And we pay for every cent. This is a uniquely American solution. We are not Canada. We are not Britain. We are America. This is a balance. We have a tradition of balance between public and private. This legislation accomplished that.

We do not buy into government-only solutions in America, but we do believe in rules of the road. Our bill provides a balanced solution. And CBO says we do so in a balanced way.

Soon it will come down to the Senate. My colleagues, this will be our opportunity to make history. Think of it. Our actions here will determine whether we will extend the blessings of better health care to more Americans.

Ours is a balanced plan that can pass the Senate. Our bill should win the support of Republicans and Democrats alike. Now the choice is up to Senators.

Hippocrates said that ''health is the greatest of human blessings.'' But too many Americans are being deprived of that blessing. Let us enact this balanced, commonsense plan to improve health care. Let us reform the health care system to control costs and premiums. And let us extend the blessings of health care coverage to all Americans.

I yield the floor and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NELSON of Florida.) The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHANNS. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 2393

Mr. JOHANNS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be set aside and that we call up amendment No. 2393.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. JOHANNS] proposes an amendment numbered 2393.

Mr. JOHANNS. I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: Prohibiting use of funds to fund the Association of Community Organizations for Reform Now (ACORN))

On page 203, between lines 23 and 24, insert the following:

SEC. 5____. None of the funds made available under this Act may be distributed to the Association of Community Organizations for Reform Now (ACORN) or its subsidiaries.

Mr. JOHANNS. I rise to talk about an amendment that should come as no surprise to my colleagues. The amendment is simple and straightforward. It is an amendment I have offered on a number of occasions that has been approved by this body. It prohibits any Federal funds from going to ACORN or any of its subsidiaries.

This amendment I have offered today was offered on three prior appropriations bills. Each time my amendment has gained significant bipartisan support: 83 votes the first time, 85 votes the second time, and by voice vote a third time. It is important we continue to take this action to prohibit funding in each of the remaining appropriations bills because ACORN is still eligible to receive Federal dollars from many other sources.

For any of my colleagues who might put forward the argument that ACORN typically does not get funding from the CJS appropriations bill, we can't be so sure. The fact is, ACORN has the opportunity to get money from various Federal pots that we could never have envisioned. For example, a public notice was sent out by the Department of Homeland Security on October 2 of this year announcing that ACORN was the recipient of an almost $1 million grant for funds typically reserved for fire departments. Remarkable. Who knew that ACORN specialized in firefighting? I never would have thought ACORN could win a grant designed for fire safety and prevention. But, lo and behold, that is what happened only a few days ago. This happened after the Senate took several stands against providing Federal funds to this group and after House action.

Until a full government investigation is launched and completed into ACORN, no taxpayer money should be used to fund their activities. I urge all colleagues to once again support my amendment. The identical amendment has passed twice on strong bipartisan votes with over 80 Senators voting in favor, and the third time it passed by a voice vote. Where Senators stand on this issue is now well known.

For the record, I respectfully suggest that we can agree upon this amendment by voice vote at the appropriate time.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. VITTER. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 2630

Mr. VITTER. I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment and call up Vitter amendment No. 2630.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. VITTER] proposes an amendment numbered 2630.

Mr. VITTER. I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To prohibit funds from being used in contravention of section 642(a) of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the amounts made available in this title under the heading ''COMMUNITY ORIENTED POLICING SERVICES'' may be used in contravention of section 642(a) of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1373(a)).

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, I will read the amendment to explain what it is about:

None of the amounts made available in this title under the heading ''COMMUNITY ORIENTED POLICING SERVICES'' may be used in contravention of section 6429(a) of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996.

That is the entire amendment. What does that mean? That Illegal Immigration Reform Act is about the mandate that local government has to fully cooperate with Federal immigration officials with regard to immigration enforcement. It doesn't mean that local governments become immigration agents, that they have the affirmative responsibility to do all of that work for the proper Federal authorities. It does mean that when they come across illegal immigrants and arrest them, for instance, for local law violations, they are dutybound under Federal law to properly inform Federal authorities.

The problem is, in several select jurisdictions, so-called sanctuary cities, they have made the affirmative public statement and decision that they are not going to do that. They will not comply with Federal law. They are going to ignore Federal immigration law, and they are not going to cooperate in any way with Federal immigration enforcement authorities.

We can debate whether that is good policy or bad, but we don't really need to get to that level of debate because it is present Federal law that cooperation must be extended by local police agencies and local governments. These sanctuary cities—it is beyond debate—are violating current Federal law. They are taking Federal law and saying: Too bad. We are not going to have anything to do with it. We will violate Federal law. We will not cooperate in any way with Federal immigration enforcement.

My amendment says if you violate Federal law, you will have to live by some consequences. Specifically, you will lose COPS funding for your specific jurisdiction. If you want to do that, if you want to flaunt the law, there is going to be a meaningful consequence. You will lose community policing grants.

I believe this is reasonable and necessary because there are a number of sanctuary cities that have made the affirmative decision that they are going