

According to a preliminary estimate by the Congressional Budget Office, the Pelosi health care plan includes more than \$1 trillion in new Federal spending on health care over the next 10 years. And when one looks past the budget gimmicks, the reality is the Pelosi health care plan will cost taxpayers roughly \$1.3 trillion and create 111 new bureaucracies.

This is not the kind of responsible health care reform the American people want. It's time for Speaker PELOSI to dump her budget-buster plan masquerading as health care reform and start over.

House Republicans have a plan for health care reform that will lower costs and provide greater access to affordable health care for all Americans. That's what the American people want.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3639, EXPEDITED CARD REFORM FOR CONSUMERS ACT OF 2009

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 884 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 884

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3639) to amend the Credit Card Accountability Responsibility and Disclosure Act of 2009 to establish an earlier effective date for various consumer protections, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Financial Services now printed in the bill, modified by the amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as the original bill for the purpose of further amendment under the five-minute rule and shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. Notwithstanding clause 11 of rule XVIII, no further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules. Each further amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such further amend-

ments are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill, as amended, to the House with such further amendments as may have been adopted. In the case of sundry further amendments reported from the Committee, the question of their adoption shall be put to the House en gros and without division of the question. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. The Chair may entertain a motion that the Committee rise only if offered by the chair of the Committee on Financial Services or his designee. The Chair may not entertain a motion to strike out the enacting words of the bill (as described in clause 9 of rule XVIII).

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOLDEN). The gentleman from Colorado is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX), and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PERLMUTTER. I ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 884.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 884 provides for consideration of H.R. 3639, the Expedited CARD Reform for Consumers Act of 2009, under a structured rule. The rule self-executes an amendment to clarify that the accelerated effective date of December 1, 2009, will apply only to those provisions of the Credit Card Act that deal directly with credit cards and currently have an effective date on or after February 22, 2010.

The amendment also provides that the accelerated effective dates are not applicable to any credit card issuer which is a depository institution with fewer than 2 million credit cards in circulation as of the date of the enactment of the bill.

This rule makes in order five amendments printed in the Rules Committee report. The amendments are each debatable for 10 minutes. The rule provides for one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, earlier this year, Congress passed and the President signed into law the Credit Card Accountability Responsibility and Disclosure Act, the CARD Act for short. This legislation ordered important new rules to credit card issuers to end unfair, exploitive, and sharp practices, and to protect consumers against the tide of arbitrary rate hikes, spiking fees, and hidden charges.

□ 1030

The bill moved to end double-cycle billing, universal default and over-the-limit fees.

We passed this bill to give Americans a fair shake. The CARD Act marked a broad overhaul in the way credit card companies do business, and I acknowledge some of these changes require no small measure of time and resources to implement. Indeed, many lenders have made an honest effort to come into compliance with these new rules.

However, Mr. Speaker, the reason I stand here today is that some lenders have not used this interim period in such good faith. Since the CARD Act was signed into law, instead of preparing to implement these consumer protection provisions, some credit card companies have raised interest rates and have decreased credit limits on their consumers in advance of the effective dates. Responsible cardholders who have regularly met monthly obligations have seen their minimum payments and interest rates arbitrarily double and triple. They are finding their credit limits slashed, and they're hit with new and hidden fees. To many consumers, this is a slap in the face, and it is a violation of the spirit of the law designed to protect them. This has now unfairly increased the financial burdens on Americans in already difficult times.

Card issuers' actions highlight the need for protections under the CARD Act now more than ever. The credit card industry requires its cardholders to act responsibly, and it holds them accountable. It is in fairness that we require card issuers to act with the same level of responsibility and accountability.

H.R. 3639 would accelerate the implementation of certain provisions in existing law related to regulations and operations of the credit card companies. The CARD Act has set deadlines for implementing various reforms and procedures, with most of those measures scheduled to take effect in February and in August of 2010. This bill would move those effective dates forward to December 1, 2009.

American consumers don't need protection next year. They need it now, so I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the rule and in favor of the underlying bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I thank my colleague from Colorado for yielding time for us.

Mr. Speaker, this rule provides for the consideration of a wholly unnecessary and potentially destructive bill that could further aggravate the struggles of small businesses and families who are suffering from an unavailability of credit during these times of economic uncertainty.

Here we are on the 4th of November, and the majority thinks that this bill is going to be passed in time to move this date up to December 1. It's totally unrealistic in addition to all the other comments that I'm going to make.

H.R. 3639 would accelerate the implementation of H.R. 627, the Credit Card

Accountability Responsibility and Disclosure Act of 2009, a bill that was signed into law earlier this year. I opposed the bill at that time because it took the wrong approach to addressing concerns with the credit card industry. The provisions it seeks to accelerate would impose unfunded private-sector Federal mandates, increased costs to borrowers; and it would limit the availability of credit to potential borrowers, which is just the opposite of what our colleagues think they are achieving.

These provisions are inappropriate in a credit card market that is fiercely competitive, and those who are concerned about the terms of their credit cards should rely on individual responsibility to become informed. Rather than taking the approach laid out in H.R. 627 and that which is accelerated by the bill before us today, consumers can always exercise the option of either avoiding carrying a balance or of shopping for a different credit card. Many people do not realize that credit cards were created to provide for a convenient form of payment for goods and services. They were not originally intended to serve as a loan system, which is how many people are using them now.

Mr. Speaker, I will urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the rule and to vote "no" on the underlying bill.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

I would say to my friend from North Carolina, in walking around the district in the suburbs of Denver, which I represent, or in doing a government at the grocery every other Saturday, a number of topics are raised. It could be the Middle East. It could be energy, health care, immigration; but always among the top five are credit cards and overdraft fees because so many people are affected by what turns out to be some sharp practices by some issuers. The purpose of the CARD Act is to stop those sharp practices.

Most of the issuers are diligent, thorough, responsible companies; but some are not. What we've seen in the interim is that those who are not have just continued to increase their prices, to increase the interest rates, and to take advantage of this interim period. It's that type of sharp practice, that irresponsible behavior, that we're trying to stop by expediting the date to December 1, 2009.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to my distinguished colleague from Illinois (Mr. ROSKAM).

Mr. ROSKAM. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule.

In a nutshell, I think we would be much better served and, ultimately, the public would have been much better served with an open rule. I have an amendment which, under an open rule,

I would have proposed. While all of this is very interesting—talking about credit card debt and those protections—and while you can have a conversation about that, the elephant in the room is this idea of national debt.

My amendment would have simply said that income tax return forms would have been amended to have four lines on them as follows: Number one, the taxpayer's dependent shares of the national debt; the taxpayer family's share of the national debt; how much each individual's share of the national debt increased in the last year; and how much adjusted gross income would be required to meet the burden of that share in the national debt.

Here is where we are right now: this Congress and this administration have doubled the national debt in 5 years, and they will triple the national debt in 10 years. Why does that matter?

That matters because we are experiencing a feeling in this country that one generation is not passing on a legacy of prosperity to the next generation. In other words, one generation is actually stealing from the next generation. Why? Because of a lack of discipline that comes from this Chamber, a lack of discipline that says we're going to spend our way into prosperity.

What Americans understand, Mr. Speaker, is you cannot borrow and spend your way into prosperity. As to the idea that we're going to incur more and more and more debt, whether it's from a stimulus that has underperformed, whether it's on a bloated budget or whether it's on a health care bill that takes people's breath away, it's so costly, I think, by and large, Americans have said enough is enough.

So, towards that end, I rise in opposition to the rule. I think the rule is tone deaf, and it doesn't offer a larger conversation on debt.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. I yield myself so much time as I might consume.

Mr. Speaker, I always appreciate hearing from my friend from Illinois. He has a number of things he wants to talk about. The trouble is that nothing he has talked about has anything to do with the bill that's before the House today. It's completely outside the topic.

I would just say to my friend from Illinois that this country, by taking a tack under President Bush and a Republican Congress, to cut taxes, prosecuting two wars, and driving this country into an economic ditch is what we, the Democrats, are trying to build ourselves out of. It will take time, and it will take a lot of effort on the part of everyone, but he should not be so quick to blame, because the roots of this financial distress go back to the Republican Congress and to President Bush.

Now, coming back to the topic at hand, this is about credit cards and about abusive practices which hurt individual Americans. It's not some amorphous kind of question that we face. It's for people who are barely

making ends meet now, who have had good credit histories and who see their credit card interest rates rising three and four and five and six—and double sometimes—from what they were originally paying, through no fault of their own. This has got to stop.

So the purpose of the bill that is before the House today is to expedite the rules and regulations that were first passed by the House last May. It is to expedite them up to December 1, 2009.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Excuses. Excuses. Excuses. That's all we hear from the other side of the aisle. Blame. Blame. Blame. Don't take responsibility, blame George Bush. I think that's getting a little old with the American people. Excuses.

You know, this country was founded on the concept of individual freedom. That's what we were founded on and on taking responsibility. We are not in the business of blaming others, or we should not be. Our economy was doing really great until the Democrats took control of this House in 2007. You can look. We've got charts. We can show you that job growth was going on and that the economy was doing terrific. The Democrats take over, and all of a sudden everything starts going downhill.

You know, the people who take out credit cards are not having guns held to their heads. They take out the credit cards. If they don't like the rates of interest that they're paying, they should get other credit cards, but don't blame the credit card companies for extending credit to people who then are irresponsible.

All this Congress is doing is setting the example for this irresponsibility by, as my colleague from Illinois said, continuing to spend money we do not have. That is the crux of the argument. It is the largest deficit in the history of this country. In fact, it is larger than all the other deficits put together. This Congress is the example for those irresponsible people out there.

I want to talk a little bit about an article by Horace Cooper, which was printed in the May 15, 2009, issue of *Politico*, which gives the history and potential consequences of the bill before us, both of which are necessary in understanding the right approach to this issue, and I will be quoting Mr. Cooper for the next few minutes:

While most Americans take credit card use and ownership for granted, credit cards are a relatively new financial device coming in in only the past 50 years, but their widespread use is ample evidence of the value they bring to most Americans.

Their use started in the 1950s with the original Bank of America cards, which cardholders were able to use at multiple merchants. Notably, the entire balance would have to be paid off each month. Now there are more than 175 million credit card holders, and today, credit cards typically have revolving accounts, giving individual

users the ability to decide how much of their charges they wish to pay off each month.

Cooper continues by highlighting the consequences these new restrictions will have on financially vulnerable populations, stating: What the advocates of these reforms have failed to understand is that these changes will dramatically raise the costs of extending loans to cardholders and will cause the riskiest cardholders to be dropped all together, and that will hurt people in the urban community—and minorities most—because their income is lower than average.

Fees and rate hikes are among the means that credit card companies use to recoup the costs associated with credit card lending. Because credit card charges aren't secured, lenders can't seize your home or even the assets you've purchased. Credit card companies use interest rates and other fees as a way to offset the risks associated with a given cardholder.

A cap or limit on fees will cause credit card companies to limit their exposure, particularly to minorities in inner city areas, since those with low incomes are at a higher risk for default, but this won't help the rest of the credit card-holding public. Everyone will likely see lower credit lines and higher average interest rates, since these are now "forever" rates instead of adjustable ones, and shorter credit card activation periods, weeks instead of months of authorized credit use.

Particularly troubling is that even minorities, women and working class families with good records of paying their debts will see credit access dry up. This is especially bad during an economic downturn as it means that fewer new small businesses, which increasingly rely on credit cards, will start to bring more jobs and economic growth into the economy, and it will be far harder for all families, including minorities and working class families, to bridge job losses or even temporary layoffs by using credit cards to temporarily buy family staples.

□ 1045

Critics of the credit card industry fail to appreciate the alternatives that presently exist to credit card use by most Americans; payday lending, auto title loans, and pawnshops for those who wish to operate within the law, and street lamp vendors named "Rocky" for those who don't. Minority and lower income families will be disproportionately forced to these alternatives when traditional credit card access goes away.

Mr. COOPER brings to the attention of the American people some very important points. What Republicans have done is to provide an alternative measure, H.R. 2327, the Protection of Consumer Credit and Consumer Choice Act of 2009, which embodies the principles necessary to protect the availability of credit while providing consumers with the information needed to make informed decisions.

H.R. 2327, of which I am a sponsor, would require credit card issuers to provide clear and conspicuous disclosures pertaining to, one, the time provided to make timely payments; two, allocation of payments when different annual percentage rates apply to different balances of such accounts; three, increases in APRs; four, a two-cycle average daily balance method of balance calculation; and, five, fees that may be assessed at the opening of each account.

Additionally, this alternative bill would require credit card issuers to provide advanced written notice of a change in such terms before it takes effect, with certain exceptions.

With the presence of this reasonable alternative that provides sensible consumer protections, while avoiding the pitfalls of assigning a variety of new federally unfunded mandates, I urge my colleagues to vote against this rule and oppose the underlying bill.

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

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask my friend if she has any other speakers?

Ms. FOXX. I do not have any further speakers, but I do intend to speak a little longer on the rule.

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, a few minutes ago during 1-minute, one of our Democratic colleagues came in and talked about the number of "shalls" in the proposed health care bill by the Democrats and then spoke about the Ten Commandments and pointed out that the Ten Commandments liberally uses the word "shall."

I think that it is the height of arrogance to compare the outrageous 2,000-page bill written in Speaker PELOSI's office with the Ten Commandments given to us by God through Moses, whose face is looking down on us from the wall of this Chamber. That, to me, is the epitome of the arrogance of the majority party right now, saying that it is okay to have a lot of "shalls" in that because the "shalls" were in the Ten Commandments.

With Federal spending and debt already out of control, the Democrat leadership is content with putting the cost of their government takeover of health care on the Nation's credit card. Again, my friend, Mr. ROSKAM from Illinois, alluded to this a few minutes ago.

The Wall Street Journal called Speaker PELOSI's 1,990-page takeover of health care the worst piece of post-New Deal legislation ever introduced.

The Congressional Budget Office estimates that Speaker PELOSI's plan will cost \$1.055 trillion over the first decade, not \$894 billion as Speaker PELOSI claims. But the Democrats are using a procedural maneuver to include the \$245 billion "doc fix" without violating PAYGO, so the real cost of the bill is closer to \$1.3 trillion.

At more than \$1 trillion and nearly 2,000 pages, H.R. 3962 is the antithesis

of patient-centered reforms that empower Americans to truly own and control their health care coverage. The fact is, H.R. 3962 will force millions of Americans off their current coverage, hand control over medical decisions to new czars and bureaucrats, raise taxes, stifle job creation, expand entitlement spending, and break already-strained State budgets.

PELOSI's plan creates 111 new boards, bureaucracies, commissions, and programs. Americans can say goodbye to personal private insurance as individual health insurance coverage is grandfathered out of existence in section 202 and more limitations also are added to Health Savings Accounts, sections 531 and 533.

H.R. 3962 permits Federal funds to be spent on abortion services, section 222, and includes a government-run plan, section 321, that will force tens of millions of Americans off their current coverage. So much for the promise that if you like your current coverage, you can keep it.

The bill increases taxes by \$729.5 billion, including a mandate that employers provide coverage or pay a tax equal to 8 percent of wages, section 512; a 5.4 percent surtax on small businesses, section 551; and a mandate that Americans purchase government-deemed acceptable health care coverage or face a tax of 2.5 percent of modified adjusted gross income, section 501.

In navigating the new health care system, Americans will have to deal with a host of new czars and bureaucracies, including the Health Benefits Advisory Committee, section 223, the Health Choices Administration and Health Choices Commissioner, section 241.

Community organizations like ACORN may assist the Health Choices Commissioner in enrolling individuals in the Health Insurance Exchange, section 305. We all know how successful ACORN has been in enrolling people appropriately into different programs.

H.R. 3962 includes a huge expansion of the Medicaid entitlement, eligibility up to 150 percent of the Federal poverty level, but leaves already overstretched State governments to pick up the \$34 billion tab, section 1701.

Mr. Speaker, I am mentioning these sections because I want the American people to know they can verify what we are saying simply by going to the bill and looking at it in these sections. This is not something we are making up. It is there.

To appease their trial lawyer base, Democrats continue to ignore the enormous medical liability crisis that needlessly drives up costs. They pay lip service to medical malpractice reform with money for States that pursue "effective" lawyer-friendly alternatives, section 2531, but they explicitly exclude States that limit attorney's fees or cap damages. Members of Congress are not subject to the same health care system Americans will have to live by under the public health insurance option, section 330.

The Democrats claim their bill allows for the sale of health insurance across State lines. In reality, this bill will only provide for regional compacts that States can enter into if their State legislatures approve it. However, these compacts can only exist after the Federal Government has established stringent national rules for minimum benefits and what constitutes a qualified plan, virtually eliminating the individual market and creating a national exchange, causing many to wonder how this would even be possible.

Rather than forcing through a bad bill with only limited support, the Democrats should keep working until they can get a bill that represents the opinions of most Americans and helps rather than hurts Americans.

Democrats in Congress often portray Republicans as obstructionists with no health care reform solutions of our own. This is simply not true. Republicans in Congress are listening to the American people. We know that Americans want commonsense, responsible solutions that make health insurance more affordable, reduce the number of uninsured Americans, and increase quality at a price our country can afford while making sure that Americans who like their health insurance can keep it.

We have proposed many commonsense solutions that fell on deaf ears as the Democrats in charge wrote their bill in secret. Republican Members have introduced more than 50 health care reform bills this year. House Republicans will support responsible health care reform and offer an alternative plan to PELOSI's 1,990-page, \$1.3 trillion takeover of health care.

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

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have and how much time does Ms. FOXX have?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado has 24 minutes remaining, and the gentlewoman from North Carolina has 12 minutes remaining.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. I just was listening to my friend from North Carolina, and she really didn't talk about the bill. She talked about health care, which is a problem that has been lingering for a long time. Republicans for 12 years in the Congress, as well as 8 years under President Bush, failed to do anything about discriminating against people with prior illnesses. This health care bill takes care of that.

They failed to deal with anything related to the increase in premiums that individuals and businesses across the country are experiencing. We are going to take care of that.

Finally, they didn't do anything with the antitrust laws that protect insurance companies, and we are going to deal with that so that there is portability.

Now, let's get back to the bill at hand. The bill at hand deals with a real problem faced by Americans every day

because companies are taking advantage of them by jacking up interest rates, continuing to use sharp practices, all to the detriment and to the harm of middle Americans. We have got to change that. So for purposes of this bill, this credit card bill, we are going to expedite the new rules to December 1. That is the purpose of the bill. That is the purpose of the underlying rule. That is why we are here today.

But with respect to the credit card bill, it is the usual Republican mantra, "Just say no, we like the status quo," just as it applies to the health care bill. "Just say no, we like the status quo."

We can't afford the status quo when it comes to credit cards. We can't afford the status quo when it comes to health care.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I like my colleague from Colorado very much on a personal level, but let's get real: This bill is going nowhere. Republicans have an alternative bill that will do very well. And those of us here know that this bill is just a time consumer, because the Democrats have no real legislation to offer. They know this bill can't go into effect by December 1, but they need something to keep us here this week because they are trying to twist arms to get the votes for the health care bill. So we have to spend time talking about something, so this is what was brought up.

Let me say that, talking about health care now, we are doing that because we know when the health care bill does come to the floor, the almost 2,000-page health care bill, or a little over 2,000 pages, I suspect, won't get any time for discussion, not what it deserves, taking over one-sixth of the economy, because, and I quote from today's Roll Call, "House Rules Chairman Louise Slaughter, Democrat-New York, said that the rule would be locked down, allowing a vote on a Republican alternative and perhaps one other, but no additional amendments," continuing the tradition that has been going on here this entire session—no amendments, because you don't want debate on what it is we should be debating.

But let me talk a minute about the Republicans' alternative plan. It will lower health care premiums for American families and small businesses, which addresses the number one priority for health care reform of Americans. It will establish universal access programs to guarantee access to affordable care for those with preexisting conditions.

I have read part of the plan that you have. It provides for waiting lists and taking people with existing conditions out of your plan. You don't even guarantee those people coverage.

Ending junk lawsuits. The Republican plan will help end costly junk lawsuits and curb defensive medicine

by enacting medical liability reforms modeled after the successful laws in California and Texas.

It will prevent insurers from unjustly canceling a policy or instituting annual lifetime spending caps. It will encourage small business health plans. It gives small businesses the power to pool together and offer health care at lower prices, just as corporations and labor unions do. It will encourage innovative State programs. It will allow Americans to buy insurance across State lines.

It will codify the Hyde amendment. The Republican plan explicitly prohibits Federal funds, whether they are authorized funds or appropriated funds, from being used to pay for abortion. It will promote healthier lifestyles. It will enhance Health Savings Accounts, and it will allow dependents to remain on their parents' policies for a longer time.

We have alternatives, sensible alternatives, what the American people want. And I think yesterday's elections give us some idea about what the American people want.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I think that my friend from North Carolina and I are going to have a lot of time on the Rules Committee to debate health care issues, so I am going to just remind her that the health care matter was never addressed by a Republican Congress and really not addressed by the President of the United States, except to create the doughnut hole for seniors. That is about the sum and substance of 12 years of Republicans in Congress and 8 years of President Bush in the White House.

□ 1100

Now, we've had three committees debate this health care bill over time, many, many amendments, lots of discussion, lots of conversations all across America dealing with the health care bill. So we're going to see that come up here very soon and we will continue to have this kind of spirited debate.

As it applies to the elections, I'm not sure if I want to remind my good friend from North Carolina that the Democrats picked up a seat in New York that they hadn't held for 154 years. So there was good news and bad news for both Democrats and Republicans in yesterday's elections.

But I would remind my friend we are here on the credit card bill. This is to move up the date for the rules and regulations to go into place to December 1 to stop the sharp practices that we see occurring today, which is the increase of interest rates, the continued use of double billing cycles, and the like, which are hurting everyday Americans. And that's got to stop.

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, again, as our good colleague from Illinois pointed out, the health care bill is going on

the Federal credit card and it's going to have very high interest rates, and it's something the American people want us to talk about because of its effect on the economy.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield 5 minutes to my distinguished colleague from Indiana and the Republican Conference Chair, Mr. PENCE.

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

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule. And while I appreciate my good friend's clarification that this rule has to do with a credit card bill that's on the floor today, I take this opportunity respectfully to speak about that issue which is foremost in the minds of the American people at this hour, and that is this freight train of Big Government moving through the Congress at a frightening speed that we believe with all our hearts will result in a government takeover of health care in America.

After months of behind-closed-doors dealings, the Democratic majority, in cooperation with the White House and special interest groups, produced late last week finally a bill. It may be amended again, Mr. Speaker, but we have a 1,990-page bill that, according to independent press estimates, includes \$1.2 trillion in new Federal spending on expanded health insurance coverage over the next 10 years. It includes \$729.5 billion in new taxes on small businesses and individuals. It is in every real sense a government takeover of health care and the burden and payment of which will be borne principally by Americans that make less than \$200,000 per year.

An independent estimate that we received yesterday, as Republicans spent hours reading the bill in our reading room, was that actually, despite the fact that as a candidate President Obama pledged that he would not raise taxes on Americans who make less than \$200,000 a year, with the Pelosi health care bill, actually the tax increases would fall most squarely on Americans making below that threshold amount. Eighty-seven percent of the taxes that are being levied in the Democrat health care bill will be paid by Americans that make less than \$200,000 a year, fees and mandates and fines and penalties falling squarely on our middle class. It's really extraordinary when you think of it that it's taking place during what is, without debate, the worst recession in a quarter of a century.

But it doesn't just stop there. When we say that it's a government takeover of health care, we are talking real numbers and real bureaucracy. Those that say otherwise ignore the fact that in this legislation there are 43 entitlement programs that are created, expanded, or extended. There are 111 additional offices, bureaus, commissions, programs, and bureaucracies that the bill creates over and above the entitlement expansions included in the prior bill.

Lastly, we all know as legislators that the word "shall" is not a friendly word when it comes in law. When the word "shall" appears in law, it means that someone must do something, a business, an enterprise, an element of the bureaucracy shall take action. The word "shall" appears in the Democrat health care bill 3,425 times. Yet the majority and the administration continue to insist that this is not a government takeover of health care? I have to tell you, Mr. Speaker, the American people are catching on and they know otherwise.

But the good news is there's an alternative. People can go to healthcare.gop.gov, and as has emerged in recent days, Republicans have a bill. I know our colleagues have been pointing at some blank pages on the floor in the last 24 hours, but the American people surfing the net know that the Republican bill is actually a little bit over 200 pages, allows Americans to purchase health insurance across State lines the way big businesses can, allows associations to pool their employees to bring down the cost of insurance. It brings about medical malpractice reform to end junk lawsuits and end defensive medicine in America, and we use those savings to actually strengthen those funds at the State level, those programs that cover preexisting conditions for Americans.

While the majority is focused on growing government to achieve something called universal coverage, Republicans are focused on what the American people want us to focus on, and that is lowering the cost of health insurance and lowering the cost of health care by giving the American people and American enterprise more choices, reasonable limits on litigation, and helping people with preexisting conditions.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time to allow the gentlewoman from North Carolina to close and then I will close.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, again I thank my colleague from Colorado.

He mentioned that we would be able to debate the health care bill in the Rules Committee, that we'd have a long time to do it. But the Rules Committee is the only committee in the Congress that meets behind closed doors, that does not allow C-SPAN to televise what it does, despite the fact that Barack Obama promised to have deliberations on all bills broadcast on C-SPAN and NANCY PELOSI promised the most open Congress in history. This is like the book "1984" by George Orwell. They say one thing and do absolutely another. It's doublespeak.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question so an amendment can be added to the rule. The amendment to the rule would provide for separate consideration of H. Res. 554, a resolution to require that legislation and conference reports be posted on the Internet for 72 hours prior to consideration by the House. It does not affect the bill made in order by the rule.

The amendment to the rule provides that the House will debate the issue of reading the bill within 3 legislative days. It does not disrupt the schedule.

The bill currently has 214 cosponsors. The discharge petition has 182 names, including five Democrats. This bill has gained support of an overwhelming majority of Americans and is widely respected by government watchdogs.

The existing House rule that committee reports be available for 3 days prior to floor consideration has been repeatedly waived by Republicans and Democrats alike.

This is not a partisan measure. As Members of Congress, we ought to agree that regardless of the legislation brought before us, we should always have the opportunity to read and understand the legislation before we vote. The American public agrees with this commonsense position. A recent survey by Rasmussen Reports found that 83 percent of Americans say legislation should be posted online and available for everyone to read before Congress votes on it. The poll also found that this is not a partisan issue: 85 percent of Republicans, 76 of Democrats, and 92 percent of unaffiliated voters favor posting legislation online prior to its being voted on.

In the beginning of the year, Members of this Congress, Democrat Members of this Congress, voted to spend almost \$790 billion in taxpayer dollars on a stimulus package that most Members did not even read. The enormous document wasn't posted on the government's Web site until after 10 p.m., the day before the vote to pass it was taken.

Furthermore, before the debate on the cap-and-tax bill offered last summer, the House was presented with a 300-plus-page amendment at 3 a.m. for debate the following morning and a vote the following afternoon. This was unacceptable and further demonstrated the need to read the bill and the arguments.

Mr. Speaker, we are elected to Congress to represent our constituents. How are we supposed to determine what is right for our fellow Americans if we have to vote on something before we even have time to read it?

We need to have this debate. If people oppose having the text of bills available to read, they should make their case. This amendment to the rule allows them to do just that. I urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question so we can have this debate and do the right thing for the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have the text of the amendment and extraneous material inserted into the RECORD prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Ms. FOXX. I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the previous question and "no" on the rule.

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

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, just to correct a couple of points, TVs are always allowed in the Rules Committee, always are invited to each and every hearing and committee meeting. Sometimes they come, sometimes they don't. My guess is that they'll be there for the debate on the health care bill.

I just want to remind my friends on the other side of the aisle, in the bill that produced the doughnut hole for seniors on Medicare and was written by a Republican Congress with a Republican President, the word "shall" appeared in that bill 2,080 times.

Ms. FOXX. Would the gentleman yield for one short question?

Mr. PERLMUTTER. I will yield to my good friend for about 10 seconds.

Ms. FOXX. Do you think that two wrongs make a right?

Mr. PERLMUTTER. No. And the gentlewoman makes a point. No question about that.

But the problem here, Mr. Speaker, is that my friends on the Republican side of the aisle, they're concerned that there's too much regulation or we're focused on trying to rein in credit card companies or rein in insurance companies when it comes to health care. Their focus is on the profits of those companies. Well, our focus is on middle Americans who felt the sharp practices of credit card companies and have seen their premiums go sky high as part of the health system that we have in this country today.

Speaking about this bill, this credit card expedited bill, our purpose before the House of Representatives is to pass a rule that allows us to take up the credit card bill to move up rules and regulations to be imposed on credit card companies on December 1, 2009, instead of waiting until February of 2010 and August of 2010. The purpose is because we have seen rates being increased dramatically on all sorts of people. We see billing practice continue to be applied which hurts everyday Americans, and this has got to stop. It's not fair that the profits come before treating people honorably, responsibly, those people who have been paying their credit cards on time regularly. They're seeing their credit cards' interest rates increase. This has got to be limited and stopped.

So I would urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the previous question and on the rule.

The material previously referred to by Ms. FOXX is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 884 OFFERED BY MS. FOXX OF NORTH CAROLINA

At the end of the resolution, insert the following new section:

SEC. 3. On the third legislative day after the adoption of this resolution, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV and without intervention of any point of order, the House shall proceed to the consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 554) amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to require that legislation and conference reports be available

on the Internet for 72 hours before consideration by the House, and for other purposes. The resolution shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution and any amendment thereto to final adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules; (2) an amendment, if offered by the Minority Leader or his designee and if printed in that portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII at least one legislative day prior to its consideration, which shall be in order without intervention of any point of order or demand for division of the question, shall be considered as read and shall be separately debatable for twenty minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent; and (3) one motion to recommit which shall not contain instructions. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of House Resolution 554.

(The information contained herein was provided by the Democratic Minority on multiple occasions throughout the 109th Congress.)

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Democratic majority agenda and a vote to allow the opposition, at least for the moment, to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's *Precedents of the House of Representatives*, (VI, 308-311) describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

Because the vote today may look bad for the Democratic majority they will say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the definition of the previous question used in the *Floor Procedures Manual* published by the Rules Committee in the 109th Congress, (page 56). Here's how the Rules Committee described the rule using information from Congressional Quarterly's "American Congressional Dictionary": "If the previous question is defeated, control of debate shifts to the leading opposition member (usually the minority Floor Manager) who then manages an hour of debate and may offer a germane amendment to the pending business."

Deschler's *Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives*, the subchapter titled

"Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: "Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Democratic majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on:

Adoption of House Resolution 884, if ordered;

Suspension of the rules on H. Res. 858; and

Suspension of the rules on H. Res. 839, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 228, nays 176, not voting 28, as follows:

[Roll No. 841]

YEAS—228

Ackerman	Cohen	Gordon (TN)
Adler (NJ)	Connolly (VA)	Grayson
Altmire	Conyers	Green, Al
Andrews	Cooper	Green, Gene
Arcuri	Costa	Griffith
Baca	Costello	Grijalva
Baldwin	Courtney	Gutierrez
Barrow	Crowley	Hall (NY)
Bean	Cuellar	Halvorson
Becerra	Cummings	Hare
Berkley	Dahlkemper	Harman
Berman	Davis (AL)	Hastings (FL)
Berry	Davis (CA)	Heinrich
Bishop (GA)	Davis (IL)	Herseth Sandlin
Bishop (NY)	DeFazio	Higgins
Blumenauer	DeGette	Himes
Bocchieri	Delahunt	Hinchesy
Boren	Dicks	Hinojosa
Boswell	Dingell	Hirono
Boucher	Doggett	Hodes
Boyd	Donnelly (IN)	Holden
Brady (PA)	Doyle	Holt
Bright	Driehaus	Honda
Brown, Corrine	Edwards (MD)	Hoyer
Butterfield	Edwards (TX)	Inslee
Capps	Ellison	Israel
Capuano	Ellsworth	Jackson (IL)
Cardoza	Engel	Jackson-Lee
Carnahan	Eshoo	(TX)
Carney	Etheridge	Johnson, E. B.
Carson (IN)	Farr	Kagen
Castor (FL)	Fattah	Kanjorski
Chandler	Filner	Kaptur
Childers	Foster	Kennedy
Clarke	Frank (MA)	Kildee
Clay	Fudge	Kilpatrick (MI)
Cleaver	Giffords	Kilroy
Clyburn	Gonzalez	Kind

Kirkpatrick (AZ) Nadler (NY)
 Kissell Napolitano
 Klein (FL) Neal (MA)
 Kosmas Nye
 Kucinich Oberstar
 Langevin Oliver
 Larsen (WA) Ortiz
 Larson (CT) Pallone
 Levin Pascrell
 Lipinski Pastor (AZ)
 Loeb sack Payne
 Lofgren, Zoe Perlmutter
 Lowey Perriello
 Lujan Peters
 Lynch Peterson
 Maffei Pingree (ME)
 Maloney Polis (CO)
 Markey (CO) Pomeroy
 Markey (MA) Price (NC)
 Massa Quigley
 Matheson Rahall
 Matsui Rangel
 McCarthy (NY) Reyes
 McCollum Richardson
 McDermott Rodriguez
 McGovern Ross
 McIntyre Ruppertsberger
 Meek (FL) Rush
 Meeks (NY) Salazar
 Melancon Sanchez, Loretta
 Michaud Sarbanes
 Miller (NC) Schakowsky
 Miller, George Schauer
 Mollohan Schiff
 Moore (KS) Schrader
 Moore (WI) Schwartz
 Murphy (CT) Scott (GA)
 Murphy (NY) Scott (VA)
 Murtha Serrano

Whitfield Wittman
 Wilson (SC) Wolf
 Young (AK) Young (FL)
 Kosmas Kucinich
 Langevin Langevin
 Larsen (WA) Larsen (CT)
 Lee (CA) Lee (CA)
 Levin Levin
 Lewis (GA) Lewis (GA)
 Lipinski Lipinski
 Loeb sack Loeb sack
 Lofgren, Zoe Lofgren, Zoe
 Lowey Lowey
 Lujan Lujan
 Lynch Lynch
 Maffei Maffei
 Maloney Maloney
 Markey (CO) Markey (CO)
 Markey (MA) Markey (MA)
 Massa Massa
 Matheson Matheson
 Matsui Matsui
 McCarthy (NY) McCarthy (NY)
 McCollum McCollum
 McDermott McDermott
 McGovern McGovern
 McIntyre McIntyre
 Meek (FL) Meek (FL)
 Meeks (NY) Meeks (NY)
 Melancon Melancon
 Michaud Michaud
 Miller (NC) Miller (NC)
 Miller, George Miller, George
 Mollohan Mollohan
 Moore (KS) Moore (KS)
 Moore (WI) Moore (WI)
 Murphy (CT) Murphy (CT)
 Murphy (NY) Murphy (NY)
 Murtha Murtha

NOT VOTING—28
 Abercrombie Kirk
 Bachmann Lee (CA)
 Barrett (SC) Lewis (CA)
 Braley (IA) Lewis (GA)
 Chu Marshall
 Davis (TN) McMahon
 Deal (GA) McNeerney
 DeLauro Moran (VA)
 Gerlach Murphy, Patrick
 Johnson (GA) Nunes

□ 1138

Mr. HOEKSTRA, Ms. GRANGER, Messrs. HUNTER and LATHAM changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

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

Stated for:
 Ms. SHEA-PORTER. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 841 on H. Res. 884, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

Ms. CHU. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 841, my pager malfunctioned and did not go off. Thus, I was not notified that votes were starting and I missed my first vote. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. FOXF. 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 234, noes 175, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 842]

AYES—234

Aderholt Franks (AZ)
 Akin Frelinghuysen
 Alexander Gallegly
 Austria Garrett (NJ)
 Bachus Gingrey (GA)
 Baird Gohmert
 Bartlett Goodlatte
 Barton (TX) Granger
 Biggert Graves
 Bilbray Guthrie
 Bilirakis Hall (TX)
 Bishop (UT) Harper
 Blackburn Hastings (WA)
 Blunt Heller
 Boehner Hensarling
 Bonner Herger
 Bono Mack Hill
 Boozman Hoekstra
 Boustany Hunter
 Brady (TX) Inglis
 Brown (GA) Issa
 Brown (SC) Jenkins
 Brown-Waite, Johnny (IL)
 Ginny Johnson, Sam
 Buchanan Jones
 Burgess Jordan (OH)
 Burton (IN) King (IA)
 Buyer King (NY)
 Calvert Kingston
 Camp Kline (MN)
 Campbell Kratoivil
 Cantor Lamborn
 Cao Lance
 Capito Latham
 Carter LaTourette
 Cassidy Latta
 Castle Lee (NY)
 Chaffetz Linder
 Coble LoBiondo
 Coffman (CO) Lucas
 Cole Luetkemeyer
 Conaway Lummis
 Crenshaw Lungren, Daniel
 Culberson E.
 Davis (KY) Mack
 Dent Manzanillo
 Diaz-Balart, L. Marchant
 Diaz-Balart, M. McCarthy (CA)
 Dreier McCaul
 Duncan McClintock
 Ehlers McCotter
 Emerson McHenry
 Fallin McKeon
 Flake McMorris
 Fleming Rodgers
 Forbes Mica
 Fortenberry Miller (FL)
 Foxx Miller (MI)

Abercrombie Cohen
 Ackerman Connolly (VA)
 Adler (NJ) Conyers
 Altmi re Cooper
 Andrews Costa
 Arcuri Costello
 Baca Courtney
 Baird Crowley
 Baldwin Cuellar
 Barrow Cummings
 Bean Dahlkemper
 Becerra Davis (AL)
 Berkley Herseth Sandlin
 Berman DeFazio
 Berry DeGette
 Bishop (GA) Delahunt
 Bishop (NY) DeLauro
 Blumenauer Dicks
 Boccieri Dingell
 Boren Doggett
 Boswell Donnelly (IN)
 Boyd Doyle
 Driehaus Insee
 Brown, Corrine Edwards (MD)
 Butterfield Edwards (TX)
 Capps Ellison
 Capuano Ellsworth
 Cardoza Engel
 Carnahan Eshoo
 McCaul Etheridge
 Carson (IN) Farr
 Castor (FL) Fattah
 Chandler Filner
 Childers Foster
 Chu Frank (MA)
 Clarke Fudge
 Mica Giffords
 Cleaver Gonzalez
 Clyburn Gordon (TN)

Nadler (NY) Scott (VA)
 Napolitano Serrano
 Neal (MA) Sestak
 Nye Shea-Porter
 Oberstar Sherman
 Obey Sires
 Oliver Skelton
 Ortiz Smith (WA)
 Pallone Space
 Pascrell Snyder
 Pastor (AZ) Space
 Payne Speier
 Perlmutter Spratt
 Perriello Stark
 Peters Sutton
 Peterson Tanner
 Pingree (ME) Teague
 Polis (CO) Thompson (CA)
 Pomeroy Thompson (MS)
 Price (NC) Titus
 Quigley Tonko
 Rahall Towns
 Rangel Tsongas
 Reyes Van Hollen
 Richardson Velázquez
 Rodriguez Visclosky
 Ross Walz
 Ruppertsberger Wasserman
 Rush Schultz
 Salazar Waters
 Sanchez, Loretta Watson
 Sarbanes Watt
 Schakowsky Waxman
 Schauer Weiner
 Schiff Welch
 Schrader Wexler
 Schwartz Wilson (OH)
 Scott (GA) Woolsey
 Scott (VA) Wu
 Serrano Yarmuth

NOES—175

Aderholt Franks (AZ)
 Akin Frelinghuysen
 Alexander Gallegly
 Austria Garrett (NJ)
 Bachus Gingrey (GA)
 Baird Gohmert
 Bartlett Goodlatte
 Barton (TX) Granger
 Biggert Graves
 Bilbray Guthrie
 Bilirakis Hall (TX)
 Bishop (UT) Harper
 Blackburn Hastings (WA)
 Blunt Heller
 Boehner Hensarling
 Bonner Herger
 Bono Mack Hill
 Boozman Hoekstra
 Boustany Hunter
 Brady (TX) Inglis
 Brown (GA) Issa
 Brown (SC) Jenkins
 Brown-Waite, Johnny (IL)
 Ginny Johnson, Sam
 Buchanan Jones
 Burgess Jordan (OH)
 Burton (IN) King (IA)
 Buyer King (NY)
 Calvert Kingston
 Camp Kline (MN)
 Campbell Kratoivil
 Cantor Lamborn
 Cao Lance
 Capito Latham
 Carter LaTourette
 Cassidy Latta
 Castle Lee (NY)
 Chaffetz Lewis (CA)
 Coble Linder
 Coffman (CO) LoBiondo
 Cole Lucas
 Conaway Luetkemeyer
 Crenshaw Lummis
 Davis (KY) Lungren, Daniel
 Dent E.
 Diaz-Balart, L. Mack
 Diaz-Balart, M. Manzanillo
 Dreier Marchant
 Duncan McCarthy (CA)
 Ehlers McCaul
 Emerson McClintock
 Fallin McHenry
 Flake McKeon
 Fleming McMorris
 Forbes Rodgers
 Fortenberry Mica
 Foxx Miller (FL)

Miller (MI)
 Miller, Gary
 Mitchell
 Moore (KS)
 Moran (KS)
 Murphy, Tim
 Neugebauer
 Olson
 Paul
 Paulsen
 Pence
 Petri
 Pitts
 Platts
 Poe (TX)
 Posey
 Price (GA)
 Putnam
 Radanovich
 Rehberg
 Reichert
 Roe (TN)
 Rogers (AL)
 Rogers (KY)
 Rogers (MI)
 Rohrabacher
 Rooney
 Roskam
 Royce
 Ryan (WI)
 Scalise
 Schmidt
 Schock
 Sensenbrenner
 Sessions
 Shadegg
 Shimkus
 Shuler
 Shuster
 Simpson
 Smith (NE)
 Smith (NJ)
 Smith (TX)
 Stearns
 Sullivan
 Taylor
 Terry
 Thornberry
 Thornberry
 Tiahrt
 Tiberi
 Turner
 Upton

Walden Whitfield Wolf
Wamp Wilson (SC) Young (AK)
Westmoreland Wittman Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—23

Barrett (SC) Gerlach Myrick
Boucher Hirono Nunes
Braley (IA) Kirk Rothman (NJ)
Bright Klein (FL) Sánchez, Linda
Culberson Markey (MA) T.
Davis (IL) McMahon Slaughter
Davis (TN) McNerney Stupak
Deal (GA) Murphy, Patrick Tierney

Burgess Gutierrez
Burton (IN) Hall (NY)
Butterfield Hall (TX)
Buyer Halvorson
Calvert Hare
Camp Harman
Cantor Harper
Cao Hastings (FL)
Capito Hastings (WA)
Capps Heinrich
Capuano Heller
Carmahan Hensarling
Carney Herger
Carson (IN) Herseth Sandlin
Carter Higgins
Cassidy Hill
Castle Himes
Castor (FL) Hinchey
Chaffetz Hinojosa
Chandler Hirono
Childers Hodes
Chu Hoekstra
Clarke Holden
Clay Holt
Cleaver Honda
Clyburn Hoyer
Coble Hunter
Coffman (CO) Inglis
Cohen Israel
Cole Issa

McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McMahon
McMorris
Rodgers
Meek (FL)
Meeks (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, Tim
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Nye
Oberstar
Obey
Olson
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pence
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Putnam
Quigley
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Rehberg
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
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
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Sutton
Tanner
Taylor
Teague
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden

Walz
Wamp
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Westmoreland
Wexler
Whitfield
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1146

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 842, had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall Nos. 841 and 842, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall 841 and "no" on rollcall 842.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MCMAHON. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall Nos. 841 and 842 I was on a visit to Walter Reed. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall 841 and "aye" on rollcall 842.

CONGRATULATING THE INTER-AMERICAN FOUNDATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 858, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 858.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 405, nays 1, answered "present" 2, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 843]

YEAS—405

Abercrombie Barton (TX) Bonner
Ackerman Bean Bono Mack
Aderholt Becerra Boozman
Adler (NJ) Berkley Boren
Akin Berman Boswell
Alexander Berry Boustany
Altmire Biggart Boyd
Arcuri Bilbray Brady (PA)
Austria Bilirakis Brady (TX)
Baca Bishop (GA) Bright
Bachmann Bishop (NY) Brown (GA)
Bachus Bishop (UT) Brown (SC)
Baird Blackburn Brown, Corrine
Baldwin Blumenauer Brown-Waite,
Barrow Blunt Ginny
Bartlett Boccieri Buchanan

Conaway Jackson (IL)
Connolly (VA) Jackson-Lee
Conyers (TX)
Cooper Jenkins
Costa Johnson (GA)
Costello Johnson (IL)
Courtney Johnson, E. B.
Crenshaw Johnson, Sam
Crowley Jones
Cuellar Jordan (OH)
Culberson Kagen
Cummings Kanjorski
Dahlkemper Kaptur
Davis (AL) Kennedy
Davis (CA) Kildee
Davis (IL) Kilpatrick (MI)
Davis (KY) Kilroy
DeFazio Kind
DeGette King (IA)
DeLahunt King (NY)
DeLauro Kingston
Dent Kirk
Diaz-Balart, L. Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Diaz-Balart, M. Kissell
Dicks Klein (FL)
Dingell Kline (MN)
Doggett Kosmas
Donnelly (IN) Kratovil
Doyle Kucinich
Dreier Lance
Driehaus Langevin
Duncan Larsen (WA)
Edwards (MD) Larson (CT)
Edwards (TX) Latham
Ehlers LaTourette
Ellison Latta
Ellsworth Lee (CA)
Emerson Lee (NY)
Engel Levin
Eshoo Lewis (CA)
Etheridge Lewis (GA)
Fallin Linder
Farr Lipinski
Fattah LoBiondo
Filner Loeb sack
Flake Lofgren, Zoe
Fleming Lowey
Forbes Lucas
Fortenberry Luetkemeyer
Foster Lujan
Foxy Lummis
Frank (MA) Lungren, Daniel
Franks (AZ) E.
Frelinghuysen Lynch
Fudge Mack
Gallegly Maffei
Garrett (NJ) Maloney
Giffords Manullo
Gingrey (GA) Marchant
Gonzalez Markey (CO)
Goodlatte Markey (MA)
Gordon (TN) Marshall
Granger Massa
Graves Matheson
Grayson Matsui
Green, Al McCarthy (CA)
Green, Gene McCarthy (NY)
Griffith McClintock
Guthrie McCollum

Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (NY)
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Nye
Oberstar
Obey
Olson
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pence
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Putnam
Quigley
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Rehberg
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner

NAYS—1
Paul

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Campbell Gohmert

NOT VOTING—24

Andrews Grijalva Sánchez, Linda
Barrett (SC) Inslee T.
Boehner Lamborn Slaughter
Boucher McCaul Speier
Braley (IA) McNerney Stupak
Cardoza Murphy, Patrick Sullivan
Davis (TN) Nunes Watt
Deal (GA) Reichert
Gerlach Rothman (NJ)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1152

Mr. FLAKE changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained and missed rollcall vote Nos. 841, 842, and 843. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on rollcall votes Nos. 841, 842, and 843.

CONDEMNING THE ILLEGAL EXTRACTION OF MADAGASCAR'S NATURAL RESOURCES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, H. Res. 839, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 839, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the yeas have it.

Mrs. HALVORSON. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.