

**Exhibit 11**

The result was announced—yeas 57, nays 42, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 391 Leg.]

YEAS—57

Akaka	Gillibrand	Murray
Baucus	Hagan	Nelson (NE)
Begich	Harkin	Nelson (FL)
Bingaman	Inouye	Pryor
Boxer	Johnson	Reed
Brown	Kaufman	Reid
Burr	Kerry	Rockefeller
Byrd	Kirk	Sanders
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Schumer
Cardin	Kohl	Shaheen
Carper	Landrieu	Specter
Casey	Lautenberg	Stabenow
Conrad	Leahy	Tester
Dodd	Levin	Udall (CO)
Dorgan	Lieberman	Udall (NM)
Durbin	Lincoln	Warner
Feingold	Menendez	Webb
Feinstein	Merkley	Whitehouse
Franken	Mikulski	Wyden

NAYS—42

Alexander	Crapo	Lugar
Barrasso	DeMint	McCain
Bayh	Ensign	McCaskill
Bennet	Enzi	McConnell
Bennett	Graham	Murkowski
Bond	Grassley	Risch
Brownback	Gregg	Roberts
Burr	Hatch	Sessions
Chambliss	Hutchison	Shelby
Coburn	Inhofe	Snowe
Cochran	Isakson	Thune
Collins	Johanns	Vitter
Corker	Kyl	Voinovich
Cornyn	LeMieux	Wicker

NOT VOTING—1

Bunning

The motion was agreed to.  
Mr. REID. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. DURBIN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

HUTCHISON POINT OF ORDER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is now 2 minutes, equally divided, prior to a vote on the constitutional point of order made by the Senator from Texas, Mrs. HUTCHISON.

The Senator from Texas.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, the 10th amendment says:

The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution . . . are reserved to the States. . . .

In this bill, a State such as Texas and many other States that have taken full responsibility for insurance plans for their employees and teachers will have to justify any change in those terms to the Federal Government.

The majority claims the commerce clause gives them the power to do what is in this bill. But what they fail to mention is the power to regulate interstate commerce has not been the basis for a robust role in insurance regulation.

This is an encroachment of the Federal Government into a role left to the States in the Constitution. The 10th amendment is being eroded by an activist Congress, and it is time to stop it now.

I urge a vote to uphold this point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, the bill before us is clearly an appropriate ex-

ercise of the commerce clause. We further believe Congress has power to enact this legislation pursuant to the taxing and spending powers. This bill does not violate the 10th amendment because it is an appropriate exercise of powers delegated to the United States, and because our bill fundamentally gives States the choice to participate in the exchanges themselves or, if they do not choose to do so, to allow the Federal Government to set up the exchanges fully within the provisions as interpreted by the Supreme Court of the 10th amendment.

I urge my colleagues to vote against the point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the constitutional point of order made by the Senator from Texas, Mrs. HUTCHISON, that the amendment violates the 10th amendment.

The question is, Is the point of order well taken?

The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. KYL. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. BUNNING).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. BUNNING) would have voted "yea."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 39, nays 60, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 392 Leg.]

YEAS—39

Alexander	DeMint	Lugar
Barrasso	Ensign	McCain
Bennett	Enzi	McConnell
Bond	Graham	Murkowski
Brownback	Grassley	Risch
Burr	Gregg	Roberts
Chambliss	Hatch	Sessions
Coburn	Hutchison	Shelby
Cochran	Inhofe	Snowe
Collins	Isakson	Thune
Corker	Johanns	Vitter
Cornyn	Kyl	Voinovich
Crapo	LeMieux	Wicker

NAYS—60

Akaka	Franken	Mikulski
Baucus	Gillibrand	Murray
Bayh	Hagan	Nelson (NE)
Begich	Harkin	Nelson (FL)
Bennet	Inouye	Pryor
Bingaman	Johnson	Reed
Boxer	Kaufman	Reid
Brown	Kerry	Rockefeller
Burr	Kirk	Sanders
Byrd	Klobuchar	Schumer
Cantwell	Kohl	Shaheen
Cardin	Landrieu	Specter
Carper	Lautenberg	Stabenow
Casey	Leahy	Tester
Conrad	Levin	Udall (CO)
Dodd	Lieberman	Udall (NM)
Dorgan	Lincoln	Warner
Durbin	McCaskill	Webb
Feingold	Menendez	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Merkley	Wyden

NOT VOTING—1

Bunning

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is not agreed to.

The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. DEMINT. Mr. President, since I have not used or yielded 10 minutes, I ask to be recognized for up to 10 minutes under rule XXII, paragraph 2.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has that right.

The Senator from South Carolina.

DEMINT MOTION TO SUSPEND

Mr. DEMINT. Mr. President, in just a moment I will move to suspend the rules for the purpose of offering an amendment that would ban the practice of trading earmarks for votes.

While I want to be careful not to suggest wrongdoing by any Member, there has been growing public concern that earmarks were used to buy votes for this legislation. It has been argued by some that this practice is acceptable because it is necessary to get things done in the Senate. I reject that argument, and I urge my colleagues to put an end to business as usual here in the Senate.

The House of Representatives has a rule prohibiting the use of earmarks to buy votes for legislation. If we were in the House considering this bill, vote trading would be a direct violation of the ethics rules. Unfortunately, a vote-trading rule does not exist in the Senate.

During the debate on the lobbying and ethics reform bill in the 110th Congress, the senior Senator from Illinois, Mr. DURBIN, and I offered an earmark reform amendment which contained the following language:

A Member may not condition the inclusion of language to provide funding for a congressional earmark . . . on any vote cast by another Member.

The Durbin-DeMint amendment was written to mirror Speaker PELOSI's earmark reforms in the House. The Durbin-DeMint amendment passed the Senate by a vote of 98 to 0 and was included in S. 1, the Honest Leadership and Open Government Act, which passed the Senate by a vote of 96 to 2.

The rule against trading votes for earmarks was in the bill when it left the Senate, but then the bill moved to a closed-door negotiation. Somehow, at some point in those closed-door negotiations, someone dropped the earmark-for-vote language. I have no idea who it was, and we may never know. Remember, this bill was called the Honest Leadership and Open Government Act. In any case, the vote-trading rule was dropped from the bill, which then passed the Senate and was signed by the President.

Just to confirm all of this, I wish to make a parliamentary inquiry to the Chair. Is the Chair aware of any prohibition in the Standing Rules of the Senate such as the previously referenced rule contained in the Durbin-DeMint amendment or in the Rules of the House of Representatives?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No such rule exists in the Senate.

Mr. DEMINT. No such rule exists.

I have an amendment which would correct this error. It mirrors the Durbin-DeMint language which passed the Senate 98 to 0, and I will read the relevant parts. I quote:

It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider a congressionally directed spending