

respond to it accordingly. I appreciate that much hard work has already been done. I know that many people are involved in this effort and many hours have been dedicated to the problem. But in the case of ongoing foreclosures nationwide and the abuses homeowners face from banks and mortgage servicers, all the hard work and effort has not been sufficient and more must be done.

Homeowners in my community and across the country are being lied to, chewed up, and abused by banks and servicers in an arbitrary and capricious system that has stripped them of their homes and their livelihoods. In my district, people who are in need of substantial help in their fights against the big banks are simply not getting it. Hard as I try with my staff, and hard as my colleagues try with their staff, we cannot do enough on our own.

Make no mistake—Republicans in Washington are not on the side of homeowners in this fight. They're using the problems with HAMP as an excuse to once again oppose the Obama administration, just as they have opposed the Obama administration on every step it has taken to rescue the economy, for purely partisan reasons. Regrettably, the Republican approach to the housing crisis is to cut and run, to starve the economy of the investments it needs to create jobs and get the economy—and the housing market—back on its feet. Their bill today does nothing to help the housing crisis and it would deprive the administration of funds that could be used to help homeowners. But their bill does one thing that I do support—it sends a message that homeowners are not getting the help they need from HAMP and that HAMP must be significantly improved or replaced in order to offer the kind of help distressed homeowners need.

So far, such improvements have not taken place. And I see no sign that they will. And left with no choice but to register one more complaint by voting to end HAMP.

I hope today's vote is understood clearly as a wake-up call to the administration that HAMP is not good enough today to earn my support and that it must be strengthened immediately or replaced by a program that does work. I hope my vote sends the message that banks and servicers are responsible for the abuse that is taking place in today's housing market and that we intend to hold them accountable for their behavior, and that we are committed to helping struggling homeowners survive and recover from this crisis.

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Chairman, since my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are ending the Home Affordable Modification Program, my amendment simply states that the Congress should encourage the banks to provide our qualifying neighbors with loan modifications. It also encourages the banks to provide our friends and families with information on foreclosure prevention and loan modification.

My Republican colleagues say that the Home Affordable Modification Program is not helping enough people. Well, it didn't help all the people. That's true. I know people who went and tried to get their loans modified, and it didn't work for them; but there have been quite a few who have been helped. I want to give you some examples just in my own area.

For example, there is this couple in Garden Grove, California. The husband became unemployed. He was a construction worker; and as we all know, construction was the first industry to fold. Well, the family fell behind on their mortgage payments despite the fact that they are extremely frugal and had been saving money for emergencies.

After some time, the husband found a job. Of course it paid less, and they are still unable to pay their full mortgage. They owed \$8,825 in missed payments with late fees; plus, they had a balance of \$482,000 on their mortgage. Thanks to the modification program, the debts were forgiven, and the balance was dropped by \$87,000 so that they have a new balance.

Even with the loss of income, they are very thankful that they can keep their home and that they have a mortgage payment that they can make. The Home Affordable Modification Program allowed this family to keep their home.

A family from Santa Ana was close to losing their home due to financial hardship as the husband's hours and income were reduced. So to make ends meet, he supplemented his primary job with a part-time job. These are not people who are asking for handouts. These are people who are trying to figure out a way to hold onto their homes and to keep stability with their children. The gentleman really wanted to keep his home, so he worked with a counseling agency to formulate a budget that was affordable to him. Thanks to the loan modification program, his payment was reduced, and the family can stay in their home. That's one more family in Santa Ana that is in their home today.

Then there was this couple who worked for a school district. The budget restraints in the State forced them to have furloughs, which took a significant toll on their income. There was a couple from Anaheim who was using their unused sick and vacation days just so they could get that check in order to make the mortgage. Thanks to the loan modification program, the couple was able to permanently modify their loan and keep their home. Their monthly mortgage payment was reduced, and it made it more affordable. Even with an income reduction, this is another couple, another family, who is still in their home.

Those are only three of the success stories we've had. I know I have worked very hard with my housing agencies and with people in putting on forums and talking to people and giving information and calling them in and getting the banks to try to modify these loans. This is a 5-year process at home that we have been working on. I don't know, maybe the rest of my colleagues didn't do this or didn't know how to do it or they weren't as successful, but we have had success. So we have families who are in their homes.

It is my hope that my Republican colleagues will reconsider this bill.

Let's work together to find solutions for people because when you keep families in their homes, the stability of the family stays intact; and when you have that in particular, if you have children, they need that stability.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, even though I am not opposed.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentlewoman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mrs. BIGGERT. We will accept the amendment.

I have had similar occurrences in my district where actually one gentleman had to pay back \$42,000 worth of late fees as well as the penalties and the difference between the loan modification. That's where I think this program has failed.

Yet I think your amendment is a sense for Congress to encourage the banks to work with our constituents and to provide loan modifications to those who are eligible. It also encourages banks to work with our constituents and to provide them with the best services. It encourages the banks to assist prospective homeowners with foreclosure prevention and counseling.

I think this is a help in the private sector and encourages the private sector to do this, so we would accept this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ).

The amendment was agreed to.

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MCHENRY) having assumed the chair, Mr. WOMACK, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration 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, had come to no resolution thereon.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 5 p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m.

□ 1830

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro