now why do I say that, Members? I say that is key and that is important so that the individuals that do have insurance—like myself and probably everyone in this Chamber because we are public workers—that they will no longer take our premiums up throughout America to 250-plus million Americans that do have insurance because of the uninsured ranks there because someone has to pay for their health care. And that's the reason why we have the \$20 tablet of aspirin. That's the reason why a box of tissues in the hospital is far beyond anything that you would ever pay for, even if you were to go into the gift shop in a Ritz-Carlton to buy a box of tissue. It costs more in that public hospital or that private hospital than it costs at some five-star hotel because that cost has to be covered somehow, somehow.

It's very, very important that everyone understands, as it relates to this overall application of health care, that we have to make sure that we provide a public and a private opportunity for individuals to be able to receive insurance. I come from a State, Mr. Speaker, where you have over 3,500 Floridians that lose their insurance every week. That's the reality. That's what's going on. And to just use that statistic as some sort of backdrop for a political speech or a backdrop to just make a point is really robbery to those individuals of the 3,500 and the 80 percent of Floridians that do have insurance. It's robbery to be able to use that as a talking point without following it up to say that action will take place; and we will have a paradigm shift to make sure those 3,500 Floridians—which adds up to a little bit over 80,000, 85,000 Floridians that are losing their insurance every year. And that automatically we know for that 80 percent or a super majority of Floridians that do have insurance, many of whom, I must add, Mr. Speaker, are on Medicare, which I must say is a public option and a lot of people would have a lot of choice words if you tried to do away with Medicare now.

□ 1645

I think that it's important that we also understand that in this debate Members are going to be misunderstood, but the foundation of the debate should be about action. I have a book full of statistics, both pro and con. The statistics are not going to help bring insurance costs down or make sure

that people have health care or make sure that individuals do not find themselves becoming bankrupt because one of their family members has a medical emergency and their insurance ran out in the first 10 days and now they're on their own and they're in open water.

And we have some facilities, believe it or not, legal or illegal, denying care to individuals that are Americans, those that have paid their taxes and have done all of the things we've asked them to do, but based on the fact that they don't have enough coverage, are underinsured, and those that find themselves uninsured because they cannot afford the premium or they can't afford the copays, they find themselves waiting. We have a lot of 50-somethings and early 60-somethings that are waiting to make it to Medicare for them to get a procedure that they should have gotten 7 years ago. And now the situation is even worse. It's going to cost not only me more, but it's going to cost everyone that I represent back in Florida more because of the paralysis of analysis that has taken place here in the halls of Congress.

Let me tell you there were some things that I was very pleased to hear during the joint session. I was happy to hear that the President was determined to be the last President to deal with this issue because I have been in politics now, or, you may say, elected service, as a public servant now for 15 years, going on 16 years. I am a second-generation Member, Mr. Speaker, as you can also appreciate. My mother before me served in this House for some 10 years. Then before that she served in the legislature and the senate and the House of Representatives and worked at a community college. So we come from a family of public servants. I was a State trooper, served in the legislature for 8 years, came here and am serving to the best of my ability.

I can't remember an election, Mr. Speaker, that I didn't have somewhere in a stump speech that I wanted to make sure that we can make health care affordable for all Americans and bring down the costs of health care for those that are paying too much and getting too little.

This health care reform package is more of a bill of rights for those of us that are out here punching in and punching out every day, signing in and signing out every day, making sure that we raise our children and do the things that we need to do to make this country strong. This bill and this concept of reform is not only for health care insurance but making sure that no American that pays for insurance finds themselves in a situation where they've sacrificed what kind of milk they buy, need it be soy milk or regular milk; or what kind of bread they buy, need it be the bread on sale or whole wheat bread; or what kind of eggs they buy, need it be organic or nonorganic eggs. It should not be based on the fact that, well, I have to pay

\$400 or \$300 out of every pay period to be able to cover health care costs for my family, for it to be there when we need it, and then they find themselves in a situation when they need it and they pull that card out of their wallet, Mr. Speaker, thinking that they're on their way to getting something, to only find out that the card that they had in their wallet wasn't even worth the plastic that it was made out of.

They find themselves paying out of pocket, even before, some \$25 to \$3,000 or \$1,600 of money that they didn't have in the first place—I'm going to break this down—going to the credit union trying to get a signature loan. This is for real. This is what happens in America. This is what happens in Florida every day. Calling family members, disclosing to third cousins the personal medical crisis that they're going through that's quite personal in many cases, to be able to swallow pride and ask them for help when they've been paying \$200, \$300 out of their pay period for health care insurance. That's not what it's about.

So I'm seeing, Mr. Speaker and Members, and I'm pleased to see, that the debate is now moving forward. We agree that something should happen, and something will happen. And the leadership, from the executive branch to legislative leaders, are saying if there are constructive components that can be placed into this insurance reform legislation, then we definitely would like to hear it.

Now, I, for one, have not and will not in this debate come to the floor to advocate any Canadian-style plan that's just a public plan. That's not what it's about, even though we know that Medicare is a plan that's similar but not the same. Medicare has private entities that are there that are helping to close the gap, but the Federal Government is making sure that our seniors that have paid into it have something to fall back on.

I can tell you also that when we look at this issue of health care and we look at the experience that real Americans and, I would add, Floridians are going through today, I wanted to come here today with really a voice of what the everyday individual is paying and what they're getting. 535 Members between the House and Senate. I think it's important that people understand that our experience is totally different from the everyday American or our constituents' experience. In 7 years in Congress, I must say that I have had some family members that have had a medical dilemma. I haven't been denied anything. I'm a Member of Congress. I don't think my constituents, and I said this last week and I will say it this week, elected me to say, Kendrick, I want you, your wife, and your two children to have better health than I could ever have. I just want you to have that, and that's the reason why I'm showing up early at seven o'clock on a Tuesday morning to vote for you.

No. I think they voted to say that I know that you know what I'm going

through, and I'm sending you to Washington, D.C., to give voice to my cause. And the cause of the everyday American is making sure that government will not be a part of the handshake deal, need it be a Democrat or Republican administration.

The fact that doctors are spending more and more time on the phone talking to someone in Sioux City, Iowa, like David Letterman would say, in a cubicle, trying to convince them that their patient needs a procedure or a test and that they need to cover it, they should not look at that person's file and say, Oh, well, you've had this, that, and the other. Well, I don't think that you're eligible for it. If you're paying for it, you get it. That's the school I come from.

So I think that it's important that no matter what your economic background is, you go into work every day and you buy health care insurance, you're in an exchange, and you have put forth the sacrifice, that you weren't able to put dollars into a college fund, that you were not able to do the things that you wanted to do, need it be whatever your religion may be, that when it comes around to that time of year, you weren't able to provide the kinds of things you wanted to provide. You were not able to have that vacation that you were looking forward to that you feel you needed to do. You could not go off to the church or synagogue or what have you, off to camp to study more, or the mosque, that you could not go because financially you're too busy paying more every year into your health care insurance.

It's not on that individual that's trying to have adequate health care, Mr. Speaker and Members; it's on us. We have the responsibility, Democrats and Republicans, to meet that common ground to be able to make it happen.

Now, for those leaders, I must add, need it be here in Congress or in a State or in a local community, sitting on the sideline of the biggest debate that has everything to do with the multinational companies that are U.S.-based being at a competitive disadvantage because of the lack of policy here on this floor to set the stage so that health care costs are not where they are right now, they're at a disadvantage. And when they're at a disadvantage, that means that they cannot provide jobs. That goes all the way down to that small business.

I talk to small businessmen and women every day, need it be through e-mail or by talking on the phone. And they say, You know, Kendrick, it pains me when I try to buy insurance as an employer, and people don't talk about that a lot, based on the individuals that I employ and based on their health care background, I pay more because I'm in a rural part of Florida where, probably, the diet is not what it should be or whatever the case may be or family history or what have you, and that plays a factor.

I have talked to businessmen and women that have a plant here and a plant there, and it costs more for the plant over here in this county versus the other county. So I don't know what goes into this whole insurance coverage and what the executives look at, but I can tell you this: That's painful for that individual that's providing jobs, because they know that their insurance is not adequate enough to make sure that their employees who helped build their company to where it is today, who allow them to live in the house that they live in, who allow them to celebrate the kind of life that they celebrate—they care about those individuals because those individuals made their company and built their family name, if that company is named after their family, to what it is today. So there is an attachment that's there.

So I think it's important when we look at this health care issue, we have to look at it from the perspective that not only does it deal with everyday Americans, it deals with everyday business, and it deals with everyday health care workers.

I will close out this segment on this point: It's nothing like a health care worker, need it be a CNA, a certified nursing assistant, or an RN, a registered nurse, or a specialist, a doctor who has been in the profession and even primary care doctors; we are going to need an army of these primary care doctors in residency spots to be able to create what we call this medical home, so that people will have somewhere to go with their insurance card.

To have them in a profession that they know that's bleeding constantly and that's hooked up and that's in ICU because of the cost of insurance and the cost of coverage and the level of coverage that everyday Americans are receiving—we have public hospitals that are going under and that are finding themselves in budget crisis and even private hospitals where staffing levels have been cut back. And when you come to a State like mine in Florida, I helped pass the legislation as it relates to nursing home staffing levels, making sure that our frail and our most vulnerable have the kind of staffing that they deserve. But when it becomes a challenge on the reimbursement rate to be able to make sure that that staffer is there for that individual that has put their loved one in a nursing home or in a hospital, they should not have to watch.

I was in Gainesville just a week ago over the Labor Day holiday, and I talked to a young lady who came up to me at a picnic and said, Congressman, my mother is in the hospital.

She didn't know me. But she said, Since you're the congressman, I want to talk to you. My family works a schedule out to go sit with my mother in the hospital because the staffing level is not what it should be. That's what's going on out there.

Now, if something were to happen to me right now, Mr. Speaker, and I hope

it doesn't, but if something were to happen to me, I don't have to worry about anything. I will get over to Bethesda or somewhere. I don't have to worry about it because I'm covered. I'm a congressman.

□ 1700

People are going to put me in a room somewhere, I'll probably have a private room and an open mic, press the button, there will be no waiting for my care. But that's not what this is about.

So if we were to replace Members of Congress with people who have health care crises, then maybe we will have a better situation as it relates to bipartisanship to be able to find some common ground on health care.

So I challenge our Members here in this Congress, you can talk about the sideshows, you can talk about the small things that are going on—or they could be important back home—but when you have an issue like health care reform that's before this Congress, it took great courage against the naysayers to create Social Security, which is providing opportunities for individuals that, when they lose everything else, Social Security is there; when someone passes on and they're able to leave their survivor benefits, even if they didn't make the kind of money they would like to have made, they didn't leave the kind of inheritance that they would like to leave to their children, to be able to leave a survivor benefit for a child or a spouse.

Or when someone is injured on the job and they fall into disability, that Social Security is there. It's not going to pay for everything, but it's going to pay for something. You've been paying for it out of your check. You mess with Social Security now, you have a problem.

I'm so glad, Mr. Speaker, the 109th Congress, when the previous administration wanted to privatize Social Security and we fought it back with not only dialog on the floor, amendments in committee, holding town hall meetings back home, we fought it back. And if Social Security—and if folks had private accounts out there running in the stock market last September, where would Social Security be right now in the trust fund? Members, I want to make sure that everyone understands that it takes courage.

Medicare, in the sixties, you know, some naysayers, oh, the government is trying to—no one is trying to take over anything, just want to make sure that the seniors have coverage in their time when they need it at 65, that they can take the option. If they want to use their Medicare or they want to use their private insurance, that this country will not turn their back on them.

And now in this legislation we expand the Medicare trust fund and really work towards stomping out not only waste, but corruption, and also bringing it under some sort of control so that we don't find ourselves in a situation like what happened with Medicare

part D prescription drugs. Let's pass a great idea; let's not worry about how we're going to pay for it and increase the debt.

So I go back to saying, when the President said he would not sign a bill that would raise the deficit more than where it is right now, that was music to my ears because we're here—and I've been on the floor for almost 7 years now talking about these issues. Some of the individuals have been talking about the debt. I'm like, where were you when all of this was happening and you said nothing about it and you did nothing about it? And now we're trying to do something about it in a bipartisan way to make sure that we don't put on to the debt, which I think makes perfect sense.

But Medicare, looking at it from where it is right now, it is a public option. And the public option, I must say, Mr. Speaker, the small part of this bill is far more conservative than Medicare: A, you have to fall under a certain income requirement; B, you have to first go into the exchange to get the private insurance. But you also have to be insured and covered.

That means individuals that don't have skin in the game now, people that are saying, hey, I'm going to throw the dice, I'm going to go to CVS, I'm going to go to Walgreen's, I'm going to go to whatever store they go to and I'm going to medicate myself, and then I'm going to find myself in a situation to where I've got to go to the doctor because I have this lump in my neck or I have this pain in my side, or I finally went to the doctor after my wife or my significant other pushed me to go only to find out that now I have a situation that I must go in, now they find themselves in the emergency room. And everyone that has insurance can look forward to \$1,000, \$1,200 either in copays or premiums the following year because that individual was not insured. Now, some people make that choice of saying I just want extra money to spend; most make that choice because they can't afford insurance.

I think it's important that we note that Congress had courage to start Medicare; and because of that courage, so many seniors, 65 years old, have a Medicare card in their wallet. It's first up right under a driver's license or right under their debit card to pull out because it's the card that they pull because they have it. And now every town hall meeting that I had—and Mr. Speaker, I had town hall meetings, there were no requirements, you didn't have to come to my office and show that you live in the 17th Congressional District in Florida. You didn't have to go through the magnetometer before you came in; 500 seats, come in, sit. We're going to have a civil discussion, and if you disagree with any position that has been taken, respect the next person and allow that individual to speak.

That's American, that's bipartisan, and that's what we will continue to do,

Mr. Speaker, because when we pass this insurance reform as it relates to health care, that's not going to be the end. This plan right now, the way it stands, will not be fully implemented until 2013. That's a long time. Some of it will be implemented as it relates to patient rights and insurance rights faster than other components of the bill.

But I want to tell the Members and I want to share with the Members, as we go and we talk to our constituents, we should not just fall for the low-hanging fruit of saying, well, if someone is perfectly healthy and says, well, you know, I don't feel we need to do this, I think that it's important as a leader—because sometimes you have to share with people things that they may not see from a broader perspective—to say, yeah, I don't know what they're doing in Washington, they don't need to do—I mean, this Congress is made up of individuals that have been elected—especially here in the House, you have the greatest democracy here in this Chamber because you cannot be appointed to this unless you're appointed to be the Chair while we're trying to find a Speaker or what have you.

But as it relates to a general Member of Congress, there is a special election called. If someone was to come to the well and say, I'm resigning, there are no appointments; you have to be elected to this body. So this is democracy at its best, and nine times out of 10 come from the ranks of the legislature or some city council or an individual that just got fired up on an issue and started knocking on doors and found themselves in this Chamber.

But so many times in Washington we look at this change agenda, we get stuck on this thing of who we had lunch with last or how leaders get drawn out. I don't think that leaders come to Washington, D.C. to sell out; I think they're drawn out. And what I'm saying about being drawn out is that you find yourself walking around the Halls here in Washington, D.C. and you get enough people, how are you doing, Congressman, Senator, good to see you, you know, great speech, it was good, you know, you start listening to those individuals—even though it's okay to get compliments—versus those individuals that are back home that are fighting this health care crisis. We have to make sure that everyone understands that.

And so I tell my constituents, if you agreed with the last word out of my mouth or not, you tell me what you feel and we will have a discussion on it, and we will do the best to try to give you the kind of representation that you deserve. So I think it's important that we bring reality to this debate.

Mr. Speaker, I'm going to close by saying that it's important that we continue to get input from the public. It's important that we continue to share with our colleagues the importance of bipartisanship. It's important that we are responsible for what we say and put into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It's

important that we allow this process to move forward so that we can have a working document from both House and Senate that can then go to Congress and that we can vote on this floor in the affirmative for.

In every piece of landmark legislation, Mr. Speaker and Members, there will always be sections and components of that legislation that a Member will disagree with. I haven't seen a Member say, you know, everything in that bill, I love it. That's like reading a book and saying, I agree with every chapter; I thought it was a good read. There is always some comment about that eighth chapter could have been a little better or more work could have gone into the twelfth chapter.

But I think it is very, very important that everyone understands, in the final analysis, when we look at health care reform, that every Member, every Governor, every mayor, every city council person, every Member of Congress has to be engaged and has to make sure that it is not about their health care; it's about the health care of the people that they represent.

So if you have health care, I'm bringing your health care costs down because you will have more of a choice and competition will be there to bring your health care down. If you have health care, the quality of your health care will go up, and you will be able to see your doctor and you will be able to continue to move on. And in the bill we have here under consideration in the House, if you leave your job, you can keep your health care.

The ongoing bleeding of Medicare will be repaired and reformed. The ongoing health care crises in so many communities that are weighing down small businesses will be better because of action. And so I think that there are some principles there that those of us that have been elected to lead—I'm not talking about standing on first base looking at second and saying I'm not going to try to steal second. I'm going to stand here and I'm going to let that person, when they hit, they may get a single, but I'm going to stand here to make sure that I can make it to second base. It's not time for that kind of leadership. It's time for you to cheat up to second base and try to take it because you're taking it because you want to win.

And we want to make sure that the people in this great country of ours win. We want to make sure that they have health care. We want to make sure that small businesses are able to provide health care for their employees. We want to make sure that health care providers can provide the most professional health care that they can. We want to make sure that we, as leaders here in Congress, that we go see the wizard and go get some courage, and get a heart while we're there, and share with people the things that should be shared with them even if it's the minority view. Discourse is good, action is better.

Mr. Speaker, it was, once again, an honor to come before the House, and I look forward to coming back. As we break for this week, hopefully we will come back ready to do business at the top of next week.

I feel good about the direction that this debate is going in; the Republican response after the President's address, a lot of things that we agree on. That means that we are heading north on this issue.

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

HEALTH CARE REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CARSON of Indiana). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, as always, it is an honor to address you on the floor of the House of Representatives.

I came down to get my material. I had prepared to rebut the gentleman from Florida, and I found myself a little bit void with major objections with what he had to say; in fact, I appreciate the tone of the gentleman in his presentation, his delivery. We will find places where we disagree, and it's important that we find places also where we can agree.

I would say, Mr. Speaker, that it did not contribute to bipartisanship to have the resolution that addressed JOE WILSON here this week. That dropped a partisan divide down between this Chamber. And if anybody thinks we are more likely to get a good solution for America on health care or anything else because of that, they would be completely mistaken, Mr. Speaker. So I make that point at the beginning of this.

I appreciate the bipartisan dialogue of the gentleman from Florida. We recognize that we come from two different places philosophically. The world looks entirely different if you look at it from the side of constitutionalism and free enterprise and individual responsibility than it does if you look at it from the standpoint that the government should be providing the resources to people for whatever reason might be their misfortune.

In fact, I serve on the Judiciary Committee, and I've been on that committee, between Congress and my time in the Iowa Senate, my 13th year. I'm one of those rare nonlawyers on the Judiciary Committee, Mr. Speaker, and so I tell the lawyers that that gives me a decided advantage in my approach.

□ 1715

In any case, this country is a country that is established on the rule of law, on our constitutional values and on personal responsibility. When we do those things that take away personal responsibility and when we punish the people who are the most productive among us and when we take away their

incentives to continue to be more productive, they have more of a tendency than to slow down their productivity. Some of them stop. Some of them will decide, well, I can't keep funding this government that's asking for more and more of the sweat from my brow or is asking for the return on the capital that they have formed, so they give up or they move their companies overseas to places like China or India or they simply don't add onto the production line of the factory. Whatever the case may be, we get less growth in our economy when we punish the people who are producing.

Ronald Reagan had a way of expressing that, and I don't know if I can get it exactly right: If you tax something, then you are punishing it. If you subsidize something, you can expect it to grow because whatever you subsidize will grow, and whatever you tax will shrink. Reagan had a clear understanding of this, and we need to have a better understanding here amongst the consensus in the House of Representatives. There always is another story. There always is another anecdote. There always is another tear-jerking way of looking at an individual case or even at aggregating some smaller cases that may not represent the broader whole.

We need to be a wise body in the House of Representatives, a wise body that looks at empirical data and that understands the psychology of the people in this country. Our job is to improve the average annual productivity of the people in the United States of America. If we do that, we will increase then the average annual productivity, of course, and it will improve the quality of life, the standard of living, and it will expand technology and medicine—anything you want to address. Yet, if we turn the safety net into a hammock, if we take that net that keeps them out of the bottom and we crank it up to the point where it becomes a hammock, then people will lay in that hammock and will take it easy, and they won't be using their best skills. Their incentives go away as you raise the safety net up and as it turns into a hammock.

So we've had an intense health care debate going on here, and I'm very grateful for this. I'm grateful that we're able to have the time throughout the month of August to have town hall meetings all across this country—town hall meetings in Florida as the gentleman previous just said. There have been all kinds of town hall meetings in Iowa. In every State that I know of, Members of Congress have had town hall meetings.

Mr. Speaker, at this point, I want to thank my senior Senator, CHUCK GRASSLEY from Iowa, for engaging in the negotiations, in the debate and in the dialogue on the health care issue on the Senate side. It may well have been the single most important key factor that allowed for the debate in health care to be extended through the

month of August and past Labor Day to get us to this point in September where we are. If it hadn't been for Senator CHUCK GRASSLEY's having negotiated these health care issues within that Gang of Six in the United States Senate, it's possible and maybe even likely that they would have found a way to ram a bill through this Chamber, to put it through the Senate and through the House and on President Obama's desk before the August break.

If that had happened, the TEA party people would have had a different reason to come to town if they'd come at all. If that had happened, the town hall meetings never would have taken place in that way. They would have seen that they'd gotten run over by Big Government. By the way, this getting run over by Big Government isn't something that has just to do with health care at all. It's the current issue of Big Government's seeking to run over the individual freedoms of the American people.

We have watched—and this would be the 17th of September, today. Now, the day after tomorrow will mark the 1-year anniversary that Secretary of the Treasury Henry Paulson came to the Capitol and insisted that we present him with a \$700 billion check so that he could buy up the toxic debt that's on the financial markets and could avert a financial meltdown, a loss of confidence in our currency and in the financial institutions, which could have caused the global economy to crash. That's how it was presented to us by the Secretary.

He said, Give me \$700 billion, and I can't have any strings attached. If you have any ideas, don't try to offer them, he said, because I've been working on this for 13 months, and you've only known about it for 24 hours. So, therefore, whatever you come up with will only make my good idea worse, so just be quiet, and give me the money. That was essentially it.

We advised him, when you ask for \$700 billion in taxpayer dollars, you've stepped into the political arena. It isn't just a matter of being shielded in the U.S. Treasury, so it was a little harder for him. In the end, he got \$350 billion with another \$350 billion that was earmarked for the next year, which was to be approved by a Congress to be elected later and to be signed by a President to be elected later. This is what was going on almost a year ago today: Henry Paulson's trip to the Capitol at a time when he predicted that there was going to be a major financial meltdown of global finances, the U.S. economy being at the heart of it and leading it.

Now, he couldn't guarantee us nor could he predict that his effort and strategy with the TARP money, with the \$700 billion in TARP money, would actually be successful, but he did predict that, if we didn't do that, we would have an economic meltdown at least to some significant degree. That was a year ago.

Since that period of time, by the way, President Obama flew into town

to meet with President Bush. We had the Presidential candidate JOHN MCCAIN who did the same. They sat around the table at the White House, along with the Speaker of the House, the Republican leader, JOHN BOEHNER, and the leadership in the Senate. They came out of there with, I'll say, not quite a unanimous position but one that was to go forward with the TARP funding.

About half of the Republicans in this House voted "no." Most of the Democrats voted "yes." About half of the Republicans voted "yes." It split the party over here. It didn't really split the party over here. Spending money doesn't bother those folks on that side as much as it does on this side, would be my view.

So the TARP money was released, at least half of it in the beginning last year, closer into October, and it was followed by an election. By the way, this TARP money was voted for and was supported by the then-Senator and candidate for President Obama, who certainly asked for the balance of that TARP funding as President and got it. So this TARP money is President Obama's economy. It's a component of his solution, and it's part of the negotiations, and it answers why they were taking place with the Presidential candidates in the White House. President Bush knew there had to be a handoff that went to the next President, and the next President was sitting at the table in the negotiation room of the White House. It could have been either JOHN MCCAIN or President Obama—they were both there—but the next President was sitting at the table.

So, as they bought into this, this responsibility for the \$700 billion in TARP lays at the feet right now of the President of the United States, Barack Obama. He supported this program. He advocated for it. He voted for it. It's a matter of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Behind that, many argued, came the necessary nationalization of Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, two government-sponsored enterprises. The chairman of the Financial Services Committee, BARNEY FRANK, had argued just in October of 2005 that he would not support a government bailout or subsidy of Fannie and Freddie. Yet, just 3½ years later, that's what happened.

Additionally, Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac received about \$100 billion in taxpayers' money each. Plus, about \$5.5 trillion in contingent liabilities went along with the deal of the Federal Government's finally nationalizing the balance of Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, formerly a private organization/quasi-government at the time but now nationalized, nationalized by the White House and by the leadership of this government.

With that came the large investment banks. Just a couple of days ago was the anniversary of Lehman Brothers' going under if you'll remember. Then we saw the nationalization of three large investment banks—AIG, which

was the huge insurance company that was insuring the risk of the mortgage lenders as they packaged up and tranching and marketed these mortgages off on the secondary and tertiary markets. They broke them up, repackaged them—cut and shuffled them, so to speak—and sent them on up through the financial chain. The value of those mortgages and the risk of their default were evaluated by AIG. There really wasn't anybody looking over the shoulder of AIG.

There are other things that went wrong with the financial institution. There was the nationalization of Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac and of three large investment banks and AIG. This was flowing along, the President having been engaged in this all of the way.

Then we saw a \$400-and-some billion omnibus spending bill get passed off the floor of the House of Representatives without debate or examination. It was just simply: we've got to keep the government running, so we'll kick the can down the road, and here is a big stack of paperwork. In it is the spending of over \$400 billion.

At right about that same time, we had President Obama calling on this Congress to give him \$787 billion in the stimulus package. I remember that discussion as he came forward to our conference and was about to talk about and ask for \$787 billion. He said that Franklin Delano Roosevelt lost his nerve and didn't spend enough money. I might be paraphrasing slightly here. It isn't exactly a quote. Yet the theme of it is very consistent with what the President said. He said that President Roosevelt lost his nerve, and got to worrying about balancing the budget, and didn't spend enough money.

The result was, in the second half of the decade of the Great Depression, we had a recession within a depression, which brought unemployment up again in the latter half of the thirties. Then along came World War II, which was the largest stimulus plan ever, which got us out of the Great Depression.

That's not just it in a nutshell. That's almost all of the nutshell that was delivered by the President that day. As I listened to that, I thought: Mr. President, you and I took a completely different lesson from the Great Depression. Wherever his economic studies came from and where he evaluated this—mine, among other things, came from reading a significant amount of material and analyses of the Great Depression. Of course, my parents grew from that and out of that, and the things that they learned also were branded within myself and within all of my siblings. They told stories about how difficult it was during the Great Depression.

I went back into the public library with the intention of writing a paper about how FDR's New Deal was a good deal and how it brought us out of the Great Depression. As I read through every newspaper that was published in

my hometown newspaper—and that was twice a week, not a daily paper—from the stock market crash in October of 1929, I went through every paper, looking for the stories that had to do with the New Deal, with the CCC, with the WPA, and with the other programs that FDR brought through in the New Deal. I was preparing to write a paper that would show how the New Deal got us out of the Great Depression and how it moved America forward—how farmers were saved, how businesses were saved and how jobs were saved.

As I read through each newspaper throughout all of those years, from 1929 up until the Japanese attacked Pearl Harbor in December of '41, I got ready to write that paper. I had all of these notes that came from story after story, and I looked at the ceiling, Mr. Speaker, and I began to wonder: How am I going to write this? I can't find evidence here in the contemporary works in the newspapers that support what I've been told by the people who talked to me in the classroom.

So I wrote the paper. I wish I had a copy of it today. I'd love to have that and introduce it into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and give some other people some insight into what I was thinking at the time.

I remember clearly that I couldn't justify that the New Deal was a good deal, and I've certainly looked at a lot of materials since those years—that's 40 years ago, perhaps. The conclusion that I drew was that the Federal Government spent a lot of money. They borrowed a lot of money, and they set up a debt that was hard to recover from. The government wasn't willing to tighten its belt, but instead, it got the idea that they could borrow money and could spend money and could stimulate the economy—the Keynesian approach to economics. I couldn't buy that. I couldn't submit to that.

I came with a different philosophy, a philosophy that, for me, grows out of *The Wealth of Nations*, the book that ADAM SMITH wrote, which is the very foundation for free enterprise. In the 1,057 pages, which I think were in my book, you go through them in a fashion to understand how ADAM SMITH articulated it, and you can see that, even though he doesn't use the term "invisible hand," the expression is "the invisible hand of the consumer makes those decisions."

I talked about this last night on the floor, Mr. Speaker. Let's just say, if you're a bakery and if you're baking bread and if there's somebody out there who is selling bread for a buck and a quarter a loaf and it goes on the shelves in the store and if you can bake bread that is of similar or better quality and can sell it for a dollar, then you might get your little spot on the shelf where you get to put six loaves of bread, and the guy who has got the name brand has got two or three shelves, which are all full of his loaves at a buck and a quarter, and yours are at a dollar a loaf.

□ 1730

Well, then, in comes the consumer, and they look at that and they think, I can save a quarter if I just buy that other brand of bread that I have never heard of. Why don't I try that. I will take that risk.

So they bring home this new loaf of bread. Well, that's good. If it's good bread, they will go back and buy that same brand over and over again, especially if it's cheaper. Meanwhile, the store owner realizes he is running out of those six loaves of bread that he is selling that are going like hot cakes, and the other bread is sitting there getting stale on him. He widens his shelf space for the bakery that is selling a high-quality product for a competitive or lower price.

That's how the good bread takes over the bread that is not as good at a higher price. That's how free enterprise works. That's how the invisible hand works. It goes in and pulls that loaf of bread off the shelf. It will look at the prices and the quality and those decisions that get made millions, and, in fact, billions of times across the country and across the globe. That demand, created by the discernment of the consumer, is what drives the production signals into all of our production in the country.

That is, how many loaves of bread are you going to bake? Well, the demand is such if you can only produce, let's say if you can produce 10,000 loaves of bread a day, and now the demand has gotten so great that you can't meet that demand any longer as a producer, someone who is marketing, then you would make the decision on whether you want to expand your operations, perhaps double them and produce 20,000 loaves of bread a day.

Or you might decide, I am as big as I want to be, and I think I can get a little more money for the bread that I have. You can raise the price. Then the price of that dollar loaf of bread could go to \$1.10, \$1.15, maybe even \$1.25, back to where the other competitors are.

Now you have a choice again, the consumer chooses on quality but not price. It can transition back and forth in a myriad of ways. This invisible hand is a wonderful foundation that has built Western civilization, free enterprise economy, and is often misunderstood by people that never got involved in commerce, didn't ever hire anybody, didn't ever make a capital investment or try to produce something, a good or a service that had value, and had to compete against somebody else that was getting up every morning and trying to figure out how to produce a good or a service that was of higher quality for a lower price than their competitor. That is a blessing to our country, to our economy, to Western civilization, the free enterprise economy.

This, the majority in this Congress, the President of the United States, and probably the majority in the United

States Senate, see this world differently. They think they can manage an economy. They think they can go through and nationalize these entities that I have talked about, and a government can manage better than individual consumers and people can manage.

To me, that is a breathtaking concept. All of my training and my experience and my life goes back to if consumers can make the decision and people that are engaged in business can do so for a profit, and the selection process is what makes it all work, why would we inject government in to make decisions? Government can't make better decisions than consumers can or individuals can or individual patients can.

There is no history of that happening anywhere in the world that I know of—government making better decisions. Now, it's true, the government has to do some things. We have to take care of the broad utilities out of the common good. We have got to take care of the transportation links. We have got to do as Abraham Lincoln said, defend our shores, carry the mail. He also said, Do for people that which they cannot do for themselves and otherwise leave us alone.

We are a long ways away from leaving us otherwise alone, and now the government wants to engage in taking over roughly one-sixth of this economy, the entire health care system in the United States and perhaps replace the entire health insurance industry and perhaps, and likely, replace the entire health care delivery system, with the single-payer one-size fits all. That's what's going on in the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, I am just going to ask your attention to a little flashback I am about to offer here that will take us back to 1993 and 1994. This, Mr. Speaker, in the flashback mode, takes me back to September 22, 1993, which was the last time that a President of the United States spoke to a joint session of Congress on an occasion other than a State of the Union address. Otherwise, most recently we could go to last Wednesday evening when President Obama spoke to a joint session of Congress and advocated his national health care act.

But this was September 22, 1993, Bill Clinton right back there in front of where you are, Mr. Speaker, and he gave a speech that was about the national health care act that they wanted to get passed. Then Hillary Clinton was engaged in often closed-door meetings to try to find a way to put out a health care bill that could be a single-payer plan that would set up all the health care in America and make it work.

This is the infamous poster that shows HillaryCare with the network of new government agencies all tied together. This is a real and legitimate flow chart. In fact, this is lifted off of the archives of The New York Times.

I had one similar to this, and probably identical to it, that hung on my

office wall throughout the 1990s and on past the turn of the millennium. But this shows this massive growth in government, the government agency and programs here along this side, Mr. Speaker, shows patients and a global budget, the HMO provider plan, which doesn't have a lot of support these days. Here is an ombudsman, another ombudsman, so that we have liaisons between people and government, a regional health alliance, a corporate health alliance.

They took some existing and wired them together; accountable health plan here and accountable health plan there, wired through to a provider plan. It gets pretty complicated. Here is your HMO plan down here to the global budget and the patients.

Here are more government agency programs. Some of these acronyms I don't recall any more. But I remember that they were all quite a conglomeration of acronyms, and the growth in government is what scared the living daylights out of me as a man who was running a construction company, which I founded. And we had a number of families that worked for me, and we worked together. We provided health insurance for our employees and a retirement plan for our employees.

But I didn't want the government to come in and tell me what I could buy and couldn't buy. I didn't want them to take away my choices to work with my employees. I wanted to be able to offer them the best plan I could, the best employment package possible, because good people are good policy are good production, and a good product comes out of that. You simply cannot do a good job unless you have the right people in place.

We wanted the best people that we could hire. We wanted to provide them the best benefits package possible. I didn't want the government to limit that.

Yet here is this flow chart that I said scared the living daylights out of the me. This is HillaryCare. This is 1993 and 1994. This is the bill that brought Senator Phil Gramm to the floor of the United States Senate right down this hallway directly ahead of you, Mr. Speaker, to the other end of this building, when he stood on the floor of the United States Senate and he said, This will pass over my cold, dead political body.

This is what, again, scared the living day lights out of me, 1993-1994, and it scared the living daylights out of the American people, who eventually shut down and killed this initiative that was brought to the floor of the House here by Bill Clinton, September 22 of 1993. They really thought that they had put the plan in place, they had the constituency base and a method to get this bill passed. But the American people rose up and said "no." They have had enough, they wanted to maintain their freedom. They have done so with regard to health care for another 15 years or so, I guess I will say 16 years.

But, Mr. Speaker, things have changed. This is the old bill. The House has passed out of committees a new health care bill.

Now if you think black and white, all of these new agencies, the weight of government that a patient would have to wade through and the hoops they would have to jump through—we all know what it's like to deal with the government. That level of frustration with bureaucracy is ever present.

One of the reasons for that is the government ends up with a monopoly, and no one that works for a monopoly has the motivation to treat you—and to me there is no competition there to improve the quality or the service.

And so, here is the black and white HillaryCare flow chart, here is a new, modern, Technicolor, some call it the jelly bean flow chart, that comes from H.R. 3200, the main bill that has passed out of several committees here in the House, including the Ways and Means and the Energy and Commerce Committee.

This new flow chart shows a bill that's different than HillaryCare in some respects. It doesn't take it all with one giant bite. It takes a great big step towards a direction of socialized medicine, in my view. It doesn't guarantee that it ends up being socialized medicine, but it certainly will cause a significant concern that that is what it ends up being.

Each of these black and white circles or squares or boxes here are existing programs or government agencies. The color ones are new government agencies that have to be created in order to have the bureaucracy to manage this H.R. 3200, the government option plan.

The part of this flow chart, Mr. Speaker, that concerns me the most resides down here in the center bottom of this chart, this chart which is available on my Web site. If you are interested, Mr. Speaker, you can simply just Google Congressman STEVE KING. On the front page, the homepage of my Web site, is a link that will take you directly to this flow chart and one or two others that are quite instructive.

But on this flow chart, here is the part that I would ask attention to. The bill, and this is the vehicle that we are working with here in the House, this isn't something that's not been legitimized by committee passage; it has been. Here is a new agency, the Health Choices Administration. It creates a Health Choices Administration to determine what choices the American people might have when it comes to health insurance. A new government agency to determine what health insurance is legitimate, takes it out of the hands of the States and puts it into the hands of the Federal Government. I think the States take too much authority there myself.

The boss, the person that heads up the Health Choices Administration, is the new Health Choices Administration commissioner. Now, he is not named, and it could be a she. This individual is

not named as a czar, because I believe the people that wrote this bill understood that America is full up to here with czars, we are over-full with czars. The President has at least 32 czars by most definitions and perhaps as many as 47 by other definitions.

They are circumventing the confirmation process that vets these candidates for Cabinet positions and other confirmation-level appointments. Instead the President is appointing people that circumvent and eclipse the authority of people in Cabinet positions.

How about the Middle East peace czar who has stepped above the Secretary of State when it comes to negotiating peace in the Middle East? How about the former, what do we call him, the green economy czar, the former czar, Van Jones? A lot of us had something to say about him when we found out that he was a self-avowed Communist, and he had some very radical ideas. Finally, when the Americans found out about Van Jones, the pressure that came caused him to step down rather than the President to dismiss him.

But, how about the executive pay salary czar? What is the White House doing with a position that doesn't exist in the Constitution, but someone who is going to look over the shoulder of executive pay for major corporations in America and determine if the CEO can be making a million dollars a year, but having no heartburn about what Michael Jordan made or, let me say, how about, how much money Tiger Woods makes playing golf? No heartburn over that, but a lot of heartburn over somebody that is actually making money and concerned that they are making too much and want to tax that. That's class envy.

Remember if you are making less than \$250,000 a year you don't have to worry, because this President won't raise your taxes. That's clearly a class envy statement, and Joe the Plumber drew the line really clear. He did that in a way that I know it wasn't planned in advance, it just came from his heart; he wants freedom. I am looking forward to maybe sharing the stage with Joe the Plumber next week in St. Louis.

But these czars, we have too many, and we shouldn't have any. There should be congressional oversight over these high-level positions.

But the President of the United States can appoint Cabinet-level people, and they go through the confirmation process, according to the Constitution in the United States Senate, and that happens. That's a good thing. But when he appoints people that have authority over czars that aren't subject to congressional oversight, that's a bad thing.

□ 1745

This Health Choices Administration commissioner would be, for all intent and purposes, a czar, a czar with authority to be able to write all kinds of

rules. A commissioner is what they call him. I sometimes call him the "commi-czar-issioner" to be able to describe it a little more accurately. This commi-czar-issioner, the Health Choices Administration commissioner, would make the decision about what private insurance policies would be approved. These are the private insurers right now in this white box. In order for them to become—and they are traditional health insurance plans, these are the companies here in this little box, 1,300 health insurance companies are in the United States. There are 1,300 separate companies selling health insurance in the United States.

Remember when President Obama said we need more competition in the health insurance industry? Did he say he thinks the appropriate number for health insurance companies would be 1,301, because that is really what he is talking about conceptually. There are 1,300 private insurance companies selling, in this white box here, policy combinations; so the variety is extended to approximately 100,000 different policy varieties that are offered by 1,300 companies. And the President's view is we need to put some competition in place.

I think we can do that in some easy ways, but I want to make sure that we understand what this means. The Health Choices Administration commissioner would write the rules. The commission would approve them. But they would write the rules on what health insurance policies would qualify under this bill to be sold in the United States.

So I could guarantee you that if this bill passes in this kind of form, then there will not be 100,000 policy varieties for people to choose from because the Health Choices Administration commissioner would regulate them in such a way that a number of them would become disqualified. They couldn't become qualified plans. We know that is true otherwise there would be no reason to create the Health Choices Administration commissioner, and there would be no reason to have language in the bill that establishes the qualified health benefits plans.

That is this purple circle. The qualified health benefits plans. So that 100,000 plans number would be reduced I think by a significant number. I think that the health choices commissioner would write regulations that would chop those 100,000 policy varieties down dramatically and reduce the numbers that are offered. They would argue that it confuses the consumer. So, therefore, we have to consolidate that and offer something that the consumer can understand.

Over here in this other circle is the public plan. The government option is over here in this health insurance exchange. So the government option then has to compete with what is left of the private insurance companies and the private health insurance policies, those that aren't regulated out of existence by the new health insurance czar.

Now let's just pick a number here. I don't think anybody has any idea; but if these 100,000 policies that are available today become 50,000 policies almost at the beginning of the new regulations, and as the competition from the government option begins to take hold, those 100,000 policies that became 50 are reduced to 25, and maybe 10,000 policy varieties; and then you can divide that by the number of States, and you get one-size-fits-all for all of the States, and you can reduce your 10,000 again to maybe a thousand. And then if you divided by five again, you end up with 200 policy options maybe, if you took the 10,000 policies and divided by the 50 States.

I believe that is about the 200 policy opportunities that one can buy. You reduce the number of companies as well. Companies would consolidate and they would merge and they would start writing policies that were at the direction of the Health Choices Administration commissioner, the czar.

So the Federal Government would write new regulations for two reasons. In the end, it would be so they could compete with the private sector that has been decimated by the new rules. They will then set the premiums of the government option. Those premiums will have to be competitive with what's left of the private health insurance. They will set their premiums, and then they will write the regulations so the private health insurance has difficulty meeting those standards so that the Federal Government can compete in this business. And in the end, this purple circle here with 1,300 companies and 100,000 policies gets shrunk down to a tiny circle of its former self.

This circle here created by the bill, the public health plans, the government option grows bigger and bigger and bigger until it encompasses perhaps all of the health insurance in America.

Now, some will say, Mr. Speaker, this is radical reactionary talk. I will submit that it is not. There are patterns that have gone before us that we can learn from. In 1968, the Federal Government passed the Federal flood insurance program. There were private property and casualty companies that were selling flood insurance at that time. There wasn't as much demand in the marketplace as there is today. We had a number of floods and natural disasters that had taken place over the previous generation that had brought this to a head in Congress, and so they passed legislation that set up the Federal Government in direct competition with the property and casualty insurance companies that were in the private sector selling flood insurance to people in the floodplains.

Now this is complicated, and there are lots of ways you can make this argument on either side, whether the Federal Government should or should not have engaged in flood insurance. But they engaged in flood insurance; and when they did, they also directed

that national banks that were writing, loaning money on mortgages on real estate that were in a floodplain, those loans had to include flood insurance as part of the loan. So if you went out into a floodplain—and by the way, I have one county that I represent that is 40 percent floodplain, the Missouri River bottoms area of Monona County is about 40 percent floodplain. To invest in anything in that floodplain, you had to buy flood insurance. That was a Federal law.

So over time, and a shorter period of time than one might imagine, from 1967 when there wasn't any Federal flood insurance available but only through private until a few years after that, the bill passed in 1968 and it took a while to get it implemented, a few years after that, there is no private flood insurance left in America. The Federal Government squeezed out all of the private and took it all over for themselves. Not only that, they created a market by setting a mandate that if you are going to borrow money from a national bank that goes into real estate in a floodplain, you have to pay the premium, their premium for flood insurance.

Now the Big Government people will argue that is a good idea and that it provided flood insurance for people that didn't have it and it took us somewhat out of the business of sending disaster money. Well, guess what, it didn't get us out of the business of sending disaster money. We sent, the first round was \$10.5 billion down to New Orleans after Katrina. The second round was \$51.5 billion to New Orleans. There were several other bites at the apple, and I am confident that the total is over \$100 billion, and there are still requests to go to that area.

So the flood insurance that existed in that area didn't solve the problem completely. I think it has helped. But that is an example. Flood insurance is an example of what can happen and probably is likely to happen to the private health insurance market in the United States.

When the Federal Government engages, they write regulations that favor the Federal Government and disfavor the private sector and set their premiums so that this purple circle shrinks, that is, the private plans. This purple circle, that is the government plans, grows.

Oh, and by the way, the Federal flood insurance program is \$19.2 billion in the red with no way to pay for it except to come back to this Congress and ask for that \$19.2 billion, which we have to borrow from the Chinese.

So wouldn't we be better off with a private sector solution? And maybe if the premiums that were paid on flood insurance would have reflected the real risk, we might have built a lot more buildings up above the floodplain so they didn't have to pay the flood insurance premium or they could afford a premium at a higher elevation.

I know these things because I have spent my life working in a floodplain

and with drainage projects and hydrology.

That is what can happen with health insurance, and this ought to scare us. It should scare the living daylights out of us. If it begins to scare us at all like it did during HillaryCare in the early 1990s, the American people will continue to do what they did, come to the town hall meetings, fill them up, write letters, get on the radio. Go see your Congressman. Let them know that you are intense about maintaining your freedom. That is a portion of this.

Now, the President of the United States has made the argument that we have to fix health care before we can fix this economy, this economy, by the way, that has had 30 percent of its profits nationalized by the Federal Government within the last year. That is again the components of the nationalization that took place in between the TARP and some of it that came out of TARP when they started buying up and nationalizing large investment banks.

But \$700 billion in TARP, three large investment banks were nationalized. Lehman Brothers went down. AIG, the large insurance company, nationalized. Fannie Mae, Freddie Mac, nationalized. General Motors, Chrysler, all nationalized. You add that all up, we are looking, Mr. Speaker, at 30 percent of the profits of the private sector in the United States now under the control of the Federal Government. And that is nationalized.

On top of it, there is an attempt here, right here in this chart, H.R. 3200 or the Senate version of the bill or whatever you would like to look at, that seeks to nationalize eventually another 17.5 percent of our economy. When you round that to the nearest percentage, that becomes, at least by one analysis, 48 percent of the private sector nationalized by the Federal Government. And when the private sector is nationalized, the freedom of the American people is diminished. That is what is going on, Mr. Speaker.

And the President has said health care costs too much money. We have to fix an economy that is in an economic crisis, and we can't fix that economy unless we first fix health care because health care costs too much money at 14.5 percent of our gross domestic product. The average of the industrialized world is about 9½ percent of their GDP. We don't know that they are comparing apples to apples because there are many government-sponsored enterprises and the nationalization that has taken place in those other countries, we are a different people, Mr. Speaker. We are a Nation that lives and breathes freedom. We want our choices. We want our freedom. We are willing to take some risks. We want to reward people that take risks and succeed. But if we spend too much money on health care, let's have a debate on how to fix that. Perhaps I will come back to that in a moment.

But I want to take us to the next point, the President's next point,

which is the other big problem. The first one is we spend too much money on health care. The other big problem is we have way too many that are uninsured: 47 million Americans are uninsured. Well, I happen to have a little poster that helps illustrate that, Mr. Speaker.

This poster illustrates the universe of the 47 million uninsured. It says that the uninsured are not all the same and you have to break it down. The 47 million number is not on here. The other poster that I had last week does. This data is produced by the Republican Conference in the United States Senate. Down that hallway, not out of this shop, but on their side. That is the source of it. This is 47 million. Now do we want to cover all of the people in this 47 million? We would believe that the 47 million are all middle and lower-middle class working families that are working for some—they want us to believe this, I don't believe it, that are working for some miserly employer that is pocketing the profits but won't provide health insurance for his employees.

First, I will say that many employers do. They do so to be competitive because they want a high-quality standard of people that will come to work for them. We all want the highest level we can, and so we want to pay as much money as we can and the best benefits as we can. The 47 million that are uninsured at any given time, that is a snapshot, Mr. Speaker, and aren't comprised 100 percent of the middle- and lower-income working poor. To some degree they are, but we start with 47 million and we start to subtract.

First, those who are in the United States illegally, this chart says undocumented, noncitizens. Those are illegal aliens in the United States. This chart says 6 million. The other data I was looking at which comes from the Senate Conference is 5.2 million. In any case, the next level of immigrants here are noncitizens who may not be eligible for government-sponsored health care. They are probably not eligible because the law in the United States, if you come to the United States, you are barred for 5 years from receiving welfare benefits. We don't want to be a magnet for people who come in here and see the United States as just a giant ATM that they can cash in on. So this is 4 million. In any case, the old chart was 5 million. So we are at 10 million people. We don't want to cover this. We don't want to reward illegals to come to the United States and cash in on ObamaCare. We would rather say to them, why don't you wake up in your home country and go build the economy in your own nation or get in line and do it the legal way behind the people who are in line waiting to come in the legal way right now.

□ 1800

So we have 10 million people of immigrants that don't qualify. They're part of the 47 million. Then we have, of the

people that are earning over \$75,000 a year, we have 9 million of those. They could presumably find a way to write a check and take care of their own premiums.

Then we have those eligible for government programs but are not enrolled. Generally, that's those eligible for Medicaid that didn't bother to sign up. That says 10. It's 9.7 million. We've got to split a couple hairs here because we're going to get down to decimal point, Mr. Speaker.

Also, of those that we don't want to insure—at least I don't—are those eligible for employer-sponsored insurance but not enrolled in it. They turned down their employer's policy or didn't bother to sign up. That's 6 million.

So, of 47 million—and when I say I don't want to insure them, I think that they should take their own responsibility to do that. They have affordable options or they're disqualified because they're illegally in the United States or barred by law.

Those left, the Americans without affordable options, aren't 47 million. They're 12.1 million people. Now, that's still a lot, but it's less than 4 percent of the population. It's a little larger than the population of Iowa. But here they are right here in orange.

Now, there's one more point to make. Out of these 12.1 million people, the Americans without affordable options, what the people who are proposing ObamaCare would like you to believe is 47 million and a crisis now become a little sliver of the American society, and I'll show you how.

This is the population of the United States, Mr. Speaker. This bluish circle represents about 306 million, perhaps as many as 307 million Americans. These people that are in—well, all this whole circle does. This big chunk of the pie, the blue chunk of the pie, represents 84 percent of the population. Those are the Americans that are covered by a plan, whether it's a private plan, employer-provided plan, Medicaid and Medicare. Americans that are covered by a plan, 84 percent of the population. Sixteen percent are not. The number is around 15.5 when you start splitting the hairs.

But here are the categories that they come in. Yellow are the illegal immigrants. Now, we already know that the President has said even that he's not going to support funding illegals in the health insurance exchange. It's pretty interesting. It really did infuriate a lot of the open borders people in the country. But the President has said so, and we're going to hold him to his words that we're not going to fund illegals.

Another 2 percent of those are under the 5-year bar. That's the black. Those are legal immigrants that are barred by law. Now we're at 4 percent. Here's 3 percent, which are individuals earning more than \$75,000 that didn't take the trouble to get insured.

And here's another 3 percent in green. Those are those that are eligible for the government programs. These

are the Medicaid eligibles, for the most part, that didn't bother to sign up. And in blue are those eligible for employer-sponsored, those 6 million, but they didn't bother to sign up or they opted out.

So when we look at this chart, we're trying—I think this is where the bipartisan outreach comes in. We're trying to fix a problem of the Americans without affordable options who are not insured and they don't really have an option, affordable option. That's that orange. That's the less than 4 percent that I mentioned when you start to subtract the others.

So think of this chart as everything but the orange is covered in one way or another or else they can take care of themselves and are, by law, with the case of illegal immigrants, required to do so. We're only down to this original sliver, less than 4 percent of the population.

Now I will submit, Mr. Speaker, that this bill, this jelly bean chart, H.R. 3200, scare-the-living-daylights-out-of-someone-in-technicolor chart right here is designed to completely transform 100 percent of the health insurance that exists today in the United States and 100 percent of the health care delivery system in the United States, the best system in the world being transformed completely by H.R. 3200. Thirty-one new agencies and a new health choices insurance czar who would write regulations and wipe out a lot of health insurance in America, all of that, a hundred percent transformation by this flowchart bill, to address this little less than 4 percent of Americans without affordable choices.

Mr. Speaker, I will submit that that is a radical approach to a problem that isn't nearly as bad as the people who want to have a socialized medicine plan would like to have the American people believe. And I'm going to list the things that the Republicans want to do about it, and then I want to yield to the gentlelady from Minnesota.

We want tort reform on this side of the aisle. We're not on the side of the trial lawyers. We want people to buy health insurance across State lines everywhere in America. We want portability so you can take your policy with you.

We want to expand health savings accounts so they can become retirement accounts if you have a healthy life and you manage your health. We want to have full deductibility for everybody's health insurance premium. We want electronic medical records with protection of people's integrity of their record so it doesn't leak out.

We want to have expansion of associated health insurance policies so groups of professionals can join together to buy insurance. And we want transparency in billing so we can see who's charging who what. And, again, the consumer can make those decisions. And we need to also take a look at long-term care so people can manage their lives in a more efficient way.

That's what Republicans want to do. That's what I want to do. And now I want to do something else, and that is I'd love to yield to the gentlelady from Minnesota, MICHELE BACHMANN, who is always in here fighting for truth, justice, and the American way.

Mrs. BACHMANN. I must have my cape on. To the stunning gentleman from Iowa, the great STEVE KING, I want to thank you for allowing me to be a part of this discussion that you're broaching. And you've done a wonderful job all week on different occasions talking about the true depth of this problem and the positive alternatives.

I appreciate the fact that you've tried to lay context about truly how many people are in need of insurance and how many people are without coverage. That's a very important part. We can't make true decisions unless we actually have the facts on the table. And I'm also extremely grateful that you're trying to give a positive alternative.

We're looking at a couple different options here to deal with health care. One would be President Obama's option, and the option that's been offered here in the House with essentially about a trillion dollars of spending on health care, and in the Senate, with something like \$850 billion worth of health care from Senator BAUCUS that was just released.

Senator BAUCUS' plan so far has not engendered much bipartisan support. I think there's a reason for that. It's because of the tremendous tax burden on the middle class of the Senate plan, and I'm sure we'll be talking about that as we go forward.

But here's a part of our positive solution. We can have one plan that will burden future American taxpayers with trillions of dollars in unfunded mandates, trillions of dollars of spending, borrowing, taxing, and that is a burden as we go forward when our country can least afford it. Or, we can take an alternative that would free up our economy and give free choices to the American people and not add to the burden of our Treasury.

It's very simply this: As my colleague STEVE KING of Iowa has said, we want freedom for the American people. We want the American people individually to own their own health care. Just like they own car insurance, just like they own their house insurance, we don't want the government to own their insurance policy. We don't want the government to call the shots or have control over people's health care decisions, or their employer. We want people to own it individually.

Then, next, we want people to have the freedom to band together with whomever they prefer, whether it's Realtors or teachers or farmers or maybe a community, like a credit union. You come together in a geographic area. You join together with whomever you want to buy or purchase a policy. So you have purchasing power.

Next, we want people to have freedom to buy any policy they want, any-

where they want in the country, from anyone they want to purchase the policy from. True choice in purchasing insurance.

Then, as my colleague STEVE KING said, we want people to be able to set aside in an account, whether it's \$5,000 a year or \$10,000 a year or \$15,000 a year, tax free. In other words, you take that money out of your earnings or out of your savings and you put it tax free in an account up to a certain amount.

If you spend more than that account, then you can deduct those health care savings off of your income tax return. That would include eyeglasses, dental work, hearing aids, chiropractic care. Whatever your health care would be, you get to fully deduct that.

Finally, we want lawsuit reform so that we don't have unnecessary spending so that doctors can try to protect themselves from frivolous lawsuits.

These are very simple, commonsense solutions. And you notice not one of these solutions requires a vast infusion of Federal tax money. That's because it's called freedom. That's the American way. And that will solve about 95 percent of our health care problems.

Will we need a government supported safety net? Always. We will always have one because there will always be people who, through no fault of their own, have physical conditions that won't allow them to work, that won't allow them to be able to pay their premiums or pay for their health care. We can afford—and we must pay for those people. But for the vast, overwhelming majority of people we can make health care affordable. That's why the proposal that was just offered by Senator BAUCUS is so concerning on the Senate side.

Congressman STEVE KING has made an excellent case against the House measure, H.R. 3200, and he made an excellent case why this option is so expensive and so burdensome on the individual. The reason why the Senate plan is equally negative in our eyes is for this reason.

I take this out of the Wall Street Journal. It said: The centerpiece of the Obama-Baucus plan—because, remember, it was just a week ago here in this Chamber when President Obama essentially backed the Senator BAUCUS version of the health care plan.

But this is what the Wall Street Journal has to say today: The centerpiece of the Obama-Baucus plan is a decree that everyone purchase heavily regulated insurance policies or pay a penalty.

Now, imagine that. I don't even think this survives a test of constitutionality. The Federal Government would make the American people purchase a product or service that people don't want to buy, and the government would fine them and tax them with penalty of going to jail if they don't buy the product or service that the government tells them they have to buy.

Think of how incredible this is. The enforcement of this mandated, brute

force health care policy would be enforced by the Internal Revenue Service. So we would be forced to buy services and products we don't want to buy at a cost we can't afford, and the Internal Revenue Service would be the enforcement mechanism.

This is not what the American people want to have, which is why the Republicans' positive alternative makes so much sense. You own it, you band together with anyone you want to purchase in any amount of policy from anyone you want, anywhere you want, with tax-free money or money that you deduct on your income tax policy, and then we have lawsuit reform.

I think it's a great alternative, and I yield back to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentlelady from Minnesota. I couldn't have asked for a better composite rendition of what we're looking at here from the health care industry and what's being driven on one side of the aisle versus that of the other and the choices that we have and the options that are there.

I think, Mr. Speaker, the things are that are not considered are that good ideas don't get debated when the wrong people hold the gavel, and I'm not speaking of you. I know my time has run out.

I appreciate your indulgence, the gentlelady from Minnesota, and I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. COSTA (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. WOOLSEY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. EDWARDS of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HEINRICH, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GRAYSON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SCHIFF, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SOUDER) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. POE of Texas, for 5 minutes, September 24.

Mr. JONES, for 5 minutes, September 24.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, September 22, 23 and 24.

Mr. SOUDER, for 5 minutes, today and September 22.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's

table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1677. An act to reauthorize the Defense Production Act of 1950, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 13 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, September 21, 2009, at 4 p.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3459. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of Defense, transmitting (Transmittal No. 09-32) pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3460. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of Defense, transmitting (Transmittal No. 09-43) pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3461. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of Defense, transmitting (Transmittal No. 09-40) pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3462. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of Defense, transmitting (Transmittal No. 09-25) pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3463. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of Defense, transmitting (Trans. No. DDTC 66-09) of a proposed sale or export of defense articles to a Middle East country, pursuant to Sec. 201 of P.L. 110-429; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3464. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of Defense, transmitting report pursuant to Section 36(a) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3465. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Hwy 90 Bridge, Biloxi/Ocean Springs, MS [COTP Mobile-07-022] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3466. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; GICW MM220 to Brooks Bridge, Fort Walton Beach, FL [COTP Mobile-07-023] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3467. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; HWY 90 Bridge, Biloxi/Ocean Springs, MS [COTP Mobile-07-024] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5

U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3468. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; HWY 90 Bridge, Biloxi/Ocean Springs, MS [COTP Mobile-07-025] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3469. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Marathon Super Boat Grand Prix, Marathon, FL [COTP Key West 07-015] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3470. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; USS Spiegel Grove Dive Site, Atlantic Ocean off Key Largo, FL [COTP Key West 07-063] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3471. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Off the Coast of Vandenberg Air Force Base, Pacific Ocean, CA [COTP LA-LB 07-001] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3472. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Pier 239/76 to the Vincent Thomas Bridge, Port of Los Angeles, CA [COTP LA-LB 07-009] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3473. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Lower Mississippi River (LMR), Mile Marker 520 to 303 [COTP Lower Mississippi River-07-001] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3474. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Lower Mississippi River (LMR), Mile Marker 440 to Mile Marker 422, Vicksburg, MS [COTP Lower Mississippi River-07-002] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3475. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Lower Mississippi River (LMR), Mile Marker 364 to Mile Marker 362, Natchez, MS [COTP Lower Mississippi River-07-004] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3476. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Lower Mississippi River (LMR), Mile Marker 440 to Mile Marker 409.5, Vicksburg, MS [COTP Lower Mississippi River-07-005] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3477. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety

Zone; Lower Mississippi River, Mile Marker 438.0 to 303.0 [COTP Lower Mississippi River-07-006] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3478. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Columbia Drawbridge, Mile 110.2 Ouachita-Black Waterway [COTP Lower Mississippi River-07-010] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3479. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Lower Mississippi River, MM 649.5 to 650.5, Westover Bend [COTP Lower Mississippi River-07-011] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3480. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Neptune Florida Yacht Club Blessing of the Fleet, Intracoastal Waterway, Lummus Island Cut, Government Cut, and Meloy Channel, Miami, FL [COTP MIAMI 07-004] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3481. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Point O'Woods Fire Company Fireworks, Great South Bay, Point O'Woods, NY [CGD01-07-087] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3482. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Nahant 4th of July Fireworks — Nahant, Massachusetts [CGD01-0-083] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3483. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Nahant 4th of July Fireworks — Nahant, Massachusetts [CGD01-07-083] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3484. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Stars Over the Bay Fireworks, Bellport, NY [CGD01-07-081] (RIN: 125-AA00) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3485. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; South Portland, Maine, Gulf Blasting Project [CGD01-07-033] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3486. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Cape Fear River, New Hanover County, Wilmington, North Carolina [CGD05-07-036] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3487. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety

Zone; Jupiter Island Club Fireworks Display, Hobe Sound, Florida [COTP Miami 07-020] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3488. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Manasquan River, Manasquan, New Jersey [CGD05-07-041] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3489. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Biscayne Bay Yacht Racing Association Cruising Races, Biscayne Bay, Miami, FL [COTP MIAMI 07-032] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3490. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special local Regulations for Marine events; Mill Creek, Fort Monroe, Hampton, Virginia [Docket No.: CGD05-07-044] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3491. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Biscayne Bay Yacht Racing Association Cruising and Full Moon Races, Biscayne Bay, Miami, FL [COTP MIAMI 07-034] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3492. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Security Zone; Queen of England Visit, Jamestown Island, VA [CGD05-07-054] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3493. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Jaguar Mid-Winter Regatta Regatta, Biscayne Bay & Intracoastal Waterway, Miami, FL [COTP MIAMI 07-040] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3494. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Langley Air Force Base, Back River, Hampton, Virginia [CGD05-07-057] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3495. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Bacardi Cup Regatta, Biscayne Bay & Intracoastal Waterway, Miami, FL [COTP MIAMI 07-041] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3496. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Founders Day, Chesapeake Bay, Hampton, VA [CCGD05-07-064] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3497. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Potomac River, Washington Channel,

Washington, DC [Docket No.: CGD05-07-067] (RIN: 1625-AA87) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3498. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Patapsco River, Curtis Creek, Baltimore, MD [CGD05-07-068] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3499. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; 30th Annual Virginia Lake Festival, John R. Kerr Lake, Clarksville, VA [CGD05-07-073] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3500. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Potomac River, Liverpool Point to Goose Bay, Charles County, MD [CGD05-07-076] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3501. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Security Zone; Severn River and College Creek, Annapolis, MD [Docket No.: CGD05-07-078] (RIN: 1625-AA87) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3502. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Chesapeake Bay, Cape Charles Harbor, Cape Charles, Virginia [Docket No.: CGD05-07-079] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3503. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Security Zone; M/V Odyssey III, Global Air Chiefs Conference, Upper Potomac River, Washington, DC [Docket No.: CGD05-07-080] (RIN: 1625-AA87) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3504. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Hopewell Celebration 2007, Appomattox River, Hopewell, VA [CCGD05-07-082] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3505. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Atlantic Ocean, Virginia Beach, Virginia [Docket No.: CGD-05-07-086] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3506. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Chesapeake and Delaware Canal, MD [CGD05-07-091] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3507. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Biscayne Bay Yacht Racing Associa-

tion Full Moon Races, Biscayne Bay, Miami FL [COTP MIAMI 07-103] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3508. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone on the waters of the Newport River and Morehead City Turning Basin [CGD05-07-096] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3509. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Potomac River, Alexandria Channel, DC [CGD05-07-097] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3510. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Security Zones; M/V Semper Fidelis III, Chesapeake Bay and its tributaries, MD and San Domingo Creek, Talbot County, MD [CGD05-07-102] (RIN: 1625-AA87) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3511. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Security Zone; APM Terminal, Portsmouth, VA [CGD05-07-103] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3512. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Security Zone; Presidential Visit, Key Biscayne, Florida [COTP Miami, Florida 07-109] (RIN: 1625-AA87) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3513. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Live-Fire Gun Exercise, Atlantic Ocean, Miami, Florida [COTP MIAMI, Florida 07-133] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3514. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; USS Harry S. Truman Visit, offshore Port Everglades, Florida [COTP MIAMI 07-167] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3515. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Live-Fire Gun Exercise, Atlantic Ocean, Fort Lauderdale and Miami, Florida [COTP Miami, Florida 07-178] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3516. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Live-Fire Gun Exercise, Atlantic Ocean, Fort Lauderdale, Florida [COTP Miami, Florida 07-179] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3517. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Gulf Intracoastal Waterway MM161 to

MM163, bank to bank [COTP Morgan City-07-001] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3518. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Bayou Lafourche, from Valentine, Louisiana to Ludeville, Louisiana, bank to bank [COTP Morgan City-07-003] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3519. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; 200 yards north to 200 yards south of the Bayou Boeuf Swing Bridge at Mile Marker 2.0 of the Morgan City Port Allen Landside Route, bank to bank, Amelia, LA [COTP Morgan City-07-004] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3520. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Biloxi Ship Channel, Biloxi, MS [COTP Mobile-07-003] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3521. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Gulf of Mexico off of Orange Beach, AL [COTP Mobile-07-009] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3522. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Gulf of Mexico, Pensacola Beach, FL [COTP Mobile-07-014] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3523. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Mobile Ship Channel from Mid Bay Light House to Channel Marker 37, Mobile, AL [COTP Mobile-07-018] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3524. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Hwy 90 Bridge, Biloxi/Ocean Springs, MS [COTP Mobile-07-019] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3525. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Austal Barge, Chickasaw Creek, AL to Austal Shipyard, Mobile, AL [COTP Mobile-07-021] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3526. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Tonawanda/North Tonawanda Fireworks Display, Niagara River, Tonawanda, NY [CGD09-07-075] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3527. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Lake Erie, Ohio. Lakeview Park Lo-

rain Sprint International Triathlon [CGD09-07-086] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 11, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3528. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Roar on the Shore Fireworks, Lake Eire, Eire, PA [CGD09-07-096] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. RANGEL (for himself, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. KIND, Mr. JONES, Mr. KAGEN, Mr. STARK, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. TANNER, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. YARMUTH, and Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida):

H.R. 3590. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the first-time homebuyers credit in the case of members of the Armed Forces and certain other Federal employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CUMMINGS (for himself, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. WATSON, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Ms. WATERS, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, and Mr. WATT):

H.R. 3591. A bill to establish a grant program to enhance existing secondary education programs for the purpose of teaching high school students about the Constitution of the United States and the constitutions of the individual States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PASCRELL (for himself, Mr. REICHTER, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas):

H.R. 3592. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a tax credit for producing oil from recycled waste; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ROYCE (for himself and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN):

H.R. 3593. A bill to amend the United States International Broadcasting Act of 1994 to extend by one year the operation of Radio Free Asia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BACHUS (for himself, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. LEE of New York, Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. JONES, Mrs. BACHMANN, and Mr. PAULSEN):

H.R. 3594. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to delegate management authority over troubled assets purchased under the Troubled Asset Relief Program, to require the establishment of a trust to manage assets of certain designated TARP recipi-

ents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey:

H.R. 3595. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reduce the Federal tax on fuels by the amount of any increase in the rate of tax on such fuel by the States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CONYERS (for himself, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, and Ms. DEGETTE):

H.R. 3596. A bill to ensure that health insurance issuers and medical malpractice insurance issuers cannot engage in price fixing, bid rigging, or market allocations to the detriment of competition and consumers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEFAZIO (for himself, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. WEINER, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. SABLAN):

H.R. 3597. A bill to extend certain economic recovery payments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Veterans' Affairs, and Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GORDON of Tennessee:

H.R. 3598. A bill to ensure consideration of water intensity in the Department of Energy's energy research, development, and demonstration programs to help guarantee efficient, reliable, and sustainable delivery of energy and water resources; to the Committee on Science and Technology.

By Mr. CLEAVER (for himself and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts):

H.R. 3599. A bill to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to provide for deposit restricted qualified tuition programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. CLEAVER:

H.R. 3600. A bill to prohibit the sale and counterfeiting of Presidential inaugural tickets; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. LOWEY:

H.R. 3601. A bill to amend the Credit CARD Act of 2009 to provide an earlier effective date, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mrs. MALONEY:

H.R. 3602. A bill to allow certain newspapers to be treated as described in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and exempt from tax under section 501(a) of such Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MARSHALL:

H.R. 3603. A bill to rename the Ocmulgee National Monument; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. NADLER of New York (for himself, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. FILNER, Mr. WEINER, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. STARK, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. GUTIERREZ, and Mr. ENGEL):

H.R. 3604. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to exempt certain elderly persons from demonstrating an understanding of the English language and the history, principles, and form of government of the United States as a requirement for naturalization, and to permit certain other elderly persons to take the history and government examination in a language of their choice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY (for himself and Mr. PUTNAM):

H.R. 3605. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to authorize States to issue special permits to allow the operation of vehicles of up to 95,000 pounds on Interstate System highways for the hauling of livestock; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. WELCH:

H.R. 3606. A bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act to make a technical correction to an amendment made by the Credit CARD Act of 2009; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BROUN of Georgia (for himself, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. HERGER, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. AKIN, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. PENCE, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. FORBES, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. HARPER, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. LINDER, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. HELLER, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. KLINE of Minnesota, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and Mr. PRICE of Georgia):

H. Res. 748. A resolution recognizing the importance of the property rights granted by the United States Constitution; affirming the duty of each Member of this body to support and defend such rights; and asserting that no public body should unlawfully obtain the property of any citizen of the United States for the benefit of another private citizen or corporation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN (for herself, Mr. PENCE, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. MACK, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. TIAHRT, and Mr. SCHOCK):

H. Res. 749. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding the November 29, 2009, elections in Honduras; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MCDERMOTT (for himself, Mr. DICKS, Mr. BAIRD, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. COHEN, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, and Mr. HONDA):

H. Res. 750. A resolution congratulating Ichiro Suzuki, outfielder for the Seattle Mariners, for becoming the first player in the history of Major League Baseball with at least 200 base hits in nine consecutive seasons; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. CHANDLER:

H. Res. 751. A resolution encouraging States to adopt laws that set clear guidelines for contact protocols for personal emergency response systems used by the Nation's senior citizens; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. HALVORSON (for herself, Mr. HARE, Ms. BEAN, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. FOSTER, and Mr. COSTELLO):

H. Res. 752. A resolution recognizing the tragic loss of life that occurred at the Cherry Mine in Cherry, Illinois, on its 100th anniversary and the contributions to worker and mine safety that resulted from this and other disasters; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HINCHEY (for himself, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. MASSA, Ms. SLAUGH-

TER, Mr. HALL of New York, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. MURPHY of New York):

H. Res. 753. A resolution honoring the Hudson River School painters for their contributions to the United States; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. HOLDEN (for himself, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. DENT, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. ALTMIRE, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mrs. DAHLKEMPER, Mr. PITTS, Mr. SESTAK, and Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania):

H. Res. 754. A resolution honoring the citizen-soldiers of the National Guard of the State of Pennsylvania, including the 56th Brigade Combat Team (Stryker) of the Pennsylvania Army National Guard on its return to the United States from deployment in Iraq; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MCMAHON (for himself and Mr. ROONEY):

H. Res. 755. A resolution celebrating the 30th anniversary of the creation of the Office of Special Investigations of the Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUPPERSBERGER (for himself and Mr. SOUDER):

H. Res. 756. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of Red Ribbon Week; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 13: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
 H.R. 16: Mr. COHEN.
 H.R. 208: Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. HONDA, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. MARKEY of Colorado, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. LATTA, Mr. MINNICK, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. BOCCIERI, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. ARCURI, Mr. INGLIS, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. HIMES, Mr. HODES, and Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee.
 H.R. 219: Mr. MARSHALL.
 H.R. 233: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
 H.R. 272: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
 H.R. 275: Mrs. MYRICK and Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin.
 H.R. 333: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
 H.R. 413: Mrs. DAHLKEMPER, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. HOLDEN, and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.
 H.R. 422: Mr. HODES.
 H.R. 444: Mr. NADLER of New York.
 H.R. 450: Mr. GINGREY of Georgia.
 H.R. 571: Mr. WELCH.
 H.R. 621: Mr. COHEN.
 H.R. 653: Mrs. CAPPS.
 H.R. 678: Mr. LATHAM.
 H.R. 690: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
 H.R. 775: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. KRATOVIL, Mr. DOGGETT, and Mr. HODES.
 H.R. 783: Mr. HODES.
 H.R. 836: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.
 H.R. 932: Mr. CONYERS, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. SESTAK, and Mr. DRIEHAUS.
 H.R. 948: Mr. COHEN.
 H.R. 953: Mr. INGLIS.
 H.R. 977: Mr. COHEN.
 H.R. 1079: Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. PAULSEN, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, and Mr. ROGERS of Alabama.

H.R. 1086: Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. CHAFFETZ, and Mr. KINGSTON.

H.R. 1132: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. BOREN, Mr. COURTNEY, Mrs. DAHLKEMPER, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, and Mr. PAULSEN.

H.R. 1182: Mr. PETERSON, Mr. INGLIS, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. FORBES, Mr. HIMES, and Mr. LOBIONDO.

H.R. 1194: Mr. TOWNS, Ms. BERKLEY, and Mr. CAO.

H.R. 1203: Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. HEINRICH, and Mr. PRICE of Georgia.

H.R. 1207: Mr. NYE.

H.R. 1229: Mr. GERLACH.

H.R. 1250: Mr. POSEY.

H.R. 1283: Mr. KAGEN, Mr. MCNERNEY, and Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.

H.R. 1346: Ms. TITUS.

H.R. 1402: Mr. MOORE of Kansas.

H.R. 1454: Mr. MINNICK.

H.R. 1507: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 1549: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. SESTAK, Mr. COHEN, and Ms. DEGETTE.

H.R. 1570: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

H.R. 1585: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania and Mr. ROE of Tennessee.

H.R. 1587: Mr. SHIMKUS and Mr. MINNICK.

H.R. 1623: Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California.

H.R. 1670: Ms. BEAN.

H.R. 1695: Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. GRIFFITH, and Mr. TIBERI.

H.R. 1706: Mr. WATT.

H.R. 1799: Mr. BISHOP of Utah.

H.R. 1826: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 1829: Mr. BROWN of South Carolina and Mr. LARSEN of Washington.

H.R. 1864: Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. FILNER, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. GRIFFITH, and Mr. ROE of Tennessee.

H.R. 1970: Mr. MELANCON.

H.R. 1987: Ms. BORDALLO and Mr. PETERSON.

H.R. 2000: Mrs. DAVIS of California.

H.R. 2006: Ms. WOOLSEY and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

H.R. 2137: Mr. PLATTS.

H.R. 2139: Ms. KAPTUR and Mr. STARK.

H.R. 2194: Mr. CLAY, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. TONKO, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. MATHESON, and Mr. MURPHY of New York.

H.R. 2195: Ms. KILROY.

H.R. 2266: Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut.

H.R. 2267: Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Mr. CLAY, and Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 2279: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 2299: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. RICHARDSON, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, and Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 2373: Mr. ELLSWORTH and Mr. FORBES.

H.R. 2378: Ms. DELAURO.

H.R. 2429: Mr. BRIGHT.

H.R. 2446: Mr. BOSWELL.

H.R. 2452: Mr. WILSON of Ohio and Ms. KILROY.

H.R. 2485: Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. WU, and Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey.

H.R. 2555: Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 2584: Mr. PENCE, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. THORNBERRY, Ms. KILROY, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. BARROW, and Mr. CAMPBELL.

H.R. 2607: Mr. DENT.

H.R. 2639: Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN.

H.R. 2708: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 2746: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. SESTAK, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. BOCCIERI, Mr. KAGEN, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, and Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 2766: Mr. HALL of New York.

H.R. 2782: Mr. BOCCIERI and Mr. WILSON of Ohio.

H.R. 2801: Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. PAUL, and Mr. GRIFFITH.

H.R. 2894: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.

H.R. 2909: Mr. MCGOVERN.

- H.R. 2932: Ms. FUDGE, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.
- H.R. 2935: Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. KRATOVIL, and Mr. BOREN.
- H.R. 2941: Mr. HALL of New York.
- H.R. 3007: Ms. KAPTUR and Mr. MASSA.
- H.R. 3012: Mr. MAFFEL.
- H.R. 3017: Mr. HINCHEY and Mr. SABLAN.
- H.R. 3044: Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. WALDEN, and Mr. BERRY.
- H.R. 3101: Mr. STARK, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, and Mr. TOWNS.
- H.R. 3105: Mr. MCKEON.
- H.R. 3184: Mr. SESTAK.
- H.R. 3212: Mr. MOORE of Kansas.
- H.R. 3217: Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California and Ms. GRANGER.
- H.R. 3226: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. INGLIS, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. BARTON of Texas, and Mrs. CAPITO.
- H.R. 3227: Mr. MCGOVERN.
- H.R. 3238: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
- H.R. 3250: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York and Mr. MCMAHON.
- H.R. 3255: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
- H.R. 3266: Mr. NYE.
- H.R. 3284: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
- H.R. 3307: Mr. POSEY.
- H.R. 3308: Mr. MATHESON and Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania.
- H.R. 3324: Mr. SNYDER.
- H.R. 3337: Mr. SCHRADER.
- H.R. 3340: Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN.
- H.R. 3355: Mr. SESTAK and Mr. FILNER.
- H.R. 3381: Mr. BISHOP of New York.
- H.R. 3383: Mr. BISHOP of Utah.
- H.R. 3400: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.
- H.R. 3407: Mr. PETERSON.
- H.R. 3421: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.
- H.R. 3438: Mr. AUSTRIA.
- H.R. 3458: Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. SESTAK, and Ms. WOOLSEY.
- H.R. 3472: Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mrs. HALVORSON, Ms. BEAN, and Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.
- H.R. 3502: Ms. SLAUGHTER.
- H.R. 3508: Mr. MARCHANT and Mr. SESSIONS.
- H.R. 3510: Mr. SESTAK, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. MEEKS of New York.
- H.R. 3519: Mr. CARTER, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, and Ms. WOOLSEY.
- H.R. 3548: Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. HINCHEY, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.
- H.R. 3549: Ms. SHEA-PORTER and Mr. PALLONE.
- H.R. 3553: Mr. LUJÁN.
- H.R. 3554: Ms. TSONGAS and Mr. PETERSON.
- H.R. 3567: Mr. LUJÁN and Mr. SARBANES.
- H.R. 3569: Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. BRADY of Texas, and Mr. SHIMKUS.
- H.R. 3571: Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. PITTS, Mr. REHBERG, Mr. BARTON of Texas, and Mr. FORBES.
- H.J. Res. 47: Mr. LANCE and Mr. JORDAN of Ohio.
- H. Con. Res. 49: Mr. BAIRD.
- H. Con. Res. 98: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.
- H. Con. Res. 151: Mr. INGLIS and Mr. COHEN.
- H. Con. Res. 158: Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. REYES, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. CHILDERS, Mrs. EMERSON, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. SERRANO, and Mr. CONYERS.
- H. Con. Res. 160: Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Mr. COHEN, and Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN.
- H. Con. Res. 168: Mr. MCDERMOTT.
- H. Con. Res. 169: Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. BOOZMAN, and Mr. SOUDER.
- H. Con. Res. 170: Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. COBLE, and Mr. NYE.
- H. Con. Res. 181: Mr. ROGERS of Michigan and Ms. KAPTUR.
- H. Con. Res. 183: Mr. CARTER, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. BERRY, and Mr. BARTON of Texas.
- H. Con. Res. 185: Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mr. SENSENBRENNER.
- H. Con. Res. 186: Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. HARE, Mr. MASSA, Mr. KISSELL, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. VISCLOSKY, Mr. BERRY, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Mrs. CAPPES, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. SALAZAR, Mr. SIRE, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. BARROW, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. WALZ, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. RUSH, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. WATT, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. CLAY, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. COHEN, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. WATSON, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. CLARKE, Mrs. HALVORSON, Ms. WATERS, and Mr. GUTIERREZ.
- H. Res. 22: Mr. HALL of New York.
- H. Res. 55: Mr. COBLE, Mr. DENT, Mr. MCHENRY, and Mr. MORAN of Virginia.
- H. Res. 150: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.
- H. Res. 167: Mr. MCINTYRE and Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey.
- H. Res. 291: Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. PETERSON, and Mr. COOPER.
- H. Res. 568: Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BILBRAY, and Mr. SOUDER.
- H. Res. 577: Mr. KLEIN of Florida and Mr. SHIMKUS.
- H. Res. 581: Mr. BONNER, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. ADERHOLT, and Mr. KING of Iowa.
- H. Res. 615: Mr. LANCE.
- H. Res. 627: Mr. BOREN.
- H. Res. 684: Ms. RICHARDSON and Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.
- H. Res. 692: Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. WELCH, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. MAFFEL, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. MINNICK, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. BACA, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. BERRY, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Ms. KILROY.
- H. Res. 709: Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. BARROW, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. COOPER, Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. LOEBACK, and Ms. PINGREE of Maine.
- H. Res. 729: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.
- H. Res. 731: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.
- H. Res. 733: Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. HONDA, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. SULLIVAN, and Mr. HARPER.
- H. Res. 734: Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. MACK, and Mr. KLINE of Minnesota.
- H. Res. 739: Mr. MASSA, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. ROSS, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, and Mr. ELLISON.
- H. Res. 740: Mr. CARNEY, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. PUTNAM, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. CHILDERS, Mr. INGLIS, Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, and Mr. BOUCHER.
- H. Res. 743: Mr. HODES, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. WELCH, Mr. HARE, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. MCMAHON, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. YARMUTH, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. WU, Mr. KAGEN, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, and Ms. SUTTON.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 3226: Mr. CLAY.