

a strategy that rightly relies upon the long-term interests in a stable aftermath. Therefore, ending this war is necessary but insufficient.

How we end it and by what means is even of greater importance for our troops' safety and our own security.

IT'S TIME WE END THIS WAR

(Mr. HALL of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HALL of New York. Mr. Speaker, a recent CRS report shows that the United States is now spending \$10 billion a month fighting the war in Iraq. That's over \$2.5 billion a week.

And what does the American taxpayer get for this \$10 billion a month? An Army being broken by repeated deployments; a National Guard that is unready or unable to respond to natural disasters or terrorist attacks at home because many of our men and women are in Iraq and most of our equipment is; an escalation in Iraq that has resulted in more death and little reduction in violence; an Iraqi government that is unable to govern, Iraqi security forces that refuse to fully stand up.

The war in Iraq has cost every man, woman and child in my district \$3,077. For over \$3,000 a person, the people in my district have gotten a war that was a strategic mistake and has made them less safe. It is time we end this war.

H.R. 2669, THE COLLEGE COST REDUCTION ACT

(Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2669, the College Cost Reduction Act of 2007. This intelligent bill increases Federal scholarship amounts and loan limits to provide students with additional assistance in paying for college, and to help them rely less on costlier private loans.

In fact, when I went to school, college, 25 years ago, college tuition at my university was \$8,000 a year, and my Pell Grant was \$2,700 a year. Today, that very school costs \$38,000 a year, and the Pell Grant is \$4,100 a year. We need to do something about this situation.

As part of this legislation, I am pleased to see that the Congress is moving to enact \$5,000 of Federal student loan forgiveness for students who are using the education they receive to serve their community and country in areas of national need.

Loan forgiveness provides a powerful message to a student: Your Government will help you if you choose to help your Nation.

The College Cost Reduction Act is an important step towards investing in American college students and our future workforce, and I look forward to working with my colleagues to pass this today.

MORE BUREAUCRACY, LESS EDUCATION

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, today the House will vote on the College Cost Reduction Act, which sounds good on the surface, but once you begin to peel back the layers of this onion, you find that it is just rotten to the core. It contains billions of dollars of new spending, and worse still, it will never even see the light of day. The President has vowed to veto the bill.

And it creates nine new entitlement government programs at a cost of \$197 billion over 5 years. That's nine new programs. And this is just the tip of the iceberg with the leadership spending this year. \$20 billion more than expected on the President's budget. They had \$6 billion more in new spending on January's omnibus, \$17 billion they added to troops spending. It goes on and on, and it is enough to make a taxpayer cry.

And if there's one thing that we all know, once you've got a government program, you've got a government program. Ronald Reagan said it best. There is nothing so close to eternal life on Earth as a Federal Government program.

The leadership knows this bill will not fly with the American people. I encourage my colleagues to vote "no."

ACTIONS SPEAK LOUDER THAN WORDS

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, a week does not go by without at least one or two Republican Senators coming forward and saying what many of us have known for months, that the President's Iraq strategy has failed. First it was Senators LUGAR and VOINOVICH. Then last week Senator DOMENICI joined them in saying that a serious change in course is needed. And then on Monday Senator SNOWE told NBC News that the time has come for binding legislation to bring home most of our troops.

The Senate Republican comments are welcome, but actions speak louder than words. Senate Republicans can't just say that a change in direction is needed; they have to actually help us change the course of the war.

And where exactly are the House Republicans? Does their silence indicate that they will once again rubber-stamp the President's failed Iraq policy?

If they won't listen to us, they should at least listen to respected members of their own party who are saying that we simply cannot continue on this same failed course.

Mr. Speaker, this month Democrats will once again demand change in Iraq. And it's time that our Republican colleagues join us.

□ 1030

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2669, COLLEGE COST REDUCTION ACT OF 2007

Ms. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 531 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 531

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 2669) to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 601 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2008. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Education and Labor 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. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate on the bill, as amended, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor; (2) the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in part B of the report on the Committee on Rules, if offered by the gentleman from California, Mr. McKeon, or his designee, which shall be in order without intervention of any point of order except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI, shall be considered as read, and shall be separately debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent; and (3) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. During consideration of H.R. 2669 pursuant to this resolution, notwithstanding the operation of the previous question, the Chair may postpone further consideration of the bill to such time as may be designated by the Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOLDEN). The gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. SUTTON) is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS). All time yielded during consideration of the rule is for debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous materials into the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 531 provides for consideration of H.R. 2669, the College Cost Reduction Act of 2007, under a structured rule. The rule provides 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking

member of the Committee on Education and Labor. The rule makes in order and provides appropriate waivers for a single amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by Representative McKEON of California or his designee.

Mr. Speaker, educational opportunity is the backbone of what we are about and everything that makes this Nation great. For this reason, I am very pleased to support the rule and the underlying legislation that will give our students a real opportunity to go to college and give them the vital tools necessary to prepare them to enter the workforce and build a positive future.

The College Cost Reduction Act addresses one of the most important and difficult issues facing our Nation. While access to higher education is more critical than ever for our younger generations, the cost is rapidly moving out of reach for many low- and middle-income families. This problem is nothing less than a crisis. How many students have had their dreams shattered because they could not afford their tuition? And how much potential has our Nation lost because of the failure to address this issue?

If students cannot afford to get the education and training necessary for them to make a productive and positive impact in our communities, it hurts us all. Investment in our younger generations not only improves their future, but it helps our economy and our retired workers whom they will help to support. It ensures our national security, continued improvements in health outcomes as well as advances in manufacturing and technology. Improving access to higher education is not only about helping America's middle class and our students and families who are in need. It is about strengthening America.

But instead of helping our students prepare themselves for a better future, recent Congresses and the administration chose to cut funding for student loan programs and have allowed this issue to become the crisis it is today. It is time for priorities to change, and this bill is part of making that happen.

Tuition and fees at 4-year public colleges and universities have risen 41 percent after inflation since 2001. The typical American student now graduates from college with \$17,500 worth of debt. If we do not take action immediately, financial barriers will prevent at least 4.4 million high school graduates from attending a 4-year public college over the next decade. This Congress has a responsibility to help our students and our working families.

Mr. Speaker, I have witnessed the heartbreak of parents who work hard day in and day out who have to tell their child that they cannot afford to send them to college. I have listened to these struggling parents and heard the ache in their voices. It is a story that is far too common. It is unacceptable and we must take action. And today we do.

H.R. 2669, the College Cost Reduction Act, will provide the single largest increase in college aid since the GI bill, and it will put college education back within reach of so many families. H.R. 2669 follows on the College Student Relief Act that passed overwhelmingly, 356-71, in this new Congress earlier this year. That bill cut interest rates in half on subsidized student loans over the next 5 years. For the average student in the State of Ohio at institutions like the University of Akron and Lorain Community College, this means a savings of roughly \$4,320 once the cuts are phased in. It is estimated that our proposal will help roughly 175,000 students just in Ohio alone and 5.5 million nationwide. Our bill increases the maximum Pell grant scholarship by at least \$500 over the next 5 years while also expanding eligibility to include and serve more students with financial need. In Ohio, roughly 224,000 students will benefit from these changes to the Pell grant program. And nationwide, over 5.7 million students will benefit and another 600,000 will become eligible for the grants, making the possibility of a college education for them a reality.

Additionally, this legislation recognizes the value of our public servants, and it shows how much we respect what they do. Individuals working jobs that make our world turn, teachers and firefighters, nurses, law enforcement officers, librarians, we provide upfront tuition assistance to qualified undergraduate students who commit to teaching in public schools in high-poverty communities or high-need subject areas. And we provide loan forgiveness for first responders, law enforcement officers, firefighters, nurses, public defenders, prosecutors, early childhood educators, librarians and others. We are investing not only in the potential of individual students, Mr. Speaker. We are investing in the strength of our communities and our country. And the return on our investment as a Nation and our students and people will, without question, provide an enormous return.

But our failure to invest likewise will have incredibly harmful consequences. Our bill makes clear we understand the importance of this investment.

And, Mr. Speaker, to make a good bill even better, the College Cost Reduction Act will benefit all of these students and families at no new cost to taxpayers. We make these important investments in education through government spending cuts. With this bill, we take the billions of access taxpayer subsidies that have gone into the profit margins of private lenders and invest it in direct support for our students. Overall, H.R. 2669 will save almost \$20 billion in taxpayer money and reinvest that money in the needs of our students. This is about where the priorities of our Nation and this Congress lie.

Mr. Speaker, as I said earlier, the lack of access to higher education is a

crisis for our Nation, and it is a burden that no family in this great country should have to bear. The College Cost Reduction Act puts us in a position to help these families and assist our students who simply want to learn and be prepared to enter the workforce and contribute to society. This bill does more than just pay lip service to the virtue of a college education. Today we act to help families, students and our country.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. SUTTON) for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. HASTINGS of Washington asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, earlier this year, the Democrat majority approved what I consider an irresponsible budget plan that calls for more spending now followed by massive tax increases in the future. Their budget plan only called for one committee, the Education and Labor Committee, to find cost savings, and that turned out, Mr. Speaker, to be a mere \$750 million over 5 years.

In comparison, when Republicans were in control, the fiscal year 2006 budget resolution called on eight House and Senate committees to find a total of \$35 billion in savings over 5 years. As a result, Congress passed and President Bush signed into law the Deficit Reduction Act, which saved American taxpayers \$38 billion.

House Resolution 531 provides for the consideration of the Democrat majority's attempt to rein in spending, the College Cost Reduction Act. However, Mr. Speaker, this bill is nothing more than an illusion. While the bill does find savings, it immediately spends most of it, \$18 billion, to create nine new entitlement programs. These entitlement programs, which grow automatically every year without congressional review, pose the largest threat to our long-term economic health. Essentially, these programs run on auto pilot with no accountability to the taxpayers writing the check.

Entitlement programs currently today make up well over half of the Federal budget and in the next decade will consume nearly two-thirds of our budget. History has proven that once an entitlement program is created, it lives forever, and even improving these programs has proven to be a very difficult task.

Taxpayers will be paying for the new entitlement programs created under this proposal for at least 5 years and likely for many years to come, thus wiping out any savings that may be achieved with this bill in the short term.

Mr. Speaker, I have to say that I share the goal of increasing access to higher education. Education in general

is very important to the future of our country. But there are many approaches the Democrat majority has chosen to take in this bill that shifts the responsibility for personal decisions made by students to the taxpayers. For instance, this bill guarantees that borrowers, no matter how much they borrow, will not have to pay more than 15 percent of their income in loan payments and allows the borrowers to have the balance of their loans disappear, disappear, Mr. Speaker, after 20 years and thus be paid for by the American taxpayer. This bill also requires those same taxpayers to pick up the outstanding student loan tab for public sector employees after just 10 years. Now, Mr. Speaker, while I agree we should encourage people to enter the public sector, I feel this approach places too heavy a fiscal burden on American taxpayers.

I believe that we must do all that we can do to make education more affordable for those who wish to pursue their education so that more Americans can achieve the dream of graduating from college. With tuition costs on the rise, students and their families are facing the inevitable question of how to pay for college education. The cost of attaining a college degree has increased over the years, and students are finding it increasingly difficult to pay for college without financial assistance.

So I believe, Mr. Speaker, that we must take a balanced approach that increases the transparency of higher education costs and targets aid to the neediest students while controlling spending and lowering the deficit.

□ 1045

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I will support the McKeon substitute amendment, which increases the maximum Pell Grant award by \$350 next year and \$100 thereafter and provides a plan for improved accountability with regard to tuition costs.

If the McKeon amendment is not adopted, I will oppose the College Cost Reduction Act, which increases a maze of Federal regulations and bureaucracy for students and parents to navigate, directs more resources to institutions of higher education rather than students, and creates new entitlement spending at the long-term expense of the American taxpayer.

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

Ms. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman, a member of the Rules Committee from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN).

Mr. MCGOVERN. I thank my colleague from Ohio for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, my home State of Massachusetts is famous for the quality of its colleges and universities. In the Third Congressional District alone, which I represent, there are 15 colleges and universities. Some of these schools specialize in the fields of medicine,

nursing, pharmacy, and health sciences. Others are community and other 2-year colleges that provide education and training for students to earn associate degrees, transfer to 4-year institutions, or upgrade their skills and experience in order to become more productive in their chosen careers.

We are privileged to have such internationally recognized colleges as Clark University, Worcester Polytechnic Institute, and Holy Cross College in my district. I have many public and private institutions, such as Worcester State College and Assumption College, which provide students with a well-rounded advanced education.

These schools attract a great diversity of students to central Massachusetts each year, over 30,000 in the Worcester area alone. H.R. 2669, the College Cost Reduction Act, will help these students realize the dream of a college education without mortgaging their futures in the process.

Mr. Speaker, this bill overhauls the student aid system and provides debt relief in order to make college more affordable for students and their parents. As others have noted, it is the single largest investment in higher education since the GI Bill. And it provides these new benefits at no new cost to the taxpayer, reducing excess subsidies that have been paid by the Federal Government to lenders in the student loan industry.

But this bill also supports and protects the 90 percent of student loan lenders that are nonprofit lenders or smaller community-based lenders. H.R. 2669 recognizes their unique mission, putting all their profits back into students and into our communities.

The College Cost Reduction Act provides a fee reduction for these lenders, making them better able to compete with large national lenders and serve students and their families. The small lenders that make up the Massachusetts Educational Financing Authority, for example, provide students and families with straightforward information and advice on how to apply for and choose a college financing plan. Along with free financial aid seminars and advice, they also provide low-cost loan programs for parents and students. H.R. 2669 will allow these types of lenders to better serve the students and families of central Massachusetts by making their loans even more affordable.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Chairman MILLER and the members of the Education and Workforce Committee for bringing us a bill that provides such substantial increases for the Pell Grant program, initiatives to help control colleges costs, increased funding for Perkins loans, greater support for the critical Upward Bound program, and restructuring the way in which students repay their loans. If we look at the Pell Grant alone, over 87,000 Massachusetts students will benefit over the next 5 years from an estimated \$357

million in additional Pell Grant funding.

Mr. Speaker, the challenge of affordable education affects not just the poor, but the middle class as well. Parents and students alike have been frustrated by the lack of action by the previous congressional leadership. I love when I hear my colleague from Washington say we all share the goal of helping struggling students be able to afford a college education. Well, students don't need our sympathy. They don't want us to feel their pain. They want us to do something. And for years they haven't done anything. Well, today we are going to do something.

Times have changed. And today we will pass a bill that will make higher education a reality for countless students and contribute greatly to a brighter economic future. We will not be able to compete in a global economy unless we have a well-educated workforce, and we need to invest in our students, and this bill does it.

I urge bipartisan support for the bill.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I just point out to my friend from Massachusetts that, since Republicans have been in control, that Pell Grants, individually, have nearly doubled in that length of time. I think the students are being well served, and they are responsible. And I think that is a very, very good policy.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to my friend from Minnesota, a member of the Education and Workforce Committee (Mr. KLINE).

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to this rule. Once again, the majority has seen fit to stifle debate when considering significant legislation.

Yesterday, I and several other members of the Education and Labor Committee presented amendments to the members of the Rules Committee with the expectation that those amendments would be seriously considered. It's now become apparent that that hearing was really just a facade; the decision had already been made to exclude those amendments.

If I had had the opportunity to offer my amendment today under a fair rule, House Members would have seen that the concept of my amendment was simple: to ensure that those most in need, college graduates that serve the public interest and college students in need of government grants, are the direct beneficiaries of Federal interest rate reductions. Instead, the majority has treated us to a show worthy of the best Las Vegas illusionist, a reconciliation process intended to reduce the growth in entitlement spending that instead creates nine new entitlement programs. That's right. The reconciliation process is designed to reduce the growth in entitlement spending to cut the Federal deficit; and, instead, this bill creates nine new entitlement programs.

While openly declaring that the underlying bill expands educational benefits for students, a little sleight of hand instead reveals legislation that fails to target aid to those students most in need.

My amendment, rejected by the Rules Committee along party lines, would have focused our limited Federal funding on those college graduates that chose a path offering less monetary reward, but serving, arguably, a much greater public purpose. My amendment achieved this goal by ensuring that those graduates who can pay their loans under a higher interest rate do so by establishing an income cap of \$65,000 for single graduates and \$135,000 for married couples, the income levels at which the existing student loan tax reductions are phased out.

After reaching that income level, which is almost twice the average family income of a student eligible to receive a subsidized student loan, the interest rate for a loan would have reverted to the current level of 6.8 percent. Those graduates who may not have as high an income, however, would have seen their interest rates stay at the reduced level. This includes, of course, those most in need because they chose to serve the public interest: members of the Armed Forces, first responders, nurses, teachers, and other graduates who choose careers in public service. By adding a fair, balanced income cap adjustment, we would have generated additional savings that could have been directed toward another truly deserving group, those utilizing need-based aid through the Pell Grant program.

Unfortunately, more than 400,000 students, Mr. Speaker, are fully prepared to attend a 4-year college but will be unable to do so because of enormous financial barriers. As a member of the Education and Labor Committee, it is paramount for me to prioritize the expansion of secondary education access for low- and middle-income students whenever possible. I am disappointed, but sadly, not surprised, the majority has instead chosen to rely on the same tired strategy of expanding entitlement spending for institutions to the detriment of currently college students struggling to pay their high tuition costs.

Ms. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman, a distinguished member of the Rules Committee from Florida (Ms. CASTOR).

Ms. CASTOR. I thank my colleague, Ms. SUTTON from Ohio, who is a true fighter for education reform for the working families of Ohio and all Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support the College Cost Reduction Act under this rule, as we are charting an historic new investment in our students and our communities.

All Americans should salute the leadership of Chairman GEORGE MILLER and Speaker NANCY PELOSI for their leader-

ship in education and this single largest investment in higher education since the 1944 GI Bill.

Chairman MILLER, on behalf of the students, colleges and universities in the State of Florida, I thank you for your dedication. And we also thank you in the State of Florida because you worked tirelessly with me and my colleague from the Rules Committee, Mr. HASTINGS, to ensure that students from States like Florida that have low tuition and low State support have access to additional need-based aid.

Passage of this act will increase access to college by making it more affordable. The cost of higher education in this country has skyrocketed over recent years. Thousands of students are left with overwhelming debt after graduation due to higher student loan rates and declining financial aid. Some may not make it to the college classroom at all because it has become so cost prohibitive.

In Florida, the average debt after college is more than \$18,000 per student. But in America, no young person with a desire to learn should be barred from moving on to college due to financial hurdles, and this act removes many of those hurdles today. The College Cost Reduction Act cuts student loan interest rates in half and increases Pell Grants by at least \$500 per student over the next 5 years. In the State of Florida alone, Federal loan and Pell Grant aid will increase by \$762 million that will benefit over 340,000 students. In my home area, the Tampa Bay area, we have the ninth largest university in the country in the University of South Florida, over 40,000 students in that university. In addition, there is the University of Tampa, the Hillsborough Community College, Manatee Community College and St. Petersburg College. So let the message go forth to those students and those families that help is on the way, that they will not have to struggle with those higher student loan interest rates; they can depend on a little more help when it comes to the Pell Grant.

This bill also acknowledges that some high school students need a little extra help to be college ready, particularly students who may be the first in their family to attend college. We're going to keep these students on track to go to college and stand up for them and protect Federal dollars for their success.

We owe a debt of gratitude to the gentleman from Virginia, Mr. BOBBY SCOTT, because he offered an amendment to this bill to maintain the Upward Bound program. I am proud to support his amendment which is contained in this bill that nationwide will protect the Upward Bound program.

In my hometown of Tampa, this means standing up for those students I met on Monday. I met with students at the great Middleton High School in Tampa. Jasmyn Hendricks and Clifton Tyson are students in the Upward Bound program at the University of South Florida.

Imagine a high school student that takes 20 Saturdays out of their life to learn about what it means to go to college, and then they spend their summers there, too. They are typically the first ones in their family to go to college. And we know that if they achieve their high school diploma, they will have a higher salary; but if they achieve their college degree, they are set up for success in life, and our communities benefit.

Jasmyn said to me, as her eyes welled up with tears, that before Upward Bound, I knew I wanted to pursue higher education, but there was no way. Jasmyn considers her Upward Bound program her second family. She said, There was no money. I just couldn't see a way for me to get to college after high school. Then Upward Bound comes along and introduces us to the fact there are college scholarships, grants and help.

Clifton, who is an athlete, said that he used to see sports as his only avenue to college; but since starting at Upward Bound, he now says sports is his second gateway. He wants to go to college for academics.

It was completely unfortunate that the White House targeted the Upward Bound program for budget cuts. In this day and age when we are spending so much money overseas, up to \$10 billion in Iraq, they target monies for folks that need to go to college.

Mr. Speaker, the College Cost Reduction Act is a momentous and historic step in a new direction, the right direction for higher education in America. It opens the door to college to thousands of students where those doors were previously slammed shut.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the ranking member of the Education and Workforce Committee, Mr. MCKEON of California.

□ 1100

Mr. MCKEON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule. This rule would provide for consideration of fiscally irresponsible legislation that will create nine new entitlement programs and misdirect billions of dollars in aid towards colleges, universities, college graduates and even philanthropic organizations, rather than low-income students and parents and those who need it the most.

My colleagues who were around in the last Congress may remember that when we passed a real budget reconciliation bill, the Education and Workforce Committee found some \$18 billion-plus in savings, two-thirds of which we directed towards deficit reduction and one-third of which we directed towards increased student benefits, for real students, such as higher loan limits, more grant aid for low-income, high-achieving students and loan forgiveness for high-demand teachers. Unfortunately, H.R. 2669 takes us in a drastically different direction.

The rule before us provides for continued abuse of the budget reconciliation process as a backdoor way to implement significant changes to programs best addressed through regular order. Not a single committee hearing has been held on this bill. The potential impact of many of its student loan cuts has never been weighed and no one has provided adequate reasons regarding why or how many of the nine new entitlement programs created under the bill are necessary or fiscally responsible.

So, by creating a bundle of new entitlement programs, complete with new bureaucracy, rules, regulations, this bill places billions of dollars in new Federal spending on autopilot with no accountability to taxpayers whatsoever. Instead, this measure could be improved by infusing more savings into the Pell Grant program. Pell is a proven success that has helped millions of young people attend college, and I am grateful that this rule will give the House an opportunity to move billions out of new, misdirected entitlement spending and into Pell later today.

Even so, the rule allows for the continuation of a budget reconciliation process that has been flawed, abused and used as a springboard for billions in new entitlement spending. As a result, I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing the rule and the underlying bill.

Ms. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), a distinguished member of the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the College Cost Reduction Act and the rule which makes in order the manager's amendment to the bill. I would like to thank Chairman MILLER and Subcommittee Chairman HINOJOSA for their work on this bill.

We know that higher education is crucial, not only to the individual but also to our Nation. We know, for example, that the more you learn, the more you earn. We know that those who are in college are much less likely to be involved with welfare, much less likely to be involved in crime. Education is critical for our national economy. We know that the economic future of the United States depends on the success of our higher education policy.

We live in a high-tech, high-information economy, so the number of college students that we have will be an important economic resource. We can't afford to have any of our children fail to achieve full potential because they were not able to afford to go to college.

There are many improvements in the bill. The cost of education through student loans will be made more affordable. There are significant increases in Pell Grants. One of the major increases, the first in the last 4 years, \$500 over the next 4 years, will be the increase in the maximum Pell Grant

award. We know this is critical, because in the last 6 years, the cost of college education has gone up about 55 percent, but in the last 4 years, the Pell Grant didn't go up at all.

This bill makes significant investments in Historically Black Colleges and Universities and other minority-serving institutions. A significant portion of the students at these colleges and universities are first-generation students. We know they often come from low-income families, so support of these institutions is critical. We know that these colleges offer an opportunity that otherwise would not be there.

This bill also makes improvements in Upward Bound. It provides additional funds for Upward Bound because many qualified Upward Bound programs were not funded this year because the program just ran out of money. Upward Bound focuses on those who have the potential to go to college but may not, just because they don't think they are expected to go to college. This bill makes critical improvements in the Upward Bound program and makes sure that those qualified programs can get funded.

Mr. Speaker, the College Cost Reduction Act will reduce the cost of going to college. It will enable many to go to college that otherwise could not have afforded to go to college. Chairman MILLER's amendment makes improvements to the bill, and therefore I support the rule and support the bill and urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS), a member of the committee.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose this rule for a number of reasons. Yesterday I testified to the Rules Committee regarding my amendment to allow the U.S. Department of Education to continue its evaluation of the Upward Bound program. I am astonished that, because of the Rules Committee action, the full House is not given an opportunity to consider this amendment.

Let me first of all make it abundantly clear, I am a very strong supporter of the Upward Bound program. There have been some preliminary studies in the Department of Education that indicate the program may not be living up to its potential. I am not sure I believe those. But currently the Department of Education has announced a rigorous, random assignment study, that is considered the gold standard of research methodologies, to evaluate the Upward Bound program's impact on students most in need of services. I believe this is a very important study to determine exactly what works best in Upward Bound and how we can improve it.

Unfortunately, during the Education and Labor Committee's consideration of the College Cost Reduction Act, the

committee adopted an amendment by voice vote to prohibit this important evaluative study of the Upward Bound program, not so much because they were against the program, but because of an ancillary aspect of it that the amendment was aimed at. My amendment would have left the ancillary program out in the dust, but would have allowed the study to go forward. As a scientist and a strong advocate for research funding, I know it is imperative that we conduct rigorous evaluations using the most sound, scientifically robust methodology to identify best practices in Federal programs, and I wish that my amendment had been made in order.

It is unfortunate that this bill does not promote good evaluation, which is critical to ensuring that taxpayer dollars are spent wisely and effectively. It also ensures that students are benefiting from proven services.

Finally, I want to express my dismay that the manager's amendment strikes the two amendments that I offered during committee consideration, which were adopted by voice vote and are noncontroversial. In particular, I am dismayed that an amendment I offered about sustainability programs at universities is removed by the manager's amendment.

I thought with Speaker PELOSI's high priority on environmental improvement and saving energy, that the new majority would accept that amendment, as they did in committee, and would let it remain in the bill so that we can wake up some of our higher educational institutions and get them to adopt sustainability programs and also establish academic programs so that future students can be educated in sustainability principles, so that we in fact as a nation can "go green" much more rapidly.

For these reasons, I will vote "no" on this unfair rule.

Ms. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN), a leader in education policy.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Let me thank the gentlewoman from Ohio for the time, and thank her for her leadership on education issues.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good day for students around the country, and it is a good day for all Americans, and I commend the Education and Labor Committee for their good work on this legislation.

During the first 100 hours of this new Congress when we passed legislation to cut the interest rates on student loans in half, many of us stood in the well here and said, this is just the beginning. That was an important first step to making college more affordable and giving millions of students a chance to further their educations and to brighten their futures.

We stand here today to take the next step, the largest investment in student loans since the GI Bill. We are keeping the promise that we made to the American people and American students,

cutting interest rates on student loans in half and now increasing Pell Grants, raising the cap on low-interest Federal loans and making it easier for students who are being pinched by other costs to pay back the payments on their interest rates and their loans.

In addition, this bill makes it easier for young people to enter public service and serve their communities by extending loan forgiveness to law enforcement officers, first responders, librarians and nurses and giving more assistance than ever to undergraduates who commit to teaching in high-need locations or subject areas. As we make these very vital changes to give more opportunities to students, we do so in a fiscally responsible manner by cutting exorbitant fees to lenders.

Mr. Speaker, by opening the doors to college and maintaining a balanced budget, we are working to ensure the best possible future for our young people. By increasing the opportunity incentive to enter public service, we harness the ability and ambition of our best and brightest. And by helping students achieve advanced degrees, we are ensuring that the United States remains on the forefront of innovation and discovery in an increasingly competitive global economy.

Mr. Speaker, I think we would all agree, there is no better investment that we can all make than in the area of education. Students and middle America are feeling the pinch of rising costs in many areas. This helps provide them greater means to open the door of college and opportunity to more and more Americans.

I encourage my colleagues to join with all of us in taking this very important step for the students of this country and, indeed, for all America.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT), another member of the Education and Workforce Committee.

Mrs. BIGGERT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule and the underlying bill, H.R. 2669, the so-called College Cost Reduction Act. Like many of my colleagues, I have serious concerns about the new mandatory spending that is included in this legislation. H.R. 2669 creates nine new entitlement programs, most of which do not attempt to address the hurdles many prospective and current college students face.

Mandatory spending entitlement programs already consume the largest portion of the Federal budget. The uncontrolled growth of entitlement programs, particularly Medicare, Medicaid and Social Security, will eventually consume the entire Federal budget by 2050 if left unchecked. That means the Federal Government would have no available funds for programs other than entitlements; no militaries, highways, courts, law enforcement or border security.

So how are we addressing this looming crisis today? Well, it seems we are

addressing it by creating new entitlement programs, nine of them. The new programs created under this legislation will not undergo the annual scrutiny of the appropriations process. Regardless of the success or failure of these programs, the American taxpayer, our constituents, will continue to pay for these new programs available to anyone that meets the basic qualifications.

Another serious concern is that some of the mandatory spending in H.R. 2669 is directed towards colleges, universities and philanthropic organizations. Traditionally entitlement programs have been directed at individuals who are in need of the Federal assistance, such as Medicare, Social Security, food stamps and student loans. Directing the mandatory funding under this legislation to institutions, instead of low- and middle-income students who need the assistance most, sends the wrong message about the priorities of this Congress.

During the Education and Labor Committee markup, I supported a substitute amendment offered by Mr. McKEON that would have invested \$12 billion in the Pell Grant program, more than double the increase provided by this bill. It also reduced the PLUS loan interest rates for the Federal Family Education Loan Program to match the interest rate in the Direct Loan Program, currently 7.9 percent. The funding provided under the McKeon substitute would have been directed to those who need the assistance most, the students, without creating new programs and additional bureaucracy for students and parents to navigate.

Finally, I have concerns about maintaining the viability of the FFELP. In the last Congress, the Education and Workforce Committee made \$20 billion in changes to FFELP by eliminating and reducing Federal subsidies to lenders. Just 2 years later, we are back again squeezing student loan lenders. My concern is this legislation is using the reconciliation process as a backdoor attempt to kill FFELP.

Mr. Speaker, I am disappointed that I have to oppose the rule and this legislation. There are a few provisions in this legislation that I believe would help college students and address some concerns in areas of academic need.

□ 1115

However, I cannot support a bill that creates new mandatory spending for institutions at a time when we are addressing the looming crisis with our existing entitlement programs for individuals. I urge my colleagues to vote against the rule and against H.R. 2669.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) who spent a long career in education and also a member of the Education and Workforce Committee.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, a couple of years ago I was in the posi-

tion of the gentlewoman from Ohio managing some of the rules for the bills, and often I was chagrined and offended by people who would complain about amendments not being made in order when they had been fully vetted and defeated in the committee.

I want you to know as I rise to talk about one amendment that was not made in order, this is not necessarily the case. Even though I had offered it in committee, I withdrew it in the committee in the spirit of comity to try to work towards a solution for this floor, not realizing that the Rules Committee would callously deny all amendments made in order on this bill.

Reconciliation is already a procedural process that limits the right of the minority to have input. To further restrict their rights by not recognizing any amendments, and indeed taking out amendments that were passed in the full committee, is something that certainly is not the definition of open government.

The issue I wish to address I will continue to talk about because philosophically I think it is larger than the bill we are actually discussing. The Department of Education drafted the language I presented, not to say they endorsed it, but to let you know this was not a cavalier but a serious effort at solving a problem. In fact, the amendment was passed last year by this body in the Higher Ed Reauthorization Act, but was one of the bills that the Senate refused to accept or consider during the last year.

I want to publicly thank the subcommittee chairman, Mr. KILDEE, for speaking to me about this amendment, Mr. McKEON, the ranking member, and his staff for talking to us at length about this amendment, and also the Department of Education.

To the full committee chairman I wish to apologize. Part of my process with these types of amendments is to sit down with the ranking member as well as the chairman to explain my purpose and intent. Six different times since the committee met, I have made an effort to try to meet with the chairman of the full committee and each time those efforts were rebuffed. So I apologize to him for not doing what I think should be the normal process.

The last time we did a reconciliation bill, there was a new entitlement that was inserted on the insistence of the Senate. That was the wrong process. But it did establish an increase in a new Pell Grant program which I like, and it required this Pell Grant to go to those who had a rigorous academic schedule, something else I like. But it also gave the Department of Education the right to establish criteria which would drive curricula. That is the part I cannot accept.

In the charter of the Education Department, it was forbidden for them to have this power. In Federal statutes, it is forbidden for them to have this power. State constitutions forbid it; yet this program has opened the door for future abuse.

In the committee it was asked: Shouldn't all States have common standards? To allow the Federal Government to establish those common standards gives the Federal Government power taken from parents and local school boards to drive curriculum decisions. It is almost like saying can't we be partially pregnant. No.

If the Department of Education has the ability to establish some curriculum decisions, they also have inherently the ability to establish all curriculum decisions, even though the current Department of Education is trying hard not to abuse this power by still saying there are four broad areas that qualify. They themselves have admitted that it needs to be refined. And what the future Department of Education without this same kind of approach would have simply meant that there can be abuse of the system in the future.

Most curriculums are always going to be driven, especially of electives, by a teacher. Other curriculum is driven by graduation requirements. But curriculum can also be driven by outside requirements. When the four colleges in Utah decided that students should have 2 years of foreign languages before they go to college, the enrollment in foreign language programs quadrupled. When the Federal Government can dangle out money for Pell Grants by taking specific classes, that will drive curriculum decisions, and it is philosophically wrong to give them that kind of power.

In this bill there is much good. Much of the good has already been stated in forms of hyperbole. There is also much bad.

In 2005 when this program to which I object was created, it was the wrong thing to do. This particular bill has nine different new entitlements which are also the wrong thing to do, so I am assuming this is probably about nine times as bad.

It is a poor and abusive procedure when we deny amendments on the floor and you deny amendments that were passed in committee and remove them without having the chance to address them again. So I will vote against this rule because it is an abuse of the procedure that unfairly limits the rights of the minority.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield such time as he may consume to the ranking member of the Rules Committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER).

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Pasco for yielding, and I congratulate him on his fine management of this rule; and I thank my friend from Ohio for her thoughtful remarks.

I have to say, as I have been listening to the debate from my friends on the other side of the aisle, they continually

say this is a great day for education. But the tragic thing is that this is a horrible day for future generations. Why? Well, as the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP), the former Rules Committee member, just stated, there are nine new entitlement programs included in this measure that is designed for budget savings. Reconciliation is all about trying to rein in the reach of the government, trying to bring about a modicum of fiscal responsibility.

Yesterday up in the Rules Committee, the distinguished Chair of the committee, my friend from Martinez, California, Mr. MILLER, when asked why it is we are making these mandatory instead of discretionary, meaning we would have the opportunity to look at them again, to possibly make modifications in them, he said we have authorization bills that are done and they end up dying, so we need to make these programs mandatory.

Well, Mr. Speaker, every single Democrat and Republican regularly talks about the need to rein in the so-called mandatory spending. We spend our time around this place talking about discretionary spending, earmarks and what we expend on the discretionary level. And it is a drop in the bucket compared to the mandatory programs that are out there. As we all know, Social Security, Medicare, veterans benefits, a wide range of mandatory programs exist, and this bill that is designed to bring about a reduction in spending establishes nine new mandatory programs.

So, Mr. Speaker, it is very obvious that we need to defeat this rule and bring about a reconciliation bill that in fact will not expand the number of mandatory programs, and we have an opportunity to do that right now. When we go into this vote, Mr. HASTINGS is going to seek to defeat the previous question so we will have an opportunity to make in order the Castle amendment. A very, very respected member from Delaware, the former Governor of the State who is an expert on dealing with our Nation's education needs, offered an amendment in the Rules Committee that was unfortunately denied. That amendment simply said that as we look at these nine mandatory programs that are put into place, he goes ahead and establishes them. But instead of making them mandatory, he makes them discretionary, discretionary so that we will have an opportunity as Members of Congress to look at those issues. And the savings created go to what everyone says they want to increase, and that is the Pell Grant program.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to regularly support the notion of our global leadership role when it comes to trade, when it comes to technology, and I recognize that it is absolutely imperative for the United States of America to have the best education system possible so that we can remain competitive globally.

I have just come back with a number of my colleagues from Indonesia, from

Mongolia and other countries in Asia over the Independence Day break, and one of the things that we found is that education is a key issue in these countries. We all know that in the United States of America we seem to be falling behind, so it is imperative that we do all that we can to ensure that there is access to education for our young people. I believe that we can put into place policies that will allow us to make education more affordable and more accessible without a dramatic increase in the number of mandatory programs.

The gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) talked about his amendment that was denied totally by the Rules Committee. The only thing made in order in this bill is a manager's amendment that will actually be self-executed, not considered on the floor and debated but self-executed if this rule in fact passes, and the amendment in the nature of a substitute that is going to be offered by the ranking member of the committee, Mr. MCKEON. But other than that, all of the other amendments that were offered, Democrats and Republicans were denied an opportunity to offer any amendments.

My California colleague, Mr. BILBRAY, had a thoughtful amendment dealing with the basic pilot program as it relates to illegal immigration. All it was saying was that institutions that get Federal funding are required to comply with the basic pilot program as it relates to the hiring, potential hiring of people who are in this country illegally. That amendment is not going to be able to be debated or even considered in this measure.

Mr. EHLERS had amendments that he sought to make in order, as did Mr. KLINE. They were very thoughtful proposals. Not one of them was made in order.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join with Mr. HASTINGS as he moves to defeat the previous question so that we can make Mr. CASTLE's amendment in order. That will allow us to take the expansive mandatory spending and shift it to discretionary spending, and the savings that we have go to the Pell Grant program.

If we do in fact fail in our quest to defeat the previous question, I hope my colleagues will vote against this rule so we can start over and do a very good and decent reconciliation package on this.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, 19 amendments were submitted to the Rules Committee. Sadly, the Democrats only allowed one single amendment to be considered, as the ranking member pointed out. Even more concerning is that this rule provides that the Miller manager's amendment shall be considered as adopted once this resolution is adopted, if in fact it is adopted.

They have carefully chosen to self-execute this amendment which does

not allow for a separate debate or clarification on the amendment, and the maneuver prohibits Members from voting specifically on the Miller manager's amendment. Members should be aware that the Miller manager's amendment reduces the amount of short-term savings to taxpayers.

In addition, if this rule is adopted, the misdirected College Cost Reduction Act can be fast-tracked through the Senate and therefore protected from filibuster.

So I am asking my colleagues to not only vote "no" on this restrictive rule, but also to vote "no" on the previous question so we can amend the rule to allow the House to consider the amendment offered by Mr. CASTLE of Delaware and provide the appropriate waivers.

As the ranking member pointed out, the Castle amendment would simply end the entitlements in this bill. I think that is a very important policy statement. Further, the savings from these entitlements would go to increase the Pell Grants by \$100 in the next 2 years and \$50 through 2018. So by defeating the previous question, we will give Members the ability to vote on the merits of the amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

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

Ms. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

We have heard here today why we must pass this rule and pass the College Cost Reduction Act, and I wanted to commend and thank Chairman MILLER for his tremendous leadership in getting this done.

□ 1130

As I said earlier, educational opportunity is the backbone of our Nation, and our students, our families and our country have waited long enough for this to happen.

With all due respect to my colleagues on the other side who seem intent on further delay, 12 years of Republican rule provided ample opportunity to act on this issue and pass a bill, to act on amendments. The American people cannot wait any longer.

This is an issue that many of us here in Congress hear about when we return to our districts because a lot of families are worrying about how they will pay for their children's education, and today, we are going to work with them. Their government is going to work with them and not against them.

I'd like to share today on the floor a letter that I bet mirrors letters that every one of our Members receives. This is a letter that came to me from a constituent, and I will share part of it.

It says: "Is anything ever going to be done about the exorbitant cost of a college education in this country? How are the middle class supposed to save for retirement and also pay the exorbitant cost of a college education for our children?"

"This country seems to be obsessed with debt, because the colleges and the high schools as well, tell you that you should expect to be in a certain amount of debt upon graduation from college. I guess if you're wealthy, it's not an issue. So the middle class are the ones that are left struggling.

"With such an importance put on having a college education to get a decent paying job in this country, how are our children supposed to be able to afford a home and car upon graduation from college when they will be so far in debt with student loans?"

"As for the parents, any raises we receive go toward the continually increasing cost of medical insurance, gasoline, utilities, property taxes, et cetera. I know, in my own case, we seem to be going backwards instead of forward, and we by no means live extravagantly or beyond our means.

"I am looking forward to hearing from you."

Well, today, this constituent hears from me and hears from this Congress, and I ask all of my colleagues to join me in supporting this rule.

For my constituent and her daughter, I urge a "yes" vote on the previous question and on the rule.

The material previously referred to by Mr. HASTINGS of Washington is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 531 OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF WASHINGTON

Strike all after the resolved clause and insert the following:

That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 2669) to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 601 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2008. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Education and Labor 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. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate on the bill, as amended, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor; (2) the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in part B of the report on the Committee on Rules, if offered by the gentleman from California, Mr. McKEON, or his designee, which shall be in order without intervention of any point of order except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI, shall be considered as read, and shall be separately debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent; (3) the further amendment printed in section 3 of this resolution, if offered by the

gentleman from Delaware, Mr. CASTLE, or his designee, which shall be in order without intervention of any point of order except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI, shall be considered as read, and shall be separately debatable for 30 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent; and (4) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. During consideration of H.R. 2669 pursuant to this resolution, notwithstanding the operation of the previous question, the Chair may postpone further consideration of the bill to such time as may be designated by the Speaker.

SEC. 3. The amendment referred to in section 1 is as follows:

At the end of part A of title I of the bill add the following new section:

SEC. 105. ADDITIONAL INCREASE IN MAXIMUM FEDERAL PELL GRANTS.

(a) FUNDS FOR ADDITIONAL INCREASE.—In addition to the amounts made available to increase maximum Federal Pell Grants by section 401(a)(9)(A) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (as amended by section 101(b) of this Act), or by any other section of this Act, there shall be available to the Secretary of Education, from funds not otherwise appropriated, the following additional amounts:

(1) \$420,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2008 and 2009; and

(2) \$207,500,000 for each of the fiscal years 2010 through 2017.

(b) USE FOR ADDITIONAL MAXIMUM FEDERAL PELL GRANTS.—Amounts made available to the Secretary of Education pursuant to subsection (a) of this section shall be used to provide increases in the amounts of the maximum Federal Pell Grant for which a student shall be eligible during an award year, in addition to any increases provided by section 401(a)(9)(B) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (as amended by section 101(b) of this Act), or by any other section of this Act, in the following amounts:

(1) \$100 for each of the award years 2008–2009 and 2009–2010; and

(2) \$50 for each of the award years 2010–2011 through 2017–2018.

Page 51, line 10, strike "shall be available" and insert "are authorized to be appropriated".

Page 62, line 8, strike "shall be available" and insert "are authorized to be appropriated", and on line 12, strike "made available" and insert "authorized".

Page 78, line 17, strike "shall be available" and insert "are authorized to be appropriated".

Page 79, line 20, strike "shall be available" and insert "are authorized to be appropriated".

Page 109, line 4, strike "shall be available" and insert "are authorized to be appropriated".

Page 110, line 24, strike "shall be available" and insert "are authorized to be appropriated".

Page 129, line 18, strike "shall be available" and insert "are authorized to be appropriated".

Page 131, beginning on line 2, strike "and there are appropriated to the Secretary, from funds not 4 otherwise appropriated".

Ms. SUTTON. 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 yeas appeared to have it.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clauses 8 and 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on adopting House Resolution 531 (if ordered); suspending the rules and adopting House Resolution 526; and suspending the rules and passing S. 1701.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 221, nays 198, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 607]

YEAS—221

Abercrombie	Gutierrez	Oberstar
Ackerman	Hall (NY)	Obey
Allen	Hare	Oliver
Altmire	Harman	Ortiz
Andrews	Hastings (FL)	Pallone
Arcuri	Hill	Pascarell
Baca	Hinchev	Pastor
Baird	Hirono	Payne
Baldwin	Hodes	Perlmutter
Becerra	Holden	Peterson (MN)
Berman	Holt	Pomeroy
Berry	Honda	Price (NC)
Bishop (GA)	Hooley	Rahall
Bishop (NY)	Hoyer	Rangel
Boren	Inslee	Reyes
Boswell	Israel	Rodriguez
Boucher	Jackson (IL)	Ross
Boyd (FL)	Jackson-Lee	Rothman
Boyd (KS)	(TX)	Roybal-Allard
Braley (IA)	Jefferson	Ruppersberger
Brown, Corrine	Johnson (GA)	Rush
Butterfield	Johnson, E. B.	Ryan (OH)
Capps	Jones (OH)	Salazar
Capuano	Kagen	Sánchez, Linda T.
Cardoza	Kanjorski	Sanchez, Loretta
Carnahan	Kaptur	Sarbanes
Carney	Kennedy	Schakowsky
Carson	Kildee	Schiff
Castor	Kilpatrick	Schwartz
Chandler	Kind	Scott (GA)
Clarke	Klein (FL)	Scott (VA)
Clay	Kucinich	Serrano
Cleaver	Lampson	Sestak
Clyburn	Langevin	Shea-Porter
Cohen	Lantos	Sherman
Conyers	Larsen (WA)	Shuler
Cooper	Larson (CT)	Sires
Costa	Lee	Skelton
Costello	Levin	Slaughter
Courtney	Lewis (GA)	Lipinski
Cramer	Lipinski	Loebsock
Crowley	Loebsock	Lofgren, Zoe
Cuellar	Lofgren, Zoe	Lowey
Cummings	Lowey	Lynch
Davis (AL)	Lynch	Mahoney (FL)
Davis (CA)	Mahoney (FL)	Maloney (NY)
Davis (IL)	Maloney (NY)	Markey
Davis, Lincoln	Markey	Matheson
DeFazio	Marshall	Matsui
DeGette	Matheson	McCarthys (NY)
Delahunt	Matsui	McCollum (MN)
DeLauro	McCarthy (NY)	McDermott
Dicks	McCollum (MN)	McGovern
Dingell	McDermott	McIntyre
Doggett	McGovern	McNulty
Donnelly	McIntyre	Meek (FL)
Doyle	McNulty	Meeks (NY)
Edwards	Meek (FL)	Melancon
Ellison	Meeks (NY)	Michaud
Ellsworth	Melancon	Miller (NC)
Emanuel	Michaud	Miller, George
Engel	Miller (NC)	Mitchell
Eshoo	Miller, George	Mollohan
Etheridge	Mitchell	Moore (KS)
Farr	Mollohan	Moore (WI)
Fattah	Moore (KS)	Moran (VA)
Filner	Moore (WI)	Murphy (CT)
Frank (MA)	Moran (VA)	Murphy, Patrick
Giffords	Murphy (CT)	Murtha
Gillibrand	Murphy, Patrick	Nadler
Gonzalez	Murtha	Napolitano
Gordon	Nadler	Neal (MA)
Green, Al	Napolitano	
Green, Gene	Neal (MA)	
Grijalva		

NAYS—198

Aderholt	Alexander	Bachus
Akin	Bachmann	Baker

Barrett (SC)	Gilchrest	Neugebauer
Barrow	Gillmor	Nunes
Bartlett (MD)	Gingrey	Paul
Barton (TX)	Gohmert	Pearce
Biggert	Goode	Pence
Bilbray	Goodlatte	Peterson (PA)
Bilirakis	Granger	Petri
Bishop (UT)	Graves	Pickering
Blackburn	Hall (TX)	Pitts
Blunt	Hastert	Platts
Boehner	Hastings (WA)	Poe
Bonner	Hayes	Price (GA)
Bono	Heller	Pryce (OH)
Boozman	Hensarling	Putnam
Boustany	Hergert	Radanovich
Brady (TX)	Hobson	Ramstad
Brown (SC)	Hoekstra	Regula
Brown-Waite,	Hulshof	Rehberg
Ginny	Hunter	Reichert
Buchanan	Inglis (SC)	Renzi
Burgess	Issa	Reynolds
Burton (IN)	Jindal	Rogers (AL)
Buyer	Johnson (IL)	Rogers (KY)
Calvert	Johnson, Sam	Rogers (MI)
Camp (MI)	Jones (NC)	Rohrabacher
Campbell (CA)	Jordan	Ros-Lehtinen
Cannon	Keller	Roskam
Cantor	King (IA)	Royce
Capito	King (NY)	Ryan (WI)
Carter	Kingston	Sali
Castle	Kirk	Saxton
Chabot	Kline (MN)	Schmidt
Chabot	Knollenberg	Sensenbrenner
Coble	Kuhl (NY)	Sessions
Cole (OK)	LaHood	Shadegg
Conaway	Lamborn	Shays
Crenshaw	Latham	Shimkus
Culberson	LaTourette	Shuster
Davis (KY)	Lewis (CA)	Simpson
Davis, David	Lewis (KY)	Smith (NE)
Davis, Tom	Linder	Smith (NJ)
Deal (GA)	LoBiondo	Smith (TX)
Dent	Lucas	Souder
Diaz-Balart, L.	Lungren, Daniel	Stearns
Diaz-Balart, M.	E.	Sullivan
Doolittle	Drake	Tancred
Drake	Mack	Terry
Dreier	Manzullo	Thornberry
Duncan	Marchant	Tiahrt
Ehlers	McCarthy (CA)	Tiberi
Emerson	McCauley (TX)	Turner
English (PA)	McCollum	Upton
Everett	McCrery	Walberg
Fallin	McHenry	Walden (OR)
Feeney	McHugh	Walsh (NY)
Ferguson	McKeon	Wamp
Flake	McMorris	Weldon (FL)
Forbes	Rodgers	Weller
Fortenberry	Mica	Westmoreland
Fossella	Miller (FL)	Whitfield
Fox	Miller (MI)	Wicker
Franks (AZ)	Miller, Gary	Wilson (NM)
Frelinghuysen	Moran (KS)	Wilson (SC)
Galleghy	Murphy, Tim	Wolf
Garrett (NJ)	Musgrave	Young (FL)
Gerlach	Myrick	

NOT VOTING—12

Bean	Cubin	Hinojosa
Berkley	Davis, Jo Ann	Porter
Blumenauer	Herseht Sandlin	Towns
Brady (PA)	Higgins	Young (AK)

□ 1157

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

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

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

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.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered. The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 222, nays 197, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 608]

YEAS—222

Abercrombie	Grijalva	Neal (MA)
Ackerman	Gutierrez	Oberstar
Allen	Hall (NY)	Obey
Altmire	Hare	Oliver
Andrews	Harman	Ortiz
Arcuri	Hastings (FL)	Pallone
Baca	Hill	Pascarell
Baird	Hinchev	Pastor
Baldwin	Hirono	Payne
Barrow	Hodes	Perlmutter
Becerra	Holden	Peterson (MN)
Berman	Holt	Pomeroy
Berry	Honda	Price (NC)
Bishop (GA)	Hooley	Rahall
Bishop (NY)	Hoyer	Rangel
Boren	Inslee	Reyes
Boswell	Israel	Rodriguez
Boucher	Jackson (IL)	Ross
Boyd (FL)	Jackson-Lee	Rothman
Boyd (KS)	(TX)	Roybal-Allard
Braley (IA)	Jefferson	Ruppersberger
Brown, Corrine	Johnson (GA)	Rush
Butterfield	Johnson, E. B.	Ryan (OH)
Capps	Jones (OH)	Salazar
Capuano	Kagen	Sánchez, Linda T.
Cardoza	Kanjorski	Sanchez, Loretta
Carnahan	Kaptur	Sarbanes
Carney	Kennedy	Schakowsky
Carson	Kildee	Schiff
Castor	Kilpatrick	Schwartz
Chandler	Kind	Scott (GA)
Clarke	Klein (FL)	Scott (VA)
Clay	Kucinich	Serrano
Cleaver	Lampson	Sestak
Clyburn	Langevin	Shea-Porter
Cohen	Lantos	Sherman
Conyers	Larsen (WA)	Shuler
Cooper	Larson (CT)	Sires
Costa	Lee	Skelton
Costello	Levin	Slaughter
Courtney	Lewis (GA)	Lipinski
Cramer	Lewis (GA)	Loebsock
Crowley	Lipinski	Lofgren, Zoe
Cuellar	Loebsock	Lowey
Cummings	Lofgren, Zoe	Lynch
Davis (AL)	Lowey	Mahoney (FL)
Davis (CA)	Lynch	Maloney (NY)
Davis (IL)	Mahoney (FL)	Markey
Davis, Lincoln	Maloney (NY)	Matheson
DeFazio	Markey	Matsui
DeGette	Marshall	McCarthy (NY)
Delahunt	Matheson	McCollum (MN)
DeLauro	Matsui	McDermott
Dicks	McCarthy (NY)	McGovern
Dingell	McCollum (MN)	McIntyre
Doggett	McDermott	McNulty
Donnelly	McGovern	Meek (FL)
Doyle	McIntyre	Meeks (NY)
Edwards	McNulty	Melancon
Ellison	Meek (FL)	Michaud
Ellsworth	Meeks (NY)	Miller (NC)
Emanuel	Melancon	Miller, George
Emanuel	Michaud	Mitchell
Engel	Miller (NC)	Mollohan
Eshoo	Miller, George	Moore (KS)
Etheridge	Mitchell	Moore (WI)
Farr	Mollohan	Moran (VA)
Fattah	Moore (KS)	Murphy (CT)
Filner	Moore (WI)	Murphy, Patrick
Frank (MA)	Moran (VA)	Murtha
Giffords	Murphy (CT)	Nadler
Gillibrand	Murphy, Patrick	Napolitano
Gonzalez	Murtha	
Gordon	Nadler	
Green, Al	Napolitano	
Green, Gene	Neal (MA)	
Grijalva		

NAYS—197

Aderholt	Boustany	Cole (OK)
Akin	Brady (TX)	Conaway
Alexander	Brown (SC)	Crenshaw
Bachmann	Brown-Waite,	Culberson
Bachus	Ginny	Davis (KY)
Baker	Buchanan	Davis, David
Barrett (SC)	Burgess	Davis, Tom
Bartlett (MD)	Burton (IN)	Deal (GA)
Barton (TX)	Buyer	Dent
Biggert	Calvert	Diaz-Balart, L.
Bilbray	Camp (MI)	Diaz-Balart, M.
Bilirakis	Campbell (CA)	Doolittle
Bishop (UT)	Cannon	Drake
Blackburn	Cantor	Dreier
Blunt	Capito	Duncan
Boehner	Carter	Ehlers
Bonner	Castle	Emerson
Bono	Chabot	English (PA)
Boozman	Coble	Everett

Fallin	Lamborn	Reichert	[Roll No. 609]	Pascrell	Salazar	Tanner
Feeney	Latham	Renzi		Pastor	Sali	Tauscher
Ferguson	LaTourette	Reynolds	YEAS—411	Payne	Sánchez, Linda	Taylor
Flake	Lewis (CA)	Rogers (AL)		Pearce	T.	Terry
Forbes	Lewis (KY)	Rogers (KY)		Pence	Sanchez, Loretta	Thompson (CA)
Fortenberry	Linder	Rogers (MI)		Perlmutter	Sarbanes	Thompson (MS)
Fossella	LoBiondo	Rohrabacher		Peterson (MN)	Saxton	Thornberry
Fox	Lucas	Ros-Lehtinen		Peterson (PA)	Schakowsky	Tiahrt
Franks (AZ)	Lungren, Daniel	Roskam		Petri	Schiff	Tiberi
Frelinghuysen	E.	Royce		Pickering	Schmidt	Tierney
Gallely	Mack	Ryan (WI)		Pitts	Schwartz	Udall (CO)
Garrett (NJ)	Manzullo	Sali		Platts	Scott (GA)	Udall (NM)
Gerlach	Marchant	Saxton		Poe	Scott (VA)	Upton
Gilchrest	McCarthy (CA)	Schmidt		Pomeroy	Sensenbrenner	Van Hollen
Gillmor	McCaul (TX)	Sensenbrenner		Price (GA)	Serrano	Velázquez
Gingrey	McCotter	Sessions		Price (NC)	Sessions	Visclosky
Gohmert	McCrery	Shadegg		Pryce (OH)	Sestak	Walberg
Goode	McHenry	Shays		Putnam	Shadegg	Walden (OR)
Goodlatte	McHugh	Shimkus		Radanovich	Shays	Walsh (NY)
Granger	McKeon	Shuster		Rahall	Shea-Porter	Walz (MN)
Graves	McMorris	Simpson		Ramstad	Sherman	Wamp
Hall (TX)	Rodgers	Smith (NE)		Rangel	Shimkus	Wasserman
Hastert	Mica	Smith (NJ)		Regula	Shuler	Schultz
Hastings (WA)	Miller (FL)	Smith (TX)		Rehberg	Shuster	Waters
Hayes	Miller (MI)	Souder		Reichert	Simpson	Watson
Heller	Miller, Gary	Stearns		Renzi	Sires	Watt
Hensarling	Moran (KS)	Sullivan		Reyes	Skelton	Waxman
Herger	Murphy, Tim	Tancredo		Reynolds	Slaughter	Weiner
Hobson	Musgrave	Terry		Rodriguez	Smith (NE)	Welch (VT)
Hoekstra	Myrick	Thornberry		Rogers (AL)	Smith (NJ)	Weldon (FL)
Hulshof	Neugebauer	Tiahrt		Rogers (KY)	Smith (TX)	Weller
Hunter	Nunes	Tiberi		Rogers (MI)	Smith (WA)	Wexler
Inglis (SC)	Paul	Turner		Rohrabacher	Snyder	Whitfield
Issa	Pearce	Upton		Ros-Lehtinen	Solis	Wicker
Jindal	Pence	Walberg		Roskam	Souder	Wilson (NM)
Johnson (IL)	Peterson (PA)	Walden (OR)		Ross	Space	Wilson (OH)
Johnson, Sam	Petri	Walsh (NY)		Rothman	Spratt	Wilson (SC)
Jones (NC)	Pickering	Wamp		Roybal-Allard	Stark	Wolf
Jordan	Pitts	Weldon (FL)		Royce	Stearns	Woolsey
Keller	Platts	Weller		Ruppertsberger	Stupak	Wu
King (IA)	Poe	Westmoreland		Rush	Sullivan	Wynn
King (NY)	Price (GA)	Whitfield		Ryan (OH)	Sutton	Yarmuth
Kingston	Pryce (OH)	Wicker		Ryan (WI)	Tancredo	Young (FL)
Kirk	Putnam	Wilson (NM)				
Kline (MN)	Radanovich	Wilson (SC)				
Knollenberg	Ramstad	Wolf				
Kuhl (NY)	Regula	Young (FL)				
LaHood	Rehberg					

NOT VOTING—12

Bean	Cubin	Hinojosa
Berkley	Davis, Jo Ann	Porter
Blumenauer	Herseth Sandlin	Towns
Brady (PA)	Higgins	Young (AK)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised that 2 minutes remain in this vote.

□ 1205

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.

SUPPORTING HOME OWNERSHIP AND RESPONSIBLE LENDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 526, 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 gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 526.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 411, nays 7, not voting 13, as follows:

Abercrombie	DeLauro	Kaptur
Ackerman	Dent	Keller
Aderholt	Diaz-Balart, L.	Kennedy
Akin	Diaz-Balart, M.	Kildee
Alexander	Dicks	Kilpatrick
Allen	Dingell	Kind
Altmire	Dogett	King (IA)
Andrews	Donnelly	King (NY)
Arcuri	Doolittle	Kingston
Baca	Doyle	Kirk
Bachmann	Drake	Klein (FL)
Bachus	Dreier	Kline (MN)
Baird	Duncan	Knollenberg
Baker	Edwards	Kucinich
Baldwin	Ehlers	Kuhl (NY)
Barrett (SC)	Ellison	LaHood
Barrow	Ellsworth	Lamborn
Bartlett (MD)	Emanuel	Lampson
Barton (TX)	Emerson	Langevin
Becerra	Engel	Lantos
Berman	English (PA)	Larsen (WA)
Berry	Eshoo	Larson (CT)
Biggert	Etheridge	Latham
Bilbray	Everett	LaTourette
Bilirakis	Fallin	Lee
Bishop (GA)	Farr	Levin
Bishop (NY)	Fattah	Lewis (CA)
Bishop (UT)	Feeney	Lewis (GA)
Blunt	Ferguson	Lewis (KY)
Boehner	Filner	Linder
Bono	Forbes	Lipinski
Boozman	Fortenberry	LoBiondo
Boren	Fossella	Loeb
Bowman	Frank (MA)	Loeffler
Bowwell	Frank (AZ)	Lofgren, Zoe
Boucher	Frelinghuysen	Lowey
Boustany	Gallely	Lucas
Boyd (FL)	Garrett (NJ)	Lungren, Daniel
Boyd (KS)	Gerlach	E.
Brady (TX)	Giffords	Lynch
Braley (IA)	Gilchrest	Mack
Brown (SC)	Gillibrand	Mahoney (FL)
Brown, Corrine	Gillmor	Maloney (NY)
Brown-Waite,	Gingrey	Manzullo
Ginny	Gohmert	Marchant
Buchanan	Gonzalez	Markey
Burgess	Goode	Marshall
Burton (IN)	Goodlatte	Matheson
Butterfield	Gordon	Matsui
Buyer	Granger	McCarthy (CA)
Calvert	Graves	McCarthy (NY)
Camp (MI)	Green, Al	McCaul (TX)
Campbell (CA)	Green, Gene	McCollum (MN)
Cannon	Grijalva	McCotter
Cantor	Gutierrez	McCrery
Capito	Hall (NY)	McDermott
Capps	Hall (TX)	McGovern
Capuano	Harman	McHenry
Cardoza	Hastert	McHugh
Carnahan	Hastings (FL)	McIntyre
Carney	Hastings (WA)	McKeon
Carson	Hayes	McMorris
Carter	Heller	Rodgers
Castle	Hensarling	McNerney
Castor	Herger	McNulty
Chabot	Hill	Meek (FL)
Chandler	Hinche	Meeks (NY)
Clarke	Hirono	Melancon
Clay	Hobson	Mica
Cleaver	Hodes	Michaud
Clyburn	Hoekstra	Miller (FL)
Coble	Holden	Miller (MI)
Cohen	Holt	Miller (NC)
Cole (OK)	Honda	Miller, Gary
Conaway	Hooley	Miller, George
Conyers	Hoyer	Mitchell
Cooper	Hulshof	Mollohan
Costa	Hunter	Moore (KS)
Costello	Inglis (SC)	Moore (WI)
Courtney	Inslee	Moran (KS)
Cramer	Israel	Moran (VA)
Crenshaw	Issa	Murphy (CT)
Crowley	Jackson (IL)	Murphy, Patrick
Cuellar	Jackson-Lee	Murphy, Tim
Culberson	(TX)	Murtha
Cummings	Jefferson	Musgrave
Davis (AL)	Jindal	Myrick
Davis (CA)	Johnson (GA)	Nadler
Davis (IL)	Johnson (IL)	Napolitano
Davis (KY)	Johnson, E. B.	Neal (MA)
Davis, David	Johnson, Sam	Neugebauer
Davis, Lincoln	Jones (NC)	Nunes
Davis, Tom	Jones (OH)	Oberstar
DeFazio	Jordan	Obey
DeGette	Kagen	Olver
Delahunt	Kanjorski	Ortiz
		Pallone

NAYS—7

Blackburn	Fox	Westmoreland
Deal (GA)	Paul	
Flake	Turner	

NOT VOTING—13

Bean	Davis, Jo Ann	Porter
Berkley	Hare	Towns
Blumenauer	Herseth Sandlin	Young (AK)
Brady (PA)	Higgins	
Cubin	Hinojosa	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1212

Mrs. BLACKBURN changed her vote from “yea” to “nay.”

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.

Stated for:

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 609 on June 11, 2007 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

TRANSITIONAL MEDICAL ASSISTANCE AND ABSTINENCE EDUCATION PROGRAM EXTENSION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 1701, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by