STILL NO JOBS PLAN AFTER 11 WEEKS

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

Mr. HINCHEY. We have now gone 11 weeks and still there hasn't been any action in committee or on this House floor on anything resembling a jobs plan from our friends here in the majority. In fact, we've seen just the opposite. Economists are estimating that from the initial action here, an estimated 800,000 jobs will be lost under their first plan and many more over the course of the rest of this issue. Hundreds of New York Head Start teachers will be fired, and thousands more teachers will be fired all across America. Thousands of my constituents won't be able to find jobs because of cuts to the Workforce Investment Act that will close job centers throughout New York, as well as thousands of others that will be closed in other States all across America. And jobs in the Hudson Valley's growing solar energy industry will be hurt by cuts to investments in renewable energy, just as it will be cut all across America. After 11 weeks, it's clear that the Republicans don't just have a no-jobs agenda, they have an anti-jobs agenda. And New Yorkers and millions of others across America will pay the price for their bad policies.

MAKING IN ORDER CONSIDERATION OF H. CON. RES. 28, AFGHANISTAN WAR POWERS RESOLUTION

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order at any time to consider House Concurrent Resolution 28 in the House, if called up by the chair of the Committee on Foreign Affairs or her designee; that the concurrent resolution be considered as read; that the previous question be considered as ordered on the concurrent resolution to final adoption without intervening motion except: number one, 1 hour of debate controlled by Representative KUCINICH of Ohio or his designee; and, number two, 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs; and that section 7 of the War Powers Resolution not apply to the concurrent resolution.

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

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 839, HAMP TERMINATION ACT OF 2011; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 861, NSP TERMINATION ACT

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 170 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 170

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, 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. 839) to amend the Emergency Economic Stabilization Act of 2008 to terminate the authority of the Secretary of the Treasury to provide new assistance under the Home Affordable Modification Program, while preserving assistance to homeowners who were already extended an offer to participate in the Program, either on a trial or permanent basis. 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 chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Financial Services now printed in the bill. The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. 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. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. At any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, 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. 861) to rescind the third round of funding for the Neighborhood Stabilization Program and to terminate the program. 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 chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Financial Services now printed in the bill. The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report (except that amendment number 9 and amendment number 10 may be offered only en bloc), may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. 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. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

□ 1230

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my friend, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time is yielded for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 170 provides for a structured rule designed and designated by the Rules Committee for consideration of H.R. 861 and H.R. 839. This rule allows the amendments submitted to the Rules Committee to be made in order as long as they were not subject to a point of order and were germane to the underlying text of H.R. 861 and H.R. 839.

This rule provides for debate and amendment opportunities for members of the minority and the majority to change the legislative text of the underlying bill.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this rule and the two underlying bills. The first piece of legislation, the Neighborhood Stabilization Program Termination Act, was introduced by my friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. GARY MILLER) on March 1, 2011, and went through committee

markup in the Financial Services Committee last week on March 9. The second bill, H.R. 839, the Home Affordable Modification Program Termination Act, was introduced by my dear friend, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY) on February 28 and marked up last week as well.

Both of these bills went through regular order, which allowed Members from both sides of the aisle the opportunity to offer amendments in the Financial Services Committee and in the Rules Committee yesterday.

The chairman of the Rules Committee, DAVID DREIER, has once again provided Members of this body a transparent and accountable structure under the rule that we are discussing today, allowing Members from both sides of this body to offer amendments and both sides to join in debate of the underlying legislation.

Mr. Speaker, last fall, Republicans pledged to the American people that we would stop the wasteful spending and put Americans back to work. These two bills that we're discussing today continue to roll back the abuse of taxpayer funds, the diminishment of jobs, and the creation of a proper government responsibility with any balance in the housing sector.

By the way, Mr. Speaker, we also said that we would make sure that we went through regular order and would allow Members time to read the bills. That is what Republicans bring forth to the floor today as we debate these two important aspects that have gone through regular order through the Financial Services Committee.

H.R. 861, the NSP Termination Act, terminates the Neighborhood Stability Program and rescinds $1 billion in unobligated funds that was authorized in the Dodd-Frank bill last year.

Congress has appropriated approximately $7 billion in three rounds of funding for this program. Eligible users for the funds include emergency assistance to State and local governments to acquire, develop, redevelop, or demolish foreclosed homes. So this doesn't stop or assist folks in getting through foreclosures. It gives money to lenders to fix up the houses to sell, while returning not one cent of the $7 billion back to the American taxpayer.

The NSP has done little to resolve the root causes of the increase in foreclosures. In fact, the NSP continues to extend and further exacerbate the current housing downturn. This program represents a costly bailout for lenders, servicers, and real estate speculators who made risky bets on the housing market, all at the expense of the American taxpayer and our debt.

While putting billions of taxpayer dollars at risk, we should understand that this is a program, two programs that must be halted. There should be an appropriate accountability and reporting, and this program lacks both. This is just another two examples, following up what we did last week with two other examples, of the Democrats' solution of throwing money at a problem rather than something that would work and be cost effective.

Taxpayers from all over this Nation are struggling with their mortgage payments, keeping their jobs, and providing for their families. Allowing for a stable economy, a future, and reining in government spending by eliminating wasteful government spending will provide for more transparency and government accountability across economic markets. That is why we are eliminating these two programs today on the floor of the House of Representatives.

Let's be honest about this. Republicans are here to try and save jobs that are on the chopping block from what wasteful government spending has done for us the last 4 years of Democrat control. Today, Republicans are on the floor to stop wasteful Washington government spending, which says directly to the taxpayers we don't want 40 cents out of every dollar that we spend to be put on a credit card, a future debt that our children and our future will be put at risk by mortgaging our future. Republicans are not going to allow that. That is why we're on the floor of the House of Representatives. That is why we will encourage every Member of this body, Republican or Democrat, to make tough decisions today about not just today, but about our future.

The second bill under this rule today, H.R. 839, rescinds the Home Affordable Modification Program known as HAMP. This is another unnecessarily and poorly managed housing program that wastes tens of billions of dollars of taxpayer dollars. Terminating this program would prevent the use of $29 billion of TARP funds, $29 billion of TARP funds we do not think should be spent.

HAMP was established in February of 2009 with the goal of assisting with loan modifications for up to 4 million homeowners. Over the life of this program, only 521,306 loans have been permanently modified, and the redefault rate for these loans is very high.

□ 1240

So what we started with is trying to help 4 million people. Thus far, we have only helped 521,000, but it comes at a high cost to the taxpayer. Only $840 million of the $29 billion earmarked for this purpose has been used—only $800 million of the $29 billion.

We need the money back, Mr. Speaker. We need the money back because this is another case in which the program actually made matters worse for many of the homeowners who were seeking to participate. The government is pushing a program which harms these homeowners. It creates a perverse incentive for borrowers to deliberately and willfully stop making their mortgage payments in the hopes that they can get government loans to reduce their payments.

This program that the government has actually encourages people to quit making payments, which still add up, including the interest on what they owe. It harms their credit ratings and adds, what I think, is a further unfair circumstance in which the government is pushing ''we're here to help you'' when, in fact, it doesn't know the rules of the game or whether a homeowner will even be able to qualify, making the homeowner wait months to then find out, ''Whoops. Sorry. You didn't qualify. Now you need to continue what you're doing.''

A false hope, Mr. Speaker.

The Washington Times, which is a great newspaper here in Washington, published an article on this program on March 1 of this year. It stated that in, perhaps, hundreds of thousands of cases, homeowners are far worse off after HAMP than they were before being talked into and getting involved with the program. Borrowers are typically not told all the potential consequences of falling behind on their mortgages. They're simply told that there's a government plan out there to help you when, in fact, they do fall behind on their mortgages.

Services have repeatedly lost documentation and have provided false information to home borrowers who were in need of assistance and good discussion about how to pay their bills—instead, trying to talk them into participating in a government program and, in some instances, even pushing individuals into default, individuals who could have continued making their payments.

In a report from the Inspector General of TARP to Secretary of the Treasury Geithner on March 25, 2010—that is 1 year ago—he notes: ''Several aspects of the HAMP design make it particularly vulnerable to redefaults.''

It is time to pull the plug. That is why Republicans are on the floor today to say straight up: We need to look at what is not working. We need to look at the $29 billion that has been spent on this program, and we need to be honest with ourselves, as has been noted in newspapers across the country, as to what the Democrats have done. What this administration and this House have done has been adversarial in helping people who needed assistance. Today, we can save the taxpayers $28 billion that has not been spent on this program.

Continued government intervention and the questionable use of taxpayer dollars only prolong our current economic crisis and ensure that the housing market will simply continue to struggle. The market needs to find its own footing free of government intervention and manipulation by this government so that we can get on with a full recovery. The deficit is expected to reach a record under President Obama: using his numbers, $1.65 trillion this year while our national debt is well over $14 trillion. The U.S. and its citizens cannot afford to spend billions of taxpayer dollars that will not be repaid, and it ends up, in many instances,

harming the people it was intended to help.

Job creation is the most effective foreclosure prevention tool. Job losses rather than unsustainable mortgage terms are now the driving force behind foreclosures and mortgage defaults. Eliminating these programs will not only save taxpayer dollars; it will encourage more responsible government spending by the Federal Government.

So, Mr. Speaker, as no surprise to you, I encourage a ''yes'' vote on the rule and a ''yes'' vote on the underlying legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Here we are again. At a time when Americans are calling for more jobs to improve the economy, my Republican colleagues want to pass legislation that won't create a single job and that will hurt the middle class by further destabilizing our housing markets.

Mr. Speaker, this week, we take up two more bills to continue weakening our housing markets and abandoning families who are working hard, struggling to stay in their homes, both of which show that my friends on the other side of the aisle continue to put partisan politics ahead of creating jobs and growing the economy.

Yesterday, in the Rules Committee, when we had several Members there from both sides who were testifying, the question was asked: Are we in a housing crisis? Everybody there agreed—and I think most of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle and on my side of the aisle agreed as well—that we are in a housing crisis. So the answer is: What is and what should be the response?

Now, this response is what we have.

My colleague from Dallas said that the current program, HAMP, lacks accountability. Well, it seems like the logical answer to that would be to create accountability for the program, not to eliminate the program. We are talking about repeal without replace. We are talking about ending rather than mending. If there is truly a housing crisis, as I believe Members across both sides of the aisle agree there is, it calls for a public policy response. Rather than talking about what we shouldn't do, I think it would be more constructive to talk about what we should do.

We are leaving nothing in the wake if this proposed repeal moves forward. At a time when our economy is finally beginning to show signs of strong, sustained growth, we need to do everything we can to put people back to work and create jobs. Instead, here we have legislation after legislation that will increase burdens on already struggling middle class families. Rather than improving and building upon or even replacing programs that keep families in their homes, the Republicans have chosen to eliminate these four programs that keep families in their homes, and they have no plan to strengthen the housing market or to help the families who will, quite literally, be left on the street as a result.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 839 will eliminate one of the last lifelines available to many homeowners. According to Treasury Secretary Geithner, ending the HAMP program would cause a huge amount of damage to a very fragile housing market and would leave hundreds and hundreds of thousands, if not millions of Americans, without the chance to take advantage of mortgage modifications that would allow them to stay in homes that they can afford.

Now, we could go into how we got into this mess in the first place, and we all know, Mr. Speaker, that there is plenty of blame to go around. Yes, people who got in over their heads with mortgages they couldn't afford deserve some of the blame. So do the brokers who shouldn't have sold them on those mortgages. So do the banks that underwrote those mortgages. So does Wall Street for packaging those mortgages and creating derivative products—and yes, so does the government for being asleep at the regulatory switch. There is plenty of blame to go around.

When the bankers needed help, they came to the government, and the government helped them. When the regulators needed help, they came to the government, and we passed financial regulatory reform last year. Well, the people who are most affected, the people who literally risk being tossed out on the street, rely on these programs to help them. How in good conscience can this Congress even consider bailing out Wall Street and bankers and not help mainstream America stay in their homes?

Yes, there is plenty of blame to go around. Believe me, many of these people facing this situation, who are barely able to make their mortgages, are not being rewarded for their bad decisions. They would much rather spend half as much on homes and not be under water, suffering as they are today. Yet the least we can do as a country to help them is to acknowledge that, yes, personal responsibility and blame don't just fall on their shoulders.

My Republican colleagues will argue that this is a failed government program and that this program hasn't helped the 3 million to 4 million homeowners it was originally projected to help. What they fail to mention is that HAMP, A, has helped to stabilize the housing market and that, B, it has helped over half a million families. Yes, that's not the 3 million or 4 million, and yes, our side of the aisle would be very open to suggestions about improving this program, whether it's the accountability of this program, the scale of this program, how it's delivered, or whether it's replacing it with another program to help those who are barely able to make their mortgage payments.

□ 1250

But what we are talking about today is to eliminate the tool that has kept one-half million American families in their homes, Mr. Speaker.

There is no doubt that many folks on the other side of the aisle are also calling this program a waste of taxpayer money. According to the CBO, the average cost per assisted homeowner in HAMP is $13,000. Now, that is a small price and actually a sound investment. It is far smaller than the $60,000 that it has been estimated to cost Freddie, Fannie, and large banks to foreclose on a home. So $13,000 to prevent the banks from foreclosing on a home, keeping that family in a home, allowing them to go to work and make their payments and pay back what is due; or, $60,000 to foreclose on that home and leave that family on the streets. The money for this program is well spent.

If an individual shows they can't stay current on their programs, they are removed from HAMP at no cost to taxpayers. In fact, of the homeowners that have had their trial modifications cancelled through the end of 2010, only 5.1 percent have been foreclosed on, and only 14.9 percent are at all in the foreclosure process.

Mr. Speaker, the program keeps families in their homes. Mortgages that have been modified under HAMP have a sustainability rate of 85 percent. Yes, we can do better. Yes, we would love to bring this program or others to keep 3 million to 4 million families in their home and stabilize housing prices. But what the bill before us does is repeal one of the only tools we have to help keep American families in their homes.

I understand the program hasn't reached the initial projections that the Obama administration put forward. But there is no question, talking to some of the families that this program has benefited, that it does work for them. With our help, the Treasury can continue to take steps to improve the effectiveness of this program and increase compliance from banks and borrowers.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 861 would rightly be titled the ''Illegal Trade Commercial Real Estate Act.'' The majority seeks to undermine the efforts of our Nation's mayors, city councils, and real estate developers and ensure that areas which have suffered due to economic downturn remain safely in control of those who do damage to communities. This is a critical program to help reform our communities.

The Neighborhood Stabilization Program, which I remind my colleagues was established and signed into law by President Bush, was designed to turn a crisis into an opportunity. In 2008, almost $4 billion was appropriated and helped 307 State and local agencies acquire, rehabilitate, and sell abandoned and foreclosed properties, exactly what is most needed now not only to revitalize our blighted areas but to help prevent the housing crisis and commercial real estate crisis from getting

worse. I remind my colleagues that every dime of this program that is not spent by the sunset of this program will already, under statute, be returned to the Treasury.

By creating a mechanism for communities to acquire, rehabilitate, and sell back to the private market abandoned and blighted properties, we give local governments a very powerful tool for economic growth and fighting crime and keeping our communities safe.

In the midst of our ongoing liquidity crisis, where many developers are having a tough time finding financing for many of their prime projects, it is a matter of public safety and critical economic importance that we continue this vehicle by which blighted properties are returned to being productive economic engines, particularly in our Nation's most troubled neighborhoods.

I also want to point out that this program isn't limited to commercial property. In my district in Adams County, Colorado, which like other areas of the country was devastated by the wave of foreclosures, we have used this program to revitalize residential neighborhoods. The Neighborhood Stabilization Program allows local governments to build communities with home rehabilitation, down payment and closing cost assistance for low- and middle-income families. By using these Federal dollars to leverage local efforts, many struggling families have been able to find and keep a home, and a modest Federal investment has been magnified severalfold by private investment, city investment, and county investment.

Mr. Speaker, I think most people in this country agree, yes, there is a housing crisis and, yes, there is plenty of blame to go around and, yes, we need a public policy response. These programs aren't perfect. We hope to work in a bipartisan way with our colleagues across the aisle on improving these programs, coming up with new market-oriented programs to help end the crisis in real estate. But the answer is not to simply repeal one of the only instruments that we have to keep families in their homes with only the vaguest of assurances that someday, somehow Congress might think up a better plan.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's comments about our being here today on the floor in a bipartisan way with a bill that went through regular order with an opportunity for any Member that would choose that has any ideas that are germane to the issue and that fall within the rules to be included. And you are going to see where there are a bunch of amendments today.

Mr. Speaker, the conversation that the gentleman and I were having should further extend, and that is the common sense that is related to why we are on the floor today, the discussion about whether we should make it better or simply repeal it. And I would quote from the IG of the TARP fund in his report to Secretary Geithner:

''Although in the final analysis it is up to the policymakers in the administration and the Congress to determine whether it is worth spending tens of billions of taxpayer dollars on a program that is assumed at its outset to fail ultimately for 40 percent of the participants, several aspects of HAMP's design make it particularly vulnerable to redefaults.''

I think the IG has said it best. When any objective person looked at what the Democrat Congress passed, they would have to question whether it was worth spending tens of billions of dollars on a program at the outset we should have known would fail for 40 percent of the participants. I think that is good reason to say, common sense should say, let's stop the plan, not continue it.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield 4 minutes to the chairwoman of the Financial Services Committee, the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT).

Mrs. BIGGERT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I do rise in support of House Resolution 170, the rule for consideration of H.R. 861, the Neighborhood Stabilization Program, NSP, Termination Act, and H.R. 839, the Home Affordable Program (HAMP) Termination Act. H.R. 861 would end NSP and rescind 1 billion taxpayer dollars that would otherwise be spent to continue this troubled program.

In total, Congress has already spent $7 billion for NSP. And instead of stabilizing neighborhoods or helping people whose mortgages are underwater, the program allows lenders and servicers to offload their bad investments onto taxpayers and delay market recovery. Even more disturbing is that critics warn that NSP creates incentives for banks and other lenders to foreclose on troubled borrowers, worsening the crisis and kicking families out of their homes.

This program is not about helping homeowners. They have already lost their house to foreclosure. They are not involved in this. This is help for lenders and bankers to take the money and build more homes through the counties, through the States, through not-for-profits, and then to sell these homes and reap the benefits of the money. There is no place in this bill to tell us where that money goes. It probably is in a slush fund.

The GAO, the inspector general for HUD, and other auditors have noted the program is plagued with problems, including lax reporting requirements and poor accountability. There is little evidence to suggest that the funds spent through NSP are producing cost-effective results.

Finally, the program lacks any requirement that remaining NSP funds are returned to taxpayers when a sponsored property is sold. Instead, the money is treated like a fund, somewhere, never to be returned.

The other bill approved by our committee is H.R. 839. This bill would terminate HAMP, which has become the poster child for failed foreclosure mitigation programs. According to the CBO, this bill would save $1.4 billion over 10 years.

Announced by the Obama administration in February of 2009, the HAMP program to date has spent $840 million out of the $30 billion in TARP funds that were set aside for the program. For this extraordinary investment, the administration predicted that up to 4 million homeowners would receive help. Instead, only 580,000 homeowners have received mortgage modifications.

Sadly, a failure to meet expectations is the least of the program's troubles. Of those who were promised help, 740,000 homeowners have had their modifications cancelled. In many cases, these homeowners were strung along on a false hope, only to end up in worse financial straits than if they had never heard of HAMP.

□ 1300

Mr. Speaker, I would like to share a statement from a March 2 subcommittee hearing during which Neil Barofsky, the Special Inspector General for the TARP program, or SIGTARP, exposed the most hazardous failings of the program. He said that there had been countless published reports on HAMP participants who wound up worse off, having engaged in a false attempt. Failed modifications often leave borrowers with more principal outstanding on their loans.

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

Mr. SESSIONS. I would like to yield the gentlewoman an additional minute.

Mrs. BIGGERT. Numerous oversight bodies, including the GAO, have cited the Treasury for failing to respond to recommendations to increase the transparency, accountability, and consistency of the program. Americans for Tax Reform called the program ''a costly failure.''

Out-of-control spending has left us with a $14.1 trillion national debt that is damaging our recovery and harming job growth. Economists agree that reducing government spending will create a more favorable environment for private sector jobs; and that is what Americans need, a job and a paycheck, not more failed experiments and taxpayer-funded housing.

I urge my colleagues to support this rule.

Mr. POLIS. It is my honor to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS).

Ms. EDWARDS. I thank the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today really troubled because I am opposed to terminating the HAMP program and the Neighborhood Stabilization Program. But I am troubled because these programs have actually been very troubled. They are not perfect. They haven't helped every homeowner that we want, but we shouldn't be in a position of just destroying the programs.

The Neighborhood Stabilization Program in particular was established to help communities acquire, rehabilitate, and resell abandoned and foreclosed properties as a result of the growing foreclosure crisis. There are so many economists across this country who tell us every single day that until we get the housing market straight, we will not get this economy straight. So I believe in theory in these programs.

Declining home values in my community have led to lower tax revenues for our local jurisdictions that are already suffering from the impacts of the economic downturn. The statewide foreclosure crisis has hit particularly hard in my district and the counties that I represent, in Prince George's and Montgomery Counties, in Maryland. They have the first and third highest number of foreclosures in our State and account for 40 percent of the foreclosures statewide.

Through the Neighborhood Stabilization Program, Montgomery County received $2 million and Prince George's County nearly $12 million in funding. This has helped in these communities. I would urge the majority to look at the benefits, and let's try to fix the programs.

At the beginning of this crisis, sure, there were bad loans. There were bad actors all over the place. But we also know that people have lost their jobs and that has contributed to foreclosures, and these families should not be punished because we can't seem to get it straight. Neighborhood stabilization does stabilize communities. It doesn't do any good to have homes that are empty and in decline and neighborhoods that will never bring the market back.

So while I am concerned about some of the programs and would like to work to try to fix these, it is not right for us to simply throw them out and minimize the impact of helping 521,000 families to stay in their homes.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Cherryville, North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY), the author of one of the pieces of underlying legislation.

Mr. MCHENRY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the bill that I am sponsoring is the HAMP Termination Act, and it is a bill that will protect at-risk homeowners across the country from a government program that has proven to be an abysmal failure.

The Home Affordable Modification Program, or HAMP, was originally supposed to help as many as 3 million to 4 million struggling homeowners avoid foreclosure by modifying loans to a level that is affordable to borrowers now and sustainable over the long term. That was the intention. However, nearly 800,000 of the 1.4 million homeowners who enrolled in this program have subsequently been rejected or terminated.

In his most recent testimony to Congress, the Special Inspector General for TARP, Neil Barofsky, stated: ''It is just not working. The Home Affordable Modification Program has to date been a failure.'' ''A failure,'' in the words of the independent individual to oversee this program. A failure.

Now, there is no doubt that people of good will created this program. There is no doubt about that. The intention was to help those that are facing foreclosure. That was the intention.

Unfortunately, the design of this program has led to more people being harmed than actually helped. Understand that. We have a government program that harms more people than it was designed to help because it strings them along with a so-called verbally modified change to their payments, and so it drains their savings. At the end of the day, the majority of the people enrolled in this program are kicked out, and they are left not only with their savings depleted, which is bad enough that a government program strings people along for that, but it also ruins their credit rating, because this government program only verbally modifies their loan terms.

In the end, you have folks that have depleted their savings, ruined their credit, and lost their house. And this is a Federal Government program paid for by the American people's tax dollars. It is an abject failure. Worse than that, it is destroying people's lives.

I would ask my colleagues to vote for this rule. It allows for a number of amendments, some of which are wise, others that I think are very flawed from my colleagues across the aisle.

But this HAMP program, we have to come to a consensus on it. All the folks that oversee this, nonpartisan, bipartisan, have all looked at this and described it as a failure.

So if we can't eliminate this government program, then I ask my colleagues, What government programs can we eliminate? Vote for the rule; and, please, I ask my colleagues to vote for the HAMP Termination Act as well.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CLARKE).

Mr. CLARKE of Michigan. You are right, it is all about debt. Debt. Our homeowners, they are very concerned about debt. It may not be the Federal debt that their grandchildren may have to pay decades from now, but it is definitely that mortgage payment that is due next month. That is the debt that our homeowners cannot afford to pay.

So here is what I am asking this Congress to do: hold off on cutting back on these foreclosure initiatives before we directly help our homeowners. And we can help them in a way that won't cost much more money.

As a matter of fact, let's give homeowners something that they typically don't have when they are facing foreclosure, and that is time. Time. Time to find a home buyer to pay off their mortgage; time to get more income to pay off their bills; and, most importantly, the time and the leverage to voluntarily negotiate with a mortgage servicer that typically will keep losing their loan modification papers until the homeowner runs out of time. Time.

I am asking this Congress to first do this: freeze all foreclosures to those homeowners who deserve the help and who can afford to stay in their homes and maintain their homes. That is the best way to stop our property values from dropping, from providing the revenue that our police officers and firefighters and emergency medical providers definitely need; and, finally, that is the best way to help save family homes, by providing time to our homeowners.

□ 1310

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO).

Ms. HIRONO. I thank the gentleman from Colorado for the time.

I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 861, the Neighborhood Stabilization Program Termination Act, NSP.

We keep hearing from the other side about wasteful government spending. Nothing represents wasteful government spending more than the continuing billions and billions of dollars of taxpayer money that we give to Big Oil, which is making record profits. This bill continues the Republican assault on the middle class and the working people.

For the sake of our communities, we cannot afford to terminate NSP. By redeveloping foreclosed and abandoned properties, this program is stabilizing neighborhoods nationwide. This not only increases property values but also reduces the number of foreclosures. NSP provides a lifeline to struggling families who are trying to secure affordable housing or simply stay in their homes.

Like the rest of the country, Hawaii has a foreclosure crisis. We rank 10th in the Nation in the rate of foreclosures. The $19.6 million in NSP funding that Hawaii received is helping our communities in the greatest need throughout my State. The City and County of Honolulu will use these funds to redevelop vacant properties and build two affordable rental housing projects in Ewa and Waianae. In Hawaii County, an affordable rental housing project will be built on vacant property in Kailua-Kona. In the counties of Maui and Kauai, NSP funds will be used to buy and rehabilitate abandoned or foreclosed homes and residential properties throughout both counties.

So you can see that this is money that is not represented as wasteful spending. Our communities need our help. Vote against this bill.

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

Mr. POLIS. I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

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

Mr. ANDREWS. I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, as we began this week, there were 15 million unemployed Americans looking for this Congress to work together to try to get something done for entrepreneurs and small businesses to create jobs. What has the Congress done? Yesterday, the majority managed, only with the help of a few dozen Democrats, to keep the government running for the next 3 weeks because they couldn't agree among themselves as to what to do with the budget. Today, they're taking up this bill that, rather than fixing a flawed program, they rip it up from the roots and throw it out. Tomorrow, they're going to pull the plug on National Public Radio.

Now, I would suggest if you're like some of those 15 million Americans who are spending the day at the public library in front of Monster.com or looking at the want ads in the newspapers, wearing out your shoe leather to figure out where your next job is going to come from, this has not been a great week. Eleven weeks the majority has been in control—no jobs bill, no jobs plan, no jobs idea. Not one word, not one bill, not one minute.

The priorities of this majority are wrong.

Republicans and Democrats should come together, work together to create an environment where small businesses and entrepreneurs can create jobs for the American people. Eleven weeks—no jobs, no sense of priorities. That's the record of this majority.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I was just reminded by the gentleman, Mr. MICA, the favorite son of Florida, who's the chairman of our Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, that the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS) had referred that we've done nothing about jobs. But the gentleman, Mr. MICA, as chairman of the committee reminded me that this House passed just 2 weeks ago a transportation bill that had been lagging, waiting since 2009, that will add a substantial number of jobs. And that was a good jobs bill.

So I wouldn't expect to get credit for anything, necessarily, on the floor, but at least we need to be honest about this. The Republicans did pass a bill that was adding jobs as opposed to this massive undertaking that we are trying to save jobs that are at risk as a result of the outlandish spending and wasteful government spending taking place here.

Secondly, the gentleman said, Why are Republicans now trying to get rid of this? Why didn't we do something to fix the program? But I would remind the American people that this is a report that went to the Secretary of the Treasury over a year ago. And I would ask the question: Why did the Democrats, why did this administration continue a failed program? Why did they continue it? That's because they were happy with it. In fact, as we've already read, a 40 percent failure rate and thousands of more people harmed. That's why Republicans are trying to fix this—because we have tried to work.

Today, we're going to pass this on the floor. It's a great bill. And we're going to ask every single person to be able to vote for this opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

Mr. ANDREWS. I thank my friend.

I want to agree with my friend from Texas that investing in transportation construction creates jobs. We agree with him. And I would ask the gentleman if he would support our Build America bill that offsets the deficit by cutting job outsources and creates more transportation construction jobs. Would he agree to put that on the floor?

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SESSIONS. As soon as it's on the floor, I'll consider that.

Mr. ANDREWS. Reclaiming my time, we'll give the gentleman a chance on the previous question motion, perhaps tomorrow.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

I would point out that the one bill that the gentleman from Texas has pointed to as a jobs bill is one bill that contained many, many earmarks from previous sessions. Also included is continuing funding for a bridge to nowhere in Alaska. So if this is the best jobs bill that a Republican Congress can bring forward, I think the American people deserve better.

It is my honor to yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Alabama (Ms. SEWELL).

Ms. SEWELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 861, which would terminate all funding for the Neighborhood Stabilization Program. The program has really helped families and communities in Alabama's Seventh Congressional District tremendously.

Our Nation is recovering from one of the worst recessions experienced in our lifetime, and in my district, the economic downturn happened long before the rest of the Nation began to experience it. The foreclosure rate in my district has reached 8 percent. These foreclosures have devastated homeowners. The foreclosures have had a debilitating effect on the neighborhoods, leading to blight, decay, and reduced property values.

The NSP program provides States and hard-hit cities with program funding to help them recover from the effects of foreclosures, abandoned properties, and declining property values. The City of Birmingham, the City of Bessemer, Jefferson County, and the State of Alabama have received funding from this program. In my district, the NSP program has revitalized 259 homes, relocated 69 families, and has saved at least nine distressed neighborhoods.

In speaking recently with the mayor of the City of Birmingham, Mayor Bell, about the effectiveness of this program, he informed me that the program has benefited greatly distressed neighborhoods in Birmingham. I've also heard from families whose neighborhoods have been improved because of this funding.

My colleagues across the aisle want to terminate NSP, but I respectfully disagree. There's still much work to be done for our families and our communities. Without a doubt, we must reduce our national budget and Congress must work together to make the tough cuts. However, such cuts cannot be made on the backs of our communities, families, and seniors.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker and my friends on both sides of the aisle, we could very easily come up with money to save this program if we would just put a windfall profits tax on the oil companies.

I'm here today to point out the critical importance of the Neighborhood Stabilization Program and to urge my fellow Members to vote against cancelling it.

Over the past decade, the people of my State in Ohio, and my district in particular, have weathered a terrible storm of foreclosures, devastating entire communities. While some neighborhoods in my district have been hollowed out by the effects of this storm, the Neighborhood Stabilization Program funds have made neighborhoods and communities safer. Those communities faced the constant risk of crime and vandals taking advantage of empty structures, and Neighborhood Stabilization funds have been used to demolish hundreds of abandoned homes in the neighborhood, to help protect existing home values, and prevented neighborhoods from falling apart.

But the Neighborhood Stabilization Program has not just financed demolition of abandoned structures. In Cuyahoga County alone, this program funded the creation of 237 units of affordable rental housing and 25 single-family home renovations and neighborhood green space improvements.

□ 1320

It has also been used to leverage non-Federal money to fund the innovative Land Bank, a public entity that buys vacant and abandoned land and puts ownership of that land back in the hands of the public so that it can be used again, often in conjunction with private development, to renew and revitalize communities. Anyone who has ever spent any time in blighted communities knows that they cry out for

innovative solutions like the Land Bank.

When NSP was first being developed, I held hearings to find out how specifically HUD planned to allocate the funds. I convinced them of the wisdom of using U.S. Postal Service and census tract data on residential home vacancies. Because of that, they adopted a need-based formula for allocating the money to neighborhoods and communities that needed it most.

Vote against this bill.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. It is my honor to yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, we are facing a CR of $61 billion in cuts causing the loss of 800,000 jobs. What is more precious to America than the opportunity to own a home?

The Neighborhood Stabilization Program has gone into inner city and urban areas and recaptured neighborhoods, giving them a boost of energy that they needed. There is always the opportunity for reform, Mr. Speaker, but I would simply raise the question: Let's mend it, don't end it. Let's not leave cities abandoned with broken down, ramshackle homes that would in fact create more blight, more gang opportunities, more dangerous conditions.

And, yes, HAMP needs reform. But what does it mean to eliminate a program? Of course the HAMP has a grandfather provision. But all America wants is to get these programs to work. Neighborhood stabilization works. HAMP can work. Now you're letting banks off the hook, so that every day a homeowner calls, they can hear the sound ''foreclosed.'' At least the intervention allowed those hardworking Americans to keep their home and to provide for their family and to keep jobs will be lost if these bills are passed. Vote no.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

Mr. CICILLINE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise in strong opposition to the bill to end the Neighborhood Stabilization Program. It is time for Americans to seriously question the Republican leadership's dedication to job creation. After 11 weeks in Congress, they've offered no jobs plan, no jobs bill.

What's worse, by their own expert witness's testimony, the Neighborhood Stabilization Program, or NSP, supports 93,000 jobs nationally. In light of this estimate, I submitted an amendment to the NSP Termination Act that would require the Congressional Budget Office to study and report to Congress the impact of this legislation on job creation or job loss. However, my friends on the other side of the aisle prevented consideration of my amendment on the floor of the House.

Last week, the Republicans waged an attack on American homeowners by voting to eliminate foreclosure mitigation programs that help underwater homeowners refinance their mortgage as well as assist temporarily unemployed Americans to remain current on their mortgage; all of this in the midst of one of the worst housing crises in the history of America. And now the Republicans are putting our most vulnerable communities at even greater risk. Terminating the Neighborhood Stabilization Program will damage our neighborhoods, devastate home values, and will slow our economic recovery.

Now is the time to protect our most vulnerable neighborhoods, families who are struggling, and now is the time to invest in the future of our communities and help to restore the American dream of homeownership, recognizing that stabilization of our housing market is key to our economic recovery.

I urge my colleagues to vote against the termination of this program. I've seen it work in Rhode Island. It's worked well. It's making a difference.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, once again, my friends and colleagues are talking about a no jobs bill, nothing about jobs. But at least there's a purist on the floor and, that is, there was one Democrat in the House who voted against the Republican jobs bill, transportation bill. That was the gentleman, Mr. POLIS. So I would think that he would have great standing on saying we've never had a bill that added jobs, but everybody else I would have to question that because they voted for the bill, because, in fact, it's a good jobs bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

With regard to the jobs bill, I acknowledge that that was the bill that my colleague from Texas cited as the one jobs bill the Republicans have brought before us. This was a bill that had dozens and dozens of earmarks, which is why, in standing with President Obama, I opposed that bill, including an indefensible earmark on which we proposed an amendment on the floor, which was voted down, I might add, without a single Republican vote, to eliminate funding for what I thought there was broad consensus we should eliminate funding for; namely, a $300 million bridge in Alaska. There was a $70 million bridge to an island with 50 people, and an additional project that is another bridge.

This is an example of earmarks at their worst, of pork barrel politics at their worst. I'm beginning to think if the Republicans do come up with a job bill, we need to ask at what price jobs? Is it going to be so filled up with Republican pork that we have to either take it or leave it? That's a choice the American people don't want to face.

Mr. Speaker, I will be the first to admit that we can improve HAMP. We can improve the Neighborhood Stabilization Program. There's no doubt about that. I would advance that we should be doing exactly that. My colleague from Michigan (Mr. CLARKE) had some excellent ideas about improving these programs. I am a cosponsor of a bill to provide for a capital gains tax exemption for investment in community banks to help them shore up their balance sheets. Why not look at, for instance, allowing investment properties to have the same mortgage deductibility as primary residences? There's a number of great ideas that I'm sure Members on both sides of the aisle could discuss and agree upon to address our housing crisis. But what the answer isn't is to repeal one of the only tools we have and to replace it with silence.

It is my honor to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN).

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I thank the gentleman.

I just want to use an example here from a district in northeast Ohio, an old industrial district. We've had chronic foreclosures for 30 years. The census just came out. The city of Youngstown went from 180,000 people down to about 65,000 people. The tax base has been eroded. And in the last few years, Youngstown has been cited as one of the top 10 best cities to start a business by Entrepreneur magazine. Site Selection magazine says it's one of the top 10 places to start or grow a business.

In part, the renaissance of Youngstown is because of Federal investments like this that help us downsize and shrink our community. And I find it ironic that our friends who are trying to reduce government spending, we're trying to get rid of dilapidated housing where it increases crime, prostitution, drug use. This all puts more pressure on the safety services within a town like Youngstown.

This bill to repeal this money is actually going to cost cities and rural areas more money because you're not allowing us to reinvest into these places, downsize them, shrink them, make them more manageable and, over time, reduce the tax burden on the local taxpayer. These are critical investments that are needed in the United States of America. This should have been $5 billion, not just $1 billion.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, if it worked that way, we'd be for it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 seconds to the gentleman to respond.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I would invite the gentleman to Youngstown, Ohio. He can see it for himself.

Mr. POLIS. It is my honor to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Colorado who serves on the Financial Services Committee, Mr. PERLMUTTER.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. I thank my friend from Colorado.

I would invite my friend from Texas to come to Aurora, Colorado, where we've actually, with the Neighborhood

Stabilization Program, had tremendous successes. This country was on its back financially 2 years ago, 2½ years ago. We're just now getting back on our feet, and my friends from the Republican side of the aisle want to just pull the rug right back out. You've got to get strong before you can do away with some of these programs.

So let's talk about Aurora, Colorado. They got $4.7 million to go and buy homes that were vacant because there had been foreclosures which were causing blight and lots of property devaluation. They went in, fixed the homes, and sold them to good families. The neighborhood starts growing again. Aurora has taken that $4.7 million and turned it into $7.8 million by the sales of these properties, so that the neighborhoods get strengthened, families are helped, and we stop this cycle of foreclosure in tough neighborhoods.

□ 1330

My friends on the Republican side of the aisle are blaming all sorts of things for the debt that have nothing to do with it and are taking away things that are really helping middle America. I'd urge them to rethink this whole bill, and I know my friend from Colorado has seen these same things, the benefits of these programs.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I will assure the gentleman I will be in Aurora, Colorado, and I'll be pleased to be there this year and probably next year, also.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to get some items on the schedule for the gentleman from Dallas during his visit to Colorado as well.

I'm the last speaker for my side, and I would like to inquire if the gentleman has any further requests for time.

Mr. SESSIONS. I appreciate the gentleman's asking. I have no further requests for time, and I appreciate the collegiality the gentleman has extended me.

Mr. POLIS. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to share with you a few stories from constituents in my district that the HAMP program has helped. My office has helped a number of constituents with this program, and I'm not alone in doing that.

Last year, I had a local artist who ran her own small business contact my office asking for help with her mortgage. Her income had declined significantly and unexpectedly due to the tough economy. She tried to find a second job but it wasn't enough. With the help of a HAMP loan modification, she's still in her home today.

We also helped a truckdriver who had become ill and needed dialysis. Although he still receives Social Security, he couldn't afford his mortgage payments without his old salary. He had nowhere else to turn, but with the HAMP modification, he was able to lower his interest rate by 2 percent and convert his loan from an adjustable rate to a 30-year fixed and stay in his home.

Mr. Speaker, the stories don't end there. HAMP has proven that it can save families on the brink of foreclosure and keep them there for the long haul. It's not the ideal program. It hasn't reached the 3 million families that were initially projected, but you ask any of those 500,000 families that HAMP has helped keep in their home and they will agree that this program works for them.

Mr. Speaker, we should be focusing on jobs. Last month, I'm proud to say, our economy added over 150,000 private sector jobs, and instead of working to increase that number, we've been passing legislation that threatens to reverse the progress that has been made by creating additional uncertainty within the real estate sector and leaving more families at risk of losing their homes.

Republicans promised to promote job creation and economic growth with their new majority. Instead of delivering on these promises, they've already used their majority to raise taxes on middle class Americans, to attack the middle class, and promote their own social agenda. This is not the change that the American people asked for.

It is time to get our fiscal house in order. I'd like to make it clear that this is not the way to solve our budget problems, by repealing a program that helps keep middle class families in their home. Mr. Speaker, the best way to get our deficit under control is through creating jobs, not through cutting the safety net of hardworking Americans and preventing our cities and counties from revitalizing their blighted neighborhoods.

Most distressing, however, is that through these bills the promise of job creation is broken yet again. I ask my colleagues to join me and vote ''no'' on this rule and ''no'' on the underlying legislation so we can keep our promise to help all of our communities rebuild and succeed, and work in a bipartisan fashion to get the very best ideas on the table about what our proper public policy response should be with regard to the housing crisis and the jobs crisis that this Nation faces.

I ask for a ''no'' vote on the rule and the underlying bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Colorado for not only engaging in a spirited debate here on floor but also for his collegiality in that endeavor.

Mr. Speaker, this Nation is being overrun still by too high a taxation, borrowing, and spending, and just last month, we hit a record deficit, $223 billion in 1 month. That is simply unacceptable. With the debt looming at over $14 trillion and unemployment hovering still around 9 percent, Americans want solutions, not handouts. And that is why we are here on the floor today, to protect the taxpayer and the integrity, I think, of the government, rather than creating more problems, at least trying to alleviate some of those and give the taxpayer back some money. The American people asked Congress to rein in spending and for efficiency, and that is what Republicans are here to do today.

We did this in an open process where every single Member of this body had a chance through regular order to prepare themselves and to come to the floor today. Since Republicans have gained the majority in January we have cut $1.2 trillion worth of spending, first of all, by repealing ObamaCare; secondly, by cutting $61 billion in H.R. 1, $8 billion last week in additional unnecessary government housing programs, and another $30 billion with this rule today. We're getting our job done.

By gaining control of government spending and eliminating wasteful government handouts, the private sector can, again, gain confidence in our economy and the direction of the future of this country to begin investing in jobs and our economic future. After all, we finally decided last year that what we would do is extend tax cuts which will help save jobs and grow our economy.

I applaud my colleagues for introducing the bills we are discussing here today. In just a few minutes, you will see the chairman of the Financial Services Committee or his designee lead that discussion through lots of amendments, lots of ideas by Members.

I want to thank the young chairman of the Rules Committee, the gentleman from California, DAVID DREIER, for providing us such a great, open, and transparent process. I encourage a ''yes'' vote on the rule and perhaps, more importantly, on the resolution before us today.

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

The previous question was ordered.

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.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 241, nays 180, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 181]

YEAS—241

Adams	Bilbray	Calvert
Aderholt	Bilirakis	Camp
Akin	Bishop (UT)	Campbell
Alexander	Black	Canseco
Altmire	Blackburn	Cantor
Amash	Bonner	Capito
Austria	Bono Mack	Carter
Bachmann	Boustany	Cassidy
Bachus	Brady (TX)	Chabot
Barletta	Brooks	Chaffetz
Bartlett	Broun (GA)	Coble
Barton (TX)	Buchanan	Coffman (CO)
Bass (NH)	Bucshon	Cole
Benishek	Buerkle	Conaway
Berg	Burgess	Cravaack
Biggert	Burton (IN)	Crawford

Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Inslee
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NAYS—180

Ackerman
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kissell
Kucinich
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—11

Cardoza
Carnahan
Costa
Crowley
Giffords
Labrador
Langevin
Lee (CA)
McHenry
Nadler
Waters

□ 1359

Messrs. FARR and DAVID SCOTT of Georgia changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mr. ALTMIRE changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

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.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 16, 2011.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
The Speaker, U.S. Capitol, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on March 16, 2011 at 11:08 a.m.:

That the Senate agreed to S.J. Res. 7.
That the Senate agreed to S.J. Res. 8.
That the Senate agreed to S.J. Res. 9.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

□ 1400

COMMUNICATION FROM FORMER CONSTITUENT SERVICES REPRESENTATIVE, THE HONORABLE JOHN P. SARBANES, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from Margaret Stephenson, former Constituent Services Representative, the Honorable JOHN P. SARBANES, Member of Congress:

MARCH 9, 2011.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives that I have been served with a subpoena, issued by the District Court of Maryland for Baltimore County, to appear as a witness in the criminal trial of a third party who contacted Congressman JOHN P. SARBANES' District office.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the precedents and privileges of the House.

Sincerely,

MARGARET STEPHENSON,
Former Constituent Services Representative, Office of U.S. Representative John P. Sarbanes.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 861 and to insert extraneous material thereon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

NSP TERMINATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 170 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 861.

□ 1404

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 861) to rescind the third round of funding for the Neighborhood Stabilization Program and to terminate the program, with Mr. BASS of New Hampshire in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Mrs. BIGGERT. I yield myself such time as I may consume.