

Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
King (NY)
Kirk
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Kucinich
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
LaTourette
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeback
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lujan
Maffei
Maloney
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Massa
Matheson
Matsui
McCaull
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McMahon
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minnick

Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (NY)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Nye
Oberstar
Obey
Oliver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Perlmutter
Perrillo
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Putnam
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Rehberg
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sanchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schmidt

Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Neal (MA)
Sires
Skeltton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Taylor
Teague
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wamp
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wexler
Whitfield
Wilson (OH)
Wittman
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (FL)

Thornberry
Tiahrt
Boyd
Clay
Davis (IL)
Delahunt
Farr
Issa

Tiberi
Walden
NOT VOTING—15
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Lynch
McCarthy (NY)
Payne
Roe (TN)

Westmoreland
Wilson (SC)
Roskam
Rush
Terry
Young (AK)

□ 1220

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, today, I missed 2 votes. Had I been present, I would have voted as follows:

Rollcall No. 694, on the Motion to Recommit with Instructions to H.R. 965, I would have voted "nay."

Rollcall No. 695, on Passage of H.R. 965, I would have voted "aye."

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask to address the House for 1 minute for the purpose of inquiring about next week's schedule, and I yield to the gentleman from Maryland, the majority leader.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

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 12 o'clock for legislative business.

On Wednesday and Thursday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for legislative business.

On Friday, no votes are expected in the House.

We will consider several bills under suspension of the rules. The complete list of suspension bills will be announced by the close of business tomorrow.

In addition, we will consider H.R. 3246, the Advanced Vehicle Technology Act of 2009, and H.R. 3221, the Student Aid and Fiscal Responsibility Act of 2009.

I yield back.

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. Since this is the first colloquy of the fall, I would like to give the Members and the public a sense of what the House will be considering over the next couple of months. What do you expect to be voting on during the months of September and October?

And I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

First of all, of course, as you know, the House has passed all 12 of our appropriation bills, so we're ready to go to conference on all 12 of those bills. The Senate has passed four of their bills and is working on the balance. We hope to conference and have on the

floor a number of those bills before the end of September, before the beginning of the fiscal year. There obviously will be, given the Senate's schedule, a requirement for a continuing resolution for some period of time, perhaps in a 30-day period time frame. So we will be considering those bills, those conference reports.

In addition, as you heard, the student loan reform bill will be on the floor next week, we believe. Defense authorization is in conference, and we expect that conference report. Health care reform, obviously we expect to do that this fall. Regulatory reform is expected to be an item on our agenda in the House this fall. Additionally, we will be waiting on the Senate on a number of items that we have sent to them, including climate change and food safety, which, as you know, the House passed. So those will be some of the items. That is not an exhaustive list, but is, I think, a good list of what we expect to be considering during the coming weeks.

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. Reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman.

Does the gentleman expect the House to be in session beyond the targeted adjournment date of October 30?

And I yield.

Mr. HOYER. I think the honest answer to that is yes. Obviously, that was a target date, not knowing exactly how quickly we would proceed.

Clearly, health care, among other issues, is taking, as we understand it needed to, a longer time. And so consideration of that and the appropriation bills and other authorization bills that are going between the two Houses will, I think, clearly take us beyond October 30.

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. Does the gentleman see the House taking any days or weeks off that are currently scheduled between now and the 30th of October?

Mr. HOYER. Let me say that I believe that every week scheduled in October we will be meeting. However, in November, as the gentleman probably knows, Veterans Day falls exactly in the middle of the week on a Wednesday. We are now talking about what that means in terms of schedule because obviously all the Members want to be home with their various organizations, municipalities, counties and communities to honor our veterans on that day and honor the service of those who have kept this country free.

As a result, we are trying to figure out whether or not it makes any sense to either schedule a Monday and Tuesday or a Thursday and Friday and have Members come back and forth for that. We have not made that decision, but it is, in terms of the weeks that we are looking at over the next 10 weeks, a week that may not be one in which we will meet. We will try to make that determination very soon, within the next couple of weeks, part of which will be dictated by the schedule, what is moving, how much time we need available.

NOES—107

Aderholt
Akin
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barrett (SC)
Barton (TX)
Blackburn
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite,
Ginny
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Carter
Cassidy
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Deal (GA)
Dreier
Duncan
Flake
Fleming
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Garrett (NJ)
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Granger
Graves
Hall (TX)
Harper
Hastings (WA)
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hoekstra
Hunter
Inglis
Johnson, Sam
Jordan (OH)
King (IA)
Kingston
Kline (MN)
Lamborn
Latham
Latta
Lee (NY)
Lewis (CA)
Linder
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McMorris
Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Moran (KS)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Olson
Paul
Pence
Poe (TX)
Posey
Price (GA)
Radanovich
Reichert
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shimkus
Smith (NE)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan

In addition to that, we will not be meeting Thanksgiving week. I say that pretty definitively. Obviously, if we could finish the Monday or Tuesday of Thanksgiving work, finish in terms of adjournment sine die for this session, then I think that might change that. But other than that, my expectation is we would not be meeting Thanksgiving week if we need to meet longer than Thanksgiving week.

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. I thank the gentleman.

Currently, you have scheduled out between now and October 30. Do you see any of those Mondays or Fridays that maybe we would not be in session, having done our work during the week, knowing that the debate is going on still within health care and others that people can be back in their district? And I yield.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

My expectation is that it is quite possible that we would take off either a Monday that is now scheduled—or two, or three—or a Friday, one or the other. Given the flow of work, we did a lot of work, worked very hard, and we passed a lot of legislation, but obviously to complete that we need it to come back from the Senate, need to complete conference reports. So to some degree, the flow of work will dictate that schedule; but on the other hand, we want to give all the Members on both sides appropriate notice so they can utilize the time at home to be discussing with their constituents pending legislation, and particularly the health care bill.

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. Would the gentleman be able to tell early for at least September, knowing the Mondays and Fridays that we may be able to be working at home?

Mr. HOYER. I'm sorry. Could you repeat that?

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. I just wonder if the gentleman, knowing the schedule of all the Mondays and Fridays now, if you've already made that decision which Mondays and which Fridays?

Mr. HOYER. We have not. What I indicated is that I hope to be working on that, and I hope next week to have at least made a preliminary decision on some of the Mondays and/or Fridays. It may not be all of the ones that we will be able to have Members have an opportunity to work at home. And again, it's a little difficult to do that because it's a little difficult to predict the workflow schedule.

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. Well, I appreciate the gentleman's answer.

Mr. HOYER. But I want to reiterate, we do expect next week to at least take a number in the relatively near term—and that means September—so that Members will have prior notice.

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. Well, I thank the gentleman.

Knowing that we heard the President last night, and we're all coming off from an August recess where we watched America wake up and really

pay attention to what is going on here in Congress and voice their opinion when it comes to health care, and having watched that and having my own townhall meetings, watching other Members' townhall meetings throughout the country and some of the questions raised, I listened to the President last night talk about ideas and a public plan, and others—the gentleman yourself had talked during your townhalls—and some leadership said the public plan has to be in the plan or a bill will not go through. I know the gentleman from Maryland said it doesn't have to be exactly a public plan in there.

□ 1230

Does the Democratic leadership position include a government option or exactly a public plan or a trigger?

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. You heard the President's comments last night. I agree strongly with the President and with the Speaker, and I think, frankly, there is no difference in the three of us. We all believe that a public option is an important option, A, to save money and, B, to give consumers options that they might not otherwise have and bring prices down for consumers as well as for government. So there is no difference there on the importance of the public option.

I am for a public option, as you probably heard me. I don't know whether you watched my town meeting, but that question was asked and I responded I am for the public option.

What I have said is essentially what the President said last night, that there is much in this bill that I think advantages consumers, businesses, individuals and families, and I think the public option is important, but there are other things in the bill which are important. But I expect that we are going to bring a bill to the floor. I am certainly hopeful that it has a public option in it. We think that is the best alternative. The President has indicated he thinks that is the best alternative.

He did, however, say, and I share his view, if there are other ways people think we can do it, provide that competitive model to bring prices down and to make sure consumers get the best product available, if there are other ways to do that, then we are certainly open to hearing them.

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. Does the gentleman believe that health care will come to the floor in the House before in the Senate?

Mr. HOYER. I think health care will come to the floor in the House when it is ready to come, and what I mean by that is when we have a consensus on exactly how the bill ought to be fashioned. We believe on this side that the committees are some 85 percent in agreement, as you know, the Energy and Commerce Committee, the Education and Labor Committee, and the Ways and Means Committee. As you also know, there are differences be-

tween those bills, and we are working on that at this point in time to see how we can make those compatible. The President's comments last night will obviously also be taken into consideration.

So we will bring to the floor a bill that we believe reflects the President's view, our view, and hopefully we would hope the views in part at least of some of the Members on your side of the aisle.

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. I thank the gentleman.

Reclaiming my time, I notice you refer to the bill and sometimes another bill, and you have this bill H.R. 3200 done by one side of the aisle, passed three committees. I know last time when President Clinton was in and they took up health care and they produced a bill in Ways and Means, it took 7 weeks of debate. I know this was 48 hours and others were a short time period.

When you refer to that bill, are you referring to H.R. 3200 coming before this body, this House?

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman.

First of all, let me say I don't know where he gets 2 weeks. The Ways and Means Committee was in discussion. You may mean formal hearings on the bill. But we have had 80 hearings in the committees over the last 24 months on health care reform, so it was an extensive part of the debate of every candidate for President over the course of 2008, and, frankly, prior to 2008.

This bill and many of its facets have been considered extensively, many of which were in plans presented by Presidential candidates on both sides of the aisle, Democrat and Republican. And clearly the President of the United States talked extensively about his ideas and where he wanted to go on health reform, and much of what he said and proposed was included in the bills that have been acted upon and I think reflect his views as well as the views of many people not only in this body but throughout the country.

So, from that standpoint, we believe this has gotten very extensive consideration. I think it is unprecedented. We had over 1,000 town meetings on our side. I know you had a number of town meetings on your side. I am not sure of the number. But literally I think thousands and thousands of Americans had an opportunity to participate and are continuing to participate in the discussion of the specifics of this bill.

So we think it has gotten very widespread and very thorough consideration. Given that consideration, there are still differences that we are working on.

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. Reclaiming my time, just referring back, what I said was when the Clinton administration did health care, on Ways and Means they debated for 7 weeks, taking the bill up itself. When we did it this time, it was 48 hours of presenting the bill, the amendments, and being voted out of committee.

Knowing the call to the American public about transparency, and we all heard that during the month of August, would the gentleman allow, before any bill comes to the floor—and I guess the bill would be H.R. 3200, from what I am hearing the gentleman say. I know it is in committee, but when you get to that final version—

Mr. HOYER. Will the gentleman yield, because I want to clarify that.

H.R. 3200 was a base bill that was put together by the committee Chairs, the committee staff, with input from others, as a mark. My expectation is that there will be a compendium that will be put together and we will probably have a new number on it. So I don't think H.R. 3200, which was a base mark, but you understand this was a bill, and, as you well know, in three committees, so there may well be a bill fashioned from the product of the three committees.

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. Reclaiming my time, so it would be a different number, but in essence the same bill.

Would the gentleman allow, before that bill is voted on on this floor when you come to the conclusion of where that bill ends up, would we be able to have the time to go back to the American public and, again, all of us have townhall meetings again for the transparency of saying this is the bill that would be voted on in the House?

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

There has been unprecedented, I reiterate, I don't think you can remember, and I have been here 29 years and I can't remember a bill that has been more widely vetted than this bill in terms of the American public. Maybe the Social Security proposal the President some years ago had, that was pretty widely vetted, but I don't think as widely vetted as this proposal.

So I say to the gentleman, you go and you vet the bill, you discuss alternatives, you then come back after having listened to those alternatives and fashion a bill. You don't have new committee hearings, whether it is a health care bill or any other bill. You amend it and you perfect it pursuant to hearings, and then you bring it to the floor. I don't expect we will treat this bill any differently.

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. I thank the gentleman.

The only thing I would ask, knowing that the American public did have this bill vetted but the majority of the American public disagreed with this bill, disagreed with the public option, and having the transparency here that the American public is asking, having the American public so engaged and educated on health care and it being such an issue, I always thought it would be helpful not only to this body but to the American public itself, before we go and vote again, whatever comes before that bill to come to the House, that you allow the opportunity

for Members to go home and have a townhall and explain what is in the final version of the bill before that vote takes place. I think the American public would appreciate it, and it would be a great opportunity for both sides.

Mr. HOYER. Well, if the gentleman will yield, I want to say clearly, as you know, the base bill, the mark bill from which the three committees worked, as you know, was put online before the August break, so that it has been online for a very long period of time. Now, there will be changes. There will be amendments. There have already been amendments in the three committees and those have been online.

So, I think the gentleman's concern is correct. We share it. We want to make sure the public has the opportunity to know what is being done, that we transparently have the specifics for the American public to know what we are doing and for the Members to have that knowledge, and we intend to do that.

Now, whether or not we are going to have a timeframe in which somebody can have a townhall meeting, which may take a month to notice and get together, I think you would be shocked if I responded to you that, oh, sure, we will just wait around until you have your town meetings. So I am not going to say that. But I do appreciate the gentleman's point, which is we want to make sure the public does in fact have notice.

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. Well, I thank the gentleman and I appreciate his answers today. The one thing I would say, I did this townhall in Bakersfield, California, where I did no notice, I didn't do a mailer, and gave enough opportunity. We have an opportunity now to know we will be in past October. I had 3,000 people, that is 1 percent of the whole city's population, turn out, and very engaged, very knowledgeable of the bill itself.

So I just hope the opportunity comes that knowing maybe there is a different number on this bill, but it is still H.R. 3200, that the public would be able to see it. And I will tell the gentleman that the Republicans on this side have a lot of ideas about health care, a lot of bills out there, of ways that we can lower the costs, take care of preexisting conditions and actually make health care much better for all Americans.

I appreciate the time and yield back.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 14, 2009

Mrs. LOWEY. 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, September 15, 2009, for morning-hour debate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LUJÁN). Is there objection to the re-

quest of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

TAXPAYERS REFUSE TO PAY FOR ILLEGAL IMMIGRANTS' HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, a Rasmussen poll found that 83 percent of voters believe only U.S. citizens should be eligible for health care subsidies. However, H.R. 3200, the health care bill, gives coverage to illegal immigrants, despite what the President says.

Although language in the bill purports to prevent illegal immigrants from getting coverage, even the Congressional Research Service confirms that there are three major loopholes that render the language meaningless.

Number one, there is no method to verify eligibility. An amendment to include it was defeated by Democrats in committee.

Item number two, illegal immigrants are not prohibited from using the "public option," better described as the government mandate.

And, number three, all members of families including illegal immigrants may be eligible as a group, and language indicates so.

So if Congress wants to represent the wishes of the people, including the 70 percent of Democrats and 87 percent of Independents, they should add citizenship verification of eligibility to any health care legislation. But they have voted it down in committee 29-28. False claims about not covering illegal immigrants are hollow.

CALLING THE PRESIDENT OUT

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, last night the President made a very eloquent speech here in the House Chamber. I am always impressed with his eloquence. But one of the things he said that stuck with me was he said if the Republicans, he didn't say "Republicans," but he said if anyone in the Chamber, and I think he was referring to Republicans, if anyone in the Chamber doesn't state the facts correctly or misleads the American people, he is going to call them out. That is a pretty tough term, "call them out."

So I just would like to say if I were talking to the President right now, Mr. President, that is a double-edged sword. You said you are going to call us out if we don't tell the truth. Well, in the next series today, I am going to take a 5-minute Special Order and I am going to go through everything, or as many as I can get to in 5 minutes, I am going to go through everything the