

Notwithstanding that, I feel a little bit like somebody who helped bring a child into the world, raised the child, sent them to the big city, and I am having trouble recognizing them, but, at the end of the day, Mr. Speaker, I know that that is still my child. And so I enthusiastically urge the adoption of S. 2856 by this body.

We must from time to time weed the garden. We have an obligation to make sure that every regulation does not exist in perpetuity. Markets change, people change, conditions change.

We are one of the richest, freest nations on the face of the planet, and part of the reason is because of capitalism. You cannot have capitalism without capital. One of the main responsibilities our committee has is to ensure that we have a vibrant capital market; and certainly our credit unions, our community banks that serve our smaller institutions, inner city, play a very vital role in those capital markets. They have been burdened.

For example, over the last decade, we have lost almost a third of our community banks. And when you speak to people at these financial institutions, there are a number of reasons for the mergers, for the consolidations, but many of them will tell you that the cost of the Federal regulatory burden is the number one reason why so many of them have gone out of business.

□ 1800

They play such a vital role in our rural communities.

So, Mr. Speaker, it is just incumbent upon us because excessive regulation, redundant regulation, costly regulation, not only does it harm these financial institutions, but at the end of the day, it makes the accessibility and the cost of credit more difficult. It means that average Americans, maybe they will not have that opportunity to buy that first home, to make that first down payment; maybe they will not have the opportunity to buy that second car that is necessary for a spouse to take a second job; maybe they will not have that opportunity to send a child to the college they want to send them to; maybe they will not have that opportunity to start a new small business, to create jobs and hope and opportunity.

But, Mr. Speaker, we are making great strides today, and because of that, I know that we will help these American families help realize their version of the American Dream with a little bit of reason in weeding this regulatory garden and making sure that they can have better lives.

So, again, I appreciate the opportunity that the chairman has given me and certainly his leadership will be severely missed but never forgotten.

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT).

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor tonight

just to be brief on two points: first to thank the chairman for his outstanding leadership in the Financial Services Committee over the years in general and specifically tonight with regard to your work on regulatory relief; and also to the gentleman from Texas who just spoke for all of his work to bring this to fruition as we have tonight.

The underlying bill here goes, as has been pointed out, to reduce the overall burden on financial institutions in general and make some technical corrections that need to be made. One of the points I want to touch upon is how it impacts on the Federal Debt Collectors Practices Act. In the underlying bill, there were two provisions that I had back in the 108th Congress that I am pleased have been included in the legislation here today.

The first of these provisions clarifies that a formal pleading in any civil action will not be considered communications now as defined by the FDCPA, and the second provision now clarifies the right of a collector to pursue an account during the first 30 days, so long as the debt collector's pursuits do not overshadow or otherwise confuse the consumer debtors.

By doing these two things, what we are doing is removing ambiguities in the FDCPA, and that increases compliance with the act and improves protections and overall helps consumers.

Additionally, the debt collection industry will be helped as well. It does that by improving guidance to them as an industry so that they can better conform to business practices to the letter of the law, additionally by curbing waste and time and money in the system, and finally, by avoiding litigation, all in the end good to the consumer, good to the industry, good for the American public.

I thank the gentleman from Texas and the chairman as well for getting it all done.

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, just to wrap up and say this has been a concerted effort. It has taken 5 years. While I guess all of us are frustrated in one way or another with the other body at times and this bill particularly, at the end of the day we did a good job and got what we could, and we will save some other things for a later day.

But JEB HENSARLING and all of the folks who worked on this legislation, I want to thank them for their cooperation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POE). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. OXLEY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 2856, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

HOPE VI REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2006

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5347) to reauthorize the HOPE VI program for revitalization of public housing projects, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 5347

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "HOPE VI Reauthorization Act of 2006".

SEC. 2. EXTENSION OF PROGRAM.

Section 24 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437v) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1) of subsection (m), by striking the matter that follows "section" and inserting the following: "such sums as may be necessary for fiscal year 2007."; and

(2) in subsection (o), by striking "September 30, 2006" and inserting "September 30, 2007".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. OXLEY) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on this legislation and to insert extraneous material thereon.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of H.R. 5347, the HOPE VI Reauthorization Act of 2006, introduced by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS). This important piece of legislation would simply reauthorize the HOPE VI program for one more year and would continue to provide a resource to revitalize severely distressed public housing units.

Since 1993, this program has been an important part of the transformation of public housing by encouraging public housing authorities to seek new partnerships with private entities to create mixed-finance and mixed-income affordable housing that is developed and operated very differently from traditional public housing.

HOPE VI epitomizes public-private partnerships for funding redevelopment projects. Mixed-finance development projects have allowed the government

to raise millions of dollars from the private sector for redevelopment projects using Federal funds as bait. For every governmental dollar, these partnerships can yield \$3 or \$4 additional in private investment.

Despite the obvious advantages of HOPE VI, the program has needed improvement. In 2003, in a previous reauthorization of HOPE VI, the Financial Services Committee added reforms by requiring the HUD to select grantees, among other criteria, on their capacity to bring planning and ultimately development to fruition within a more expedited time frame.

In addition, the committee was concerned that the HOPE VI program was biased toward larger urban areas. Thus, the committee required that at least 5 percent of the HOPE VI funds be awarded to smaller communities, particularly rural areas, where public housing authorities are not present, to assist in the redevelopment of town areas for affordable housing. Now known as the Main Street Project, many rural communities are able to access these vital redevelopment funds.

The HOPE VI program has been a valuable program in addressing many of this country's housing needs by revitalizing communities rather than simply building public housing. This House has repeatedly spoken on this program by continuing to fund HOPE VI in the relevant appropriations bills year after year.

I would like to thank good friend CHRIS SHAYS for his leadership on this important affordable housing program. By reauthorizing HOPE VI, this bill will continue the reforms established in 2003 to ensure that smaller communities have access to important revitalization dollars and will continue to make HOPE VI a cost-effective and efficient program for the American taxpayer.

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

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to myself such time as I may consume.

(Ms. WATERS asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks and include extraneous material.)

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5347, the HOPE VI Reauthorization Act of 2006. I am one of the original cosponsors of the legislation, and I want to take time to congratulate the distinguished chairman, Mr. OXLEY; Ranking Member FRANK; Mr. WATT; and Mr. SHAYS for sponsoring this important legislation.

The members of the Subcommittee on Housing and Community Affairs, of which I am ranking member, have worked tirelessly to overcome obstacles to extend HOPE VI. Indeed, there is a strong possibility that the HOPE VI program would have expired at the end of this fiscal year without the strong leadership displayed on this bill.

HOPE VI is a valuable program, but not a perfect program. Some of the criticisms include displacement of ten-

ants, delays in development of projects, and a built-in bias toward large urban areas. As with any major Federal program, there are lessons to be learned, and in the case of HOPE VI, many of the challenges that have been identified were addressed in prior reauthorization bills. We also must understand that these concerns must be understood within the context of the different communities that have utilized the HOPE VI program. This might explain why HUD has evaluated HOPE VI grantees on a case-by-case basis, rather than on the basis of formal program requirements.

One major issue compounding HOPE VI is the fact that in many communities the supply of available and affordable housing is not adequate to accommodate those who become displaced. Secondly, the development process related to HOPE VI is far more complicated than what was envisioned by the architects of the program, and many delays are attributed to the needs of the many stakeholders in the community, including tenants.

According to the 2003 GAO report entitled "HOPE VI Resident Issues and Changes in Neighborhoods Surrounding Grant Sites," the Tucson, Arizona, Housing Authority submitted a revitalization plan for a site to the Tucson City Council for approval only after the residents had voted to approve it. This type of deliberative democratic process adds time to the development approval process, whether it is a HOPE VI project or not.

Thirdly, some fear that there is a bias to urban areas under the HOPE VI program requirements. In my view, that is not really a fair criticism because this is merely a program outcome. I see no reason why we would not want to make sure that HUD targets nonurban areas as we move forward to determine HOPE VI works. I have said on numerous occasions that the housing needs of the urban communities are not drastically different than the housing needs of nonurban communities.

Both GAO and CRS provide important findings on the HOPE VI program.

As of June 2004, 56,221 households had been relocated by HOPE VI revitalization grantees. Of these households, 48 percent were moved to public housing, 32 percent were given section 8 vouchers, 6 percent evicted, 19 percent moved to revitalized units, and 13 percent made other housing choices.

The neighborhoods in which 1996 HOPE VI sites are located generally have experienced improvements in indicators such as education, income and housing.

And mortgage lending activity increased in HOPE VI neighborhoods compared to other neighborhoods.

These strong findings are, in part, why I support the HOPE VI reauthorization bill. The bill has strong bipartisan support, and HOPE VI would be reauthorized through 2007, although we had originally intended for the bill to be extended through 2011. Importantly,

the factors used to assess grant applications for the programs include need, capacity, quality and leveraging. So perhaps as we move forward, it is more appropriate for the detractors of the program to measure the track record of the HOPE VI program's use of these new criteria and not base the success of the program on individual project outcomes.

By some estimates, HOPE VI has leveraged between \$5 billion and \$8 billion of private investment in communities across the Nation. The demand for HOPE VI grants in communities throughout the country continues to exceed the available resources. HUD receives three applications for every HOPE VI award made.

The need to revitalize distressed public housing is precisely the reason that HOPE VI was conceived. Communities throughout this country with old, decaying and abandoned public housing stock often located on prime land needed to seek ways to improve the quality of life in their communities. HOPE VI provided one answer to addressing these conditions in its early stages; and with improvement in the way the program will be operated in the future, even greater progress will be made in meeting needs.

Absent the bipartisan support that HOPE VI enjoys today, the elimination of the program was a near certainty. By changing the criteria to evaluate grantee applications, including evaluation of the capacity of the grantees to undertake HOPE VI projects, support for the program should broaden. HOPE VI is an extremely competitive program that reflects success. Communities should be able to include this Federal resource in their revitalization planning efforts immediately and in the future.

I would urge my colleagues to support this bill.

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

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield such time as he may consume to the able gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS), the author of this legislation.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. Speaker, this is a bipartisan bill that, as amended, reauthorizes the HOPE VI program through 2007. Reauthorizing the HOPE VI for an additional year will have an important impact on the lives of low-income people and will also pay tremendous dividends in towns and cities across America.

I am grateful to have worked on this legislation with my colleagues JIM LEACH, MAXINE WATERS, ARTUR DAVIS who has worked very hard on this, MEL WATT as well, CHARLIE DENT, and appreciate the assistance and guidance they have provided.

□ 1815

I also appreciate the support of Chairman OXLEY and Ranking Member FRANK in moving this bill forward. I

have tremendous admiration for my chairman and ranking member and the work that they have done throughout a number of years. With their assistance, this legislation passed the Financial Services Committee by voice vote.

HOPE VI epitomizes public-private partnerships for funding redevelopment projects. Mixed-finance agreements have allowed the government to raise millions of dollars from the private sector for redevelopment properties using Federal funds as leverage. For every government dollar granted, these partnerships can yield an additional \$3 or \$4.

Let me give an example of an incredible HOPE VI project that has been completed in Stamford, Connecticut. A \$26 million HOPE VI grant leveraged an additional \$80 million in State, local, and private funds. The HOPE VI transformed Southfield Village, a dim, crime-ridden, and dilapidated housing project into Southwood Square, a beautiful place to live and raise your children.

It is also a mixed-income community, where low-income families and those paying market rent live side-by-side. I am talking about people who make more than \$100,000. Their children play together, and they have the opportunity to grow and learn from one another.

As a result of this Federal assistance, Southwood Square is now a safe place for children to play. Its residents receive job training on site. Others are going to work, and working parents have access to child care facilities. Instead of the BMW belonging to drug dealers, they belong to employees who work for the many businesses in the community. Just as importantly, residents are involved in their community.

I wish Members could see the transformation that has taken place there. Another HOPE VI project at Fairfield Court in Stamford is now beginning and promises to be just as successful as Southwood Square.

The lesson here is, when the Federal Government demonstrates its interest in improving the housing needs of low-income families, the community responds in a big way.

I urge all my colleagues to support this legislation and again thank Chairman OXLEY and Ranking Member FRANK for their cooperation in bringing this legislation before us, as well as the lead cosponsors on both sides of the aisle for their support. This was a team effort, and that is why passage tonight is so satisfying.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Alabama. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Let me say just one thing at the outset, Mr. Speaker. Prior to the conception of the HOPE VI program, we tended to believe that public housing was a condition that was not alterable, it was not changeable; and, similarly, we believed that it would look pretty much

as it did when a public housing unit was conceived.

The signal event that happened when this program was passed in the late 1980s was that, all of a sudden, we recognized that a public housing unit, like any other piece of property in America, can be transformed. It can be made esthetically attractive. It can be made a unit that will attract residents from different income levels. It can be made a place that is not just a shelter, that is not just four walls, but that is a home.

I have to think that that recognition about the capacity to physically change communities has had a carry-over impact on the lives of the people who live there.

So put aside all the statistics that we have talked about, put aside the information that we have discussed today about the leveraging of investments and the leveraging of dollars in the communities. This is ultimately about a new stake and a new confidence in places in America that have historically been neglected.

Let me thank a few people. I certainly want to thank the outstanding Chair of this committee, as he leaves the House and moves into the private sector, for being such a consistent voice in support not just of this program but all kinds of other good housing programs for the United States.

Obviously, I want to thank the ranking member for being so diligent on this issue. I want to thank two of my colleagues who are here, Mr. WATT of North Carolina and Ms. WATERS of California, who yielded time.

A lot of us support HOPE VI, but what has distinguished MAXINE WATERS and MEL WATT is that for a period of their whole 14 years in the House they have constantly said, yes, we can make it better, yes, we can fix it, but let us not do away with it. And when the critics and the detractors have questioned this program, the two of them have been enormously vigilant.

Let me certainly thank Mr. SHAYS for his work, and let me recognize someone whose name has not been called, who is also departing the House, Ms. HARRIS of Florida.

Twice we have had to bring amendments to the floor of the House to sustain funding for this program. Twice we have had to ask the House to second-guess the administration, to make a dollar commitment to this program. Two years ago, we got 59 Republicans to cross party lines. This year we topped that. We got 64 Republicans to cross party lines. And a lot of that was a function of Ms. HARRIS' work.

So I want to end on this note. We all agree, or so many of us in this Chamber agree about the value of this program. I hope there are two people in the United States who will take heed of that, the President of the United States and the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development. Because for 4 years now they have given us budgets that would do away with HOPE VI. For

2 years, this House has accurately and correctly second-guessed them and put the money back in. And today this House will make another statement by reauthorizing this program.

This works when the two branches of government that the people select, the executive and the legislative, actually listen to each other. This business works better when the executive branch every now and then takes heed of what we do here.

There are two more budgets, Ms. WATERS, that will be issued from the Bush administration before the President takes leave to Crawford. I hope that both of those budgets are much more reflective of MIKE OXLEY and CHRIS SHAYS and KATHERINE HARRIS, as well as the numerous people on this side of the aisle who believe in the utility of this program.

So this is an important statement for families who live in these units, and it is a statement of our values as well.

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT).

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in strong support of the HOPE VI Reauthorization Act of 2006, H.R. 5347.

This program does play a vital role in the redevelopment of severely dilapidated public housing units and promotes self-sufficiency among the residents of the community. HOPE VI projects forge new relationships and partnerships between local businesses and development agencies, garnering growth and investment in poverty stricken neighborhoods.

In May, 2005, the Allentown Housing Authority, located in my district, received \$20 million from this program for the redevelopment and revitalization of the Hanover Acres and River-view Terrace public housing facilities. Once complete, the project will provide 322 new housing units and a community center for families, as well as adult education services, youth programs, child care, and homeownership and money management education programs for residents.

Because of this investment, families will have increased opportunities for education, job skills, training, and job placement. This HOPE VI project is not only crucial to Hanover Acres but ultimately a catalyst for the revitalization of the entire community and neighborhood.

The HOPE VI program has already facilitated the redevelopment of 80,000 housing units across the Nation. However, there are approximately 60,000 units still in desperate need of revitalization. Each revitalization project we undertake across the country will undoubtedly provide crucial economic stability for countless children and families through housing, community centers, and educational services.

I believe it is crucial that we continue to provide the means for revitalization of our most distressed neighborhoods and the opportunity for families and children to prosper in secure

surroundings. I ask that my colleagues vote in favor of the HOPE VI Reauthorization Act.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the Chair of the Congressional Black Caucus, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WATT).

Mr. WATT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from California for yielding time.

I rise in support of H.R. 5347. It is necessary to extend this program, and we are extending it for 1 year, the reauthorization, and that is the best we can do. You may sense frustration in that statement, because there is a sense of frustration. I have been at this HOPE VI for a long time now, and I think we need to go back and trace a little bit of the history of how we got here.

HOPE VI is not a Democratic program. It was introduced under a Republican administration. It was the brainchild of Jack Kemp when he was Secretary of Housing and Urban Development. And the idea was that we were not going to make any progress on dealing with community issues as long as we had these tremendous numbers, thousands of people in dense public housing communities in various places throughout the country, and that the only way we could approach the problem effectively was to disperse poverty and create communities with mixed incomes, low-income people, middle-income people, and high-income people. And so HOPE VI was about community revitalization.

All of the complaints I have heard about it over the years make it sound like people don't understand how difficult it is to do community revitalization. Because every time somebody says, well, they didn't finish a project in a year, I say to them, you can do construction in a year, you cannot do community revitalization in a year. It takes time to revitalize a community.

Now, why am I so passionate about this? We have seen five communities in the city of Charlotte, North Carolina, completely transformed as a result of HOPE VI. We have seen one community in Greensboro, North Carolina, in my congressional district, completely transformed as a result of HOPE VI. We have seen two communities completely transformed in the Winston Salem part of my congressional district as a result of HOPE VI. We bring a little bit of Federal money, private people come to the table, and you end up with a mixed community in terms of income, racially and otherwise.

And I can tell you, if you come into downtown Charlotte now, you will see a completely different story than you saw 10, 12, 15 years ago. You will see a beautiful community where a concentration of low-income public housing used to be. Now if anybody tells me that is not success, I say I do not know what success is. That was exactly what the program was designed to do.

And I don't understand how this President, on so many issues, including this one, will take a successful pro-

gram and all of a sudden say this program doesn't work.

Now, coincidentally, most of the money is going into Democratic districts. That is really what the debate, the subtext of a lot of this debate, has been about. We knew where the public housing projects were. They were in most of our congressional districts. We set out to try to do something about those, and we have done something about those using HOPE VI. It has been the single most successful community revitalization and housing program probably that our Nation has ever seen, contrasted with the whole idea of warehousing poor people in concentrations of low-income communities.

So I am passionate about this. I am delighted we are extending this program for a year. But, at the same time, we need to recognize there is not but \$99 million even in the appropriations bill that hasn't been passed and finalized. And every time we have had to fight this battle to reauthorize the program we have lost funding for the program, so it gets less and less and less effective at accomplishing its mission.

So I congratulate my friends for extending the program, and I ask for their support, all of our support, for extending a program that is a no-brainer. We ought to all be supporting this program.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 5347 the HOPE VI Reauthorization Act of 2006.

Public housing is a necessity in communities throughout this country. With the stock of affordable housing declining nationwide because of the rising cost of land, materials and labor, many families cannot afford to buy or even rent homes.

A study in Broward County alone showed the county needs 15,000 new affordable units a year to keep pace with demand. A Miami-Dade study, based on the 2000 U.S. Census, found the county needs to construct an additional 81,400 housing units for very low- and middle-income residents between 2000 and 2015.

At the same time, the number of Americans living in poverty has risen for 4 straight years in a row. Today, about 37 million Americans live at or below the poverty level. The hardest hit are women and children, over 12 million children live in poverty.

For many of these people, public housing is often the only option available to them. We know this is true because the sad truth is that public housing stocks are often in terrible condition. I have visited public housing units in my district with peeling paint, broken floor boards and windows, dilapidated appliances and defective wiring. This kind of neglect is not unique; the are many such housing units.

Mr. Speaker, that is why the HOPE VI program is so important. H.R. 5347, the HOPE VI Reauthorization Act of 2006, will continue for an additional 5 years the program begun in 1990 to demolish run-down housing projects and to replace them with attractive, safe, fully functioning and affordable housing in mixed income communities.

Even as we reauthorize the HOPE VI program and recognize its potential to revitalize neighborhoods and communities and provide

quality housing to people who need it, we must also acknowledge the need to make sure that HOPE VI does not destroy neighborhoods in the name of revitalizing them and that we extract from HOPE VI dollars the maximum amount of housing for local residents.

Because successful HOPE VI grants require such a high percentage of local funding, they are a good way to stretch scarce Federal housing dollars. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 5347, the Hope VI Reauthorization Act of 2006.

Congress created the bipartisan HOPE VI program in 1992 to restore distressed housing and build new, safe, and cohesive communities. To date HOPE VI has awarded over \$5 billion to revitalize 193 public housing developments.

In my district alone, we have three HOPE VI projects: Mandela Gateway, Lions Creek Crossing, and Chestnut Linden Court.

The HOPE VI program works because its requirement for community buy-in is a responsive, flexible, and accessible redevelopment tool that effectively addresses the multi-billion dollar backlog in public housing capital needs.

But despite the accomplishments of HOPE VI, the administration continues to try and kill it. That just doesn't make any sense.

In passing H.R. 5347 today, we send a message to the administration, to housing authorities, and to the business community that HOPE VI is here to stay.

But we can't stop with Hope VI re-authorization.

We must also fully fund our housing authority's capital and operating needs, Section 8 vouchers, and special-needs tenants like the elderly, the handicapped, and those living with HIV/AIDS.

Together these initiatives can help re-focus our attention on those who are most in need.

□ 1830

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. OXLEY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5347, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 5637, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 6115, by the yeas and nays;

S. 2856, by the yeas and nays.

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