

□ 1510

In a letter to Congress, the NGA wrote, this provision “would establish a Federal mandate for every paid meal in every school in the country for the first time ever.” They went on to say this will, “price out some low-income families from paid school meals and punish school districts that in good faith have worked to increase the quality of school meals, while simultaneously holding down the paid meal prices.”

Allowing the Federal Government to create price mandates is a dangerous precedent and should not be set. By approving this motion to recommit, we can block this harmful tax on working families. We have thoroughly debated the broader objections to this legislation today, arguing against the spending and mandate, but that is not the debate we’re having now.

This motion to recommit is a modest pair of corrections that will make the bill better. It will make our children safer and protect working families, and I urge my colleagues to support its passage.

I yield back my time.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

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

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Madam Speaker, Members of the House, we have known for some time, and certainly known all today, that our colleagues on the other side of the aisle oppose this legislation, and that’s what the gentleman, my colleague, Mr. KLINE, just spoke to, his opposition to this legislation.

They have opposed this legislation even though this legislation is fully paid for under the PAYGO rules. They’ve opposed this legislation even though it passed unanimously out of the Senate committee. They opposed this legislation even though it passed unanimously on the floor of the Senate and was sent to us, because they know that we’re in the last days of this session, and if they can attach something to this legislation, they can kill this bill.

They can kill the years of hard work that have gone into this legislation to make it less expensive for school districts, to make it more flexible for school districts, to make it easier on parents, to make it sure that we have safe meals so, when food is recalled, the school districts will be informed right away. Usually, they’re the last to know that they’re serving dangerous and maybe lethal food on the food recall.

They know that what this bill does is create for the first time healthy meals so we can address the problems of diabetes and obesity that are swamping this Nation’s health care system, that are swamping the health care budgets of families, of businesses, that start with children and have adult onset as a result of that. This effort is endorsed

by the pediatrics association and every other health care association because they understand this is the front line if we’re going to reverse this trend.

So now what have they done, as they’ve talked about the Federal Government, extending the mandate of the Federal Government? The Federal Government is about to swoop in on family day care providers, more family day care providers than any other kind of day care provider in the country, very important in rural areas, very important in poor areas, person takes care of four or five of their neighbors’ friends, they know these people. Now they have a mandate. They have to do a background check. These are marginal operations. Do they have to pay for that? Do they know with certainty who’s going to do that? Who’s going to do that check? And if they’re in a school setting, does the school district pay for it? They’ve got to have a background check. If they’re in a kindergarten as part of a child care program, do they pay for that?

So what they’re trying to do is kill this bill. It wouldn’t matter what this amendment said. If it goes back to the Senate, we’ve struggled all of us mightily, on both sides of the aisle, with the nature of the Senate. But here we have the opportunity to have a major program, to improve the nutrition and flexibility and the health and the safety of this program, and now this is an effort to kill it.

I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Ladies and gentlemen, we all want to pursue the legislative process. One of the things that has undermined the legislative process in this House perhaps on both sides is the “gotcha” amendments. This amendment has a worthwhile objective, obviously, of protecting our children. We’re going to give everybody an opportunity to vote on this amendment in just a few short hours, and then we’re going to pass this bill—because the gentleman’s debate had nothing to do with this amendment until the last few seconds of his remarks.

His remarks went to the substance of this bill. He’s opposed to this bill. He said he’s opposed to this bill. This bill passed unanimously. Unanimously means that every Republican, as well as every Democrat, wanted to reach out to provide for child nutrition for America’s children.

This bill, I believe, enjoys the majority’s support on this floor. We’ll pass this bill, and we will pass it tomorrow, but we’re going to give Members on this side of the aisle, as well as on your side of the aisle, an opportunity to pass an amendment that in effect says, okay, if you want to put these regulations on these small providers in these small jurisdictions, fine, we will do it; we want to protect children as much as you do. And I’ve said that during the substance of our debate, that we wanted to protect children, and I’m sure

you want to make sure the children are well fed.

So, my belief is that we will rise now. We will come back on this amendment, which is not related. We’ll give you an opportunity to vote on your amendment, and then we are going to pass this bill and send it to the President of the United States, as the Senate of the United States unanimously voted to do.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I yield back the balance of my time.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of S. 3307 is postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H. Res. 1217,

H. Res. 1724, both de novo.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. The second electronic vote will be conducted as a 5-minute vote.

HONORING FORT DRUM’S SOLDIERS OF 10TH MOUNTAIN DIVISION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution (H. Res. 1217) honoring Fort Drum’s soldiers of the 10th Mountain Division for their past and continuing contributions to the security of the United States, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. ESHOO. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 415, noes 0, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 594]

AYES—415

| | | |
|------------|----------|-------------|
| Ackerman | Austria | Barton (TX) |
| Aderholt | Baca | Bean |
| Adler (NJ) | Bachmann | Becerra |
| Akin | Bachus | Berkley |
| Alexander | Baird | Berman |
| Altmire | Baldwin | Berry |
| Andrews | Barrow | Biggert |
| Arcuri | Bartlett | Bilbray |