

(The information contained herein was provided by 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.

Ms. CASTOR. Madam 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.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2634, JUBILEE ACT FOR RESPONSIBLE LENDING AND EXPANDED DEBT CANCELLATION OF 2008

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1103 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1103

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. 2634) to provide for greater responsibility in lending and expanded cancellation of debts owed to the United States and the international financial institutions by low-income countries, 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 chairman 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. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of 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. The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived except those arising under clause 10 of rule XXI. Notwithstanding clause 11 of rule XVIII, no amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such 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 amendments 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 to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a

separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. 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. During consideration in the House of H.R. 2634 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. The gentleman from Vermont is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Madam Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS). All time yielded during consideration of the rule is for debate only.

I yield myself such time as I may consume. I also ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 1103.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Madam Speaker, House Resolution 1103 provides for consideration of H.R. 2634, the Jubilee Act for Responsible Lending and Expanded Debt Cancellation, under a structured rule. The rule provides 1 hour of general debate controlled by the Committee on Financial Services. The rule also makes in order four amendments printed in the Rules Committee report, each of which is debatable for 10 minutes. The rule provides for one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

Madam Speaker, structured, responsible debt relief has been proven to be one of the most effective methods of fighting global poverty. In 1996 the World Bank and the IMF, the International Monetary Fund, developed the Heavily Indebted Poor Countries, or HIPC, Initiative to provide debt relief to the world's most impoverished nations. The 28 countries that participated in this program have been spending the debt relief on good things in their country for the very poor people, on education and health. In the first 10 years of the program, the IMF and the World Bank provided \$62 billion of debt relief, cutting the countries' debt by an average of two-thirds.

The results speak for themselves. The participating countries now spend four times as much on health, education, and social services as they do on paying back debt. Tanzania, for instance, has used its money from debt cancellation to eliminate school fees for elementary school education. Think about it. The poorest countries, their kids were having to pay fees to go to elementary school, something that's not even required here, while Zambia eliminated fees for health care in rural areas. Multilateral efforts in Niger reduced debt from 76 percent of their

gross domestic product, and think about that, 76 percent of the gross domestic product was used in debt relief, in 2002 to 14 percent in 2006. With that savings Niger has been able to make investments in health and education. They've reduced the infant mortality rate, cut it in half. Primary school completion has increased from 16 to 28 percent, and access to drinkable water increased from 40 percent for the people in Niger to 69 percent.

The bill that this rule will bring to the floor today will build on this record of quantifiable success to expand efforts to reduce the debts owed by impoverished nations. This legislation makes debt forgiveness immediately possible for nine countries that meet the standards of the Jubilee Act. This is not a giveaway program.

□ 1130

These nations are among the poorest in the world with per capita incomes of less than \$3 a day, \$1,065 a year. Countries initially eligible under this legislation for debt relief would include Cape Verde, Georgia, Kenya, Mongolia and Vietnam.

But as I mentioned, the Jubilee Act does not give countries that borrowed money a free ride with debt forgiveness. It includes strict parameters to ensure that the participating countries: one, have transparent and effective budget processes; two, do not support terrorism; three, cooperate in international counternarcotic efforts; and, four, uphold human rights standards.

In addition, funds made available as a result of loan forgiveness must be directed toward antipoverty programs, and countries must publish an annual report to be accountable on how those funds were spent.

These criteria ensure the loan forgiveness funds are used wisely and well. They provide an incentive for noneligible countries to reduce corruption and improve human rights practices so they may, one day, become eligible for debt forgiveness.

Fifteen additional countries, including Bangladesh, Nigeria and Zimbabwe would be eligible for debt cancellation upon making required reforms.

This is the brand of leadership that America needs more of where we are doing our share, but we are working with our allies and where we are using the incentive of debt forgiveness. Many of these debts, incidentally, were taken by kleptocrats who formerly ruled in these countries, and now these countries are trying to free themselves of the yoke of this terrible leadership. This debt forgiveness program allows us, working with our allies, the IMF and the World Bank, to give them a boost.

Finally, Madam Speaker, it must be noted that because the international financial institutions like the World Bank and the IMF are expected to pay the bulk of the debt relief, the tremendous improvements that can be

achieved under this bill come at a very reasonable cost to the U.S. taxpayer.

The cost of America canceling bilateral debt for the countries initially eligible is estimated to be \$197 million. That is less than what we spend for 14 hours in Iraq, just to put it in perspective. However, this bill does not actually authorize any debt cancellation. It authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to enter into negotiations to cancel debt. Any debt cancellation agreement reached by the Secretary returns to Congress for our approval. In fact, the Congressional Budget Office has scored this legislation at no cost to the taxpayers.

Debt reduction has been proven to be one of the most effective, both cost effective and socially effective, ways to achieve significant reductions in global poverty.

I urge my colleagues to support this rule and the underlying bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, I want to thank my friend, the gentleman from Vermont, for the time that he is yielding me to discuss H.R. 2634, the Responsible Lending and Expanded Debt Collection Cancellation Act of 2007. This legislation follows on the heels of legislation passed just 2 weeks ago providing aid to mostly African and Caribbean countries to fight AIDS and promote development programs in underdeveloped countries, including programs to improve food, water, the treatment of other infectious diseases, poverty alleviation programs, microcredit, schools and teachers, legal aid, agricultural assistance and biomedical research.

Today's legislation would follow up on this enormous prior financial commitment by further reducing or eliminating the debt obligations of the world's poorest nations. It attempts to accomplish this goal by creating a framework to having the debts of low-income countries owed to the United States and to international financial institutions eliminated.

To do this, this bill authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to negotiate the full cancellation of these countries' debts with the Paris Club, the IMF, and the World Bank, and to reach agreements on future creditor transparency and responsible lending.

It improves oversight by ensuring that countries receiving this debt relief have economies that are capable of redirecting their debt services payments, and requires a GAO audit of countries where illegal loans may have been made. Finally, it includes a sense of Congress that the U.S. should pay off \$600 million worth of arrears to multilateral development banks.

Madam Speaker, no one in this body disputes the worthiness of this goal that is enshrined within this legislation. The reduction of global poverty and suffering around the world is a laudable goal, and it is certainly in our national interests to combat conditions that may breed the hopelessness

and poverty that allows dictators and terrorists to thrive.

So it is doubtlessly important that the most heavily indebted poor countries be relieved of these kinds of crushing debt that prevents their future development, self-sufficiency and the improvement of their citizens' lives.

This policy should be implemented, along with other policies that increase public sector investment and decrease the barriers to trade with these countries, as well as ensuring that the countries eligible for this relief do not encourage terrorist activities or abuse human rights.

I am surprised, however, that Speaker PELOSI didn't see the irony in scheduling this step forward for developing nations on the first legislative week after handing them a serious defeat by turning off the fast track authority for the Colombia Free Trade Agreement. In other words, here we're trying to help poor countries and now the decision is made that we won't engage in trade with them that would help their countries also grow economically free.

While giving the most heavily indebted countries relief from crushing and unserviceable debt is necessary to increase their future development, it is simply not sufficient. The economies of these countries must be more integrated with the rest of the globe to provide their citizens with real choices and development alternatives for their future, and increased trade with America is a great way of accomplishing this.

So while I appreciate the Financial Services Committee's efforts on the issue of improving conditions for the world's poorest countries, I remind my colleagues that development does not occur in a vacuum, and that by postponing the Colombia Free Trade Agreement, we have effectively told all of these countries, people who should be our friends and we should be concerned about more than just their debt, but about their economic viability, we've said that Congress is less concerned about promoting trade with them and growing their economies than it is with complying with the demands of labor union bosses in an election year.

I encourage the Democrat leadership to take a long-term and more holistic view of global poverty, recognizing that these cycles of abject poverty cannot be broken without creating the conditions that encourage private sector investment, such as respect for contracts and rule of law and that it also encourages international trade.

Madam Speaker, I believe that a broader policy of understanding poverty and the United States' role in helping to make our world better would include trade and would include encouraging the private markets around the world.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr.

FRANK), the chairman of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Madam Speaker, I am pleased that we appear to have a very broad consensus in favor of this. My friend from Texas is right. There is no one single answer to the problems of poverty. But I am pleased that we have agreement that this is an important part of it.

We have some history here that argues for this bill. In the year, I think it was 2000, we in this House passed a bill on the floor over some objection from the administration at the time, the Clinton administration, and from some of the House leadership. But we passed a bill to begin the process known as the HIPC, the heavily indebted poor country debt relief, and it has worked very well. And for those who think that these enterprises are doomed to failure, we can point to many successes in HIPC. And we did this in a way so that countries that had not lived up to what should have been their part of the bargain didn't get the benefit.

The time has now come to do this again. And if this is done right, relieving countries of debt—debt that was often incurred by prior undemocratic and repressive regimes, and they will be primarily African but not entirely—relieving these countries of debt does as much to promote education and reduce poverty as anything else we can do.

I think it is particularly noteworthy on this day when His Holiness the Pope is in our city that we received a letter from the Most Reverend Thomas G. Wenski, the Bishop of Orlando, who is chairman of the Committee on International Policy of the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops. He strongly supports the bill, and I ask that that be introduced into the RECORD now, along with a letter from the Jubilee Coalition, the Jubilee Network, many religious and civic organizations, and the NAACP.

COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL JUSTICE AND PEACE; DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, PEACE AND HUMAN DEVELOPMENT, U.S. CONFERENCE OF CATHOLIC BISHOPS,

Washington, DC, April 9, 2008.

House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: As Chairman of the Committee on International Policy of the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops (USCCB), I urge you to support the Jubilee Act for Responsible Lending and Expanded Debt Cancellation of 2007 (HR 2634).

Inspired by the call of our late, beloved Pope John Paul II, USCCB has long been a strong advocate of lifting the heavy burden of debt from the backs of millions of people living in the world's poorest countries. As Pope Benedict XVI makes his first Apostolic Visit to the United States, it is fitting that Congress show support for this important initiative that would help alleviate the debt burden of some of our poorest brothers and sisters around the world.

As you know, since 1999 major new debt relief initiatives have been adopted by the international community. These initiatives have resulted in the reduction of the debt of 22 poor countries by over \$60 billion. Another

19 countries are receiving, or are potentially eligible to receive, billions more in debt cancellation. These reductions are freeing up substantial funds each year for expenditures in education, health and other investments essential for improving the lives of poor people.

Despite this progress, a substantial number of needy countries are not eligible for the existing debt relief initiatives. HR 2634 represents a major new step towards correcting this deficiency and making debt cancellation a reality for virtually all very poor countries that have participatory processes and financial management systems sufficient to assure that debt cancellation savings will be used to benefit the poor. We urge you to complete the unfinished business of poor country debt relief and support HR 2634.

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS G. WENSKI,
Bishop of Orlando,
Chairman.

SEPTEMBER 4, 2007.

DEAR MEMBER OF CONGRESS: As organizations committed to ending global poverty, we write to urge you to co-sponsor the Jubilee Act for Responsible Lending and Expanded Debt Cancellation of 2007 (H.R. 2634). The Jubilee Act safeguards the gains made by debt cancellation to date and expands eligibility for cancellation to countries that need it to meet the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs).

Debt cancellation is a proven way to reduce poverty. The debt cancellation supported by Congress in 1999 and 2005 has reached more than two dozen countries in Africa and Latin America. This year, Zambia is using its savings of \$23.8 million on agricultural projects and to eliminate fees for health care in rural areas. Uganda is using the \$57.9 million freed by debt cancellation to increase spending on primary education, malaria control, health care and infrastructure.

But significant challenges remain. First, the IMF and World Bank continue to urge impoverished nations to adopt policies including privatization of essential services and liberalization of trade in sensitive sectors in exchange for debt cancellation or new aid, the net effect of which can be to limit spending on public services. Today, IMF/World Bank conditions are holding up much needed debt cancellation for eligible countries including Haiti, the Democratic Republic of Congo, and Liberia. These economic conditions are undermining the benefits of debt cancellation and hurting the poor; the Jubilee Act would prohibit them. Second, rogue lenders and so-called "vulture funds" threaten to compromise the benefits of debt cancellation. The Jubilee Act requires the Secretary of the Treasury to curtail the activity of vulture funds.

2007 marks the half way point to the MDGs, but we are far from halfway to meeting the goals, especially in Africa. Debt cancellation should be expanded to include countries that need it to meet the MDGs and to fight HIV/AIDS and other diseases. The Jubilee Act would make up to 27 additional low-income countries eligible for debt cancellation by the United States, the World Bank, and the International Monetary Fund provided that they demonstrate their ability to use the money to fight poverty and provide an annual report detailing the use of funds on poverty reduction.

In order to learn from past errors and ensure more responsible lending, we must address the problem of odious and unjust debts (debts accrued by undemocratic regimes or that did not benefit the population). The Jubilee Act does this by requiring the Comptroller General of the US to undertake au-

dits of debt portfolios of previous regimes in countries such as the Democratic Republic of Congo and South Africa, where there is accepted evidence of odious loans.

In order to prevent a continual and wasteful debt/forgiveness cycle, it is essential to establish a framework for responsible and transparent lending in the future. The Jubilee Act calls for the development of responsible financing standards where creditors and aid/loan recipients alike adhere to standards to assure transparency and accountability to citizens, human rights, and the avoidance of odious debt, while encouraging the development of renewable energy and a transition away from dependence on oil.

The U.S. can lead the way to completing the good work already begun on debt cancellation. We urge you to cosponsor H.R. 2634, the Jubilee Act for Responsible Lending and Expanded Debt Cancellation of 2007.

Sincerely,

ActionAid International USA.
AFL-CIO.

Africa Action.

Ainsworth United Church of Christ, Portland, Oregon.

Alliance for Global Justice.

American Friends Service Committee.

American Jewish World Service.

Americans for Informed Democracy.

Bread for the World.

Capuchin Franciscans, Midwest Province.

The Capuchin Province of Mid-America.

Center of Concern.

Church World Service.

Citizens for Global Solutions.

Conference of Major Superiors of Men.

DATA—Debt AIDS Trade Africa.

The Episcopal Church.

Essential Action.

Evangelical Lutheran Church in America.

Friends of the Earth US.

Gender Action.

Institute for Justice and Democracy in Haiti.

Jubilee Justice Task Force of the United Church of Christ.

Jubilee National Capital Area.

Jubilee Northwest Coalition, Seattle, Washington.

Jubilee San Diego.

Jubilee USA Network.

Justice, Peace & Integrity of Creation Office of the Wheaton Franciscans.

Marianists International.

Maryknoll Office for Global Concerns.

Medical Mission Sisters' Alliance for Justice.

Menonite Central Committee.

Metanoia Peace Community United Methodist Church, Portland, Oregon.

Missionary Oblates of Mary Immaculate, Justice, Peace/Integrity of Creation Office.

Missionary Society of St. Columban (US Region).

National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP).

Nicaragua Network.

Oil Change International.

The ONE Campaign.

Oxfam America.

Pax Christi USA: National Catholic Peace Movement.

Presbyterian Church, (USA), Washington Office.

Priority Africa Network.

RESULTS.

SHALOM Network, Dallas Unit of the School Sisters of Notre Dame.

School Sisters of Notre Dame, Mankato Province.

School Sisters of Notre Dame-St. Louis Mission Effectiveness Office.

Sisters of the Holy Cross, Notre Dame, IN.

Sojourners/Call to Renewal.

South Bay Jubilee Coalition.

St. Francis Xavier Jubilee parish, Missoula, MT.

TransAfrica Forum.
 Union for Reform Judaism.
 Unitarian Universalist Association of Congregations.
 United Church of Christ, Justice and Witness Ministries.
 United Methodist Church, General Board of Church and Society.
 Washington Office on Africa.
 Witness for Peace.
 Women's Edge.

WASHINGTON BUREAU, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF COLORED PEOPLE,

Washington, DC, April 14, 2008.

Re Support for the Jubilee Act for Responsible Lending and Expanded Debt Cancellation Act of 2007, H.R. 2634.

Members,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), our nation's oldest, largest and most widely-recognized grassroots civil rights organization, I strongly urge you to support legislation to address the debilitating debt that many countries throughout the world face. While debt is often a necessary tool used for a plethora of economic reasons, unmanageable debt can cripple a country, preventing it from meeting the most basic human needs of its people. Specifically, I urge you to support H.R. 2634, the Jubilee Act, when it comes before you on the floor of the House tomorrow.

As a signatory to the Millennium Development Goals, the U.S. is charged with helping to alleviate poverty as well as promote education and health throughout the world. H.R. 2634, the Jubilee Act for Responsible Lending and Expanded Debt Cancellation of 2007, would make great strides in freeing resources to achieve these goals through the forgiveness of debts. This crucial piece of legislation would help ease the overwhelming debt burden many countries face while making available funds for these nations to use to provide their citizens with vital resources and services. For example, in countries such as Burundi, Ghana, Honduras, Tanzania and Zambia, money saved from debt relief has been used to improve infrastructure, education, and health care and to increase access to daily necessities of life such as food and clean drinking water.

While these reports are certainly encouraging, more needs to be done. For example, in Sub-Saharan Africa, the approximate number of people living on less than a dollar a day has actually increased since 1990. If current trends are not reversed, Africa will be the only region in the world where there will be more poor people in 2015 than in 1990.

Thank you in advance for your attention to the NAACP position. Should you have any questions or comments, please do not hesitate to contact me at my office at (202) 463-2940.

Sincerely,

HILARY O. SHELTON,
Director.

Helping countries reduce the debt is a very effective way of giving them the tools to go forward with development.

One other important point here. We have been plagued in the past by the international financial community and the judgment of many of us, liberal, conservative, Democrat and Republican, unduly injecting itself into the decisions in particular countries. Democratic societies should not be told from the outside what the water rate should be, what the tax structure

should be and what education fees should be. And very often in the past, these had a very negative effect from the standpoint of poverty alleviation.

Unanimously out of our committee, this bill includes a restriction on what is called conditionality of that sort. There will be no possibility of using debt relief as a lever for outsiders to impose on these Democratic societies choices that ought to be made within their society. We do say that the donors, and these are both the individual countries and the international financial institutions, should insist on a variety of procedural safeguards of democracy, of openness and negotiating with the minority.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. We have said that from the standpoint of the U.S., in order to be eligible for our help, they will have to cooperate with us against human trafficking, against terrorism and against illegal immigration. Those are the kind of conditions that is appropriate to impose.

Finally, we should note that this bill obviously does not, as it cannot itself, accomplish debt relief. It is a mandate to the United States executive branch to begin negotiations. And these negotiations must be multilateral, because we do not want to see America give debt relief when other countries don't do it and that nullifies the effect. And we also want to press the international financial institutions to do it using our influence there.

Today, we take a step widely hailed by particularly those who are concerned with the alleviation of poverty in other parts of the world. We take the step that does more than any other single step to reach that goal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has again expired.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. We have had a problem in the world of economic growth occurring in ways that shut out a great majority of the people in various countries from the benefit. We need a coordinated strategy so that we can have growth, but we can have growth in an equitable way. Debt relief is an essential part of that overall strategy.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, if I could inquire of my friend of any remaining speakers that he has.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. I am the last speaker on our side.

Mr. SESSIONS. I thank the gentleman very much.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas is recognized to close.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, I would like to put into the RECORD a statement of administrative policy from the White House on this bill.

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY, H.R. 2634—JUBILEE ACT FOR RESPONSIBLE LENDING AND EXPANDED DEBT CANCELLATION OF 2008

(Rep. Waters (D) CA and 104 cosponsors.)

The Administration has provided strong international leadership on debt relief for the world's most heavily-indebted poor countries. Ongoing debt relief initiatives, including the Enhanced Heavily Indebted Poor Countries (HIPC) Initiative and the Multilateral Debt Relief Initiative (MDRI), are expected to provide over \$100 billion in debt reduction to 32 countries and another eight countries could eventually qualify under these initiatives. To ensure that gains from debt relief are available for the long term, the Administration led efforts in the multilateral development banks to use a debt sustainability framework to determine the appropriate mix of grants and lending. While the Administration believes the goals of this bill are laudable, the Administration does not support H.R. 2634 for the reasons stated below.

The countries to be covered by the bill are managing their debt, and some of the countries that would be covered by this bill are now actively working towards expanded access to international capital markets. Providing debt relief to countries that can service their debt sends the wrong message, and undermines efforts to assist countries in developing sound debt management practices that will allow them to transition gradually toward access to private capital markets.

Any debt relief should be conditioned on the adoption of policies that promote sound economic practices. Policy conditionality is important and often necessary to ensure that debt relief is used in a manner that will promote economic growth and provide real benefits to the poor.

The budget impact of such a program would be significant, and would require trade-offs that could affect key foreign policy priorities. The Treasury Department estimates that the budget cost to forgive the \$2.5 billion in nominal debt (including loan guarantees) owed to the United States by countries that do not currently qualify under the HIPC Initiative would be approximately \$1 billion. This cost estimate assumes that all potentially eligible International Development Association countries would qualify for debt relief in FY 2008 and would change depending on the year that each country qualifies. These countries also owe the World Bank and IMF over \$32 billion in nominal debt, in addition to other bilateral and multilateral debts. While the bill calls for international financial institutions to fund debt relief from internal resources, the availability of such resources is very likely to be limited, as recently demonstrated by the requirements for donor funding of the MDRI. Any additional debt relief from the international financial institutions is therefore likely to require substantial additional contributions from the U.S., in addition to the estimated \$1 billion cost of the bilateral debt relief portion of the proposal. Rather than embarking on expanded debt relief, the United States must focus on fulfilling its current commitments.

The Responsible Lending Framework described by the bill could also hinder access by poor countries to private capital. The bill calls for the creation of a binding international legal framework for lending by all multilateral, bilateral, and private creditors. While we recognize the goals underlying such a framework—to encourage sustainable lending and borrowing levels—the prospects for such an agreement are doubtful. Given the wide range of international creditors, creation of such a framework would be very difficult and enforcement would be nearly impossible. Finally, the threat of sanctions

based on such a framework would likely discourage legitimate creditors from lending to poor countries, further reducing these countries' access to financial markets.

Finally, H.R. 2634 contains several provisions raising constitutional concerns by purporting to limit the President's ability to conduct the Nation's foreign affairs.

Madam Speaker, as every American taxpayer is acutely aware, yesterday was Tax Day, or the final day for individuals and families to file taxes without incurring financial penalties. This is not to be confused with Tax Freedom Day, which the Tax Freedom Foundation has defined as the day on which the average American has finally earned enough money to pay this year's tax obligations at the federal, State and local level, which won't arrive this year until next week on April 23.

□ 1145

In recognition of these two important days on every taxpayer's calendar, today I will be asking each of my colleagues to vote "no" on the previous question to this rule. If the previous question is defeated, I will amend the rule to make in order for the House to consider H.R. 2734, a comprehensive bill offered by my friend from Michigan, Congressman TIM WALBERG.

This legislation repeals the sunset date of the 2001 Economic Growth and Tax Relief Reconciliation Act and makes the tax reductions enacted by that act permanent. In other words, instead of increasing taxes, we would like to make these tax cuts permanent for economic growth and development in this country, which will encourage investment and thereby grow jobs in this country.

We have heard today several speakers from the Democrat majority question what is wrong with America today, and even blaming President Bush for the economic woes that exist. But today the Republican Party is saying if we want to do the things that President Bush wants, and I think that the American people want, let's make tax cuts permanent to ensure that we have job growth and development of companies and employers in America.

It also repeals the termination date for provisions of the 2003 Jobs and Growth Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2003, reducing income tax rates on dividends and capital gains, because that is how you grow jobs. The reverse is happening, which America understands right now, and that is the new Democratic majority wants to increase taxes, which causes the economy not to stimulate, but to contract, which is exactly what is happening now, which is exactly what we understand the new policies of the Democratic majority have been about for 17 months.

At some point, this Democratic majority is going to have to take responsibility for the things that happen under their watch, instead of just blaming President Bush. President Bush says let's make these tax cuts permanent. That is what has worked up to now, and we need to do it today.

We will also amend the Internal Revenue Code to make permanent a tax deduction for State and local sales tax. That needs to be done. We have done that each of the last 5 years. Also the tax deductions for tuition. Let me repeat that; the tax deduction for tuition. Here we are on the floor trying to do something for students, to get student loans, but yet we will not have a deduction for tuition and related expenses.

The increased expensing allowed for small businesses. Small business is the engine of our economy. That is why Republicans want to make the tax cuts permanent, so that we make sure that we allow small businesses to grow, not contract.

And the tax credit for increasing research and development. Research and development is how we are going to cure the ills and the problems of the world that we see today.

Instead, the new Democratic majority, now for 17 months, wants to increase taxes. They want to take away the deductions for tuition; they want to increase taxes on small business; they want to make investment very difficult in this country, doubling, if you listen to some of the candidates that are on the trail, doubling the capital gains rate. And certainly they won't be for increasing research and development. They want to tax that.

Finally, this opportunity today would express the sense of the House of Representatives that the Committee on Ways and Means should report legislation on or before the end of the year to simplify the Federal income tax system.

Madam Speaker, I can think of no more fitting action for Congress during this week between Tax Day and Tax Freedom Day than to provide this kind of certainty to the American taxpayer. That is what we should be about, is good policy that encourages the opportunity to grow our economy and have new jobs.

By voting "no" on the previous question, Members will not be voting to kill or delay this debt relief legislation. They will simply be voting to provide tax relief, so that we can grow our economy for Americans at the same time that we provide debt relief to the world's poorest countries. What a wonderful opportunity.

Madam Speaker, I encourage all my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote "no" on the previous question.

Madam Speaker, I would also like to ask unanimous consent to have the text of the amendment and extraneous material appear in the RECORD just prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Madam Speaker, I want to point out a couple

of things. Number one, this legislation comes to you with bipartisan support from the Financial Services Committee. There was a recognition on that committee between the members on the majority and the members on the minority that this Congress had an opportunity to do something concrete, something practical, to help the most impoverished countries in this world.

This legislation is practical. It is going to give relief that translates into higher literacy rates, lower infant mortality rates and better access to education, and it is done at very modest expense to the American taxpayer. It also is America working with other countries and with international institutions, the IMF and the World Bank, to have a positive influence in foreign policy. It makes sense. It is bipartisan. It should be done.

I have to say I disagree with the suggestion of my good friend from Texas that we essentially transform this into a debate about extending the Bush tax cuts. That is a refrain we are hearing constantly that is brought up as a way of taking attention off of the things that we can do immediately in the legislation that is before us.

The fact of the matter is that what we have seen in the past few years under the fiscal leadership of the Bush administration is we have gone from a record surplus to a record deficit. We have gone from a point of paying down our national debt to increasing it to close to \$7 trillion.

The reality is that this legislation is about one thing and one thing only: It is about helping countries where the daily income of its citizens is on average \$3 a day. That is what it is. We can decide that we are going to take concrete action to help those countries move ahead, or use this as an opportunity to engage in a debate about whether to extend tax cuts, as is being requested by the gentleman.

So, Madam Speaker, by passing this proposed rule and this bill for which it provides consideration, Congress can build on this immensely successful debt relief effort we have had on a bipartisan basis and started more than a decade ago to provide relief for the world's poorest countries. It is an essential tool in the fight on the war on poverty.

Incidentally, it is money well spent. Much less of our money and the money of our allies is spent than when we have to engage in military conflict. The legislation represents what I believe should be the face of American leadership around the globe. I believe the sponsors of this legislation believe it will make the world a better place and make the world safer and more stable.

This is a good bill, a bipartisan bill. It enjoys the support not only of Chairman FRANK and Chairwoman WATERS, but of their Republican counterparts on the committee, our colleagues Congressman BACHUS and Congresswoman BIGGERT. That is why I urge a "yes"

vote on the previous question and on the rule.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Res. 1103—Rule providing for consideration of H.R. 2634—Jubilee Act for Responsible Lending and Expanded Debt Cancellation of 2007. I also strongly support the underlying legislation, H.R. 2634, the Jubilee Act for Responsible Lending and Expanded Debt Cancellation, which I am proud to join over 100 of my colleagues in cosponsoring. I would like to thank my colleague, Congresswoman WATERS, for introducing this bill, as well as the Chairman of the Financial Services Committee, Congressman FRANK, for his leadership on this important issue.

This rule allows for the consideration of four amendments. I am proud to support the Manager's Amendment, introduced by Congressman FRANK, which adds additional conditions to the eligibility criteria for debt relief, including complying with minimum standards for eliminating human trafficking, cooperating with American efforts to stop illegal immigration, and being committed to free and fair elections.

I also support the amendment offered by my colleague Congressman HASTINGS of Florida. This amendment adds a Sense of Congress stating that, due to the current humanitarian and political instability in Haiti, including food shortages and political turmoil, the Secretary of the Treasury should use his influence to expedite the complete and immediate cancellation of Haiti's debts to all international financial institutions, or if such debt cancellation cannot be provided, to urge the institutions to immediately suspend the requirement that Haiti make further debt service payments on debts owed to the institutions. After deadly food riots last week in Port-au-Prince, which resulted in the death of a Nigerian U.N. peacekeeper, I believe that this amendment is both crucial and timely.

I also support the amendment introduced by my colleague Mr. WEINER. This amendment modifies the qualification for "eligible low-income country" to include those countries that are eligible for both International Development Association loans and World Bank loans.

Countries throughout the world suffer from the heavy burden of debt. The inability of nations to escape from these financial commitments has profound impacts on any attempts they make at poverty reduction, health care, economic development, and sustainable growth. The Highly Indebted Poor Countries, HIPC's, the majority of which are located in Africa, are particularly crippled by debt. Nearly three years ago, we saw an outpouring of support for debt relief as G8 leaders met in Gleneagles, Scotland, to pursue a policy of poverty reduction. While some positive progress has been made since that meeting, it is absolutely undeniable that this is an issued on which a great deal remains to be done.

Today, we have an opportunity to take a positive and concrete step toward ending global poverty by helping needy and deserving low-income countries. The Jubilee Act expands existing debt relief programs for the world's poorest countries, and it includes measures to ensure that the benefits of debt relief are not eroded by future abusive lending.

Debt relief has, in the past, proved an effective tool to reduce poverty in some of the world's poorest countries. Debt relief initiatives

passed in 1999 and 2005 are benefiting more than two dozen countries in Africa and Latin America. Uganda is using the \$57.9 million it has saved from debt cancellation on primary education, to ensure a future for its children, as well as much needed improvements in malaria control, health care, and infrastructure. Zambia is using its savings of \$23.8 million on agricultural projects, and to eliminate fees for health care in rural areas.

Debt cancellation has enabled programs in Uganda and Zambia to directly help the people of these nations. However, there are many impoverished and deserving countries that do not currently benefit from debt relief. The International Monetary Fund, IMF, and the World Bank continue to place restrictive conditions on debt cancellation, calling for policies requiring the privatization of essential services and the liberalization of trade in sensitive sectors in exchange for debt cancellation. These conditions are currently holding up desperately needed debt relief in several eligible countries, including Haiti, the Democratic Republic of Congo, and Liberia.

Madam Speaker, the legislation we are considering today will not only bring the benefits of debt cancellation to more countries than ever before, it will also ensure that these benefits are felt by all strata of society. This bill would direct the Secretary of the Treasury to negotiate an agreement with the IMF and World Bank, as well as other bilateral and multilateral creditors, to make up to 25 additional low-income countries eligible for complete debt cancellation. Governments of these countries will be required to allocate the money saved through debt cancellation to poverty reduction programs, such as initiatives to improve economic infrastructure, basic education, nutrition, health services, and programs to redress environmental degradation.

This legislation does not remove all conditions from debt relief programs. Countries still must demonstrate transparent and effective budget and financial management systems, and they can be excluded from debt relief if they do not. In addition, countries committing massive violations of human rights are not eligible, nor are countries that support international terrorism, have excessive levels of military expenditures, or fail to cooperate on international narcotics control. The Jubilee Act encourages the developing of responsible financing standards, and assures financial transparency and accountability.

Finally, but perhaps most importantly, the Jubilee Act calls for the development of a responsible financing framework for the future. Debt forgiveness is a good short-term solution, but to be truly effective we must find a way to fix the broken system of international lending. Of particular concern to me has been the proliferation of vulture funds, which, like their avian namesake, seek to make a profit off of already weakened prey.

Madam Speaker, vulture funds purchase the debt of countries (or companies) in financial distress. They then hold out for the full value of the debt, plus any interest, which they pursue through litigation, much of which takes place in U.S. courts. The inability of nations to escape from these financial commitments has profound impacts on any attempts they make at poverty reduction, health care, economic development, and sustainable growth. The Highly Indebted Poor Countries, HIPC's, the majority of which are located in Africa, are

particularly crippled by debt. Though these countries may not appear to be the most profitable prey for vulture funds, which in theory prefer to purchase debt that a country has, or may in the future develop, the ability to pay, according to reports there are numerous lawsuits currently pending against HIPC countries.

Vulture funds, together with other forms of irresponsible lending, undermine international efforts to provide much needed debt relief to the world's most indebted poor countries. The Jubilee Act directs the Secretary of the Treasury to develop and promote policies to prevent bilateral, multilateral, and private creditors from eroding the gains of debt relief through irresponsible or exploitive lending. I am particularly pleased that this legislation takes this important step toward fixing broken systems of international lending.

Madam Speaker, if we are serious about meeting the Millennium Development Goals, we must take concrete steps toward reducing poverty. Debt cancellation is a proven way to do this. This legislation has the support of numerous organizations doing excellent work around the world, including the AFL-CIO, American Jewish World Service, Church World Service, DATA—Debt AIDS Trade Africa—Jubilee USA Network, the ONE Campaign, Oxfam America, and RESULTS.

I strongly urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this rule, and the underlying legislation.

The material previously referred to by Mr. SESSIONS is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 1103 OFFERED BY MR. SESSIONS OF TEXAS

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 3. That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution the House shall, without intervention of any point of order, consider the bill (H.R. 2734) to make the Economic Growth and Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2001 and certain other tax benefits permanent law. All points of order against the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate on the bill equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means; and (2) an amendment in the nature of a substitute if offered by Representative Rangel of New York, which shall be considered as read and shall be separately debatable for 40 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent; and (3) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

(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. WELCH of Vermont. Madam 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.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam 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 adopting the resolution, if ordered; ordering the previous question on House Resolution 1107; and adopting House Resolution 1107, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 217, nays 196, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 192]

YEAS—217

Abercrombie	Grijalva	Olver
Ackerman	Gutierrez	Ortiz
Allen	Hall (NY)	Pallone
Altmire	Hare	Pascarell
Andrews	Hastings (FL)	Pastor
Arcuri	Herseth Sandlin	Payne
Baca	Higgins	Perlmutter
Baird	Hinche	Peterson (MN)
Baldwin	Hinojosa	Pomeroy
Becerra	Hirono	Price (NC)
Berkley	Hodes	Rahall
Berman	Holden	Rangel
Berry	Holt	Reyes
Bishop (GA)	Honda	Richardson
Bishop (NY)	Hooley	Rodriguez
Blumenauer	Hoyer	Ross
Boren	Inslee	Roybal-Allard
Boswell	Israel	Ruppersberger
Boucher	Jackson (IL)	Ryan (OH)
Boyd (FL)	Jackson-Lee	Salazar
Boyd (KS)	(TX)	Sanchez, Linda
Braley (IA)	Jefferson	T.
Brown, Corrine	Johnson (GA)	Sanchez, Loretta
Butterfield	Johnson, E. B.	Sarbanes
Capps	Jones (OH)	Schakowsky
Capuano	Kagen	Schiff
Cardoza	Kanjorski	Schwartz
Carnahan	Kaptur	Scott (GA)
Carney	Kennedy	Scott (VA)
Carson	Kildee	Serrano
Castor	Kilpatrick	Sestak
Chandler	Kind	Shea-Porter
Clarke	Klein (FL)	Sherman
Clay	Kucinich	Shuler
Cleaver	Langevin	Sires
Clyburn	Larsen (WA)	Skelton
Cohen	Larsen (CT)	Smith (WA)
Conyers	Lee	Snyder
Cooper	Levin	Solis
Costello	Lewis (GA)	Space
Courtney	Lipinski	Speier
Cramer	Loeb	Spratt
Crowley	Loeb	Stark
Cuellar	Lofgren, Zoe	Stupak
Cummings	Lynch	Sutton
Davis (AL)	Mahoney (FL)	Tanner
Davis (CA)	Maloney (NY)	Tauscher
Davis (IL)	Marshall	Taylor
Davis, Lincoln	Matheson	Thompson (CA)
DeFazio	Matsui	Thompson (MS)
DeGette	McCarthy (NY)	Tierney
Delahunt	McCollum (MN)	Towns
Dicks	McDermott	Tsongas
Dingell	McGovern	Udall (CO)
Doggett	McNerney	Udall (NM)
Donnelly	McNulty	Van Hollen
Doyle	Meeks (NY)	Velázquez
Edwards	Melancon	Visclosky
Ellison	Michaud	Walz (MN)
Ellsworth	Miller (NC)	Wasserman
Emanuel	Miller, George	Schultz
Engel	Mitchell	Waters
Eshoo	Mollohan	Watson
Etheridge	Moore (KS)	Watt
Farr	Moore (WI)	Waxman
Filner	Moran (VA)	Weiner
Foster	Murphy (CT)	Welch (VT)
Frank (MA)	Murphy, Patrick	Wilson (OH)
Giffords	Murtha	Woolsey
Gillibrand	Nadler	Wu
Gonzalez	Napolitano	Wynn
Gordon	Neal (MA)	Yarmuth
Green, Al	Oberstar	
Green, Gene	Oby	

NAYS—196

Aderholt	Boehner	Cannon
Akin	Bonner	Cantor
Alexander	Boozman	Capito
Bachmann	Boustany	Carter
Bachus	Brady (TX)	Castle
Barrett (SC)	Brown (GA)	Chabot
Barrow	Brown (SC)	Coble
Bartlett (MD)	Brown-Waite,	Cole (OK)
Barton (TX)	Ginny	Conaway
Bean	Buchanan	Crenshaw
Biggart	Burgess	Cubin
Bilbray	Burton (IN)	Culberson
Bilirakis	Buyer	Davis (KY)
Bishop (UT)	Calvert	Davis, David
Blackburn	Camp (MI)	Davis, Tom
Blunt	Campbell (CA)	Deal (GA)

Dent	Kirk	Ramstad
Diaz-Balart, L.	Kline (MN)	Regula
Diaz-Balart, M.	Knollenberg	Rehberg
Doolittle	Kuhl (NY)	Reichert
Drake	LaHood	Renzi
Dreier	Lamborn	Reynolds
Duncan	Lampson	Rogers (AL)
Ehlers	Latham	Rogers (KY)
Emerson	LaTourette	Rogers (MI)
English (PA)	Latta	Rohrabacher
Everett	Lewis (CA)	Ros-Lehtinen
Fallin	Lewis (KY)	Royce
Feeney	Linder	Ryan (WI)
Flake	LoBiondo	Sali
Forbes	Lucas	Saxton
Fortenberry	Lungren, Daniel	Schmidt
Fossella	E.	Sensenbrenner
Fox	Manzullo	Sessions
Franks (AZ)	Marchant	Shadegg
Frelinghuysen	McCarthy (CA)	Shays
Gallegly	McCaul (TX)	Shimkus
Garrett (NJ)	McCotter	Shuster
Gerlach	McCrery	Simpson
Gilchrest	McHenry	Smith (NE)
Gingrey	McHugh	Smith (NJ)
Gohmert	McIntyre	Smith (TX)
Goode	McKeon	Souder
Goodlatte	McMorris	Stearns
Granger	Rodgers	Sullivan
Graves	Mica	Tancredo
Hall (TX)	Miller (FL)	Terry
Hastings (WA)	Miller (MI)	Thornberry
Hayes	Miller, Gary	Tiahrt
Heller	Moran (KS)	Tiberi
Hensarling	Murphy, Tim	Turner
Herger	Musgrave	Upton
Hill	Myrick	Walberg
Hobson	Neugebauer	Walsh (OR)
Hoekstra	Paul	Walsh (NY)
Hulshof	Pearce	Wamp
Hunter	Pence	Weldon (FL)
Inglis (SC)	Petri	Weller
Issa	Pickering	Westmoreland
Johnson (IL)	Pitts	Whitfield (KY)
Johnson, Sam	Platts	Wilson (SC)
Jones (NC)	Poe	Wittman (VA)
Jordan	Porter	Wolf
Keller	Price (GA)	Young (AK)
King (IA)	Pryce (OH)	Young (FL)
King (NY)	Putnam	
Kingston	Radanovich	

NOT VOTING—18

Bono Mack	Harman	Roskam
Brady (PA)	Mack	Rothman
Costa	Markey	Rush
DeLauro	Meek (FL)	Slaughter
Fattah	Nunes	Wexler
Ferguson	Peterson (PA)	Wilson (NM)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Two minutes are remaining on this vote.

□ 1218

Mr. SAXTON and Mr. BARTON of Texas changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, on roll-call No. 192, 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.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Madam 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 220, nays 190, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 193]

YEAS—220

Abercrombie Grijalva Obey
Ackerman Gutierrez Oliver
Allen Hall (NY) Ortiz
Altmire Hare Pallone
Andrews Hastings (FL) Pascrell
Arcuri Herseht Sandlin Pastor
Baca Higgins Payne
Baird Hinchey Perlmutter
Baldwin Hinojosa Peterson (MN)
Barrow Hirono Pomeroy
Bean Hodes Price (NC)
Becerra Holden Rahall
Berkley Holt Rangel
Berman Honda Richardson
Berry Hooley Hoyer
Bishop (GA) Hoyer Inslee
Bishop (NY) Inslee Israel
Blumenauer Israel Jackson (IL)
Boren Jackson-Lee Jackson-Lee
Boswell (TX) Jefferson
Boucher Boyd (FL) Johnson (GA)
Boyd (FL) Johnson (GA) Johnson, E. B.
Boyda (KS) Johnson, E. B. Jones (OH)
Braley (IA) Jones (OH) Kagen
Brown, Corrine Kagan Kanjorski
Butterfield Kaptur Kaptur
Capps Capuano Kennedy
Capuano Cardoza Kildee
Cardoza Carnahan Kilpatrick
Carnahan Carney Kind
Carson Castor Klein (FL)
Castor Kucinich Kucinich
Chandler Lampson Langevin
Clarke Clay Larsen (WA)
Clever Larson (CT) Lee
Clyburn Lee Levin
Cohen Levin Lewis (GA)
Conyers Cooper Lipinski
Cooper Costello Loeb sack
Costello Courtney Lofgren, Zoe
Courtney Lowey
Crowley Cuellar Lynch
Cuellar Cummings
Cummings Davis (AL)
Davis (AL) Davis (CA)
Davis (CA) Davis (IL)
Davis (IL) Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Lincoln DeFazio
DeFazio DeGette
DeGette Delahunt
Delahunt Dicks
Dicks Dingell
Dingell Doggett
Doggett Donnelly
Donnelly Doyle
Doyle Edwards
Edwards Ellison
Ellison Ellsworth
Ellsworth Emanuel
Emanuel Engel
Engel Eshoo
Eshoo Etheridge
Etheridge Farr
Farr Filner
Filner Foster
Foster Frank (MA)
Frank (MA) Giffords
Giffords Gillibrand
Gillibrand Gonzalez
Gonzalez Gordon
Gordon Green, Al
Green, Al Green, Gene

NAYS—190

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

Fallin Latham
Feeney LaTourette
Flake Latta
Forbes Lewis (CA)
Fortenberry Lewis (KY)
Fossella Linder
Foxy LoBiondo
Franks (AZ) Lucas
Gallagher Lungren, Daniel
Garrett (NJ) E.
Gerlach Manzullo
Gilchrest Marchant
Gingrey McCarthy (CA)
Gohmert McCaul (TX)
Goode McCotter
Goodlatte McCrery
Granger McHenry
Graves McHugh
Hall (TX) McKeon
Hastings (WA) McMorris
Hayes Rodgers
Heller Mica
Hensarling Miller (FL)
Herger Miller (MI)
Hill Miller, Gary
Hobson Moran (KS)
Hoekstra Murphy, Tim
Hulshof Musgrave
Hunter Myrick
Inglis (SC) Neugebauer
Issa Paul
Johnson (IL) Pearce
Johnson, Sam Pence
Jones (NC) Petri
Jordan Pickering
Keller Pitts
King (IA) Platts
King (NY) Poe
Kingston Porter
Kirk Price (GA)
Kline (MN) Pryce (OH)
Knollenberg Putnam
Kuhl (NY) Radanovich
LaHood Ramstad
Lamborn Regula
Rehberg

Aderholt Harman
Brady (PA) Mack
Costa Markey
Cramer Meek (FL)
DeLauro Nunes
Fattah Peterson (PA)
Ferguson Reyes

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Two minutes are remaining in this vote.

□ 1225

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.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5715, ENSURING CONTINUED ACCESS TO STUDENT LOANS ACT OF 2008

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on House Resolution 1107, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 218, nays 198, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 194]

YEAS—218

Abercrombie Grijalva Obey
Ackerman Gutierrez Oliver
Allen Hall (NY) Ortiz
Hare Pallone
Harman Pascrell
Hastings (FL) Pastor
Herseht Sandlin Payne
Higgins Perlmutter
Hinchey Peterson (MN)
Hinojosa Pomeroy
Hirono Price (NC)
Hodes Rahall
Holden Rangel
Holt Reyes
Honda Richardson
Hooley Rodriguez
Hoyer Ross
Inslee Roybal-Allard
Israel Ruppertsberger
Jackson (IL) Ryan (OH)
Jackson-Lee Salazar
(TX) Sanchez, Linda
Jefferson T.
Johnson (GA) Sanchez, Loretta
Johnson, E. B. Sarbanes
Jones (OH) Schakowsky
Kagen Schiff
Kanjorski Carney
Kaptur Schwartz
Kennedy Scott (GA)
Kildee Kennedy Scott (VA)
Kilpatrick Kildee Serrano
Kind Kilpatrick Sestak
Klein (FL) Klein (FL) Shea-Porter
Kucinich Kucinich Sherman
Langevin Shuler
Larsen (WA) Sires
Larson (CT) Skelton
Lee Skelton Skelton
Levin Smith (WA)
Lewis (GA) Snyder
Lipinski Solis
Loeb sack Space
Lofgren, Zoe Speier
Lowey Spratt
Lynch Stark
Mahoney (FL) Stupak
Maloney (NY) Sutton
Marshall Tanner
Matheson Tauscher
Matsui Taylor
McCarthy (NY) Thompson (CA)
McCollum (MN) Thompson (MS)
McDermott Tierney
McGovern Towns
McIntyre Tsongas
McNulty Udall (CO)
Udall (NM) Van Hollen
Udall (NM) Velázquez
Van Hollen Velázquez
Velázquez Visclosky
Walz (MN) Walz (MN)
Wasserman Wasserman
Schultz Schultz
Waters Waters
Watson Watson
Watt Watt
Waxman Waxman
Weiner Weiner
Welch (VT) Welch (VT)
Wilson (OH) Wilson (OH)
Woolsey Woolsey
Wu Wu
Yarmuth Yarmuth

NAYS—198

Brady (TX) Conaway
Broun (GA) Crenshaw
Brown (SC) Cubin
Brown-Waite, Culberson
Ginny Davis (KY)
Buchanan Davis, David
Burgess Davis, Tom
Burton (IN) Deal (GA)
Buyer Dent
Calvert Diaz-Balart, L.
Camp (MI) Diaz-Balart, M.
Campbell (CA) Doolittle
Cannon Drake
Cantor Dreier
Capito Duncan
Carter Ehlers
Castle Emerson
Chabot English (PA)
Coble Everett
Cole (OK) Fallin