

overwhelming majority of the population that are tightening their family budgets to continue paying their mortgages on time. Passage of this legislation in its current form could send mortgage rate fees higher for our regular homeowners as creditors pass on the risk of bankruptcy procedures. This is a question of fairness, in my mind. We must be certain that in the pursuit of helping those who deserve help and need help that we do not unduly burden those who have worked hard to keep their heads above water.

I also have concerns about the state of the HOPE for Homeowners Program. During a recent hearing in our Financial Services Committee, one of the witnesses from the Department of Housing and Urban Development agreed with me when I posited the question: Should we just scrap this and start over? Realizing that as of today, HOPE for Homeowners, which has been in effect for several months now, has only helped 50 homeowners in their current situation. I offered an amendment, and I feel that we should give the FHA new authority to reshape this program where it can really work quickly and is targeted to the population who desperately need this help. I offered an amendment to the Rules Committee to achieve this goal, but I was prevented from offering it on the floor and am, therefore, prevented from discussing it on the floor in a fuller manner. So later today I will be introducing that proposal as stand-alone legislation, the REFI for Homeowners Act.

There are some provisions in this bill that I do support, like the safe harbor provisions that will encourage more modifications, the increasing of deposit insurance for FDIC and NCUA, and the ultimate goal of this bill, which is to help homeowners. However, the cramdown of mortgages and the continuation of the HOPE for Homeowners Program that is not working is not in the best interest of our taxpayers. I think we can do better than what this bill offers.

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

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to Chairman FRANK.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Chair, I think her amendment is a very important one. I would ask her if we could withhold further action to do a little work on it because the notion that we should put a requirement on these servicers to get funding is a valid one. There are some interconnections here, and I think we could actually make it apply to more people. But, also, if a servicer is only doing two or three of these, the requirement that they notify everybody might become a deterrent to doing some. So I would like to sharpen it and broaden it at the same time. And if the gentlewoman would agree, we could work on this, and I think by the time this gets

through the Senate, never known for breakneck speed, we would have a version that would improve it. So I would suggest that to the gentlewoman.

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 45 seconds to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CULBERSON).

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chair, we fiscal conservatives are in the minority, unfortunately, and have been working hard to lay out alternatives to stimulate the economy with immediate tax cuts, with spending cuts.

The new majority in Congress, with this new President, has spent more money in less time than any Congress in history. In fact, that's all borrowed money. About \$1.3 trillion in borrowed money has already been spent by this Congress.

I would like to ask the Congresswoman from Nevada (Ms. TITUS), who ran on a record of being fiscally responsible, Ms. TITUS, how is it fiscally responsible that you voted for \$1.2 trillion in new spending, borrowed money, which is going to be paid for by our children and grandchildren? How is that fiscally responsible?

□ 1330

Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California. Mr. Chairman, that is not a germane point. I would raise a point of order.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman's time has expired.

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to comment on Chairman FRANK's offer to help work on this amendment in terms of both its scope and depth. I appreciate that offer of assistance. I think we can improve the amendment. I think it is very important that we have an aggressive borrower outreach program so people who are in trouble can find out about the help that is available to them and find that out before it is too late.

Mr. Chairman, I would ask unanimous consent that the amendment be withdrawn.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Chairman, I have time remaining; is that correct?

I reserve the right to object.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman could have reserved the right to object before the amendment was withdrawn, but the amendment has been withdrawn.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, it was not our intention to shut off the gentlewoman from West Virginia. Is it in order to ask unanimous consent that she be allowed the remaining time as if it had not been withdrawn?

The Acting CHAIR. Yes, it is.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Then I would make a unanimous consent request that the gentlewoman from West Virginia be able to conclude her remarks as if the amendment had not been withdrawn.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentlewoman from West Virginia reclaims the balance of her time.

There was no objection.

Mrs. CAPITO. I thank the chairman for the unanimous consent request.

I yield the time I have remaining to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON).

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. You know, one of the things that concerns me is that we have spent trillions of dollars in the last few weeks, trillions. The people of this country were very concerned about the money they had in the banks so the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation raised the amount of money from \$100,000 to \$250,000 so people will feel secure, they will know their money is safe in the banks. Yet today, the head of the FDIC, Sheila Bair, said the fund could become insolvent this year.

That is the craziest thing this woman could possibly say. If she wants to avoid a run on the banks and scaring the American people to death, she shouldn't be making these kinds of comments. To say that the FDIC is not going to insure the deposits of the people of this country is insane, especially at a time when everybody in this country is scared to death.

Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. TITUS) having assumed the chair, Mr. SALAZAR, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1106) to prevent mortgage foreclosures and enhance mortgage credit availability, had come to no resolution thereon.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 34 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1641

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SERRANO) at 4 o'clock and 41 minutes p.m.

HELPING FAMILIES SAVE THEIR HOMES ACT OF 2009

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 190 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 1106.

□ 1641

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole

House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 1106) to prevent mortgage foreclosures and enhance mortgage credit availability, with Mr. HOLDEN (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, a request for a recorded vote on amendment No. 3, printed in House Report 111-21, offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) had been postponed.

Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in House Report 111-21 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 1, as modified, by Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.

Amendment No. 2 by Mr. PRICE of Georgia.

Amendment No. 3 by Mr. PETERS of Michigan.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MS. ZOE LOFGREN OF CALIFORNIA, AS MODIFIED

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ZOE LOFGREN), as modified, on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 263, noes 164, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 100]
AYES—263

Abercrombie	Carney	Donnelly (IN)
Ackerman	Carson (IN)	Doyle
Adler (NJ)	Castle	Driehaus
Altmire	Castor (FL)	Edwards (MD)
Andrews	Chandler	Edwards (TX)
Arcuri	Childers	Ellison
Baca	Christensen	Ellsworth
Baird	Clarke	Engel
Baldwin	Clay	Eshoo
Barrow	Cleaver	Etheridge
Bean	Clyburn	Farr
Becerra	Cohen	Fattah
Berkley	Connolly (VA)	Filner
Berman	Cooper	Foster
Berry	Costa	Fox
Bishop (GA)	Costello	Frank (MA)
Bishop (NY)	Courtney	Fudge
Blumenauer	Crowley	Giffords
Bocieri	Cuellar	Gonzalez
Bordallo	Cummings	Gordon (TN)
Boren	Dahlkemper	Grayson
Boswell	Davis (AL)	Green, Al
Boucher	Davis (CA)	Green, Gene
Boyd	Davis (IL)	Griffith
Brady (PA)	Davis (TN)	Grijalva
Braley (IA)	DeFazio	Gutierrez
Bright	DeGette	Hall (NY)
Brown, Corrine	Delahunt	Halvorson
Butterfield	DeLauro	Hare
Capps	Diaz-Balart, L.	Harman
Capuano	Diaz-Balart, M.	Hastings (FL)
Cardoza	Dicks	Heinrich
Carnahan	Doggett	Herseth Sandlin

Higgins	McDermott
Hill	McGovern
Himes	McHugh
Hinches	McIntyre
Hinojosa	McMahon
Hirono	McNerney
Hodes	Meek (FL)
Holden	Meeks (NY)
Holt	Michaud
Honda	Miller (NC)
Hoyer	Miller, George
Inslee	Minnick
Israel	Mitchell
Jackson (IL)	Mollohan
Jackson-Lee	Moore (KS)
(TX)	Moore (WI)
Johnson (GA)	Moran (VA)
Johnson, E. B.	Murphy (CT)
Jones	Murphy, Patrick
Kagen	Murtha
Kanjorski	Nadler (NY)
Kaptur	Napolitano
Kennedy	Neal (MA)
Kildee	Norton
Kilpatrick (MI)	Nye
Kilroy	Oberstar
Kind	Obey
Kirkpatrick (AZ)	Oliver
Kissell	Ortiz
Klein (FL)	Pallone
Kosmas	Pascrell
Kratovil	Pastor (AZ)
Kucinich	Payne
Lance	Perlmutter
Langevin	Peters
Larsen (WA)	Peterson
Larson (CT)	Pierluisi
Lee (CA)	Pingree (ME)
Levin	Polis (CO)
Lewis (GA)	Pomeroy
Lipinski	Velázquez
Loeb	Price (NC)
Loeb	Rahall
Lofgren, Zoe	Rangel
Lowe	Reyes
Lujan	Richardson
Lynch	Rodriguez
Maffei	Ros-Lehtinen
Maloney	Ross
Markey (CO)	Rothman (NJ)
Markey (MA)	Roybal-Allard
Marshall	Ruppersberger
Massa	Rush
Matheson	Ryan (OH)
Matsui	Sablan
McCarthy (NY)	Salazar
McCollum	

NOES—164

Aderholt	Culberson
Akin	Davis (KY)
Alexander	Deal (GA)
Austria	Dent
Bachmann	Dreier
Bachus	Duncan
Barrett (SC)	Emerson
Bartlett	Fallin
Barton (TX)	Flake
Biggert	Fleming
Bilbray	Forbes
Bilirakis	Fortenberry
Bishop (UT)	Franks (AZ)
Blackburn	Frelinghuysen
Blunt	Gallely
Boehner	Garrett (NJ)
Bonner	Gerlach
Bono Mack	Gingrey (GA)
Boozman	Gohmert
Boustany	Goodlatte
Brady (TX)	Granger
Broun (GA)	Graves
Brown (SC)	Guthrie
Brown-Waite,	Hall (TX)
Ginny	Harper
Buchanan	Hastings (WA)
Burgess	Heller
Burton (IN)	Hensarling
Buyer	Herger
Calvert	Hoekstra
Camp	Hunter
Campbell	Inglis
Cantor	Issa
Capito	Jenkins
Carter	Johnson (IL)
Cassidy	Johnson, Sam
Chaffetz	Jordan (OH)
Coble	King (IA)
Cole	King (NY)
Conaway	Kingston
Crenshaw	Kirk

Sánchez, Linda	Price (GA)
T.	Putnam
Sanchez, Loretta	Radanovich
Sarbanes	Rehberg
Schakowsky	Reichert
Schauer	Roe (TN)
Schiff	Rogers (AL)
Schrader	Rogers (KY)
Schwartz	Rogers (MI)
Scott (GA)	Rohrabacher
Scott (VA)	Rooney
Serrano	Roskam
Sestak	Royce
Shea-Porter	Ryan (WI)
Sherman	
Shuler	
Sires	
Skelton	
Slaughter	
Smith (WA)	
Snyder	
Space	
Speier	
Neal (MA)	
Spratt	
Stupak	
Sutton	
Nye	
Oberstar	
Obey	
Oliver	
Ortiz	
Pallone	
Pascrell	
Pastor (AZ)	
Payne	
Perlmutter	
Peters	
Peterson	
Pierluisi	
Pingree (ME)	
Polis (CO)	
Pomeroy	
Velázquez	
Price (NC)	
Rahall	
Rangel	
Reyes	
Richardson	
Rodriguez	
Ros-Lehtinen	
Ross	
Rothman (NJ)	
Roybal-Allard	
Ruppersberger	
Rush	
Ryan (OH)	
Sablan	
Salazar	

Kline (MN)	
Lamborn	
Latham	
LaTourette	
Latta	
Lee (NY)	
Lewis (CA)	
Linder	
LoBiondo	
Lucas	
Luetkemeyer	
Lummis	
Lungren, Daniel	
E.	
Mack	
Manzullo	
Marchant	
McCarthy (CA)	
McCaul	
McClintock	
McCotter	
McHenry	
McKeon	
McMorris	
Rodgers	
Mica	
Miller (FL)	
Miller (MI)	
Moran (KS)	
Murphy, Tim	
Myrick	
Neugebauer	
Nunes	
Olson	
Paul	
Paulsen	
Pence	
Petri	
Pitts	
Platts	
Poe (TX)	

Scalise	Terry
Schmidt	Thompson (PA)
Schock	Thornberry
Sensenbrenner	Tiahrt
Sessions	Tiberi
Shadegg	Walden
Shimkus	Wamp
Shuster	Westmoreland
Simpson	Whitfield
Smith (NE)	Wilson (SC)
Smith (NJ)	Wittman
Smith (TX)	Wolf
Souder	Young (AK)
Stearns	Young (FL)
Sullivan	

NOT VOTING—10

Cao	Ehlers	Perriello
Coffman (CO)	Faleomavaega	Stark
Conyers	Melancon	
Dingell	Miller, Gary	

□ 1649

Mr. FORTENBERRY changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

Ms. MARKEY of Colorado and Mr. RANGEL changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. PRICE OF GEORGIA

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 211, noes 218, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 101]
AYES—211

Aderholt	Buchanan	Ellsworth
Akin	Burgess	Emerson
Alexander	Burton (IN)	Fallin
Altmire	Buyer	Flake
Arcuri	Calvert	Fleming
Austria	Camp	Forbes
Bachmann	Campbell	Fortenberry
Bachus	Cantor	Foster
Barrett (SC)	Capito	Fox
Barrow	Carter	Franks (AZ)
Bartlett	Cassidy	Frelinghuysen
Barton (TX)	Castle	Gallely
Bean	Chaffetz	Garrett (NJ)
Berry	Chandler	Gerlach
Biggert	Childers	Giffords
Bilbray	Coble	Gingrey (GA)
Bilirakis	Cole	Gohmert
Bishop (UT)	Conaway	Goodlatte
Blackburn	Connolly (VA)	Gordon (TN)
Blunt	Crenshaw	Granger
Boehner	Culberson	Graves
Bonner	Dahlkemper	Griffith
Bono Mack	Davis (AL)	Guthrie
Boozman	Davis (KY)	Hall (TX)
Boren	Deal (GA)	Halvorson
Boucher	Dent	Harper
Boustany	Diaz-Balart, L.	Hastings (WA)
Brady (TX)	Diaz-Balart, M.	Heinrich
Broun (GA)	Donnelly (IN)	Heller
Brown (SC)	Dreier	Hensarling
Brown-Waite,	Duncan	Herger
Ginny	Edwards (TX)	Himes

Tiahrt	Walden	Wexler
Tiberi	Walz	Whitfield
Tierney	Wamp	Wilson (OH)
Titus	Wasserman	Wilson (SC)
Tonko	Schultz	Wittman
Towns	Waters	Wolf
Tsongas	Watson	Woolsey
Turner	Watt	Wu
Upton	Waxman	Yarmuth
Van Hollen	Weiner	Young (AK)
Velázquez	Welch	Young (FL)
Visclosky	Westmoreland	

NOES—2

Flake Lewis (CA)

NOT VOTING—12

Akin	Faleomavaega	Miller, Gary
Billbray	Kaptur	Perriello
Cao	McMorris	Stark
Coffman (CO)	Rodgers	
Ehlers	Melancon	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1738

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIR. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ROSS) having assumed the chair, Mr. HOLDEN, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1106) to prevent mortgage foreclosures and enhance mortgage credit availability, pursuant to House Resolution 190, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I am.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Price of Georgia moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 1106, to the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Financial Services with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

At the end of the bill, add the following new title:

TITLE III—LIMITATIONS ON USE OF FUNDS FOR PREVENTION AND MITIGATION OF MORTGAGE FORECLOSURES

SEC. 301. LIMITATIONS ON USE OF FUNDS FOR PREVENTION AND MITIGATION OF MORTGAGE FORECLOSURES.

(a) PROHIBITIONS ON USE OF TARP AND OTHER FORECLOSURE MITIGATION ASSISTANCE.—

(1) TARP FUNDS.—Notwithstanding any provision of title I of the Emergency Economic Stabilization Act of 2008, no funds made available to the Secretary of the Treasury pursuant to section 115(a)(3) of such Act and used by the Secretary in any manner for the prevention or mitigation of foreclosures on mortgages on residential properties, may be used for any assistance or relief in violation of the prohibitions under paragraph (3).

(2) ASSISTANCE UNDER THIS ACT.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act or any amendment made by this Act, no relief or assistance may be provided under this Act, the amendments made by this Act, or any authority or program established or amended by this Act, in violation of the prohibitions under paragraph (3).

(3) PROHIBITIONS.—Relief or assistance in violation of the prohibitions under this paragraph is relief or assistance as follows:

(A) MISREPRESENTATION.—Relief or assistance to, for, or on behalf of any mortgagor who obtained the mortgage with respect to which the assistance or relief is provided by material misrepresentation, false pretenses, or actual fraud.

(B) FAILURE TO FOLLOW UNDERWRITING STANDARDS.—Relief or assistance to, for, or on behalf of any lender or mortgagee that failed to comply with underwriting standards for residential mortgages applicable to such lender or mortgagee.

(C) INCENTIVE PAYMENTS FOR BORROWERS OR SERVICERS.—Relief or assistance in the form of providing any payment, discount, reduction, or other thing of value to any mortgagor, mortgagee, or servicer of a mortgage as an incentive to engage or participate in any activity or program for the prevention or mitigation of foreclosure on the mortgage, or other mortgage modification or workout, including any of the following incentive payments under the Homeowner Affordability and Stability Plan of the Secretary of the Treasury:

(i) The incentives under such Plan referred to as the “Pay for Success Incentives to Servicers”, which provide servicers with an up-front fee of \$1,000 for each eligible modification meeting guidelines under the Plan and monthly payments in an amount up to \$1,000 each year for three years, as long as the borrower stays current on the mortgage.

(ii) The incentives under such Plan referred to as “Incentives to Help Borrowers Stay Current”, which provide a monthly balance reduction payment that goes toward reducing the principal balance of the mortgage loan, in an amount of up to \$1,000 for each year for five years, as long as a borrower stays current on the mortgage.

(iii) The incentives under such Plan referred to as “Reaching Borrowers Early”, which provide a payment of \$500 to servicers, and a payment of \$1,500 to mortgage holders, if they modify at-risk loans before the borrower falls behind.

(b) REQUIREMENT FOR SUBMISSION OF TARP FORECLOSURE MITIGATION PLAN TO CONGRESS.—Notwithstanding any provision of title I of the Emergency Economic Stabilization Act of 2008, none of the funds otherwise available to the Secretary of the Treasury pursuant to section 115(a)(3) of such Act may be used by the Secretary for the prevention or mitigation of foreclosures on mortgages on residential properties, unless—

(1) a comprehensive plan for the use of the funds has been submitted to the Congress by the Secretary and the 90-day period that begins upon such submission has expired; and

(2) the plan provides for equitable treatment of all mortgagors, and does not limit assistance only to mortgagors that are delinquent, or in danger of defaulting, on their mortgages.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the motion to recommit be suspended.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, at a time when the government is going to unprecedented lengths to stabilize the banking system, this legislation—the underlying legislation—is shortsighted, untimely, unfair, and counterproductive. While some might see cramdown as a quick fix, in reality, this legislation will have a costly impact on generations to come.

Ranking Member SMITH of the Judiciary Committee sent a thoughtful letter to the administration, raising concerns that this bill will lead to significant taxpayer liability for Federal mortgage guaranties by redistributing wealth from responsible taxpayers.

The letter that Ranking Member SMITH sent to the administration raised concerns about the underlying bill leading to significant taxpayer liability for Federal mortgage guaranties by redistributing wealth from responsible taxpayers to irresponsible borrowers and lenders by the hoarding by banks of hundreds of billions of dollars in capital while undermining the efforts that had been undertaken by the government in September to stabilize the financial markets.

Finally, additional constriction in the home lending market. Markets are very stressed right now. The homeownership market is leading the way. There is more uncertainty than confidence. Many in America are having real financial problems, and we understand that. This bill only increases that uncertainty. If any Member truly desires fairness in the system of homeownership, then this motion to recommit will give them that assurance.

The underlying bill leaves the door open to reward irresponsible actors, and our motion to recommit ensures that that doesn't happen. It would prohibit taxpayer assistance to any borrowers who misrepresented or lied about their income on their mortgage applications. It would prohibit taxpayer assistance to any lender who failed to follow proper underwriting standards. It would prohibit taxpayer funds from being used as incentives to lenders to rework loans for irresponsible borrowers, in essence, bribes from the taxpayer to pay mortgages. It would prohibit taxpayer funds from

being used unless the President submits a new plan that provides equitable treatment of all mortgages.

□ 1745

His current plan does not do that. Contrary to the words from President Obama, his plan rewards irresponsible behavior and continues a reckless course.

What we're asking for instead is a plan that's fair to everyone, a plan that provides equitable treatment for everyone. All homeowners are struggling right now, and this plan in the underlying bill rewards bad behavior.

The key aspects of the Obama administration's housing bailout proposal rewards irresponsible borrowers and lenders at the expense of the more than 90 percent of American families still making their mortgage payments on time. This is fundamentally unfair, and the American people know it.

Mr. Speaker, our motion to recommit will ensure that unscrupulous and irresponsible actors will not be bailed out by the overwhelming majority of working families that have lived responsibly and within their means.

I urge adoption of the motion to recommit.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, before turning to this motion to recommit, I have a serious subject I want to address.

A number of Members have been concerned about the increased assessment that's hit community banks from the FDIC, in part because of failures to which they did not contribute. Today, the Chair of the FDIC, Sheila Bair, has written to our Senate counterparts to say that in effect, if we go ahead with the increase in FDIC borrowing authority—some of that is in this bill; it would be improved on in the Senate in ways that we agree with—but if she gets the increased borrowing authority, a process that begins in this bill, she will substantially reduce that assessment on the community banks.

So voting for this bill will be an important step towards reducing the assessment of the community banks.

I insert this letter into the RECORD at this point.

FEDERAL DEPOSIT
INSURANCE CORPORATION,
Washington, DC, March 5, 2009.

Hon. CHRISTOPHER J. DODD,
Chairman, Committee on Banking, Housing,
and Urban Affairs U.S. Senate, Wash-
ington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing to express my support for the Depositor Protection Act of 2009, legislation to increase the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation's borrowing authority with the Treasury Department if losses from failed financial institutions exceed the industry funded resources of the Deposit Insurance Fund (DIF).

As you know, the FDIC's borrowing authority was set in 1991 at \$30 billion and has

not been raised since that date. Assets in the banking industry have tripled since 1991, from \$4.5 trillion to \$13.6 trillion. As I indicated in my previous letter of January 26, 2009, the FDIC believes it is prudent to adjust the statutory line of credit proportionately to leave no doubt that the FDIC can immediately access the necessary resources to resolve failing banks and provide timely protection to insured depositors.

The legislation would include important additional authority for the FDIC and would rationalize the FDIC's current borrowing authority. Under current law, the FDIC has the authority to borrow up to \$30 billion from Treasury to cover losses incurred in insuring deposits up to \$100,000. In addition, when Congress temporarily increased deposit insurance coverage to \$250,000, it temporarily lifted all limits on the FDIC's borrowing authority to implement the new deposit insurance obligation.

The bill would permanently increase the FDIC's authority to borrow from Treasury from \$30 billion to \$100 billion. In addition the bill also would temporarily authorize an increase in that borrowing authority above \$100 billion (but not to exceed \$500 billion) based on a process that would require the concurrence of the FDIC, the Federal Reserve Board, and the Treasury Department, in consultation with the President.

Because the existing borrowing authority for losses from bank failures provides a thin margin of error, it was necessary for the FDIC recently to impose increased assessments on the banking industry. These assessments will have a significant impact on insured financial institutions, particularly during a financial crisis and recession when banks must be a critical source of credit to the economy.

The size of the special assessment reflected the FDIC's responsibility to maintain adequate resources to cover unforeseen losses. Increased borrowing authority, however, would give the FDIC flexibility to reduce the size of the recent special assessment, while still maintaining assessments at a level that supports the DIF with industry funding. While the industry would still pay assessments to the DIF to cover projected losses and rebuild the Fund over time, a lower special assessment would mitigate the impact on banks at a time when they need to serve their communities and revitalize the economy.

In conclusion, the Depositor Protection Act would leave no doubt that the FDIC will have the resources necessary to address future contingencies and seamlessly fulfill the government's commitment to protect insured depositors against loss. I strongly support this legislation and look forward to working with you to enact it into law.

Sincerely,

SHEILA C. BAIR.

Now, as to the motion to recommit, the gentleman from Georgia slightly under-described his amendment. Understatement is not his usual metier, but he alluded to it today. He said it would prevent, as I recall page 3, section C, help for any irresponsible borrower. No. It prevents mortgage assistance to any borrower, responsible or not, no matter what the cause. This proposal simply makes it impossible to carry out any mortgage relief.

One of the things that the President said was we would go to the servicers who now can get a payment for foreclosure. And we would say under this bill, we would authorize a payment if they did a modification instead of a

foreclosure. This amendment says no, that can't happen.

We say here that we will work with the borrowers to reduce the amount that they are entitled to receive under the contract on the grounds that they would be better off avoiding foreclosure. It would have the Federal Government work with them in this. This would make it impossible.

The gentleman from Georgia kind of made clear his general position when he began by denouncing the part of this bill that deals with bankruptcy. Now, of course, this amendment, as he's offered it, doesn't deal with bankruptcy. That's why I'm here instead of my colleague from Michigan. But the purpose is clear. His view is that there should not be a Federal program to try to diminish mortgage foreclosures.

Here is the point. Diminution of mortgage foreclosures currently has a compassionate aspect. Not surprisingly, that has less appeal in some parts of this House than others. But there is also an enlightened self-interest to it. Irresponsible subprime mortgage lending and borrowing and underwriting and securitizing a whole lot of guilty parties was the biggest single cause of the financial crisis we are in. The continued cascade of foreclosures and consequent deterioration of asset prices is the major reason why we have continued economic deterioration.

There is broad agreement that until we begin to stem the tide of foreclosures—we can't stop it all, and we're not trying to stop it all; not everybody who's being foreclosed upon can be helped or should be helped—but until we do a great deal to reduce this, you will not get an end to the current crisis.

So this is a direct shot. Now, I know I do not attribute this to the gentleman from Georgia, but there is, for instance, a noted commentator on public affairs, Mr. Limbaugh, who has a certain number of fans on that side—and if they aren't fans, they're afraid to say so. He has asked that the President fail. Well, the effect of this amendment would be giving Mr. Limbaugh his wish because if you cripple the effort to reduce mortgage foreclosure, you cripple the effort to get out of the economic slump we are in.

So I understand what some people would like to see happen. They do not want President Obama and a Democratic Congress to get any credit for helping to reduce our economic situation. I understand that, but they're taking a lot of innocent people hostage. They have a right to be very partisan and go after us. But don't do it at the expense of an awful lot of Americans who would lose their homes and of an economic situation that is deteriorating.

So I reiterate that defeating this motion and passing this bill will be an important step towards, among other things, reducing those FDIC assessments—and we have the word of Sheila Bair—and it will be a responsible way

of trying to reduce mortgage foreclosure. It's to the benefit of the individual, to the benefit of the communities that are suffering from this, it's to the benefit of other homeowners whose property values have deteriorated by foreclosure; and at last, I must concede to my Republican friends, it might help the President in his effort to improve the economy. I apologize for that, but I hope you can put up with it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of passage.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 182, noes 242, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 103]

AYES—182

Aderholt	Duncan	Mack
Akin	Emerson	Manzullo
Alexander	Fallin	Marchant
Austria	Flake	Marshall
Bachmann	Fleming	McCarthy (CA)
Bachus	Forbes	McCaul
Barrett (SC)	Fortenberry	McClintock
Barrow	Fortenberry	McCotter
Bartlett	Franks (AZ)	McHenry
Barton (TX)	Frelinghuysen	McHugh
Biggert	Gallely	McIntyre
Biliray	Garrett (NJ)	McKeon
Bilirakis	Gerlach	McMorris
Bishop (UT)	Gingrey (GA)	Rodgers
Blackburn	Gohmert	Mica
Blunt	Goodlatte	Miller (FL)
Boehner	Granger	Miller (MI)
Bonner	Graves	Minnick
Bono Mack	Guthrie	Moran (KS)
Boozman	Hall (TX)	Murphy, Tim
Boustany	Harper	Myrick
Brady (TX)	Hastings (WA)	Neugebauer
Bright	Heller	Nunes
Broun (GA)	Hensarling	Olson
Brown (SC)	Herger	Paul
Brown-Waite,	Hoekstra	Paulsen
Ginny	Hunter	Pence
Buchanan	Inglis	Petri
Burgess	Issa	Pitts
Burton (IN)	Jenkins	Platts
Buyer	Johnson (IL)	Poe (TX)
Calvert	Johnson, Sam	Posey
Camp	Jones	Price (GA)
Campbell	Jordan (OH)	Putnam
Cantor	King (IA)	Radanovich
Capito	King (NY)	Rehberg
Carter	Kingston	Reichert
Cassidy	Kirk	Roe (TN)
Castle	Kline (MN)	Rogers (AL)
Chaffetz	Lamborn	Rogers (KY)
Childers	Lance	Rogers (MI)
Coble	Latham	Rohrabacher
Cole	LaTourette	Rooney
Conaway	Latta	Ros-Lehtinen
Crenshaw	Lee (NY)	Roskam
Culberson	Lewis (CA)	Royce
Davis (KY)	Linder	Ryan (WI)
Deal (GA)	LoBiondo	Scalise
Dent	Lucas	Schmidt
Diaz-Balart, L.	Luetkemeyer	Schock
Diaz-Balart, M.	Lummis	Sensenbrenner
Donnelly (IN)	Lungren, Daniel	Sessions
Dreier	E.	Shadegg

Shimkus	Teague
Shuster	Terry
Simpson	Thompson (PA)
Smith (NE)	Thornberry
Smith (NJ)	Tiahrt
Smith (TX)	Tiberi
Souder	Turner
Stearns	Upton
Sullivan	Walden

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1808

Ms. HARMAN, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California and Mr. GUTIERREZ changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 234, nays 191, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 104]

YEAS—234

NOES—242

Abercrombie	Grijalva	Nye
Ackerman	Gutierrez	Oberstar
Adler (NJ)	Hall (NY)	Obey
Altmire	Halvorson	Olver
Andrews	Hare	Ortiz
Arcuri	Harman	Pallone
Baca	Hastings (FL)	Pascrell
Baird	Heinrich	Pastor (AZ)
Baldwin	Herseth Sandlin	Payne
Bean	Higgins	Perlmutter
Becerra	Hill	Peters
Berkley	Himes	Peterson
Berman	Hinchev	Pingree (ME)
Berry	Hinojosa	Polis (CO)
Bishop (GA)	Hirono	Pomeroy
Bishop (NY)	Hodes	Price (NC)
Blumenauer	Holden	Rahall
Bocchieri	Holt	Rangel
Boren	Honda	Reyes
Boswell	Hoyer	Richardson
Boucher	Inslee	Rodriguez
Boyd	Israel	Ross
Brady (PA)	Jackson (IL)	Rothman (NJ)
Braley (IA)	Jackson-Lee	Roybal-Allard
Brown, Corrine	(TX)	Ruppersberger
Butterfield	Johnson (GA)	Rush
Capps	Johnson, E. B.	Ryan (OH)
Capuano	Kagen	Salazar
Cardoza	Kanjorski	Sánchez, Linda
Carnahan	Kaptur	T.
Carney	Kennedy	Sánchez, Loretta
Carson (IN)	Kildee	Sarbanes
Castor (FL)	Kilpatrick (MI)	Schakowsky
Chandler	Kilroy	Schauer
Clarke	Kind	Schiff
Clay	Kirkpatrick (AZ)	Schrader
Cleaver	Kissell	Schwartz
Clyburn	Klein (FL)	Scott (GA)
Cohen	Kosmas	Scott (VA)
Connolly (VA)	Kratovil	Serrano
Conyers	Kucinich	Sestak
Cooper	Langevin	Shea-Porter
Costa	Larsen (WA)	Sherman
Costello	Larson (CT)	Shuler
Courtney	Lee (CA)	Sires
Crowley	Levin	Skelton
Cuellar	Lewis (GA)	Slaughter
Cummings	Lipinski	Smith (WA)
Dahlkemper	Loebsack	Snyder
Davis (AL)	Lofgren, Zoe	Space
Davis (CA)	Davis (CA)	Speier
Davis (IL)	Lujan	Spratt
Davis (TN)	Lynch	Stupak
DeFazio	Maffei	Sutton
DeGette	Maloney	Tanner
Delahunt	Markey (CO)	Tauscher
DeLauro	Markey (MA)	Taylor
Dicks	Massa	Thompson (CA)
Dingell	Matheson	Thompson (MS)
Doggett	Matsui	Tierney
Doyle	McCarthy (NY)	Titus
Driehaus	McCollum	Tonko
Edwards (MD)	McDermott	Towns
Edwards (TX)	McGovern	Tsongas
Ellison	McMahon	Van Hollen
Ellsworth	McNerney	Velázquez
Engel	Meek (FL)	Visclosky
Eshoo	Meeke (NY)	Walz
Etheridge	Michaud	Wasserman
Farr	Miller (NC)	Schultz
Fattah	Miller, George	Waters
Finer	Mitchell	Watson
Foster	Mollohan	Watt
Frank (MA)	Moore (KS)	Waxman
Fudge	Moore (WI)	Weiner
Giffords	Moran (VA)	Welch
Gonzalez	Murphy (CT)	Wexler
Gordon (TN)	Murphy, Patrick	Wilson (OH)
Grayson	Murtha	Woolsey
Green, Al	Nadler (NY)	Wu
Green, Gene	Napolitano	Yarmuth
Griffith	Neal (MA)	

NOT VOTING—7

Melancon	Stark
Miller, Gary	
Perriello	

Abercrombie	Doyle	Lee (CA)
Ackerman	Driehaus	Levin
Adler (NJ)	Edwards (MD)	Lewis (GA)
Altmire	Ellison	Lipinski
Andrews	Engel	Loebsack
Baca	Eshoo	Lofgren, Zoe
Baird	Etheridge	Lowe
Baldwin	Farr	Lujan
Barrow	Fattah	Lynch
Bean	Filner	Maffei
Becerra	Foster	Maloney
Berkley	Frank (MA)	Markey (MA)
Berman	Fudge	Marshall
Bishop (GA)	Giffords	Matsui
Bishop (NY)	Gonzalez	McCarthy (NY)
Blumenauer	Grayson	McCollum
Bocchieri	Green, Al	McDermott
Boswell	Green, Gene	McGovern
Boyd	Grijalva	McHugh
Brady (PA)	Gutierrez	McIntyre
Braley (IA)	Hall (NY)	McMahon
Brown, Corrine	Halvorson	McNerney
Butterfield	Hare	Meek (FL)
Capps	Harman	Meeks (NY)
Capuano	Hastings (FL)	Michaud
Cardoza	Heinrich	Miller (NC)
Carnahan	Herseth Sandlin	Miller, George
Carson (IN)	Higgins	Minnick
Castle	Himes	Mitchell
Castor (FL)	Hinchev	Mollohan
Chandler	Hinojosa	Moore (KS)
Clarke	Hirono	Moore (WI)
Clay	Hodes	Moran (VA)
Cleaver	Holt	Murphy (CT)
Clyburn	Honda	Murphy, Patrick
Cohen	Hoyer	Murtha
Connolly (VA)	Inslee	Nadler (NY)
Conyers	Israel	Napolitano
Cooper	Jackson (IL)	Neal (MA)
Costa	Jackson-Lee	Nye
Costello	(TX)	Oberstar
Courtney	Johnson (GA)	Obey
Crowley	Johnson, E. B.	Olver
Cuellar	Jones	Ortiz
Cummings	Kagen	Pallone
Davis (AL)	Kanjorski	Pascrell
Davis (CA)	Kaptur	Pastor (AZ)
Davis (IL)	Kennedy	Payne
DeFazio	Kildee	Pelosi
DeGette	Kilpatrick (MI)	Perlmutter
Delahunt	Kilroy	Peters
DeLauro	Kirkpatrick (AZ)	Peterson
Diaz-Balart, L.	Klein (FL)	Pingree (ME)
Diaz-Balart, M.	Kosmas	Polis (CO)
Dicks	Kucinich	Pomeroy
Dingell	Langevin	Price (NC)
Doggett	Larsen (WA)	Rahall
Donnelly (IN)	Larson (CT)	Rangel

Reyes	Scott (VA)	Tonko
Richardson	Serrano	Towns
Rodriguez	Sestak	Tsongas
Ros-Lehtinen	Shea-Porter	Turner
Ross	Sherman	Van Hollen
Rothman (NJ)	Shuler	Velázquez
Roybal-Allard	Sires	Vislosky
Ruppersberger	Skelton	Walz
Rush	Slaughter	Wasserman
Ryan (OH)	Smith (WA)	Schultz
Salazar	Snyder	Waters
Sánchez, Linda	Space	Watson
T.	Speier	Watt
Sanchez, Loretta	Spratt	Waxman
Sarbanes	Sutton	Weiner
Schakowsky	Tanner	Welch
Schauer	Tauscher	Wexler
Schiff	Thompson (CA)	Wilson (OH)
Schrader	Thompson (MS)	Woolsey
Schwartz	Tierney	Wu
Scott (GA)	Titus	Yarmuth

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:
Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 104, had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

RAISING A QUESTION OF THE PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of the privileges of the House previously noticed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 212

Whereas The Hill reported on February 10, 2009, that "a top defense-lobbying firm" that "specializes in obtaining earmarks in the defense budget for a long list of clients" was "recently raided by the FBI.":

Whereas Roll Call reported on February 11, 2009, that "the defense-appropriations-focused lobbying shop" had in recent years "spread million of dollars of campaign contributions to lawmakers.":

Whereas Politico reported on February 13, 2009, that "federal investigators are asking about thousands of dollars in campaign contributions to lawmakers as part of an effort to determine whether they were illegal 'straw man' donations.":

Whereas Roll Call reported on February 20, 2009, that they have "located tens of thousands of dollars worth of [the raided firm]-linked donations that are improperly reported in the FEC database.":

Whereas Roll Call also reported that "tracking Federal Election Commission records of campaign donations attributed to [the firm] is a comedy of errors, misinformation and mysteries, providing more questions than answers about how much money the lobbying firm actually raised for Congressional campaigns.":

Whereas CQ Today reported on February 19, 2009, that "104 House members got earmarks for projects sought by [clients of the firm] in the 2008 defense appropriations bills," and that 87 percent of this bipartisan group of Members received campaign contributions from the raided firm;

Whereas The Hill reported on February 10, 2009, that in 2008 clients of this firm had "received \$299 million worth of earmarks, according to Taxpayers for Common Sense.":

Whereas The Hill reported on February 23, 2009, that "clients of a defense lobby shop under investigation are continuing to score earmarks from their patrons in Congress, despite the firm being on the verge of shutting its doors permanently" and that several of the firm's clients "are slated to receive earmarks worth at least \$8 million in the omnibus spending bill funding the federal government through the rest of fiscal 2009":

Whereas the Washington Post reported on June 13, 2008, in a story describing increased earmark spending in the House version of the fiscal year 2009 defense authorization bill that "many of the earmarks serve as no-bid contracts for the recipients.":

Whereas the Associated Press reported on February 25, 2009, that "the Justice Department's fraud section is overseeing an investigation into whether [the firm] reimbursed some employees for campaign contributions to members of Congress who requested the projects.":

Whereas Politico reported on February 12, 2009, that "several sources said FBI agents have spent months laying the groundwork for their current investigation, including conducting research on earmarks and campaign contributions.":

Whereas the reportedly fraudulent nature of campaign contributions originating from the raided firm, as well as reports of the Justice Department conducting research on earmarks and campaign contributions, raise concern about the integrity of congressional proceedings and the dignity of the institution; and

Whereas the fact that cases are being investigated by the Justice Department does not preclude the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct from taking investigative steps: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That (a) the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, or an investigative subcommittee of the committee established jointly by the chair and ranking minority member shall immediately begin an investigation into the relationship between earmark requests on behalf of clients of the raided firm already made by Members and the source and timing of past campaign contributions related to such requests.

(b) The Committee on Standards of Official Conduct shall submit a report of its findings to the House of Representatives within 2 months after the date of adoption of this resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The resolution qualifies.

MOTION TO TABLE

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I move to lay the resolution on the table.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to table will be followed by a 5-minute vote on the motion to suspend the rules on House Resolution 153, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 222, noes 181, answered "present" 14, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 105]

AYES—222

Abercrombie	Cohen	Gonzalez
Adler (NJ)	Connolly (VA)	Gordon (TN)
Altire	Conyers	Grayson
Andrews	Cooper	Green, Al
Arcuri	Costa	Green, Gene
Baca	Costello	Griffith
Baird	Courtney	Grijalva
Baldwin	Crowley	Gutierrez
Barrow	Cuellar	Hare
Becerra	Cummings	Harman
Berkley	Dahlkemper	Hastings (FL)
Berman	Davis (CA)	Heinrich
Berry	Davis (IL)	Herseth Sandlin
Bishop (GA)	Davis (TN)	Higgins
Bishop (NY)	DeFazio	Hill
Blumenauer	DeGette	Hinchee
Boren	Delahunt	Hinojosa
Boswell	DeLauro	Hirono
Boucher	Dicks	Holden
Boyd	Dingell	Holt
Brady (PA)	Doggett	Honda
Braley (IA)	Doyle	Hoyer
Brown, Corrine	Driehaus	Inslee
Capps	Edwards (MD)	Israel
Capuano	Edwards (TX)	Jackson (IL)
Cardoza	Ellison	Jackson-Lee
Carnahan	Engel	(TX)
Carney	Eshoo	Johnson (GA)
Carson (IN)	Etheridge	Johnson, E. B.
Childers	Farr	Jones
Clarke	Fattah	Kagen
Clay	Filner	Kaptur
Cleaver	Frank (MA)	Kildee
Clyburn	Fudge	Kilpatrick (MI)

NAYS—191

Aderholt	Franks (AZ)	Mica
Akin	Frelinghuysen	Miller (FL)
Alexander	Gallegly	Miller (MI)
Arcuri	Garrett (NJ)	Moran (KS)
Austria	Gerlach	Murphy, Tim
Bachmann	Gingrey (GA)	Myrick
Bachus	Gohmert	Neugebauer
Barrett (SC)	Goodlatte	Nunes
Bartlett	Gordon (TN)	Olson
Barton (TX)	Granger	Paul
Berry	Graves	Paulsen
Biggart	Griffith	Pence
Bilbray	Guthrie	Petri
Bilirakis	Hall (TX)	Pitts
Bishop (UT)	Harper	Platts
Blackburn	Hastings (WA)	Poe (TX)
Blunt	Heller	Posey
Boehner	Hensarling	Price (GA)
Bonner	Herger	Putnam
Bono Mack	Hill	Radanovich
Boozman	Hoekstra	Rehberg
Boren	Holden	Reichert
Boucher	Hunter	Roe (TN)
Boustany	Inglis	Rogers (AL)
Brady (TX)	Issa	Rogers (KY)
Bright	Jenkins	Rogers (MI)
Broun (GA)	Johnson (IL)	Rohrabacher
Brown (SC)	Johnson, Sam	Rooney
Brown-Waite,	Jordan (OH)	Roskam
Ginny	Kind	Royce
Buchanan	King (IA)	Ryan (WI)
Burgess	King (NY)	Scalise
Burton (IN)	Kingston	Schmidt
Buyer	Kirk	Schock
Calvert	Kissell	Sensenbrenner
Camp	Kline (MN)	Sessions
Campbell	Kratovil	Shadegg
Cantor	Lamborn	Shimkus
Capito	Lance	Shuster
Carney	Latham	Simpson
Carter	LaTourette	Smith (NE)
Cassidy	Latta	Smith (NJ)
Chaffetz	Lee (NY)	Smith (TX)
Childers	Lewis (CA)	Souder
Coble	Linder	Stearns
Cole	LoBiondo	Stupak
Conaway	Lucas	Sullivan
Crenshaw	Luetkemeyer	Taylor
Culberson	Lummis	Teague
Dahlkemper	Lungren, Daniel	Terry
Davis (KY)	E.	Thompson (PA)
Davis (TN)	Mack	Thornberry
Deal (GA)	Manzullo	Tiahrt
Dent	Marchant	Tiberi
Dreier	Markey (CO)	Upton
Duncan	Massa	Walden
Edwards (TX)	Matheson	Wamp
Ellsworth	McCarthy (CA)	Westmoreland
Emerson	McCaul	Whitfield
Fallin	McClintock	Wilson (SC)
Flake	McCotter	Wittman
Fleming	McHenry	Wolf
Forbes	McKeon	Young (AK)
Fortenberry	McMorris	Young (FL)
Foxx	Rodgers	

NOT VOTING—7

Cao	Melancon	Stark
Coffman (CO)	Miller, Gary	
Ehlers	Perriello	

□ 1817

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.