

[Roll No. 813]

YEAS—385

Ackerman Donnelly (IN) Lance
 Aderholt Doyle Langevin
 Adler (NJ) Driehaus Larsen (WA)
 Akin Duncan Larson (CT)
 Alexander Edwards (MD) Latham
 Altmire Edwards (TX) LaTourette
 Andrews Ehlers Latta
 Arcuri Ellison Lee (CA)
 Austria Ellsworth Lee (NY)
 Bachmann Emerson Levin
 Bachus Engel Lewis (CA)
 Baird Eshoo Lewis (GA)
 Baldwin Etheridge Linder
 Barrow Fallin Lipinski
 Bartlett Farr LoBiondo
 Barton (TX) Fattah Loeb sack
 Becerra Filner Lowey
 Berkley Fleming Lucas
 Berman Fortenberry Luetkemeyer
 Berry Foster Luján
 Bilbray Foxx Lummis
 Bilirakis Frank (MA) Lungren, Daniel
 Bishop (NY) Frelinghuysen E.
 Blackburn Fudge Lynch
 Blumenauer Gallegly Mack
 Blunt Garrett (NJ) Manzullo
 Boccieri Gerlach Marchant
 Boehner Giffords Markey (CO)
 Bonner Gingrey (GA) Markey (MA)
 Bono Mack Gonzalez Marshall
 Boozman Goodlatte Massa
 Boren Gordon (TN) Matheson
 Boswell Granger Matsui
 Boucher Graves McCarthy (CA)
 Boustany Grayson McCarthy (NY)
 Brady (PA) Green, Al McClintock
 Brady (TX) Green, Gene McCollum
 Bright Griffith McCotter
 Brown (SC) Grijalva McDermott
 Brown, Corrine Guthrie McGovern
 Brown-Waite, Gutierrez
 Ginny Hall (NY) McHenry
 Buchanan Hall (TX) McIntyre
 Burgess Halvorson McKeon
 Burton (IN) Hare McMahan
 Butterfield Harman McMorris
 Camp Harper McNeerney
 Campbell Hastings (FL) Meek (FL)
 Cantor Hastings (WA) Meeks (NY)
 Cao Heinrich Mica
 Capito Heller Michaud
 Capps Hensarling Miller (FL)
 Carnahan Herger Miller (MI)
 Carney Herseth Sandlin Miller (NC)
 Carson (IN) Hill Miller, Gary
 Carter Himes Miller, George
 Cassidy Hinchey Minnick
 Castle Hirono Mitchell
 Castor (FL) Hodes Mollohan
 Chaffetz Hoekstra Moore (KS)
 Chandler Holden Moore (WI)
 Childers Holt Moran (KS)
 Chu Honda Moran (VA)
 Clarke Hoyer Murphy (CT)
 Clay Hunter Murphy (NY)
 Cleaver Inglis Murphy, Patrick
 Clyburn Israel Murphy, Tim
 Coble Issa Murtha
 Coffman (CO) Jackson (IL) Myrick
 Cohen Jackson-Lee Nadler (NY)
 Cole (TX) Napolitano
 Conaway Jenkins Neal (MA)
 Connolly (VA) Johnson (GA) Neugebauer
 Conyers Johnson (IL) Nunes
 Cooper Johnson, E. B. Nye
 Costa Johnson, Sam Oberstar
 Costello Jordan (OH) Obey
 Crenshaw Kagen Olson
 Crowley Kanjorski Olver
 Cuellar Kaptur Ortiz
 Cummings Kennedy Pallone
 Dahlkemper Kildee Pascrell
 Davis (CA) Kilpatrick (MI) Pastor (AZ)
 Davis (IL) Kilroy Paulsen
 Davis (KY) Kind Payne
 Deal (GA) King (NY) Pence
 DeFazio Kingston Perlmutter
 DeGette Kirk Perriello
 Delahunt Kirkpatrick (AZ) Peters
 DeLauro Kissell Peterson
 Dent Klein (FL) Petri
 Diaz-Balart, L. Kline (MN) Pingree (ME)
 Diaz-Balart, M. Kosmas Pitts
 Dicks Kratovil Platts
 Dingell Kucinich Poe (TX)
 Doggett Lamborn Polis (CO)

Pomeroy Schock
 Posey Schrader
 Price (GA) Schwartz
 Price (NC) Scott (GA)
 Putnam Scott (VA)
 Quigley Serrano
 Radanovich Sessions
 Rahall Sestak
 Rangel Shea-Porter
 Rehberg Sherman
 Reichert Shimkus
 Reyes Shuler
 Rodriguez Shuster
 Roe (TN) Simpson
 Rogers (AL) Sires
 Rogers (KY) Skelton
 Rohrabacher Slaughter
 Rooney Smith (NE)
 Ros-Lehtinen Smith (NJ)
 Roskam Smith (TX)
 Ross Smith (WA)
 Rothman (NJ) Snyder
 Roybal-Allard Souder
 Luján Ruppberger Space
 Ryan (OH) Speier
 Salazar Spratt
 Sanchez, Linda Stark
 T. Stearns
 Sanchez, Loretta Stupak
 Sarbanes Sullivan
 Scalise Sutton
 Schakowsky Tanner
 Schauer Taylor
 Schiff Teague
 Schmidt Terry

Thompson (CA)
 Thompson (MS)
 Thompson (PA)
 Tiberi
 Tierney
 Titus
 Tonko
 Towns
 Tsongas
 Turner
 Upton
 Van Hollen
 Velázquez
 Visclosky
 Walz
 Wasserman
 Schultz
 Waters
 Watson
 Watt
 Waxman
 Weiner
 Welch
 Westmoreland
 Whitfield
 Wilson (OH)
 Wilson (SC)
 Wittman
 Wolf
 Woolsey
 Wu
 Yarmuth
 Young (FL)

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BRALEY of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I missed votes on Friday, October 23, 2009. If I were present, I would have voted: “aye” on rollcall 812, On Agreeing to the Kratovil of Maryland Amendment to H.R. 3619 and “yea” on rollcall 813, On Final Passage of H.R. 3619, the Coast Guard Authorization Act of 2010.

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN ENGROSSMENT OF H.R. 3619, COAST GUARD AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2010

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk be authorized to make technical corrections in the engrossment of H.R. 3619, to include corrections in spelling, punctuation, section numbering, cross-referencing, and the insertion of appropriate headings.

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

There was no objection.

NAYS—11

Broun (GA) King (IA) Sensenbrenner
 Courtney Paul Shadegg
 Flake Royce Tiahrt
 Franks (AZ) Ryan (WI)

NOT VOTING—36

Abercrombie Cardoza Maffei
 Baca Culberson Maloney
 Barrett (SC) Davis (AL) McCaul
 Bean Davis (TN) Melancon
 Biggert Dreier Richardson
 Bishop (GA) Forbes Rogers (MI)
 Bishop (UT) Gohmert Rush
 Boyd Higgins Thornberry
 Braley (IA) Hinojosa Walden
 Buyer Insole Wamp
 Calvert Jones Wexler
 Capuano Lofgren, Zoe Young (AK)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). One minute is left in the vote.

□ 1057

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 813 I was not able to vote on the House floor on the passage of H.R. 3619, the Coast Guard Authorization Act due to a family matter. Had I been present, I would have voted “aye.”

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 813, final passage of the Fiscal Year 2010 U.S. Coast Guard Authorization Act, had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. CARDOZA. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to be present for several votes taken on the House floor today, Friday, October 23, 2009, due to illness. As a result, I missed rollcall votes Nos. 812 and 813.

Had I been present: On rollcall vote No. 812 I would have voted “aye” and on rollcall vote No. 813 I would have voted “yea.”

□ 1100

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I'd like to yield to my friend, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) the majority leader, for the purposes of finding out about next week's schedule. And I yield.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, on Monday the House will meet at 12:30 p.m. for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business with votes postponed until 6:30 p.m. On Tuesday the House will meet at 10:30 A.M. for morning-hour debate and noon for legislative business. On Wednesday and Thursday the House will meet at 10 a.m. for legislative business, and on Friday the House will meet at 9 a.m.

We'll consider several bills under suspension of the rules. The complete list of suspension bills will be announced by the close of business today. In addition, Mr. Speaker, we will consider H.R. 3854, the Small Business Financing and Investment Act of 2009. We also will consider the conference report, H.R. 2996, on the Department of the Interior, Environment and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, and also a House joint resolution making further appropriations for fiscal year 2010, and for other purposes, otherwise known as a CR. The CR, as the gentleman from Virginia knows, will run out on the 31st of this month.

I yield back.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the gentleman about some reports that we've been hearing about other bills that could perhaps come to the floor next week, and I wonder if he could add

some clarity to that. There have been reports that perhaps an estate tax bill would be coming to the floor next week. And I yield.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman. We're working with the Ways and Means Committee and would like to bring to this floor in the next few weeks, at least, if not next week, a bill to deal with the estate tax issue.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman and, Mr. Speaker, would ask further whether we can expect that bill to include the statutory PAYGO provisions and whether that bill would be compliant with those provisions. And I yield.

Mr. HOYER. Yes on both questions. We will probably have, either in the bill or by rule, we'll adopt statutory PAYGO, which we pledged to do in our budget, as you know, and it will be compliant.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman, Mr. Speaker, and I just wanted to reiterate so, in my understanding, that would mean that the estate tax bill would be paid for if it came to the floor of the House. I yield.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding. As the gentleman will recall, I would remind the House, Mr. Speaker, the budget that we passed provided for baseline spending for four items, that is to say, that the baseline which is, essentially, the premise that I think your party has adopted with respect to tax legislation, that the estate tax, the alternative minimum tax, the middle income tax cuts and the so-called "doc fix," the sustainable growth rates, would be scored at baseline, which means effectively you would not pay for them.

And I would expect us to comply with that budget provision, giving those four exceptions of which the estate tax is one.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman. And I believe, Mr. Speaker, what I'm hearing is that neither the estate tax bill nor the other items included in the budget resolution passed would be paid for, and that there would be an assumption somehow that that money would just be taken care of. And I yield.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding. It's sort of like your assumptions when we have tax bills on the floor, yes.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for that observation. Again, I just wanted to make the point that, again, as we are in unprecedented times incurring debt unlike we have ever in this country, that these obviously very important bills that need consideration are coming to the floor without being paid for contributing to the exacerbation of the debt situation on our children and their children. I would ask, Mr. Speaker, further—

Mr. HOYER. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANTOR. I would yield to the gentleman, sure.

Mr. HOYER. The gentleman, of course, knows that if we don't act on

the estate tax that there will be a great cost next year. The gentleman's aware of that which will itself exacerbate the budget.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I'd respond to the gentleman, he and I both know that we actually have shared position on the fact that we need to address the uncertainty surrounding the cliff, if you will, in the estate tax expiration of the repeal.

But, again, if we are in the age of being very concerned about the deficit, the Members, I believe, on our side need to know that the bills coming to the floor are not paid for. They may be compliant with provisions in the budget resolution, but simply are not paid for. And the assumptions made about baseline are just those.

Mr. HOYER. Will my friend yield again?

Mr. CANTOR. I yield.

Mr. HOYER. Given my friend's concern, would the gentleman join me in supporting and getting the votes for a statutory PAYGO on its own? I yield back.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. HOYER. Because of our concern about the deficit, which I share.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I would say, that I, as well as other Members of our leadership and our conference certainly would be willing to engage in crafting solutions as to how we go about implementing PAYGO provisions without raising taxes because, as we know now, families across this country are hurting, small businesses are having difficulty keeping lights on. And now, certainly is not the time for us to see increased taxes on the working families or small businesses of this country.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask the gentleman further about what we could expect in terms of the reports surrounding the so-called "doc fix" on the sustainable growth rate formula and whether we can expect such a bill to come to the floor next week and whether that bill would be paid for. And I yield.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding. As you know, when the former administration was in office, we regularly passed the doc fix which, as you know, wasn't paid for. We think that's not appropriate. But we agree with you that now is not the time to raise taxes. However, we also understand that if we do not address the sustainable growth rate for doctors, that Medicare recipients won't have doctors to go to. We want to ensure that Medicare recipients do in fact have providers who can meet their medical needs.

As a result, Senator REID, as you know, tried to pass the sustainable growth rate modification so there wouldn't be a 21 percent cut in January to doctors. Unfortunately, all of your party voted against that and 13 of my party voted against that, so it lost 47-53. But we believe that that's going to be addressed one way or another so

that we assure and we intend to do that, to assure our Medicare recipients that they will not lose the services of their doctors.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I'd ask the gentleman again, might we expect that bill to come to the floor next week? And if not, when could we expect such a bill to come to the floor? And I yield.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I'm not sure that we're going to have it next week, but I can assure the gentleman that we do intend to address the issue so that doctors do not confront a 21 percent cut in their Medicare reimbursements for Medicare patients, yes.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman. And if I could, Mr. Speaker, turn the gentleman's attention to the question of the bill that Ranking Member ROSLEHTINEN and Chairman BERMAN are working on in terms of the Iran Refined Petroleum Sanctions Act. This is a bill, Mr. Speaker, that the gentleman has indicated to me, as well as to the chief deputy whip, Mr. MCCARTHY, last week that that bill would be coming to the floor within the next few weeks, and would ask the gentleman, does he expect the bill on the floor next week or the week following? And I yield.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for the question. As I have said, Mr. BERMAN expected to mark up the bill, as is my expectation, and Mr. BERMAN will be marking up the bill. As the gentleman probably knows, that bill is subject to joint jurisdiction or co-jurisdiction by three other committees, the Oversight Committee, the Financial Services Committee and the Ways and Means Committee, so they will have to do their work on that bill as well.

But I do look forward to moving that bill, as the gentleman, as I've indicated in the past, and not only that, I want to say to the gentleman, I look forward to discussing it with him in the next couple of days.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman for that, and appreciate his efforts to try and bring that bill to the floor. I know he and I share a commitment to try and make that happen as quickly as possible.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask the gentleman where we stand as far as the schedule for November and December. As we know now, we are within a week or so of the October 30 targeted adjournment. I guess all of us understand that that is not going to be met. But we've not been given a schedule; and as the gentleman knows, Members on his side as well as ours are used to having some advance notice about scheduling their lives and when they can be home with their families, their constituents, when they will be asked to be here in Washington performing their duties. And I don't recall that we've ever been in a situation where there's not been an official schedule issued this far or this close up to an adjournment.

So I'm asking the gentleman, Mr. Speaker, if he could tell us, officially,

what the schedule could be for the next month and the month succeeding that. And I yield.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I have, for at least 3 weeks now, been indicating what I thought the schedule was going to be in November. As you know, a little earlier this week I modified that. As I caveated when I announced that we would be meeting the first and third weeks of November, and not the second week of November—because Veterans Day, which all of our Members want to be home with those memorializing those we have lost in the defense of freedom and celebrating those who have served in defending freedom and democracy. Our Members want to be with their fellow citizens at home accomplishing that objective, including myself and, I'm sure, yourself.

The fact is, however, I also caveated that with, if we could pass health care we may use a portion of that week. Therefore, let me make it very clear officially, if you will, that I do not expect and do not plan that we'll be here Thanksgiving week. I expect us to be here the first and third weeks, from Monday through Friday of November.

On the second week of November, which starts with the 9th of November, I want Members to make available and ask their schedulers now for Saturday the 7th, Monday the 9th and Tuesday the 10th as possible dates, possible on which we would meet. The contingency will be whether or not we can move the health care bill, which we believe is the most important piece of legislation that we'll consider, and probably both sides believe that, whatever their view of what they're going to do on that legislation, that we will consider.

And if, in fact, it's possible to pass it prior to Tuesday the 10th, then we will possibly be in on Saturday the 7th, Monday the 9th and Tuesday the 10th. On Tuesday the 10th we would meet no later than 3 p.m.

In December—I've had discussions with the majority leader in the Senate. We are of the opinion that we certainly ought to make every effort and will make every effort to be out of this session, the first session of this Congress, by Friday the 18th of December. The following week is Christmas week and we certainly, my view is, want to have people home on Christmas week. And I have no intention of meeting the following week either. We are in discussions about the first, the month of January, not just the first 2 weeks, but the month of January. I'm hopeful that fairly soon I'll be able to announce what we want to do on that.

□ 1115

As a matter of fact, I would be glad to have discussions with the gentleman from Virginia on that issue.

Mr. CANTOR. I appreciate that, Mr. Speaker, and I would just reiterate the custom, which is to release an official schedule so that, as he knows, Members can do their planning.

Mr. HOYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANTOR. Yes.

Mr. HOYER. We all want that. But I think anyone who has served any time in the House or the Senate knows that as you begin to wind down a session—in this case the first session of this Congress—legislation passing between the two bodies dictates your schedule more than simply arbitrarily saying we'd like to be out on this day. And as a result, we will have to see where we are as we move along.

The Interior bill I was hopeful that we would consider 2 weeks ago, it's on the schedule for this coming week. As you know, we were unable to get to agreement. We now appear to have got an agreement in the conference, and we're ready to move forward.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman. Again, whether we are in or whether we are out, I don't think we're advocating a position of being out and certainly not completing work.

But, again, it is rather unprecedented where we are without the ability for us to have an official schedule, which is why I continue, Mr. Speaker, to prod on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, if I could then turn to the question of the piece of legislation that the gentleman referred to, health care reform, and about its timing and, frankly, the inclusion of a public option.

We've been hearing a tremendous number of reports—many of them conflicting—about what will be the timing of the health care bill coming on the floor of this House, what may be included. Again, we are in a position being kept in the dark, which is rather odd given the repeated insistence by this White House and the President—both as he is our President now and when he was a candidate for President, when he proclaimed that negotiations over important bills—and, of course, this would be one of them—would occur in the light of day and even appear on C-SPAN. That's obviously not been the case.

We've heard yesterday from the Speaker quoted in the press that she had the votes for a public option. We then have heard today reports indicating that there isn't the support on your side for a robust public option.

Again, this just underscores the fact that there is so much movement on one side of the aisle without any participation by the other.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman to clarify and give us some clarity on this notion and whether he could define for us what is included in a robust public option, what is the difference between a robust public option or something else which seems to have now captured the interest of everybody in this body and certainly those in the press.

And I yield.

Mr. HOYER. I don't know that I am going to get into a long, extended discussion about the substance of this bill or we could be here until late tonight.

I will tell the gentleman, however, that no one ought to be surprised, having watched this bill being considered over the last 6 to 7 months, some 70-plus hearings that have been held over the last 2 years, to know this is a very difficult subject of great magnitude of impact on the American public and the American economy. One-sixth of our economy is health care expenditures.

No one should be surprised that it's receiving a lot of discussion and attention. No one should be surprised that there are differences as to how to get from where we are—which is a system that is escalating at a very rapid rate. Family costs are increasing by probably \$1,800 a year, families are being forced out of the market, and the uninsured grow. So we are trying to deal with that issue.

The fact is that in terms of the public option as has been discussed, there are a number of ways to provide an alternative assurance of coverage to individuals other than simply an exchange, which would be like the Office of Personnel Management's Federal employee health benefit exchange—which is private sector—folks competing for our business and the business of those that are employed by the Federal Government. There is a lot of discussion about that.

That discussion continues, and I will tell the gentleman that as the Speaker said and I've said, we will bring the bill to the floor when we think it's ready to come to the floor. And I've further asserted emphatically that we will give the 72-hours notice that we had indicated we would give.

I would tell you further that until such time as we've resolved what the bill is going to look like, it is impossible for CBO to give a final score.

We had pledged that we're going to be deficit free, that is to say the bill will be paid for, will not add to the deficit. The President indicated that in his speech to the joint session, and we intend to do that.

So I tell the gentleman we're having continuing discussions on not just the public option, to which the gentleman refers, and to how that will be configured, but there are other matters as well of concern to the public and to all of us.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

I think the gentleman makes one of the points I am trying to convey, and that is these discussions, these continuing negotiations are occurring behind closed doors, they're occurring just on one side of the aisle in and around issues of health care that affect every American—young, old, Republican, Democrat, male, female. It is universal in its application, the issue of health care.

So it is troubling, at the very least, for us to sit here and witness these ongoing negotiations behind closed doors when we on our side, I think, have posited alternatives. The gentleman and I have met on discussions surrounding some points that we can agree upon.

But what's troubling right now is the insistence that we continue to read about that there be a public option. My office has received reports about their being three different public options that your side is considering.

Now, we've heard reports that you have whipped those three distinct public options. My question, Mr. Speaker, to the gentleman is, what are those three public options? I think the public deserves the right to know. The public has rejected the notion of a public option replacing their health care. That is really the impetus, I believe, that the gentleman would want to put on display about this discussion about the so-called public option and the three versions that are discussed.

Mr. HOYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANTOR. I yield.

Mr. HOYER. I reject the gentleman's conclusion, which I think is incorrect, the premise that the public has rejected. In fact, as the gentleman probably knows, hopefully, the polling data indicates that the support for the public option has risen since August—has risen, I tell my friend. And there are a number of different ways to get there.

The Senate has one that's on public display, has been on the Internet. The House Education and Labor Committee has one option with Ways and Means that has been on the Internet. It's been on the Internet since July. Energy and Commerce has one—a different correlation of that—and it's been on the Internet since July. There have been a lot of discussions, and I would refer my friend to the Internet, and I am sure he has copies of all of those bills.

Nothing is secret, nothing is behind closed doors.

Now, are we having discussions with ourselves about how we want to get there and with people who will vote for the bill?

The gentleman has made it very clear, I don't think your side is for a public option. We disagree on that. That is a fair disagreement. You're not for a public option, and I haven't talked to anybody on your side that's for a public option.

We disagree. We believe that the public option is an option that the public ought to have and not simply be in the sights of insurance companies who may or may not give them the price or the coverage that they could either afford or need. That's the difference. But I haven't talked to anybody on your side who wants a public option no matter how it is configured.

So very frankly, I will tell my friend that discussions with your side on a public option seem somewhat pointless.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I'm a little taken aback by the gentleman's statement saying it's pointless for him to have discussions with Republicans regarding health care.

Mr. HOYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANTOR. I will.

Mr. HOYER. I didn't say that.

The gentleman, as he cited, we had a meeting. Am I incorrect in saying that the gentleman indicated to me he was not for a public option? Is that an accurate statement?

Mr. CANTOR. The gentleman is not incorrect because Republicans believe that a public option doesn't bring about competition. I think both of us, Mr. Speaker, agree that competition is what is needed to bring down prices to increase access.

We believe that real competition comes from the ability for individuals to choose not just from two or three insurance companies that may have 50 percent of market share; we believe real competition comes from the ability for an individual to choose from a thousand different insurance plans for that individual and his or her family. That's where we begin to—that's what we can agree on. The competition brings down prices. We don't believe public option brings competition.

And that is the essence. The end shouldn't be public option.

Mr. HOYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANTOR. I will yield when I finish.

And I would further say again to the gentleman's representation about where the American public is because of a poll that was taken this week, I think there have been numerous articles written on debunking the methodology behind that poll. In fact, the question when posed, do you support a public option to compete with private insurance, is and would yield a different response than if you were to ask, would you support a public option that replaces the current health care coverage that you have.

And, Mr. Speaker, this is our position. We believe that if you introduce a government that also makes the rules as a competitor, that there will no longer be an even playing field for competition, that you are on a path to single-payer health care in this country. That is the difference, Mr. Speaker. But I don't think that the gentleman is correct in his saying it is fruitless to have discussions surrounding health care because we have a difference of opinion.

And I yield.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The gentleman misstates what I said. I said discussion regarding a public option when I had talked to nobody on your side who was for a public option.

It seems pointless, from my perspective, to talk to somebody about how a public option ought to be configured if, as you have just stated, you're not for a public option. Therefore, a discussion about a public option does in fact to me seem pointless.

Furthermore, let me say this: The gentleman was here when we—I believe you were here—when we adopted the current part D of the Medicare program. The gentleman will recall in that bill you provided for a public op-

tion. You provided for a public option to provide competition and availability of a health care prescription-drug coverage. Now, you provided it in the event that there was no private sector, or at least not more than one, available in any one segment of our society.

So I tell the gentleman, in your own bill—that I think you supported; I don't know that off the top of my head—but my presumption is you supported it or certainly the overwhelming majority of your party supported with very few Democratic votes, and that provided for an option of a public option.

Mr. CANTOR. I would say to the gentleman there are a lot of differences to the construct of the MMA, the legislation passed that created part D than what is being discussed today.

Mr. HOYER. I agree with that. But it did provide for an option of a public option.

Mr. CANTOR. Reclaiming my time.

So I would say if the gentleman is of that opinion that there is an ability to discuss things surrounding health care, then why is it that we continue to see closed door negotiations?

So the gentleman points to the different options, public options or versions thereof, being discussed in the three different committees in the House. Are those the public options that the gentleman and his side have whipped and are being discussed now behind closed doors?

□ 1130

Frankly, any imposition of a public plan is going to cost taxpayers and small businesses money. I would certainly think the gentleman would share the notion that Republicans should be involved, and it would be of concern to both Republicans and Democrats throughout this country that the American people would want their right to know being realized in these discussions, which is my point as to why is it that we can't hear what these three different public options are and what the differences are therein.

Mr. HOYER. I would repeat, you know exactly what the options are. As I just told you, they are online. They have been discussed. They were discussed extensively in the committee on television. Surely the gentleman would not want the Speaker or anybody else to be misunderstood as the fact that your party doesn't have discussions among yourselves as to what options you want to pursue.

If that's your representation, frankly, I tell my friend, I don't think many people are going to believe that. Are we having discussions? We are. I don't believe either you individually or anybody that I have talked to on your side of the aisle is for a public option.

We are discussing how public option ought to be configured. You don't believe there ought to be a public option, period, for the reasons you have stated. We understand that. We have a difference of opinion on that.

Now, if you are for public option on some configuration, then if you will submit that to me, I would be glad to talk to you about it.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, we have always and continue to represent that we are ready to work with him, his leadership and the other side in crafting and affecting positive health care reform. Again, shutting down discussions is not a route to achieve that that could fairly produce what the American people want.

I don't think it could produce fairly or unfairly what the American people want if it is going to be about my way or the highway as far as health care discussions and a bill that passes on this floor.

I thank the gentleman.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, OCTOBER 26, 2009

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Monday next for morning-hour debate, and further, when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet at 10:30 a.m. on Tuesday, October 27, 2009, for morning-hour debate.

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

There was no objection.

SUFFERING AT HANDS OF HEALTH INSURANCE COMPANIES

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

Mr. LUJÁN. Mr. Speaker, I have heard from constituents across my district who are suffering at the hands of health insurance companies.

I have heard from doctors who do their best to treat those without insurance.

I have heard from entrepreneurs who want to start their own businesses but fear that they won't be able to find coverage for their sick children because they have preexisting conditions.

I have heard from women who can't replace their ill children's used catheters because they were denied by their insurance companies.

I have heard from small business owners struggling to afford coverage that their employees depend on.

They need us to act, they are asking us to act, they are demanding us to act, and that's why we must.

We need to fix our broken health insurance system. We need a health insurance system that works for men, for women, for children, seniors and families, for everyone. We need action to combat rising health care costs to make health care more accessible and to offer real choice.

We need a public option. We must demand a public option.

HONORING GREATER MIAMI YMCA

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize the wonderful work of the YMCA of Greater Miami and the addition of its new chief development officer, Pat Morris.

Every day, YMCAs across the country help improve our communities and provide positive programs for youth and adults. Over the past year alone, the YMCA of Greater Miami has cared for 4,700 children. The Miami Y has coached and instructed more than 3,650 children in sports, held summer programs for more than 2,900 kids, and mentored over 100 teens.

The YMCA of Greater Miami is working with other community groups to build affordable homes for families and seniors and will open a brand-new preschool in the near future.

With the help of Pat Morris, the YMCA of Greater Miami will continue to foster positive growth in our neighborhoods.

I congratulate my good friend, Pat, for his position as chief development officer. He has dedicated himself to helping our south Florida community, first as cofounder of the community service organization Hands On Miami and now as a member of the YMCA team.

Congrats to the YMCA of Greater Miami, and I wish the agency continued success as they improve the lives of all of our neighbors.

AMERICANS SUPPORT IMMIGRATION ENFORCEMENT

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, a recent survey by Rasmussen Reports shows that a growing majority of Americans want our immigration laws enforced.

Nearly two-thirds of those surveyed believe law enforcement officers should conduct surprise visits at locations where illegal immigrants are employed. Only 19 percent opposed the visits, compared to 24 percent last April. By a 13-point margin, Americans believe that the Federal Government should not prevent local law enforcement officers from checking on individuals' immigration status.

The Phoenix Business Journal and the Washington D.C. Examiner both reported the poll's findings, but coverage in news outlets that regularly cover immigration issues was glaringly missing.

Mr. Speaker, the media should report all of the facts, not omit those they disagree with.

WHERE ARE THE JOBS?

(Mrs. CAPITO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Speaker, I have one question. Where are the jobs?

We are now more than 7 months from passage of the so-called stimulus package, yet it is more apparent than ever that the bill has fallen woefully short. In my home State of West Virginia, the White House predicted that this legislation would create 20,000 jobs. Well, guess what? At this point, since February, the reality is that we have lost 13,000 jobs. Sadly, the stimulus isn't living up to its promise of job creation.

Additionally, the policies of this administration are actually contributing to job losses in my State. Cap-and-trade legislation will put an economic target on the back of our States, States like mine. Meanwhile, the EPA has continued to hold up mine permits across Appalachia, creating an unprecedented sense of unease and uncertainty that's already costing us mining jobs and threatening thousands more.

Mr. Speaker, my constituents deserve better now, and they certainly deserved better when we first debated this bill. I join them in asking: Where are the jobs?

HEALTH CARE REFORM SHOULD NOT BE ON BACKS OF OUR SMALL BUSINESSES

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

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. Speaker, we need health care reform, but not on the backs of our small businesses. The proposed plan would impose more than \$820 billion in new taxes, something hardworking Americans and small businesses can't afford.

In a letter, Gilbert Travis of Travis Lumber Company in Mansfield, Arkansas, described how his company and many other lumber companies have been forced to cut back on the number of days a week in operation. Some have met an even worse fate—closure.

Gilbert is not optimistic that the outlook for these businesses will get better any time soon and writes there is no way the American economy, with it's hardworking people, can afford the absolutely wasteful spending and tax increases that Washington is trying to impose at every angle they can possibly think of.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with Gilbert. We cannot be imposing new taxes on hardworking American businesses that are struggling to make ends meet in this economic climate. Let's craft a real reform that will decrease health costs, allowing more persons to get the care they deserve.

THE STIMULUS: IS THAT ALL THERE IS?

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