

Davis (KY) Kanjorski Owens
 Davis (TN) Kaptur Pallone
 DeFazio Kennedy Pascrell
 DeGette Kildee Pastor (AZ)
 Delahunt Kilpatrick (MI) Paul
 DeLauro Kilroy Paulsen
 Dent Kind Payne
 Deutch King (IA) Pence
 Diaz-Balart, L. King (NY) Perlmutter
 Diaz-Balart, M. Kingston Perriello
 Dicks Kirk Peters
 Dingell Kirkpatrick (AZ) Peterson
 Djou Kissell Petri
 Doggett Klein (FL) Pingree (ME)
 Donnelly (IN) Kline (MN) Pitts
 Doyle Kosmas Poe (TX)
 Dreier Kratovil Polis (CO)
 Driehaus Kucinich Pomeroy
 Duncan Lamborn Posey
 Edwards (MD) Lance Price (GA)
 Edwards (TX) Langevin Price (NC)
 Ehlers Larsen (WA) Putnam
 Ellison Larson (CT) Quigley
 Emerson Latham Radanovich
 Engel LaTourette Rahall
 Eshoo Latta Rangel
 Etheridge Lee (CA) Rehberg
 Fallin Lee (NY) Reichert
 Farr Levin Reyes
 Fattah Lewis (CA) Richardson
 Filner Lewis (GA) Rodriguez
 Flake Linder Roe (TN)
 Fleming Lipinski Rogers (AL)
 Forbes LoBiondo Rogers (KY)
 Fortenberry Lofgren, Zoe Rogers (MI)
 Foster Lowey Rohrabacher
 Fox Lucas Ros-Lehtinen
 Frank (MA) Luetkemeyer Roskam
 Franks (AZ) Lujan Ross
 Frelinghuysen Lummis Rothman (NJ)
 Gallegly Lungren, Daniel Roybal-Allard
 Garamendi E. Royce
 Garrett (NJ) Lynch Ruppersberger
 Gerlach Mack Rush
 Giffords Maffei Ryan (OH)
 Gingrey (GA) Maloney Ryan (WI)
 Gohmert Manzullo Salazar
 Gonzalez Marchant Sanchez, Linda
 Goodlatte Markey (CO) T.
 Gordon (TN) Markey (MA) Sanchez, Loretta
 Granger Marshall Sarbanes
 Graves (GA) Matheson Scalise
 Graves (MO) Matsui Schakowsky
 Grayson McCarthy (CA) Schauer
 Green, Al McCarthy (NY) Schiff
 Green, Gene McCaul Schmidt
 Griffith McClintock Schock
 Grijalva McCollum Schrader
 Guthrie McCotter Schwartz
 Gutierrez McDermott Scott (GA)
 Hall (NY) McGovern Scott (VA)
 Hall (TX) McHenry Sensenbrenner
 Halvorson McIntyre Serrano
 Hare McKeon Sessions
 Harman McMahon Sestak
 Harper McMorris Shadegg
 Hastings (FL) Rodgers Shea-Porter
 Hastings (WA) McNerney Sherman
 Heinrich Meek (FL) Shimkus
 Heller Meeks (NY) Shuler
 Hensarling Melancon Shuster
 Herger Mica Simpson
 Herseth Sandlin Michaud Sires
 Higgins Miller (FL) Skelton
 Hill Miller (MI) Slaughter
 Himes Miller (NC) Smith (NE)
 Hinchey Miller, Gary Smith (NJ)
 Hinojosa Miller, George Smith (TX)
 Hirono Minnick Smith (WA)
 Hodes Mitchell Snyder
 Holden Mollohan Space
 Holt Moore (KS) Speier
 Honda Moore (WI) Spratt
 Hoyer Moran (VA) Stark
 Hunter Murphy (CT) Stearns
 Inglis Murphy (NY) Stupak
 Inslee Murphy, Patrick Sullivan
 Israel Murphy, Tim Sutton
 Issa Myrick Tanner
 Jackson (IL) Nadler (NY) Teague
 Jackson Lee Napolitano Terry
 (TX) Neal (CA) Thompson (CA)
 Jenkins Neugebauer Thompson (MS)
 Johnson (GA) Nunes Thompson (PA)
 Johnson (IL) Nye Thornberry
 Johnson, Sam Obey Tiahrt
 Jones Olson Tiberi
 Jordan (OH) Oliver Tierney
 Kagen Ortiz Titus

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

NOT VOTING—15

Brady (TX) Johnson, E. B.
 Clay Loeb sack
 Ellsworth Moran (KS)
 Fudge Oberstar
 Hoekstra Platts
 Rooney
 Taylor
 Wamp
 Woolsey
 Young (AK)

□ 1134

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and 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. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 405, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall Nos. 402, 403, 404, and 405, had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on each.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 4173, DODD-FRANK WALL STREET REFORM AND CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT

Mr. MCGOVERN, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 111-518) on the resolution (H. Res. 1490) providing for consideration of the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 4173) to provide for financial regulatory reform, to protect consumers and investors, to enhance Federal understanding of insurance issues, to regulate the over-the-counter derivatives markets, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

WAIVING REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 6(a) OF RULE XIII WITH RESPECT TO CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1487 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1487

Resolved, That the requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII for a two-thirds vote to consider a report from the Committee on Rules on the same day it is presented to the House is waived with respect to any resolution reported through the legislative day of July 3, 2010, providing for consideration or disposition of any of the following:

(1) A conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 4173) to provide for financial regulatory reform, to protect consumers and in-

vestors, to enhance Federal understanding of insurance issues, to regulate the over-the-counter derivatives markets, and for other purposes.

(2) A measure that includes a subject matter addressed by H.R. 4213 or any amendment pertaining thereto.

SEC. 2. It shall be in order at any time through the legislative day of July 3, 2010, for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules. The Speaker or her designee shall consult with the Minority Leader or his designee on the designation of any matter for consideration pursuant to this section.

SEC. 3. It shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider concurrent resolutions providing for adjournment during the month of July.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 1 hour.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MCGOVERN. I also ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 1487.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 1487 provides for consideration of a rule that allows for the same-day consideration of a conference report to accompany H.R. 4173 and a measure that includes the subject matter addressed by H.R. 4213. Additionally, this rule allows for legislation to be considered under suspension of the rules through July 3, 2010, and allows for the consideration of concurrent resolutions providing for adjournment during the month of July.

Mr. Speaker, this is a simple and straightforward rule. It allows the rules for the Wall Street reform conference report in either the tax extenders jobs bill or subject matters related to the jobs bill, such as unemployment insurance, to be considered on the same legislative day that they report it out of the Rules Committee. This is an important step that must be taken if we are to pass these bills before the Senate adjourns for the funeral of Senator BYRD.

This bill allows for clear actions, up-or-down votes on the conference report to prevent Wall Street from melting down like it did 2 years ago and a bill to provide unemployment compensation to people who have lost their jobs who cannot find work in this economy.

□ 1140

Mr. Speaker, these are clear-cut choices. Either you support fixing Wall Street or you don't. Do you believe unemployed Americans looking for work should receive unemployment benefits to help them pay for their mortgages,

utilities, and food for their families or do you not?

So far my Republican friends have been on the wrong side of these issues. I can only hope that they change their minds and decide to put everyday Americans first instead of continuing to play politics with these issues.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the rule, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) for yielding me time, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the rule we are discussing today allows for martial law authority for any bill pertaining to the extenders package as well as what is called the Dodd-Frank bill, which is a 2,300-page government takeover of the financial sector.

Mr. Speaker, this is as much about saving the financial industry as the health care bill was about health care, and it's as much about jobs as the jobs bill supposedly was. It was about the diminishment of jobs, and this is about the diminishment of the financial sector of this country.

Additionally, this rule gives suspension authority through the end of the week for the fifth straight legislative week. Mr. Speaker, it seems like every time I come to the House floor that I point out that my Democratic colleagues are using an unprecedented restrictive and closed process. I think the American people want and need transparency, accountability, and solutions.

I remember just a few short years ago when our Speaker said that she would run a House that was the most honest, open, and ethical Congress. I have yet to see evidence of that these last few years. As a matter of fact, week after week after week I see closed rules, unprecedented shenanigans related to bringing legislation to the floor, and a closed process. I know where it is. Democrats left it out on the campaign trail. It was an empty promise when they made it, and the emptiness of this promise has been fulfilled the past few years by an unprecedented amount of restrictive rules.

Since this Congress has managed to rack up a record \$1.4 trillion deficit since 2009, more than three times the size of the deficit in 2008, and are on target to once again hit a \$1.3 trillion deficit again this year, my Republican colleagues and I are going to use this time to talk about excessive borrowing, excessive spending, and excessive taxation that seems to be the Democrat majority's agenda.

Mr. Speaker, in an effort to address some of this wasteful government spending that's happening here in Washington, Republicans created something called YouCut. This is an online voting tool for Americans to vote on what wasteful government spending programs they would review, and they can make the decision on what to eliminate.

Today, I have the opportunity to call for a vote on the previous question for this week's YouCut winner, which, of course, I am proud to cosponsor. Hundreds of thousands of Americans have voted this week alone.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the American people are looking for people who can come to Washington, D.C., to make tough choices, and this Democrat majority is not even bringing a budget to the floor of the House of Representatives for the 2011 budget.

Mr. Speaker, I've worked in business, small business, been around lots of people who, every single organization I've ever been a part of, started their year with a budget. I'm shocked and dismayed that this Democrat majority will not bring a budget to the floor, so Republicans will spend their time talking about how we believe we can better the circumstance we're in, talking about YouCut and the American people being engaged in helping to move this country forward.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage all my colleagues to eliminate this wasteful spending by voting against the rule and previous question.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, my Republican friends have consistently been against reining in the excesses of Wall Street. I'm not shocked that they have that view because they've always had that view. I am dismayed.

But the American people want us to pass a regulatory reform bill. They also want us to extend unemployment benefits to those who are out of work. Unfortunately, my Republican colleagues have been blocking that. So that's what this rule does, allows us to actually do something, and do many things, quite frankly, that the American people want us to do.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. As one who has repeatedly and vigorously opposed all bank bailouts, whichever President proposed them, I view this bill as modest but very important progress. I'm voting "yes" because I stand with working families against big banks, for transparency in the financial markets, with small businesses and family farmers and ranchers for tougher Wall Street oversight, and for progress toward preventing future bank bailouts.

The AARP said, this bill offers "new tools to combat investment scams targeted at older adults" and will hold "scam artists accountable." The Consumer Federation of America says these reforms will "improve the marketplace for consumers and investors."

If you're mugged on the street, you could lose your wallet. But if you're mugged by Wall Street, as too many Americans have been, you can lose a lifetime of savings.

This bill arms families with more ways to protect themselves with the information that they need for informed financial decisions. It addresses protections for questionable, often out-

rageous, financial industry practices, preventing onerous hidden fees that have plagued credit card holders and borrowers, and it creates a new hotline to report misconduct.

The Consumer Financial Protection Bureau will offer help against unscrupulous mortgage promoters, foreclosure scam operators, and payday and student lenders.

This bill should have done more, much more about those Wall Street interests that are paid too much, taxed too little, and whose immense power continues to threaten our economic stability. But with stubborn opposition from Republicans, both here and especially over in the Senate, as well as rejection of some reform by the Treasury Department, we lack the more complete reforms, but we are making significant strides forward in offering consumer protection that Americans really deserve.

Restoring discipline, supervision, accountability, and transparency will only be opposed by those who unfairly profit at the expense of working and retired Americans. Whether it's savings for a soon-to-be college student, or an investment in a home or a retirement nest egg, this bill will provide greater security and peace of mind. Let us adopt it promptly.

□ 1150

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the Republican whip, the gentleman from Virginia, the favorite son (Mr. CANTOR).

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, today I rise in opposition to this question of the previous question because today we should be voting and will be voting on the sixth YouCut proposal. And well over 1 million Americans have sent a clear message to Washington: Stop the wasteful spending.

I say, Mr. Speaker, to the American people, Republicans hear you. And today I hope that our colleagues on the other side of the aisle will listen as well and join us. This week's YouCut proposal addresses one of the most egregious yet underreported sources of government waste. Taxpayers are on the hook for the salaries and benefits of Federal workers who simultaneously work for their public employee unions to the tune of \$120 million per year. By the way, these are the same unions that spend millions on political activities and lobbying, often for causes that hamper economic growth and private-sector job creation.

Specifically, Mr. Speaker, the National Labor Relations Board union billed the taxpayers for an average of 12.18 hours for each of its 1,104 employees. Since each hour costs \$42, taxpayers are paying each worker \$700 per year on official union duties.

America is at a crossroads. We are not under any illusions. This cut alone may not erase the deficit overnight. But this cut is a reflection of the symptom of the virus that has put our country's economy on life support. Only by

finally drawing a firm line on wasteful spending can we begin to kill the virus and preserve American prosperity for generations to come.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I find it interesting that the previous speaker didn't talk about the Wall Street regulatory reform bill that my friends on the Republican side of the aisle have been trying to block.

The minority leader in a recent interview said that the bill that we are bringing forth in Congress, this is killing an ant with a nuclear weapon. I find it disturbing that anyone would characterize this financial crisis that was brought on by Wall Street as an ant. I mean it impacted millions and millions of our citizens.

I will ask to put this interview that appeared in the Pittsburgh Tribune-Review in the RECORD.

In that same interview, and I think it's important for my colleagues to know, the minority leader talked about his belief that we should raise the retirement age for Social Security to 70. Clearly, we need to talk about how we keep Social Security solvent. But he then went further to say that we should take that money and not put it into Social Security but pay for the war. So our senior citizens should pay for this war, the rest of us don't, but the burden once again falls on our senior citizens.

We know what they're about. We know what their beliefs are. And given an opportunity to take back control of the House, we know that they will try to undo Wall Street regulatory reform and try to undercut Social Security.

Mr. Speaker, I would appreciate it if I were not interrupted while I am speaking. And we know what they believe. And it is in this interview which we will put in the RECORD.

[From the Pittsburgh Tribune-Review, June 29, 2010]

OBAMA'S GOOD FOR GOP, BOEHNER SAYS
(By Mike Wereschagin and Salena Zito)

House Republican Leader John Boehner, the Ohio Republican with his eye on Speaker Nancy Pelosi's gavel, said the tide is turning the GOP's way.

"The American people have written off the Democrats," Boehner said Monday in an interview with Tribune-Review editors and reporters. "They're willing to look at us again."

Boehner stopped short of predicting Republicans would gain the 39 seats they need to retake control of Congress, but he said a backlash against President Obama's policies has energized Republican voters more than Democrats. Boehner said voters are angry at a government they believe is overreaching and indifferent.

University of Virginia political scientist Isaac Wood said excitement among tea party protesters might not carry over to the electorate as a whole.

"While the enthusiasm of tea party types may drive them to the polls and boost Republicans, it does not yet seem that huge waves of new voters will be flocking to the polls," Wood said.

Boehner said the protests are emblematic of deep voter anger against Washington's leaders.

"They're snuffing out the America that I grew up in," Boehner said. "Right now, we've

got more Americans engaged in their government than at any time in our history. There's a political rebellion brewing, and I don't think we've seen anything like it since 1776."

The health care law passed in March "pushed most Americans over the edge," Boehner said.

If Republicans retake control of the House, Boehner promised a vote on a bill repealing the health care law and replacing it with a scaled-down package of tax breaks and court reforms. Democrats likely would maintain control of the Senate, and Obama could veto the proposal, all but eliminating its chances of succeeding.

"We are going to do everything we can to make sure that this law and this program never really takes effect," Boehner said. One option would be to repeal the \$534 billion in Medicare cuts, which pay for more than half of the law's provisions. "They're going to need money from the Congress to hire these 20,000-plus bureaucrats they need to hire to make this program work. They're not going to get one dime from us."

Boehner criticized the financial regulatory overhaul compromise reached last week between House and Senate negotiators as an overreaction to the financial crisis that triggered the recession. The bill would tighten restrictions on lending, create a consumer protection agency with broad oversight power and give the government an orderly way to dissolve the largest financial institutions if they run out of money.

"This is killing an ant with a nuclear weapon," Boehner said. What's most needed is more transparency and better enforcement by regulators, he said.

Allan H. Meltzer, a political economy professor at Carnegie Mellon University, said the financial bill "does nothing to restore integrity to the mortgage market by correcting Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, and the bill does not eliminate 'too big to fail.'"

Boehner said Obama overreacted to the BP oil spill in the Gulf of Mexico. The spill might warrant a "pause" in deepwater drilling, but Obama's blanket ban on drilling in the gulf—which a judge overturned last week—could devastate the region's economy, he said. Louisiana State University scientists estimate the ban could have affected more than 10,000 jobs.

Boehner had praise, however, for Obama's troop surge in Afghanistan and stepped-up drone attacks in Pakistan. He declined to list any benchmarks he has for measuring progress in the nine-year war, at a time of increasing violence and Obama's replacement of Gen. Stanley McChrystal with Gen. David Petraeus.

Ensuring there's enough money to pay for the war will require reforming the country's entitlement system, Boehner said. He said he'd favor increasing the Social Security retirement age to 70 for people who have at least 20 years until retirement, tying cost-of-living increases to the consumer price index rather than wage inflation and limiting payments to those who need them.

"We need to look at the American people and explain to them that we're broke," Boehner said. "If you have substantial non-Social Security income while you're retired, why are we paying you at a time when we're broke? We just need to be honest with people."

At this point I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR).

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. I thank Congressman MCGOVERN from the Rules Committee for yielding time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of reforming Wall Street and this rule.

Under this new Wall Street reform, consumers and middle class families win, and the big banks on Wall Street lose. The Wall Street reform bill is the toughest regulation of Wall Street in generations. And it comes after years of recklessness that led to the financial meltdown and the worst recession in our life times. That economy was built on a house of cards.

Wall Street reform will provide a new foundation for our economy to go, one that inspires confidence and will spur new jobs. Under the new law, consumers and middle class families will benefit from a new consumer financial protection agency, a new independent watchdog that will be on the side of American families and consumers, because there always seems to be hidden charges and fees when you are applying for a credit card or a mortgage or some transaction. The new consumer agency will root out the deceptive practices. Its mission will be to protect homeowners and small businesses rather than the big banks on Wall Street.

We will have new cops on the beat on Wall Street, new enforcement, transparency, and oversight. The reform measure rightfully outlaws future bank bailouts by taxpayers. I voted against the Wall Street bailout, known as TARP, because it focused entirely on Wall Street rather than middle class families, and it did not include safeguards on executive pay, bonuses, and transparency.

The Wall Street reform bill that we will pass today now levels the playing field despite the opposition from the big banks and my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. The reform bill is also designed to protect consumers from predatory lending.

I strongly agree with the new requirements for mortgage lenders that they must ensure that a person has an ability to repay a loan rather than what happened in the subprime market, where they peddled the loans, flipped them, and then pocketed the cash and left us all with the mess.

So thank you, Chairman FRANK, and all of my colleagues on the Financial Services Committee. This is a great day in Washington and all across America because consumers and middle class families win.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, to balance out this argument just a little bit, I know we have those that want to characterize what Republicans stand for, but I would like to also address the statements that have been made here on the floor and balance out the attacks against Republicans.

The gentleman Mr. HOYER on June 22 said this in regards to what our leader Mr. BOEHNER said, and I quote: "On the spending side, we could and should consider a higher retirement age, or one pegged to lifespan; more progressive Social Security and Medicare benefits . . ."

Mr. Speaker, you know, just the unrelenting liberal attacks on this country that have diminished this country's

ability to have a free enterprise system have brought us higher taxes, incredible debt, and a future that diminishes our ability for our children and grandchildren.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER).

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend for yielding.

And, Mr. Speaker, I do so because unfortunately the manager on the other side of the aisle wouldn't yield to me. And I am happy within my 2-minute time frame to yield to him at any time when he would like to ask me to yield.

Let me just say that the notion of saying that because Mr. BOEHNER argued that this bill is itself killing an ant with a nuclear weapon is designed to say this bill puts into place permanent bailout authority. Now, the American people are virulently opposed to going down this path that we already seem to be on of establishing bailout after bailout. And they know that it's a mistake. And so Mr. BOEHNER simply was arguing that while we all want to deal with the issue of regulatory reform to ensure that what we went through in the last 2 years will not confront us again, the idea of putting your hand up and saying, we know what they're all about—there is no one who wants to maintain the status quo. We all want to take steps to ensure that we don't have to suffer as we have for the past 2 years. But this bill establishing permanent bailout authority will in fact undermine our ability to get this economy back on track, and, as Mr. BACHUS pointed out in his testimony upstairs in the Rules Committee a few minutes ago, will cost jobs. That's the reason we have great concerns about it.

And on the issue of Social Security, the notion that somehow we are saying to someone who is on Social Security today that you are going to end up seeing the age increase to 70 is preposterous. We know full well that what's going to happen is we are talking about young workers today in their twenties and thirties who want to make sure that there is something there for Social Security. If we don't tackle the issue of entitlements, we won't be able to do what the American people have said this Congress should be doing, and that is reining in the kind of spending the likes of which—we have seen an 84 percent increase in nondefense spending in the last 17 months. We need to make sure we rein that in. And these kinds of proposals will do just that.

□ 1200

Mr. SESSIONS. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, my objection about Mr. BOEHNER's statements with regard to Social Security was that he wanted to take the money from Social Security and pay for the war. Not put it into a Social Security trust fund, not to shore-up Social Security. That's what bothers me, is their continued determination to undermine the Social Security system.

Mr. BOEHNER said in his interview that we should raise the retirement age to 70, take their money, and put it towards the war. For 8 years, they abdicated their responsibility to pay for the war. Now they want to pay for it on the backs of senior citizens. That's what I object to. That's what I object to.

And the other thing, Mr. Speaker, is that we hear time and time again, Well, we all want to deal with the excesses in Wall Street. We all want to do this; we all want to do that. But when it comes time to do anything meaningful, they are missing in action.

So this is an opportunity for us to get something done, and I urge my colleague to support the bill.

At this time I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ).

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of taxpayers in California who will no longer be on the hook when Wall Street fails. This body has spent the last 3 years dealing with the fallout from the financial crisis. In my district in southern California, we've seen lost jobs, homes, businesses, and shattered dreams of financial security.

These challenges were in large part the result of an ineffective, and in some places, nonexistent regulatory system. This encouraged risk and allowed financial institutions to operate in a lawless environment where there were no consequences for their actions.

The legislation that we put forth today seeks to fix those failures and provide families nationwide with the security of knowing that future financial challenges will be the result of honest markets, not crooked traders. Honesty is what this bill is about. We all support a free market and the ability of each business to succeed or fail on its own merits. This landmark legislation allows that competition to take place on a level playing field. It will help prevent another crisis like the one we're still recovering from.

I'm surprised that there's opposition to this legislation. After what our country has been through, how can anyone oppose bringing credit default swaps out into the sunshine? How can anyone oppose allowing shareholders a say on executive compensation? Or a framework that prevents future bailouts by allowing companies that deserve to fail because they're engaging in risky practices to fail?

Families in the 39th District of California will be more secure because of the action that we are taking today.

I thank our leadership, Chairman FRANK, and the conferees for their hard work and urge my colleagues to pass this legislation.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, at this time I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Marietta, Georgia, Dr. PHIL GINGREY.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Madam Speaker, all across the country, Americans are asking Congress to get our fis-

cal house in order. This desire for change and fiscal responsibility can be seen in the 1.1 million votes for House Republican Whip CANTOR's YouCut initiatives. Each vote is a vote to cut spending and to cut that spending now. I can think of no clearer message to the Democratic leadership who, unfortunately to date, have kept their earplugs in and they have refused to listen.

Their solution instead has been more borrowing, more spending, and more bailouts. Indeed, that's what they recommended at the recent G-8/G-20 conference in Toronto which was totally rejected by the other participating nations.

Madam Speaker, this week, week six of the YouCut program, Americans chose my proposal to address the waste associated with Federal employee unions. In 2008, the Office of Personnel Management, OPM, reported in a sample of 61 Federal agencies that approximately three million official time hours, taxpayer time hours, were used in union activities by Federal employees for a cost to the taxpayer of \$120 million.

Currently, some Federal employees spend up to a hundred percent—that's right, a hundred percent—of their work day paid by taxpayers doing work for their unions. My proposal prevents Federal employees from using taxpayer-funded time to participate in union activities and would save \$1.2 billion over the next 10 years and 30 million hours of taxpayer time—\$1.2 billion and 30 million hours.

So Madam Speaker, every American knows that Congress has a spending problem. Our national debt is simply unsustainable, and tough choices need to be made now to get our debt and our budget deficits under control. I urge you to listen to Americans across the country, to Republicans on this side of the aisle, and to act now. And this proposal is a first step.

A worthy second step would be actually passing a budget this year, because as every American family knows, you can't begin to cut spending until you actually come up with a budget.

Madam Speaker, the American people are tired of this reckless spending addiction that has resulted in a record national debt and record budget deficits. Like every addict knows, the first step to recovery is admitting that you have a problem.

I urge my Democratic colleagues to take that step and start addressing the problems by saving taxpayers over \$1 billion to date. Vote to defeat the previous question so we can amend the rule to include this YouCut provision of fiscal responsibility submitted by the American people.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, my friend from Georgia's proposal represents less than one-tenth of 1 percent of what was borrowed to pay for the Iraq and Afghanistan war. Let's get serious here. And when I see that poster that says "YouCut," what they don't

show you is what they're cutting and what they want to cut is Social Security, and the minority leader made that very clear in his interview, that they're going to basically take money out of Social Security to pay for the wars. Our senior citizens who have fought in wars, who have worked in our factories, who have raised our families are being told to pay for the wars.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, this is a very emotional time for many Americans as they look at pending unemployment, long months of addressing the question of how they pay their mortgage, and reflecting on how we got to this place.

That is why I stand today to support the underlying rule and this financial accountability complex legislation that has taken many, many hours and days and weeks for us to come up with a way to say to America, We heard you.

And so the first point of this bill is that there will be no taxpayer-paid bailouts. And then for the first time the consumers of America will have their own personal advocacy. They will have the Consumer Protection Board that will look at credit card increases and outlandish interest rates. They will have an oversight board that will look at how they address the question of banking loans. Small businesses will be able to access credit. There will be transparency and accountability. What is there to be opposed to?

Those who happen to be included in minority- and women-owned businesses will for the first time not be stopped at the door to access credit.

Then of course we'll be able to have an oversight board that will forever eliminate the words "too big to fail." Experts who will continuously look at the infrastructure of this financial system.

We know that capitalism is strong, but it must be a strong system that has a heart, that can withstand the scrutiny of those who are seeking to find the weaknesses. We have to stand with the consumer so that the consumer does not fall victim to the too big to fail who were willing to take risks because they were padding their pockets.

This is the right decision that is now being made, and this bill will provide you with the oversight and the protective coverage for the banking consumer. Support the underlying rule and this bill. Stand with the American people and make a difference.

□ 1210

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Topeka, Kansas, Congresswoman JENKINS.

Ms. JENKINS. Madam Speaker, over the past 6 weeks, more than 1 million Americans have demanded action, and House Republicans have listened. Unfortunately, the majority in the House has not. While there are many issues

that these people in this body disagree on, there are some issues that we should all agree on.

We should agree that skyrocketing debt is a priority. We should agree that we cannot continue spending money that we don't have. We should agree that it is wrong for taxpayers to pay for the salaries of employees who answer to unions instead of to the American people, and we should agree on this very simple bill that says union activities should be funded by unions.

I urge my colleagues to stand with the American people, to vote to save \$1.2 billion and to end the abuse of taxpayer money.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I hope we all can agree that we shouldn't be cutting Social Security. I hope the minority leader will get on the floor and will retract his statement that we should be cutting Social Security to pay for this war. They have abdicated their responsibility for 8 years, and now they want the senior citizens of this country to pay for this war. I think that's wrong.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. CARSON).

Mr. CARSON of Indiana. Madam Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Massachusetts to engage in a short colloquy.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to confirm that all insurance companies, specifically mutual insurance holding companies, are included in the definition of "insurance company" that appears in the Resolution Authority title of the conference report.

Further, I would like to confirm my understanding that, under title II of the conference report, all insurance companies, specifically including mutual insurance holding companies, remain subject to resolution under the existing State insurance insolvency and liquidation regimes.

Will the chairman confirm my understanding on this point?

I yield to Chairman FRANK.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I thank the gentleman, and I commend him for paying attention to a very specific but very important point.

He is absolutely right. We have no intention here of disturbing the well-run State insurance regime. We respect and honor that form of the mutual insurance holding company. The gentleman's interpretation is entirely correct. They will remain subject to resolution under their existing State insurance liquidity and insolvency regimes.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. TERRY).

Mr. TERRY. Madam Speaker, I definitely agree, in part, with some of this bill in that we need transparency and some accountability, especially in the exotic instruments, but this bill also grants some carte blanche power over the financial markets, not just on Wall Street but on Main Street, too. This bill is going to raise the costs for small business operators and consumers who will use financial institutions.

I also find it interesting that part of the discussion here is to criticize or is to try to suggest that the Republicans want to cut Social Security. I'm curious as to how the Members who are raising that issue on the floor today voted on a health care bill that actually took \$500 billion out of Medicare, which our seniors rely on. They voted to cut \$500 billion out of it.

Mr. MCGOVERN. If the gentleman wants to know why I think you want to cut Social Security, I am referring to the article in which the minority leader is quoted quite extensively on that issue.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MOORE).

Mr. MOORE of Kansas. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the rule to consider the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform Conference Report.

For too many years, Wall Street was not properly regulated. Who paid for these mistakes? Unfortunately, it was our constituents on Main Street who paid the price, not Wall Street financial firms.

According to a recent Pew survey, this result directly impacted more than half of working Americans, pushing far too many into unemployment, pushing far too many to take pay cuts, reduced hours, part-time jobs, or delayed retirement plans. So it is not surprising that many Americans have lost their faith and trust in our financial system.

The Dodd-Frank Act will restore Americans' trust in a well-functioning financial system. While the bill ends "too big to fail" and taxpayer bailouts, it also shields community banks, credit unions, and small businesses from the necessary regulatory burdens that will be focused on Wall Street and on others who created the financial crisis. Most importantly, this new law is fully paid for. Taxpayers will not have to pick up the tab.

I urge my colleagues to protect consumers, investors and taxpayers by supporting this conference report.

I will now turn to Chairman FRANK for a brief colloquy.

Mr. Chairman, thank you for your extraordinary leadership on this historic bill.

First, do you agree the conferees did not intend to impose the regulatory authority of the bureau over the activities of broker-dealers and investment advisers otherwise subject to regulation by the SEC and CFTC?

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. If the gentleman would yield to me, I agree.

As the gentleman knows, our bill does give the SEC the power we expect them to use to impose greater fiduciary responsibilities on these people. The consumer protection bureau will be a very powerful one. It will be dealing with financial products in the lending area and elsewhere. It was not intended to duplicate existing regulation. So, in fact, as the gentleman knows, we enhance the regulatory authority of those entities he mentioned,

and there is no intention whatsoever, nor is there language, I believe, that would lead to duplicate supervision by the consumer protection bureau.

Mr. MOORE of Kansas. I thank the gentleman.

CLARIFICATION FOR THE RECORD: CONSUMER BUREAU VS. SEC/CFTC POWERS, PROVIDED BY REP. DENNIS MOORE (KS-03), JUNE 30, 2010, H.R. 4173, DODD-FRANK CONFERENCE REPORT

It was the conference committee's intent to avoid gaps in oversight, but also to avoid creating duplicative or competing rule-making and supervisory authorities, one vested in the Consumer Bureau and the other in the SEC or CFTC.

As such, the final report provides exclusive authority to the SEC and the CFTC over persons they regulate to the extent those persons act in a "regulated capacity." If such persons are not acting in a regulated capacity, their activities relating to the offering and provision of consumer financial products or services may be subject to the authority of the Bureau instead of the SEC or CFTC.

But to the extent they are acting in a "regulated capacity", only their functional regulator—the SEC or the CFTC—has rule-making, supervisory, examination or enforcement authority over the regulated person or such activities. To that end, the conference report specifically states that "the Bureau shall have no authority to exercise any power to enforce this title with respect to any person regulated by the Commission" or the CFTC.

It was not the intent of the conference committee to impose the regulatory authority of the Bureau over the activities of broker-dealers and investment advisers otherwise subject to regulation by the SEC and CFTC.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, at this time, I yield 2 minutes to one of the newest Members of this body, the gentleman from Hawaii, CHARLES DJOU.

Mr. DJOU. I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding.

Madam Speaker, today, I rise and count myself among the 1.1 million Americans who have already voted to cut spending via YouCut, a dynamic idea courtesy of the Republican whip, ERIC CANTOR.

These Americans are saying to this Congress that enough is enough. This government is spending far too much money on programs that do not work. Worst of all, we have no plan to pay this money back. Since the majority in Congress is refusing to cut spending, to exercise discipline or to even pass a budget, the American people are rising up and are standing in this gaffe.

Today's YouCut winner, which we are going to be looking at, is a straightforward proposal. It would simply prohibit taxpayer funding for union activities. This would save taxpayers \$120 million this year alone and \$1.2 billion over the next 10 years. This is a simple, commonsense idea, and it is one step in the right direction to restoring fiscal order in our House.

I urge my colleagues to listen to the American people, to cut this wasteful spending and to make tough choices that will provide us with a better tomorrow for ourselves and for our families.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, again, the proposal that the Republicans are talking about today represents less than one-tenth of 1 percent of the Bush tax cuts that weren't paid for. I mean, where was the fiscal responsibility then?

At this point, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH).

Mr. LYNCH. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, for the purpose of a colloquy, I would like to engage with the chairman of the committee and the drafter of this legislation. I congratulate him on the great work he has done on this reform bill.

Mr. Chairman, I want to call your attention to sections 726 and 765 of the bill. These two provisions require the CFTC and the SEC to conduct rulemakings to eliminate the conflicts of interest arising from the control of clearing and trading facilities by entities such as swap dealers and major swap participants.

This problem arises because, right now, 95 percent of all of the clearinghouses in this country are owned by just five banks. So, while we are relying on the clearinghouses to reduce systemic risk, we have the banks now owning the clearinghouses.

The question I have is regarding the intent of the conferees in retaining subsection B of these provisions. It could be loosely construed to leave it up to the agencies whether or not to adopt rules.

Mr. Chairman, do you agree that my reading of sections 726 and 765 affirmatively require these agencies to adopt strong conflict of interest rules on control and governance of clearing and trading facilities?

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. If the gentleman would yield to me, he has been a leader in this important area, and he is a careful lawyer and understands that just saving a principle isn't enough. You've got to make sure it is carried out. Dealing with a conflict of interest that he has been a leader in identifying is essential if this is going to work. So I completely agree with him. Yes, we mean both of those subsections, and it is a mandatory rule-making.

I will say to my neighbor from Massachusetts that we will be monitoring this carefully. They can expect oversight hearings because, yes, this is definitely a mandate to them to adopt rules to deal with what would be a blatant conflict of interest in the efficacy rules, and we intend to follow that closely.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, at this time, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE).

□ 1220

Mr. ROYCE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise in opposition to this rule and to the underlying legislation. I rise be-

cause reform is desperately needed, but the reforms needed most are not in this bill.

For example, this legislation fails to reform the government-sponsored enterprises, and when you think about it, the housing crisis and the meltdown that we saw in that sector, and most of the losses, were in the government-sponsored enterprises.

That was not caused by a lack of government intervention. Each of those failed institutions had a regulator overseeing it, but it was Congress, especially with the GSE Act, actively tying the hands of those regulators in what amounted to a failed attempt, maybe for a good social end, the idea was to get everybody into a home. But to do that by putting these mandates on the GSEs that 50 percent of the portfolios that they held, 50 percent of that \$1.7 trillion in portfolios that they held be in subprime and Alt-A, obviously, obviously created very real problems.

The political intervention to get the 20 percent down payment down to 3 percent and then down to zero obviously had an effect. These institutions, Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, were at the center of the housing market, and they were largely responsible for some 70 percent of subprime and Alt-A mortgages throughout our financial system.

In order to reach the affordable housing mandates that Congress enacted in 1992, Fannie and Freddie became the largest purchasers of these junk loans, ending up with \$1.8 trillion. In essence, they made the junk loan market.

Knowing of the systemic threat posed by these institutions, the Federal Reserve actually came to Congress, came to us a number of times, over a dozen times, and asked us to rein in their excessive risk taking. And when you hear the arguments back and forth about, well, at one point or another we tried to have legislation to address this, ask yourself this. I will remind you of this. What the Fed wanted was the ability to deleverage these portfolios. What the Fed wanted was the ability to control Fannie and Freddie for systemic risk, and that is a responsibility that Congress would not give them.

In 2005, that debate came to a head, and under the leadership of Chuck Hagel and RICHARD SHELBY, Senate Republicans moved a bill, supported by the Fed, through the Banking Committee that attacked the heart of the problem, the excessive buildup of leverage and risk within the mortgage portfolios. And, as the Wall Street Journal said, the White House, Treasury Department and Federal Reserve lined up behind Mr. SHELBY. But he was never able to bring his bill to the floor because of opposition from Democrats. Both in the House and Senate, Democrats were aggressively trying to defeat our efforts under the guise of protecting affordable housing. Mr. DODD and Mr. Sarbanes blocked those reforms in the Senate.

Luckily, some Members from the other side have noted this failure. In

2008, President Clinton said, "I think the responsibility that the Democrats have may rest more in resisting any efforts by Republicans in the Congress, or by me when I was President, to put some standards and tighten up a little on Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac."

It is unfortunate that we lost that battle. Our housing market, our financial sector and the broader economy are dealing with the consequences of that very systemic shock that the Fed had anticipated and warned us about.

Today, despite what some may claim, we are not advocating for the elimination of the GSEs tomorrow, but we want them addressed in this legislation.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK).

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I just want to correct the wholly-inaccurate-because-of-being-incomplete history of the gentleman from California. He blames the Senate Democrats for not passing a bill. I didn't hear him infer, maybe I missed it, that the House was then in control of the Republicans, and the House didn't pass that bill either.

The gentleman from California had an amendment that he liked. He was repudiated by his own party, overwhelmingly. Now, I am sorry he wasn't more persuasive with the Republicans. I am sorry that the chairman of the committee and the current leadership of the House and the then leadership of the House voted against him, but you can't blame that on the Democrats. And, in fact, what the Senate Republicans offered was the House Republican bill.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GUTIERREZ).

Mr. GUTIERREZ. I thank Mr. MCGOVERN for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Massachusetts, the chairman, to engage in a short colloquy.

Chairman FRANK, with regard to assessments on financial institutions under the resolution authority title of the bill, title II, I want to clarify that the risk matrix criteria regarding the FDIC to take the scope and nature of an institution's activity into consideration when setting assessments means that such assessments should be made in light of the impact of potential assessments on the ability of an institution that is a tax-exempt, not-for-profit organization to carry out their legally required charitable and educational activities.

Can the chairman confirm my understanding on this point?

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. If the gentleman will yield to me, yes, I absolutely can. Let me say this is consistent with the leadership the gentleman from Illinois has shown in dealing with risk factors. Up until now, and until this bill passes, we have been automatically assessing institutions solely on the basis of their assets or

their amounts. We want to discourage excessive risk and make those who take the risk bear a fair share.

Here the gentleman is clearly correct that to the extent you have got a tax exemption because you engage in charitable activity, in effect you shouldn't get assessed on that basis.

The gentleman has gone further. Smaller banks in this country will be the beneficiaries of an important piece of this legislation, thanks to his leadership. The riskier the bank's activity, the higher their FDI assessment will be in general. That is an important piece of it, and this particular application of it for these charitable institutions is essential.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, in order to allow the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) time to rebut, I yield the gentleman 1 minute.

Mr. ROYCE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I am ready to recognize, Chairman FRANK, that you were successful in defeating that amendment. You were successful, and certainly a majority of this body, including many Republicans, joined you, and I think in 2003 you stated it well in terms of this perspective. You said, "I do think I do not want the same kind of focus on safety and soundness that we have in OCC and OTS. I want to roll the dice a little bit more in this situation towards subsidized housing."

This was an argument that gained ground on both of sides of the aisle, there is no doubt about it, but at the same time, it was the Fed that supported my amendment that I brought before this body in order to try to give the Federal Reserve the ability to deleverage these portfolios in the interest of safety and soundness.

This is a debate we have had many times. We had a different perspective. But today going forward, we are expanding systemic risk in many ways in this legislation.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK).

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Madam Speaker, the gentleman from California still won't be forthright about this.

The Republican-controlled House, chaired by Mr. Oxley in the committee, passed the bill that he objected to. He said I was successful in defeating it. No, I played a fairly minor role under Mr. DeLay and the Republican leadership. Mr. DeLay did not take advice from me. If Mr. DeLay took advice from me, he wouldn't have gone on the dance show. I would have advised him against it.

The fact is that it was a Republican House that passed the bill the gentleman is denouncing, and I don't know why he keeps mentioning history and leaving that out until he has to be reminded.

He did offer an amendment. He was overwhelmingly defeated. More than two-thirds of the Republicans voted against him.

By the way, as to my own view, yes, in 2003 I said there was no problem. In 2004, after President Bush, while the Republicans controlled Congress and didn't hinder him, ordered Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac to increase their purchase of loans from people below the median, I changed my position. So I joined the Republican leadership of the House as a fairly minor player in supporting legislation.

He was against it, and I would just make that point again.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield the gentleman an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I don't understand the purpose of giving such a partial history. He neglects to mention in 2007 when the Democrats took the majority and I became chairman, we passed the bill that he couldn't get passed in 2005, because we worked with Secretary Paulson, who acknowledges this in his book.

So, yes, in 2003 I was not concerned, but by 2005 I was.

□ 1230

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam, Speaker, we're sitting here arguing on the floor about who gets credit for what. I think we ought to give credit. We ought to give credit to the Democrats for taxing, spending, record unemployment, higher debt. And what we're talking about today, this bill, the financial services sector of this country will not be healthy if we do not turn around our economy. And that too, Madam Speaker, is pin-the-tail-on-the-donkey.

At this time I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Roanoke, Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE).

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose the rule on this legislation that's coming forward. But before we get to the vote on the rule, we're going to have a vote on ordering the previous question, and I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on ordering the previous question because that is the way to show your support for today's spending cut reduction under the YouCut program that millions of Americans have participated in.

This week's spending cut, developed by Congressman PHIL GINGREY of Georgia, addresses one of the perpetual roadblocks to American private-sector job creation and economic recovery—Federal employee unions. The proposal would prohibit taxpayer funding for union activities, saving taxpayers \$120 million a year, or \$1.2 billion over the next 10 years. Federal employees' unions collect millions in revenue each year and spend significant amounts on political activities and lobbying. I do not believe that they should also be subsidized by the taxpayers for their official functions. Instead of subsidizing union activities, the Federal

Government must work to both eliminate every cent of waste and squeeze every cent of value out of each dollar our citizens entrust to it.

When we're facing gigantic deficits each year, the President's budget that he submitted earlier this year projects a 70 percent expenditure over top of what we're going to take in in revenues—\$3.8 trillion in spending and \$2.2 trillion in tax revenues coming in. That is completely unsustainable, and yet as far as the eye can see for the next 10 years, as far out as the Congressional Budget Office projects, we face deficits that are two and three times as large as they had ever been previously in our history, including the last time the Republicans were in the majority in this Congress.

We spent too much money in 2004 when we had a \$400 billion deficit. That looks like peanuts today compared to what we're facing. Support the effort to cut our government spending. Oppose the ordering of the previous question.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Before the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts, the Chair would remind Members to be more cognizant of the gavel.

The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, just in response to the last speaker, this gimmick that the Republicans have brought to the floor is really just that—a gimmick. \$120 million a year they're going to save. Let me just put that in perspective. Just two policies dating from the Bush administration—tax cuts and the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan—accounted for over \$500 billion of the deficit in 2009, and will account for almost \$7 trillion of deficits in 2009 through 2019, including the associated debt services cost.

We need to get serious about dealing with the debt and dealing with our deficit. But let's make one thing clear: When Mr. Bush came to power, President Clinton left him a budget surplus. No deficit. We're paying down the debt. When Mr. Bush left office, he left Barack Obama with a record deficit that he is now trying to dig us out of in the midst of one of the worst economies since the Great Depression. So when they get on the floor with these gimmicks, let's understand what they are—they are gimmicks. If you want to get serious about reducing the debt, then let's get serious about it.

I will tell you one thing I do disagree with him on very strongly. Again, I'll go back to the article I referred to before when Minority Leader BOEHNER talked about raising the retirement age of Social Security to 70 and taking that money and not putting it in Social Security to keep that program solvent, but then moving it to pay for the wars. I think that is wrong. I think our seniors deserve better than that.

I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. BEAN).

Ms. BEAN. Since the 2008 financial crisis that reduced the values of their homes and savings, our constituents have demanded action and answers. What went wrong and what will Congress do to make sure it doesn't happen again? This bill answers with strong protections for American families.

The problems started in our neighborhoods where too many home buyers took out loans they couldn't afford and too many lenders approved those loans. This bill ends the period of no-doc loans and drive-by appraisals with new lending standards, with risk retention to ensure lenders want to keep those good loans on their books, and rating agency liability and reform.

Next, derivatives were at the heart of the AIG failure. This bill creates regulation where it did not exist in this multitrillion market with required transparency, ensuring that these trades are exchange-traded cleared and-or reported. Capital reserves will be required to back up the risks they take and protect the entire system. And, most important, it ends taxpayer bailouts. Those companies who take risk, if you fail, you're fired. Your shareholders will lose money and the financial industry is responsible for liquidation.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield the gentlewoman 30 additional seconds.

Ms. BEAN. Everyone, from home buyers in our neighborhoods to wizards on Wall Street to regulators in Washington, recognizes that the era of no regulation is over. Status quo doesn't work. It's time to act and protect the American people.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the ranking member of the Financial Services Committee, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS).

Mr. BACHUS. This bill has good in it. It really does. It has enhanced consumer protection similar to what the Federal Reserve has enacted. It has greater transparency and disclosure. In the field of derivatives, it has provisions to prevent companies like British Petroleum from manipulating the market, as they did last year. But there's a lot of bad in this bill, and there's a lot of ugly. I'm going to talk about the bad when I address the bill. And the bad is some capital requirements on companies that could cost a trillion dollars. And that's a greater amount than the two stimulus put together. That could cost hundreds of thousands of jobs.

But right now I want to talk about the ugly. And the ugly is the bailout of creditors and counterparties. This is a Wall Street bailout bill, make no mistake about it. This bill says that the FDIC can lend to a failing company. Now this is a company that is failing. They can't meet their obligations. You loan a failing company money. You can purchase the assets. This is the government purchasing the assets of the large-

est financial companies in America. They can take a security interest in the assets. They can guarantee the obligations of the firm. We did that with Fannie and Freddie. We told the Chinese bondholders, We'll pay you a hundred cents on the dollar. And with AIG we did the same thing. We told the European banks, we told Goldman and Morgan, We'll pay these credit swaps off at a hundred percent. They can do that under this bill. They can bail out creditors and counterparties. And they can even sell and transfer to the FDIC the assets of a failing firm.

Now how do they do that? Well, they have to borrow money. You can't buy something for free. You can't guarantee things without money. Under the House bill, you can borrow 90 percent of the fair value of the failed firm's total consolidated assets. You're going to borrow. In other words, the government, the taxpayers, are going to borrow 90 percent of that amount. What are we talking about? Potentially, with just the largest six companies in America—Bank of America, Morgan Chase, Citi, Wells Fargo, Goldman Sachs, Morgan Stanley, the so-called Wall Street banks, most of which, including Goldman Sachs, have said, We like this provision. It's a great provision. The Federal Government can borrow for those six firms \$8.5 trillion. Yet we've not asked, Where are you going to borrow this money from? Are you going to go back to the Chinese?

□ 1240

What will it cost? How will it affect the FDIC when the taxpayers borrow this kind of money? How will it affect our ability to pay the depositors that we have guaranteed those obligations? How will it affect our ability to meet our commitments today, Medicare, Medicaid, Social Security? How will it impact the deficit? What will it do to interest rates? Is there an exit strategy?

The largest bailout which is not addressed in this bill, the largest bailout in the history of this country was of Fannie and Freddie. We still haven't gotten out of that. In August of 2008, every Republican in this body said, Reform them before you bail them out. We've bailed them out. We guaranteed \$400 billion of their assets over our protest. And then last December 31, the President guaranteed all their obligations; and just this week, we hear that that could amount to \$1 trillion.

A trillions dollars there, \$2 trillion here, \$2 trillion here, \$2 trillion here, almost \$1 trillion there. How do we do it? How do the taxpayers get paid back?

Mr. MCGOVERN. I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I think it's pretty obvious that Republicans today have come down and debated the substance of this rule and the bill. The rule, as it relates to the conference report, is straightforward.

It puts in order on the floor of the House of Representatives today a bill which will be a monstrous spending bill for financial institutions, \$18 billion that will be passed on to consumers. It's all done for bigger government. This bill empowers the Federal Government not only to get larger, but it gives them raw power. It gives them the opportunity to be the decision-maker in literally all parts of financial services. I think that's a mistake. I think that the balances and the opportunities that we had had as we have spoken in the last few years, we should aim for safety and soundness, not for overbearing government rules and regulations.

This bill, once again, is as much about the financial services industry as the health care bill was about health care. It's about diminishing the free enterprise system. It's about diminishing people who really should take the role and the responsibility for that which they do. And it's about creating a larger government that will encroach upon every single one of us and ultimately crush us. The Republican Party disagrees with this bill because we think that the time should be spent on this floor to encourage job creation, not to diminish job creation. And that's what this bill does today also: it diminishes job creation. Taxing, spending, bigger government. Of course, I guess it depends whether you are working for the government; you want the government to win or the free enterprise system.

We've looked at the numbers over the last 4 years since Speaker PELOSI's come into office, and we know what that agenda is—taxing, spending, more debt, bigger government, rules, regulations and using every single excuse they can to say, Well, you guys could have done this when you were in. Well, we don't want to do that. We don't want to do this. We don't want the taxing. We don't want the spending. To say that we could have done this, that now we're opposed to it, that's crazy. We don't like this.

We want to be about the free enterprise system, job creation, and the opportunity for people back home to have confidence in this body. We're at the lowest level ever that people have confidence in this body. And no wonder. Taxing, spending, rules, regulations, blaming things on former Presidents. My gosh, grow up. Madam Speaker, no wonder the American people are worried about our country, because the Mickey Mouse still goes on and is going on even today.

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment and extraneous material immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 4½ minutes.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, the American people are frustrated. They're frustrated that we haven't passed a Wall Street regulatory reform bill sooner. I think my friends on the other side of the aisle just don't get it. I don't think they understand that an unregulated Wall Street with no checks and balances will produce another economic crisis like the one we are trying to dig ourselves out of right now. The Republican minority leader, Mr. BOEHNER, said, This is killing an ant with a nuclear weapon. An ant? It was the worst financial crisis since the Great Depression.

America has lost 8 million jobs and \$17 trillion of retirement savings and net worth. The irresponsible fiscal policies of the previous administration—and a lot of my friends on the other side—were much more than an ant to the American workers and their families and small businesses. They have suffered greatly because of Wall Street's excesses. And this notion that somehow we should just let Wall Street continue unregulated I think demonstrates that my friends on the other side of the aisle just don't get it.

Madam Speaker, this rule would also allow for the same-day consideration of an extension of unemployment benefits to millions of Americans who have lost their jobs. Americans are frustrated because they can't understand why Congress can't just approve this. What is the big deal? My friends on the other side of the aisle say, Well, we can't afford it. Yet when it comes to war or when it comes to tax cuts for wealthy people, we are a bottomless pit. But the fact of the matter is, we have an obligation to help those who are suffering because of this bad economy, and hopefully we will do that.

Madam Speaker, let me finally say that when we enact this bill today, this will be tough legislation that will end an era without accountability for Wall Street and big banks that cost us 8 million jobs. It will rein in big banks and their big bonuses. It will put an end to taxpayer bailouts and the idea of too big to fail and protect and empower consumers to make the best decisions on homes, credit cards, and our own financial future. The American people want us to pass this bill. They want us to pass an extension of unemployment benefits, and hopefully by the end of today, we will do both.

So, Madam Speaker, I urge a "yes" vote on the previous question and on the rule.

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

AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 1487

OFFERED BY MR. SESSIONS OF TEXAS

At the end of the resolution add the following new section:

SEC. 4. Immediately upon the adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant

to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3251) to repeal certain provisions of title 5, United States Code, relating to Federal employees' official time and labor organization activities. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the Majority Leader and the Minority Leader or their respective designees. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommend with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 3251.

(The information contained herein was provided by Democratic Minority on multiple occasions throughout the 109th Congress.)

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Democratic majority agenda and a vote to allow the opposition, at least for the moment, to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's *Precedents of the House of Representatives*, (VI, 308-311) describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said:—"The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

Because the vote today may look bad for the Democratic majority they will say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate

vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever.” But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the definition of the previous question used in the Floor Procedures Manual published by the Rules Committee in the 109th Congress, (page 56). Here’s how the Rules Committee described the rule using information from Congressional Quarterly’s “American Congressional Dictionary”: “If the previous question is defeated, control of debate shifts to the leading opposition member (usually the minority Floor Manager) who then manages an hour of debate and may offer a germane amendment to the pending business.”

Deschler’s Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled “Amending Special Rules” states: “a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate.” (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: “Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon.”

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Democratic majority’s agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

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

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clauses 8 and 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on adoption of House Resolution 1487, if ordered; and the motion to suspend the rules on H.R. 4505.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 243, nays 182, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 406]

YEAS—243

Ackerman	Butterfield	Dahlkemper
Adler (NJ)	Capps	Davis (CA)
Altmire	Capuano	Davis (IL)
Andrews	Cardoza	Davis (TN)
Arcuri	Carnahan	DeFazio
Baca	Carney	DeGette
Baird	Carson (IN)	Delahunt
Baldwin	Castor (FL)	DeLauro
Barrow	Chandler	Deutch
Bean	Chu	Dicks
Becerra	Clarke	Dingell
Berkley	Clay	Doggett
Berman	Cleaver	Donnelly (IN)
Berry	Clyburn	Doyle
Bishop (GA)	Cohen	Driehaus
Bishop (NY)	Connolly (VA)	Edwards (MD)
Blumenauer	Conyers	Edwards (TX)
Boccheri	Cooper	Ellison
Boswell	Costa	Ellsworth
Boucher	Costello	Engel
Boyd	Courtney	Eshoo
Brady (PA)	Critz	Etheridge
Braley (IA)	Crowley	Farr
Brown, Corrine	Cummings	Fattah

Filner	Lofgren, Zoe
Foster	Lowey
Frank (MA)	Lujan
Fudge	Lynch
Garamendi	Maffei
Gonzalez	Maloney
Gordon (TN)	Markey (CO)
Grayson	Markey (MA)
Green, Al	Marshall
Green, Gene	Matheson
Grijalva	Matsui
Gutierrez	McCarthy (NY)
Hall (NY)	McCollum
Halvorson	McDermott
Hare	McGovern
Harman	McIntyre
Hastings (FL)	McMahon
Heinrich	McNerney
Herseth Sandlin	Meek (FL)
Higgins	Meeks (NY)
Hill	Melancon
Himes	Michaud
Hincheey	Miller (MI)
Hinojosa	Miller (NC)
Hirono	Miller, George
Hodes	Mollohan
Holden	Moore (KS)
Holt	Moore (WI)
Honda	Moran (VA)
Hoyer	Murphy (CT)
Inslee	Murphy (NY)
Israel	Murphy, Patrick
Jackson (IL)	Nadler (NY)
Jackson Lee	Napolitano
(TX)	Neal (MA)
Johnson (GA)	Oberstar
Johnson, E. B.	Obey
Kagen	Oliver
Kanjorski	Ortiz
Kennedy	Owens
Kildee	Pallone
Kilpatrick (MI)	Pascarella
Kilroy	Pastor (AZ)
Kind	Payne
Kirkpatrick (AZ)	Perlmutter
Kissell	Perriello
Klein (FL)	Peters
Kosmas	Peterson
Kratovil	Pingree (ME)
Kucinich	Polis (CO)
Langevin	Pomeroy
Larsen (WA)	Price (NC)
Larson (CT)	Quigley
Lee (CA)	Rahall
Levin	Rangel
Lewis (GA)	Reyes
Lipinski	Richardson
Loeb sack	Rodriguez

NAYS—182

Aderholt	Castle
Akin	Chaffetz
Alexander	Childers
Austria	Coble
Bachmann	Coffman (CO)
Bachus	Cole
Barrett (SC)	Hunter
Bartlett	Inglis
Barton (TX)	Issa
Biggart	Jenkins
Bilbray	Johnson (IL)
Bilirakis	Johnson, Sam
Dent	Jones
Diaz-Balart, L.	Jordan (OH)
Diaz-Balart, M.	Kaptur
Djou	King (IA)
Dreier	King (NY)
Duncan	Kingston
Ehlers	Kirk
Emerson	Kline (MN)
Fallin	Lamborn
Flake	Lance
Fleming	Latham
Forbes	LaTourette
Fortenberry	Latta
Fox	Lee (NY)
Franks (AZ)	Lewis (CA)
Frelinghuysen	Linder
Gallely	LoBiondo
Garrett (NJ)	Lucas
Gerlach	Luetkemeyer
Giffords	Lummis
Gingrey (GA)	Lungren, Daniel
Goodlatte	E.
Granger	Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)	Graves (MO)
Griffith	McCarthy (CA)
Guthrie	McCaul
Hall (TX)	McClintock

Ross	McCotter
Rothman (NJ)	McHenry
Roybal-Allard	McKeon
Ruppersberger	McMorris
Rush	Rodgers
Ryan (OH)	Mica
Salazar	Miller (FL)
Sánchez, Linda	Miller, Gary
T.	Minnick
Sanchez, Loretta	Mitchell
Sarbanes	Moran (KS)
Schakowsky	Murphy, Tim
Schauer	Myrick
Schiff	Neugebauer
Schrader	Nunes
Schwartz	Nye
Scott (GA)	Olson
Scott (VA)	Paul
Serrano	Paulsen
Sestak	Pence
Shea-Porter	Petri
Sherman	Pitts
Shuler	Platts
Sires	
Skelton	
Slaughter	
Smith (WA)	
Snyder	
Space	
Speier	
Spratt	
Stark	
Stupak	
Sutton	
Tanner	
Teague	
Thompson (CA)	
Thompson (MS)	
Tierney	
Titus	
Tonko	
Towns	
Tsongas	
Van Hollen	
Velázquez	
Viscosky	
Walz	
Wasserman	
Schultz	
Waters	
Watson	
Watt	
Waxman	
Weiner	
Welch	
Wilson (OH)	
Wu	
Yarmuth	

Poe (TX)	Shimkus
Posey	Shuster
Price (GA)	Simpson
Putnam	Smith (NE)
Radanovich	Smith (NJ)
Rehberg	Smith (TX)
Reichert	Stearns
Roe (TN)	Sullivan
Rogers (AL)	Terry
Rogers (KY)	Thompson (PA)
Rogers (MI)	Thornberry
Rohrabacher	Tiahrt
Rooney	Tiberi
Ros-Lehtinen	Turner
Roskam	Upton
Royce	Walden
Ryan (WI)	Westmoreland
Scalise	Whitfield
Schmidt	Wilson (SC)
Schock	Wittman
Sensenbrenner	Wolf
Sessions	Young (FL)
Shadegg	

NOT VOTING—7

Davis (AL)	Taylor	Young (AK)
Gohmert	Wamp	
Marchant	Woolsey	

□ 1315

Mrs. BLACKBURN, Messrs. ROYCE, REICHERT, BOREN, Ms. GRANGER, and Mr. CUELLAR changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ and Mr. FATTAH changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

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

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 237, noes 189, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 407]

AYES—237

Ackerman	Chu	Engel
Adler (NJ)	Clarke	Eshoo
Altmire	Clay	Etheridge
Andrews	Cleaver	Farr
Arcuri	Clyburn	Fattah
Baca	Cohen	Filner
Baird	Connolly (VA)	Foster
Baldwin	Conyers	Frank (MA)
Barrow	Cooper	Fudge
Bean	Costa	Garamendi
Becerra	Costello	Gonzalez
Berkley	Courtney	Gordon (TN)
Berman	Critz	Grayson
Berry	Crowley	Green, Al
Bishop (GA)	Cuellar	Green, Gene
Bishop (NY)	Cummings	Grijalva
Blumenauer	Dahlkemper	Gutierrez
Boccheri	Davis (CA)	Hall (NY)
Boswell	Davis (IL)	Halvorson
Boucher	Davis (TN)	Hare
Boyd	DeFazio	Harman
Brady (PA)	DeGette	Hastings (FL)
Braley (IA)	Delahunt	Heinrich
Brown, Corrine	DeLauro	Higgins
Butterfield	Deutch	Hill
Capps	Dicks	Himes
Capuano	Dingell	Hincheey
Cardoza	Doggett	Hinojosa
Carnahan	Donnelly (IN)	Hirono
Carney	Doyle	Hodes
Carson (IN)	Driehaus	Holden
Castor (FL)	Edwards (MD)	Holt
Chandler	Edwards (TX)	Honda
Brown, Corrine	Ellison	Hoyer

Inlee	Michaud	Sarbanes
Israel	Miller (NC)	Schakowsky
Jackson	Miller, George	Schauer
Jackson (IL)	Mollohan	Schiff
Jackson Lee	Moore (KS)	Schrader
(TX)	Moore (WI)	Schwartz
Johnson (GA)	Moran (VA)	Scott (GA)
Johnson, E. B.	Murphy (CT)	Scott (VA)
Kagen	Murphy (NY)	Serrano
Kanjorski	Murphy, Patrick	Sestak
Kennedy	Nadler (NY)	Shea-Porter
Kildee	Napolitano	Sherman
Kilpatrick (MI)	Neal (MA)	Sires
Kilroy	Oberstar	Skelton
Kind	Obey	Slaughter
Kissell	Olver	Smith (WA)
Klein (FL)	Ortiz	Snyder
Kosmas	Owens	Space
Kucinich	Pallone	Speier
Langevin	Pascarell	Spratt
Larsen (WA)	Pastor (AZ)	Stark
Larson (CT)	Payne	Stupak
Lee (CA)	Perlmutter	Sutton
Levin	Lewis (GA)	Perriello
Lewis (GA)	Loeb sack	Peters
Loeb sack	Lofgren, Zoe	Peterson
Lofgren, Zoe	Lowey	Pingree (ME)
Lowey	Lujan	Polis (CO)
Lujan	Lynch	Pomero y
Lynch	Maffei	Price (NC)
Maffei	Maloney	Quigley
Maloney	Markey (CO)	Rahall
Markey (CO)	Markey (MA)	Rangel
Markey (MA)	Marshall	Reyes
Marshall	Matheson	Richardson
Matheson	Matsui	Rodriguez
Matsui	McCarthy (NY)	Ross
McCarthy (NY)	McCollum	Rothman (NJ)
McCollum	McDermott	Roybal-Allard
McDermott	McGovern	Ruppersberger
McGovern	McIntyre	Rush
McIntyre	McMahon	Ryan (OH)
McMahon	McNerney	Salazar
McNerney	Meek (FL)	Sánchez, Linda
Meek (FL)	Meeks (NY)	T.
Meeks (NY)	Melancon	Sanchez, Loretta

NOES—189

Aderholt	Djou	Latham
Akin	Dreier	LaTourette
Alexander	Duncan	Latta
Austria	Ehlers	Lee (NY)
Bachmann	Ellsworth	Lewis (CA)
Bachus	Emerson	Linder
Barrett (SC)	Fallin	Lipinski
Bartlett	Flake	LoBiondo
Barton (TX)	Fleming	Lucas
Biggart	Forbes	Luetkemeyer
Biggs	Fortenberry	Lummis
Bilirakis	Fox	Lungren, Daniel
Bishop (UT)	Franks (AZ)	E.
Blackburn	Frelinghuysen	Mack
Blunt	Gallely	Manzullo
Boehner	Garrett (NJ)	Marchant
Bonner	Gerlach	McCarthy (CA)
Bono Mack	Giffords	McCauley
Boozman	Gingrey (GA)	McClintock
Boren	Goodlatte	McCotter
Boustany	Granger	McHenry
Brady (TX)	Graves (GA)	McKeon
Bright	Graves (MO)	McMorris
Brown (GA)	Griffith	Rodgers
Brown (SC)	Guthrie	Mica
Brown-Waite,	Hall (TX)	Miller (FL)
Ginny	Harper	Miller (MI)
Buchanan	Hastings (WA)	Miller, Gary
Burgess	Heller	Minnick
Burton (IN)	Hensarling	Mitchell
Buyer	Herger	Moran (KS)
Calvert	Herseth Sandlin	Murphy, Tim
Camp	Hoekstra	Myrick
Campbell	Hunter	Neugebauer
Cantor	Inglis	Nunes
Cao	Issa	Nye
Capito	Jenkins	Olson
Carter	Johnson (IL)	Paul
Cassidy	Johnson, Sam	Paulsen
Castle	Jones	Pence
Chaffetz	Jordan (OH)	Petri
Coble	Kaptur	Pitts
Coffman (CO)	King (IA)	Platts
Cole	King (NY)	Poe (TX)
Conaway	Kingston	Posey
Crenshaw	Kirk	Price (GA)
Culberson	Kirkpatrick (AZ)	Putnam
Davis (KY)	Kline (MN)	Radanovich
Dent	Kratovil	Rehberg
Diaz-Balart, L.	Lamborn	Reichert
Diaz-Balart, M.	Lance	Roe (TN)

Rogers (AL)	Sessions	Thornberry
Rogers (KY)	Shadegg	Tiahrt
Rogers (MI)	Shimkus	Tiberi
Rohrabacher	Shuler	Titus
Rooney	Shuster	Turner
Ros-Lehtinen	Simpson	Upton
Roskam	Smith (NE)	Walden
Royce	Smith (NJ)	Westmoreland
Ryan (WI)	Smith (TX)	Whitfield
Scalise	Stearns	Wilson (SC)
Schmidt	Sullivan	Wittman
Schock	Terry	Wolf
Sensenbrenner	Thompson (PA)	Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—6

Davis (AL)	Taylor	Woolsey
Gohmert	Wamp	Young (AK)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1323

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has agreed to a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 285. Concurrent resolution recognizing the important role that fathers play in the lives of their children and families and supporting the goals and ideals of designating 2010 as the Year of the Father.

The message also announced that the Senate has agreed to the following resolution:

S. Res. 574, relative to the memorial observances of the Honorable ROBERT C. BYRD, late a Senator from the State of West Virginia.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 105-292, as amended by Public Law 106-55, and as further amended by Public Law 107-228, the Chair, on behalf of the President pro tempore, upon the recommendation of the Republican Leader, appoints the following individual to the United Commission on International Religious Freedom:

Richard D. Land of Tennessee.

ROLL CALL CONGRESSIONAL BASEBALL GAME

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

Mr. DOYLE. Madam Speaker, as you know, last night was the 49th annual Roll Call baseball game.

I am happy to announce to the House today that that score has been settled this year, and the Democrats were victorious, 13-6. Of course, the biggest winners last night were our two charities—the Washington Literacy Council and the Boys and Girls Club of Washington, DC. The final numbers aren't in, as donations are still coming in, but we went over the \$150,000 mark for our charities last night.

I want to commend our Republican team for a hard-fought game. They

gave us a tough game right up to the last inning, and we kept all the fans in their seats to the very end.

We had a couple of outstanding plays on the Democratic side. All of us woke up with great chagrin this morning to watch ESPN's top 10 and see ANTHONY WEINER as No. 9 of the top 10. Also, there was some outstanding hitting from STEVE DRIEHAUS, but the MVPs on the Democratic side were killer bees JOE BACA, JOHN BOCCIERI, and BRIAN BAIRD. They all had outstanding plays.

So, Madam Speaker, once again, the coveted Roll Call trophy stays blue.

I yield to my good friend, the Republican manager, JOE BARTON.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Madam Speaker, there have been those on the other side of the aisle who, from time to time, have spoken of the lack of generosity, of the stinginess, and of the coldheartedness of the Republicans, but the seventh inning last night should put that to rest forever. We were very generous. Every man of the Republican nine made some effort in generosity of spirit to drop balls, to misplace throws, or to go out of their way to make sure that, at least on the diamond, the Democrats would feel good.

Now, we don't want this to go to your head, though, Mr. DOYLE. That trophy is on loan. If you would look wherever the records are kept, if you win the next 20 in a row, there would still be more "R" wins than "D" wins.

Mr. DOYLE. I'll just say my friend is living in the past.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. So in the spirit of the moment, we cannot say that Chairwoman SLAUGHTER ran a closed rule out on us. It was an open rule. It was a fair competition. Luckily, for both sides, the real winners were, as you said it, the Boys and Girls Club of Washington, DC, and the Washington Literacy Council.

I do want to commend my Republican team. I am very proud of them. JOHN SHIMKUS pitched his heart out. BILL SHUSTER made an almost unassisted double play when he caught the ball and picked somebody off at first base. Every member of our team got to play. They all were in good spirits and good fellowship.

We will show up next year with warmth in our hearts, and we will continue this tradition, hopefully, with a more pleasurable outcome for our side.

Congratulations to you, Mr. DOYLE. You ultimately deserved the win. You played better. We congratulate you.

Mr. DOYLE. Thank you.

EXPANDING ACCESS TO STATE VETERANS HOMES FOR GOLD STAR PARENTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the