United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 110th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 154 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, MAY 7, 2008 No. 75

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m.

Pastor Joe Hishmeh, Fellowship Bible Church, Topeka, Kansas, offered the following prayer:

Almighty Father in heaven:

What a joy and privilege it is to seek You through prayer. All across this great land of the United States of America, we are in need of Your guidance, Your direction, wisdom, and grace. Heal us from our sins, restore us to Yourself and be glorified in our lives.

We entrust our citizens, our troops, public servants, and leaders to You this day. You have established this distinguished assembly of leaders to represent our citizens, and we simply ask You to use each of them to make a positive difference today.

We recognize Your powerful hand of guidance, Your heart of love for people, Your mind of wisdom and righteousness. May they offer a help and a hand, a hope and a future through the decisions that are made in this place.

I ask this in the name of Jesus. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House her approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Madam Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Madam Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. CHABOT led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed with amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 5493. An act to provide that the usual day for paying salaries in or under the House of Representatives may be established by regulations of the Committee on House Administration.

WELCOMING PASTOR JOE HISHMEH

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentlewoman from Kansas (Mrs. BOYDA) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOYDA from Kansas. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

When Pastor Joe Hishmeh first came to Topeka from Chattanooga by way of Dallas, the Topeka Fellowship Bible Church's congregation consisted roughly of about 100 people. Six years later, that same church now has over 1,300 loyal members.

Pastor Hishmeh, a husband and a father of three great boys, has initiated a number of programs which greatly benefit our community of Topeka. One of those programs is called ''Sharefest.'' Originally, there were three churches performing much-needed upkeep on two of our local schools. This year, the program has grown to eight different churches, including over 500 volunteers, painting and landscaping our Topeka schools.

Through ''Sharefest,'' Pastor Joe has shown his congregation the joy of giving without expecting anything in return, very, very, very biblical in the principles of our Lord and Savior, Jesus Christ. Through ''Sharefest,'' in almost no time at all he has created a ripple effect of goodness and charity in the community of Topeka and beyond.

Pastor Joe Hishmeh, thank you for bringing that ripple effect all the way to Congress.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to 10 further requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

END THE WAR IN IRAQ

(Mr. KUCINICH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KUCINICH. Madam Speaker, $183.7 billion war-funding request in light of more than 4,000 U.S. troops who have died, tens of thousands injured, a million dead or more innocent Iraqis, a cost of $2 to $3 trillion. We're borrowing money from China to fight this war. We're ruining our economy. We're ruining our moral standing in the world. We're ruining our children's future and making the world more dangerous for a war based on lies.

Why do we keep funding it? Support the troops by bringing them home. End the war. End the occupation. Close the

Printed on recycled paper.

bases. Bring the troops hope. Set in motion an international security and peace-keeping process that can create the circumstances for our troops to come home. Have a program of reconciliation and reconstruction in Iraq. Return all oil assets to Iraqi control. End the war. Stop funding it.

Vote ''no'' on the war appropriations.

CONGRESS NEEDS TO GET TOUGH ON CRIME

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

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, last month the President signed into law the Second Chance Act authorizing hundreds of millions of dollars to assist offenders transitioning back into our societies. My concern is that this Congress has done little or nothing to prevent future crimes from occurring. With more than 700,000 offenders expected to be released back into our communities next year and the number of people who are entering their so-called high-crime years being at an all time high, conditions are ripe for a perfect storm of crime to hit our communities.

In my view, this Congress should act to, among other things, strengthen victims' rights; make restitution something that's real, not just words on paper; crack down on drug dealers who sell death on our streets, and truly protect witnesses so more people will be willing to come forward to testify against gang members who all too frequently virtually control many neighborhoods, especially urban areas and cities across this country.

The time to act is now before it's too late.

VOTE ''YES'' ON THE DEMOCRATIC HOUSING PACKAGE

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

Mr. SIRES. Mr. Speaker, today the House will begin debate on the comprehensive housing package that will help families keep their homes, prevent foreclosures in the future, and help the recovery of communities left almost vacant by the housing crisis. Today, more than 3.5 million homes sit empty in America, and if Washington does not act, another 2 million Americans are expected to lose their homes in the coming months.

The Democratic housing package will provide mortgage refinancing assistance to families so they can stay in their homes. We do this by expanding the FHA program so the borrowers in danger of losing their homes can refinance into lower-cost government-issued mortgages. The housing package also provides $15 billion in loans and grants to States so they can acquire foreclosed homes and rehabilitate properties in areas hit hard by the housing crisis.

Mr. Speaker, this housing package is the best response to our Nation's housing problem.

□ 1015

DEMOCRATS HOLD IRAQIS ACCOUNTABLE FOR THEIR OWN RECONSTRUCTION COSTS IN SUPPLEMENTAL

(Ms. WATSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow this House will have the opportunity to send the Iraqi Government a strong message: They're now responsible for their own reconstruction funding.

As we debate a new war supplemental, Democrats are bringing an amendment to the floor that requires all Iraqi reconstruction costs to be provided on a dollar-for-dollar match.

To date, the United States has spent an estimated $46 billion in reconstruction costs in Iraq, all while our infrastructure is crumbling. The Iraqi Government is also currently working under a budget surplus, while, thanks to the Bush administration, we continue to face record deficits.

The amendment also requires the Iraqi Government to charge the U.S. military in Iraq the same discounted price for fuel that it charges everyday Iraqis. Another fair measure considering that the Iraqis are expected to take in a record $70 billion in oil revenues this year.

Mr. Speaker, I would hope that Democrats and Republicans could come together tomorrow to pass this common-sense amendment so that we can invest in America, rather than Iraq.

CHINA

(Mr. WOLF asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my frustration and disappointment with the leadership's decision to bypass the Appropriations Committee and to bring up the 2008 supplemental without giving Members an opportunity either on the floor or in the committee to offer an amendment.

I wanted to offer an amendment to prohibit U.S. Government employees from attending the Beijing Olympics on the taxpayers' dime because of China's violent repression of religious minorities and human rights activists.

Catholics, Protestants, Tibetan Buddhists, Uyghur Muslims, Falun Gong practitioners and other religious minorities in China face harassment, imprisonment, even torture and death. China is actively engaging in espionage against our country and now participating in a genocide in Sudan.

The political prisoners in China and the dissidents around the world will be deeply demoralized if senior American officials attend the games.

TIME FOR A NEW DIRECTION ON ENERGY POLICY

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

Mr. ALTMIRE. Mr. Speaker, while the consumers continue to pay record prices at the pump, the Big Oil companies are once again pocketing all-time record profits; yet they disavow any correlation to those high gas prices. But do they really expect the American people to believe that?

During the first six years of the Bush administration, Congress pursued policies that furthered our dependence on oil. They showered the Big Oil companies with billions of dollars in taxpayer subsidies but never explained why those corporations deserve corporate welfare.

Since regaining control of Congress, Democrats have twice passed legislation to redirect every penny of those taxpayer subsidies into research and development on alternative sources of fuel.

For years, Republicans in Washington have supported a policy of corporate welfare for Big Oil that clearly hasn't worked. It's time for a new direction on energy policy.

SUPPLEMENTAL FUNDING

(Mr. STEARNS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, efforts by Americans and our allies in Iraq have greatly weakened al Qaeda. If we withdraw our troops from Iraq before their mission is complete, we would forfeit all the progress we have made so far.

Since the surge began last year, we have made remarkable progress, both on the military front and on the political front. While we all agree that more needs to be done politically, there is no questioning the tremendous efforts our military have done to bring stability to areas once controlled by radical extremists.

There should be absolutely no question of whether we provide them the funding they need to do the job we've asked them to do. House Republicans stand united with our troops and our veterans who have fought bravely on the front lines. The least we can do is front the resources necessary for them to complete the task we sent our military to do.

We cannot delay, and we should provide this supplemental funding without extra new spending and extra new programs before we leave for Memorial Day.

DEMOCRATIC SUPPLEMENTAL AMENDMENT CALLS FOR ALL TROOPS TO BE HOME BY DECEMBER OF 2009

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

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, this week Congress has an opportunity to change the course of the war in Iraq by supporting an amendment to the emergency supplemental that would not only direct the President to immediately begin bringing our troops home but would also force the Iraqi Government to start paying their own reconstruction costs.

The amendment calls on the Bush administration to begin redeploying our troops out of Iraq one month after it is signed into law, with the goal of having all of our troops out by December of next year.

Another year of the status quo in Iraq is unacceptable. April was the deadliest month for U.S. troops in seven months, and the political reconciliation that President Bush promised when he implemented his troop escalation plan has not become a reality.

Mr. Speaker, this is a significant step in the right direction, but for some reason, congressional Republicans want to once again send President Bush a blank check. Blank checks have not worked in the past and they will not this time.

We all know that there is no military solution to war in Iraq. It's time we let the Iraqis know that our days there are numbered.

TIME FOR THE IRAQIS TO PAY FOR THEIR OWN FREEDOM

(Mrs. MILLER of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, our entire Nation honors the brave men and women in our armed services who have sacrificed so greatly in the effort to bring freedom and liberty to the people of Iraq, and we also recognize the sacrifice of the American taxpayers, who have shouldered the financial burden of this effort to protect America.

It is now time for Iraq to stand up and shoulder the burden of protecting their own freedoms, and it is long past time for Iraq to start paying its own way. With the cost of oil, and the money that Iraq is making on their oil, they need to be paying, at a minimum, entirely for their own reconstruction.

As we continue to transition from American forces to Iraqi security forces, we also need to quickly transition from the American taxpayer footing the entire bill to the now free country of Iraq paying to protect their own freedom and rebuilding their own country.

Americans understand that freedom is not free, and the Iraqi people need to understand that securing their own freedom will require their own investment.

HONORING SERGEANT ALEX JIMENEZ

(Ms. TSONGAS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. TSONGAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the service and sacrifice of Sergeant Alex Jimenez and to express my continued support for Alex's family during this most difficult time.

On May 12, 2007, Sergeant Jimenez and Private First Class Byron Fouty, members of the 10th Mountain Division, were ambushed south of Baghdad. There has been no information regarding their whereabouts since that time.

On June 27, the United States Army changed Sergeant Jimenez's status from duty status whereabouts unknown to missing or captured. We may not know where Alex is, but he is never far from our thoughts.

Family members like Alex's father, Andy, or his wife, Yaderlin, have weathered agonizing uncertainty while demonstrating support for their loved one's service to our country. We owe them a debt of gratitude.

The community in Lawrence, Massachusetts, has been extremely supportive. A POW ride will take place this weekend in honor of Sergeant Jimenez and in support of his family.

The Jimenez and Fouty families are not alone as we all pray for the safe return of Alex and Byron.

Sergeant Jimenez put his life in danger for our country. We cannot leave him or any other behind. I support legislation to create a select committee on POW/MIA affairs to help these families learn the whereabouts of their loved ones.

WE NEED TO STOP THE WHINING

(Mr. WESTMORELAND asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Speaker, it's interesting to come down here and to listen to the majority party, the Democrats, talk about a new change in direction for our energy policy or something new to do about our troops.

News flash: Y'all are in charge. You've got 230-plus votes. You're in charge. You can pass anything you want to.

Mr. Speaker, we need to stop the whining. Since they took over in 2007, with a new energy policy, H.R. 6, our gasoline has gone up about $1.50 a gallon.

So here's what I want everybody to do, Mr. Speaker. I want you to go home tonight and I want you to go to Home Depot and I want you to buy some energy saving bulbs because, in their energy bill, light bulbs are mentioned 350 times, where gasoline was mentioned 6, crude oil was mentioned 12. I want you to go home, I want you to take those energy saving light bulbs, I want you to put them in, and then I want you to drive to the gas station and see if gas has come down, because that's the way their plan is supposed to work.

You're in charge. If you're in charge, lead. Mr. Speaker, we need some leadership here. We need to do something to help the American people at the gas pump with these outrageous gasoline prices and crude oil fixing to go to $150-plus a barrel. Do something.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCNULTY). All Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

GAS PRICES

(Mr. HALL of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HALL of New York. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the price of oil broke another record yet again, closing at over $120. Families feel the impact of these costs every time they shell out close to $4 a gallon at the pump. In districts like mine, where commuting is a way of life, it's forcing some painful sacrifices.

Our oil dependence has become the energy albatross around America's economic neck, and I'm proud that the majority in Congress has advanced ideas for short-term relief and long-term solutions. We've pushed for higher tax incentives for hybrid cars, expanded the use of renewables and efficiency, consumer protection to keep the oil companies honest, and a time-out from taking 70 million barrels a day of oil off the market and putting it into the strategic petroleum reserve, the SPR.

What is the response from the President and his allies here in Congress? Let's go drill for some more oil that won't hit the markets for another 10 years, and let's keep sending more taxpayer dollars to the oil companies that are already making record profits.

Most Americans would agree that we cannot wait a decade for relief and we shouldn't send anymore of their money to Big Oil. Let's stop filling the SPR to provide immediate relief and ask the President to move with us into a green, domestic, job-producing energy future.

HOUSING PACKAGE IMPORTANT TO BOOST ECONOMY AND STABILIZE MARKET

(Mr. ELLISON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, every day between 7,000 and 8,000 people file for foreclosures on their homes. In the next 2 years, one in 33 homeowners is projected to be in foreclosure as a result of subprime loans.

But the housing crisis doesn't only affect families losing their homes. An additional 40 million neighboring homeowners could see their property values drop, with 44 percent of all homeowners likely to feel the ripple effect of foreclosures from subprime loans.

And the overall impact does not end in the housing market. The ripple effects are felt throughout the economy with a reduction in economic activity and severe job loss.

Mr. Speaker, we simply cannot turn our Nation's economy around without properly addressing the housing crisis, and that is exactly what we plan to do this week. Today, House Democrats will bring a package of housing bills to the House floor that will address the current housing crisis, while also seeking to prevent the problem from getting worse. These bills are the appropriate response to a problem that is affecting our families, our communities and our overall economy. I hope it receives the bipartisan support that it deserves, Mr. Speaker.

□ 1030

WORLD AIDS ORPHANS DAY

(Ms. LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize World AIDS Orphans Day, which is commemorated every year on May 7.

Over 15 million children have already lost one or both of their parents to HIV and AIDS, 12 million of which live in Sub-Saharan Africa. By 2010, there could be 20 million children.

Children who have been orphaned by HIV and AIDS of course are left without food, shelter, education or protection. Three years ago, we enacted legislation that I authored with Chairman Henry Hyde to better focus and coordinate our foreign assistance programs to address the unique needs of these children. Last month, the House passed legislation named after two great men who love children, former Chairman Tom Lantos and Chairman Henry Hyde, to reauthorize and provide $50 billion for our global HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis and malaria programs, and to allocate 10 percent of global AIDS funding to meet the needs of AIDS orphans.

Today, on World AIDS Orphans Day, I urge my colleagues in the other body to take the next step and to pass this important bill. Together we can create a brighter, safer and more secure future for the world's children.

HOUSING PACKAGE IMPORTANT TO BOOST ECONOMY AND STABILIZE MARKET

(Mr. WU asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WU. Mr. Speaker, the housing crisis has devastated millions of American families who have lost their homes, but the crisis doesn't end there. Experts predict that housing foreclosures could reduce overall economic activity by over $160 billion this year thanks to sharp declines in real estate, the construction industry, and in consumer spending.

The slump in the real estate market is hurting manufacturers, construction firms and other businesses that have been forced to lay off thousands of workers. Ending the foreclosure crisis is vital to the American economy, our economic recovery, and to Americans who are hurting. And that is why it is so important that this Congress pass the bipartisan housing package that we are presenting this week. It reported out of the Financial Services Committee by both Republicans and Democrats and sent to this floor for our consideration.

Mr. Speaker, serious problems with subprime mortgages have pushed the housing market into its worst slump in decades, weakening the economy and making American families less secure. The package of bills we are presenting today will help stabilize the housing industry and give the American economy the boost it so sorely needs. And I urge every Member of the House to support these much-needed bills.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Today is the day of Calendar Wednesday. The Clerk will call the roll of committees.

The Clerk called the committees.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. SESSIONS (during the call). Mr. Speaker, I have a point of parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his inquiry.

Mr. SESSIONS. I understand that this procedure that we are going through is known as Calendar Wednesday.

Is it correct that any bill reported by a committee and placed on the Union or House Calendar could have been called up by the chairman as the committee name was read?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Clause 2(b) of rule XIII is sufficient authority for the chairman of the committee to call up from the Calendar a non-privileged bill on Calendar Wednesday.

Mr. SESSIONS. Further point of parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his inquiry.

Mr. SESSIONS. Does the jurisdiction of the Energy and Commerce Committee, as provided under clause 1 of rule X of the rules of the House of Representatives, include exploration, production, storage, supply, marketing, pricing and regulation of energy resources, including all fossil fuels, which includes legislation to lower the price of gasoline which has increased to over $3.60 a gallon under Speaker PELOSI's watch?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair believes that the gentleman correctly stated the rule up to the point where he embarked on commentary.

Mr. SESSIONS. I have a further point of parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his inquiry.

Mr. SESSIONS. H.R. 3236, introduced by Congressman BOUCHER of Virginia, to promote energy efficiency improvements in buildings and appliances was reported by the Energy and Commerce Committee on August 3, 2007, and placed on the Union Calendar.

Would it be possible for Mr. DINGELL, the chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee, to call up this bill under his committee's jurisdiction to help the Speaker to implement her secret plan to reduce gas prices by diverting less of America's energy supply to buildings and appliances, or for any other membership of the Democrat majority to help their leadership to call up the bill?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will respond to the Member's parliamentary inquiry but not his political commentary and repeat that clause 2(b) of rule XIII is sufficient authority for the chairman of the committee to call up from the Calendar a non-privileged bill on Calendar Wednesday.

Mr. SESSIONS. Further point of parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may state his inquiry.

Mr. SESSIONS. Is it in order for any Member of the majority to call up H.R. 3239, also introduced by Mr. BOUCHER of Virginia and also available on the Union Calendar, to promote advancing plug-in hybrid vehicles and vehicle components through loan guarantees and grants, and if this would help the Speaker to implement her secret plan by reducing the demand for gasoline and bringing down the prices that have skyrocketed under this Democrat leadership?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Only the chairman or another member of the committee acting by its express direction may call up a bill.

Mr. SESSIONS. Final point of parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may state his inquiry.

Mr. SESSIONS. Under the rules of Calendar Wednesday, is it in order for any Member of this body, including Speaker PELOSI, to call up H. Res. 1135, legislation drafted by Congressman DEAN HELLER of Nevada, which would call on Speaker PELOSI to reveal her secret commonsense plan to bring down gas prices since it's obviously not contained in the ''no energy'' energy bill passed by the Congress last December?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. No. To be considered under the Calendar Wednesday rule, a bill must be on the Calendar, be non-privileged, and be called up either by the committee

chairman or by another member of the committee having specific authorization of the committee to call it up.

Mr. SESSIONS. So in other words, Mr. Speaker, what you're saying is that the committee chairman and the Speaker have the ability to call up any bill that has been reported out.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. No, but that is not a parliamentary inquiry.

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to adjourn.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. SESSIONS. 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, this 15-minute vote on the motion to adjourn will be followed by 5-minute votes on the approval of the Journal, and the motion to suspend the rules on H. Res. 1166.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 132, nays 269, not voting 31, as follows:

[Roll No. 267]

YEAS—132

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachus
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Broun (GA)
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis, David
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doggett
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Emerson
Everett
Fallin
Flake
Forbes
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gilchrest
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Hall (TX)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Keller
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
LaHood
Lamborn
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCrery
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Musgrave
Myrick
Nunes
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Saxton
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shays
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Tancredo
Thornberry
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walsh (NY)
Wamp
Westmoreland
Wilson (SC)
Wittman (VA)

NAYS—269

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Altmire
Arcuri
Baca
Bachmann
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Buyer
Cannon
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Carney
Castle
Castor
Cazayoux
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis, Lincoln
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Dicks
Dingell
Donnelly
Doyle
Edwards
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Feeney
Filner
Fortenberry
Foster
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Gerlach
Giffords
Gillibrand
Gingrey
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Graves
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Hulshof
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jordan
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Kingston
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
Lampson
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Platts
Poe
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Reyes
Rodriguez
Rogers (MI)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sali
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tiahrt
Tierney
Towns
Tsongas
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Weller
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—31

Andrews
Bishop (NY)
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Campbell (CA)
Cardoza
Carson
Conaway
Conyers
Cubin
Ferguson
Fossella
Jefferson
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kennedy
McCollum (MN)
McHenry
Oberstar
Paul
Peterson (PA)
Richardson
Rogers (AL)
Rush
Speier
Udall (CO)
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Wexler
Whitfield (KY)
Young (AK)

□ 1104

Mr. EMANUEL changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mrs. MYRICK changed her vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
The Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: I have the honor to transmit herewith a facsimile copy of a letter received from the Honorable Jay Dardenne, Secretary of State, State of Louisiana, indicating that, according to the unofficial returns of the Special Election held May 3, 2008, the Honorable STEVE SCALISE was elected Representative to Congress for the First Congressional District, State of Louisiana.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

LORRAINE C. MILLER,
Clerk.

Enclosure.

Hon. LORRAINE C. MILLER,
Clerk, House of Representatives, The Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR MS. MILLER: This is to advise you that the unofficial results of the Special Election held on Saturday, May 3, 2008, for Representative in Congress from the First Congressional District of Louisiana, show that "STEVE" SCALISE received 33,867 or 75.13% of the total number of votes cast for that office.

It would appear from these unofficial results that "STEVE" SCALISE was elected as Representative in Congress from the First Congressional District of Louisiana.

To the best of our knowledge and belief at this time, there is no contest to this election.

As soon as the official results are certified to this office by all Parishes involved, an official Certificate of Election will be prepared for transmittal as required by law.

If I can ever be of any assistance to you, please do not hesitate contacting me.

With best wishes,

JAY DARDENNE,
Secretary of State, State of Louisiana.

ELECTION # 5/03/08 RESULTS FOR OFFICE

Office: U.S. Representative, 1st Congressional District (One to be Elected), Precincts reporting: 505 of 505, Total Votes: 45,075 100%

SPECIAL ELECTION

Votes	Percent	Candidate name	Pty
786	1.74	R.A. "Skip" Galan	N
280	0.62	Anthony "Tony G" Gentile	O
10,142	22.50	Gilda Reed	D
33,867	75.13	"Steve" Scalise	R

SWEARING IN OF THE HONORABLE STEVE SCALISE, OF LOUISIANA, AS A MEMBER OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MCCRERY. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana, the Honorable Steve Scalise, be permitted to take the oath of office today.

His certificate of election has not arrived, but there is no contest and no question has been raised with regard to his election.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Will the Representative-elect and the members of the Louisiana delegation present themselves in the well.

Mr. SCALISE appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office, as follows:

Do you solemnly swear or affirm that you will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that you will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that you take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that you will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which you are about to enter, so help you God.

The SPEAKER. Congratulations. You are now a Member of the 110th Congress.

WELCOMING THE HONORABLE STEVE SCALISE TO THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. MCCRERY) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. MCCRERY. Madam Speaker, it is a pleasure for me on behalf of the Louisiana delegation to introduce to the Members of the House our newest Member, STEVE SCALISE. STEVE is a graduate of the home of the current national college football champions, the LSU Tigers. And he has a degree in computer science. And he told me to tell you all that if you are having problems with your computer, feel free to call him.

STEVE comes to us after 12 years' experience in the Louisiana legislature where he had a distinguished career. He was known as a reformer in a place where there was not much reform on the minds of many people in State government. So STEVE comes to us with a distinguished record of service for the people of Louisiana already. And I am sure he will bring that same distinction to his service here in the House.

STEVE has a lovely family, which I will give him the honor of introducing. Please help me welcome to our ranks STEVE SCALISE.

Mr. SCALISE. Thank you, Congressman MCCRERY. Thank you, Madam Speaker, Leader BOEHNER, the rest of the members of the Louisiana delegation and all of my new colleagues here in the House of Representatives.

It is truly an honor to serve in this distinguished body. I must thank so many people. But I have got to first thank God for helping to give me the strength to get here. I want to thank my family and my wife, Jennifer, who is in the balcony with our beautiful daughter, Madison. It is also Jennifer's birthday today, so it is an even extra special day. I promise I will not sing here on the floor, maybe later. We do have a 13-month-old beautiful daughter, Madison.

My father is here with his wife, Maggie. I want to thank him and Maggie for coming. My sister, Tara, is here as well. And my brother, Glenn, could not be with us. I know my mom, Carol, is looking from above and smiling. And so many other friends and family, we have got a wonderful group of friends that are here with us today as well. And it is truly an honor. I want to thank the voters of the First Congressional District for giving me this honor.

While we have many challenges, while we are still recovering, I want to thank each of you for all the help you have given us in the recovery from Hurricanes Katrina and Rita. There is still work to do, but the help you have given has really helped people start to get their lives back in order. I know our country faces many great challenges too, but our Founding Fathers created the greatest democracy in the history of the world when they created this system that we have, this House and Senate. In this building we have got the ability, the talent and the people to solve those problems. I look very forward to working with each and every one of you to help tackle those challenges.

Thanks again to the voters of the district and my family. God bless Louisiana, and God bless the United States of America.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. Under clause 5(d) of rule XX, the Chair announces to the House that, in light of the administration of the oath to the gentleman from Louisiana, the whole number of the House is 434.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

Mr. KINGSTON. Madam Speaker, I reserve the right to object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCNULTY). The gentleman from Georgia is recognized under his reservation.

Mr. KINGSTON. I thank the gentleman for recognizing me.

Reserving the right to object and I do possibly plan to object, because we are on the eve of passing the largest supplemental appropriations bill in the history of the United States House of Representatives. The history of supplemental bills actually goes back to the Second Congress, so it is not unusual to have a supplemental appropriation bill. It is just that over the years we have gotten, in recent years, out of the habit of offsetting these pieces of legislation.

Now traditionally they have been used for a war or for a sudden disaster or for a health care crisis or something like that. But now we are on the verge of passing a large supplemental appropriation bill for things that aren't emergencies. This bill is not confined to emergencies.

□ 1115

I would say to my friends on the other side of the aisle that I strongly believe that one reason that we are in——

Ms. CASTOR. Regular order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal which the Chair will put de novo.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Ms. CASTOR. 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, this 15-minute vote on approving the Journal will be followed by a 5-minute vote on suspending the rules and agreeing to House Resolution 1166.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 229, nays 184, answered ''present'' 1, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 268]

YEAS—229

Abercrombie	Cohen	Gonzalez
Ackerman	Conyers	Goode
Allen	Cooper	Green, Al
Arcuri	Costa	Green, Gene
Baca	Costello	Grijalva
Baird	Courtney	Gutierrez
Baldwin	Cramer	Hall (NY)
Barrow	Crowley	Hare
Bean	Cuellar	Harman
Becerra	Cummings	Hastings (FL)
Berkley	Davis (AL)	Herseth Sandlin
Berman	Davis (CA)	Higgins
Berry	Davis (IL)	Hill
Biggert	Davis, Lincoln	Hinchey
Bilbray	DeFazio	Hinojosa
Bishop (GA)	DeGette	Hirono
Blumenauer	Delahunt	Hodes
Boren	DeLauro	Holden
Boswell	Dent	Holt
Boucher	Diaz-Balart, L.	Honda
Boyd (FL)	Diaz-Balart, M.	Hooley
Boyda (KS)	Dicks	Hoyer
Brady (PA)	Dingell	Inslee
Braley (IA)	Doggett	Israel
Brown, Corrine	Doyle	Jackson (IL)
Butterfield	Edwards	Jackson-Lee (TX)
Capps	Ellison	Jefferson
Capuano	Emanuel	Johnson (GA)
Cardoza	Engel	Johnson (IL)
Carnahan	Eshoo	Johnson, E. B.
Carson	Etheridge	Kagen
Castor	Farr	Kanjorski
Cazayoux	Fattah	Kaptur
Chandler	Filner	Kennedy
Clarke	Foster	Kildee
Clay	Frank (MA)	Kilpatrick
Cleaver	Gerlach	Kind
Clyburn	Gillibrand	

Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
Lampson
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Perlmutter
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rodriguez
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuster
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Spratt
Stark
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Tsongas
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth

NAYS—184

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Bachmann
Bachus
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carney
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Donnelly
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Ellsworth
Emerson
English (PA)
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gingrey
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Hall (TX)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
LaHood
Lamborn
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCotter
McCrery
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mitchell
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Tim
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Saxton
Scalise
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shays
Shimkus
Shuler
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Tancredo
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman (VA)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—1

Gohmert

NOT VOTING—19

Andrews
Bishop (NY)
Burton (IN)
Campbell (CA)
Conaway
Cubin
Ferguson
Fossella
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
McHenry
Oberstar
Paul
Peterson (PA)
Richardson
Rush
Speier
Udall (CO)
Whitfield (KY)

□ 1132

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

SENSE OF HOUSE REGARDING REPUBLIC OF GEORGIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, H. Res. 1166.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATSON) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1166.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. REHBERG. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 390, noes 23, answered ''present'' 2, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 269]

AYES—390

Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Altmire
Arcuri
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Buchanan
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Carter
Castle
Castor
Cazayoux
Chabot
Chandler
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole (OK)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Lincoln
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Edwards
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Feeney
Filner
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gingrey
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hobson
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (OH)
Jordan
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Lampson
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Nunes
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sali
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Shays
Shea-Porter
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield (KY)
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)

Wittman (VA)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth

NOES—23

Abercrombie
Bartlett (MD)
Broun (GA)
Burgess
Clarke
Coble
Davis, Tom
Delahunt
Duncan
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Kucinich
Lee
Lofgren, Zoe
McKeon
Poe
Rohrabacher
Royce
Sherman
Tancredo
Westmoreland
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—2

Bean
Tierney

NOT VOTING—18

Andrews
Barton (TX)
Bishop (NY)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burton (IN)
Campbell (CA)
Conaway
Cubin
Ferguson
Fossella
McHenry
Oberstar
Paul
Richardson
Rush
Speier
Sullivan
Udall (CO)

□ 1144

Messrs. DUNCAN, JONES of North Carolina, MCKEON, ABERCROMBIE, and Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Mr. SHIMKUS changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. REHBERG. Mr. Speaker, I move to reconsider the vote.

MOTION TO TABLE OFFERED BY MS. CASTOR

Ms. CASTOR. Mr. Speaker, I move to lay the motion to reconsider on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to table.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. REHBERG. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 218, noes 191, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 270]

AYES—218

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Altmire
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Castor
Cazayoux
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Lincoln
DeGette
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Foster
Frank (MA)
Giffords
Gillibrand
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Hastings (FL)
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Klein (FL)
Lampson
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Skelton
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Tsongas
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth

NOES—191

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachmann
Bachus
Bartlett (MD)
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Buyer
Camp (MI)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Costa
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Delahunt
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
English (PA)
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gilchrest
Gingrey
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Hall (TX)
Harman
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Tim
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Saxton
Scalise
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shays
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Tancredo
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Wamp
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield (KY)
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman (VA)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—24

Andrews
Barrett (SC)
Barton (TX)
Bishop (NY)
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Campbell (CA)
Conaway
Cubin
DeFazio
Fossella
Gohmert
Linder
McHenry
Oberstar
Paul
Richardson
Rush
Slaughter
Speier
Sullivan
Taylor
Udall (CO)
Weldon (FL)

□ 1154

Ms. CLARKE changed her vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the motion to table was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mr. REHBERG. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is the motion to adjourn.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. REHBERG. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 140, noes 246, not voting 47, as follows:

[Roll No. 271]

AYES—140

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachmann
Bachus
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boustany
Broun (GA)
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Castle
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Crenshaw
Davis, David
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Emerson
English (PA)
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Forbes
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Garrett (NJ)
Gingrey
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Hall (TX)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kanjorski
Keller
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
LaHood
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCrery
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Roskam
Ryan (WI)
Saxton
Scalise
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shays
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns

Sullivan
Tancredo
Thornberry
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Wamp
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield (KY)
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman (VA)
Young (AK)

NOES—246

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Altmire
Arcuri
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Capps
Capuano
Carney
Carson
Castor
Cazayoux
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Lincoln
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Donnelly
Doyle
Edwards
Ehlers
Ellsworth
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fortenberry
Foster
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gerlach
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gonzalez
Graves
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hulshof
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Jordan
Kagen
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Kingston
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
Lampson
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Peterson (MN)
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Reyes
Rodriguez
Rogers (MI)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Salazar
Sali
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tiahrt
Tierney
Towns
Tsongas
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—47

Andrews
Baca
Berman
Bishop (NY)
Braley (IA)
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Campbell (CA)
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carter
Cohen
Conaway
Costa
Cubin
Davis (KY)
DeLauro
Doggett
Ellison
Emanuel
Fossella
Gohmert
Hinchey
Hoyer
Lamborn
Linder
Mahoney (FL)
McHenry
McNerney
Miller, George
Murphy, Patrick
Oberstar
Paul
Perlmutter
Richardson
Rohrabacher
Royce
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Scott (GA)
Speier
Terry
Udall (CO)
Walz (MN)
Weldon (FL)

□ 1211

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. Speaker, on roll-call No. 271, I was detained getting back to the Chamber. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY—Continued

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POMEROY). The Clerk will resume the call of the roll of committees.

The Clerk called the committees.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5818, NEIGHBORHOOD STABILIZATION ACT OF 2008

Ms. CASTOR. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1174 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1174

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. 5818) to authorize the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to make loans to States to acquire foreclosed housing and to make grants to States for related costs. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman 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 except those arising under clause 10 of rule XXI. Notwithstanding clause 11 of rule XVIII, no amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in 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 except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. 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. After a motion that the Committee rise has been rejected on a legislative day, the Chair may entertain another such motion on that day only if offered by the chairman of the Committee on Financial Services or the Majority Leader or a designee. After a motion to strike out the enacting words of the bill (as described in clause 9 of rule XVIII) has been rejected, the Chair may not entertain another such motion during further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 3. During consideration in the House of H.R. 5818 pursuant to this resolution, notwithstanding the operation of the previous question, the Chair may postpone further consideration of the bill to such time as may be designated by the Speaker.

□ 1215

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Florida is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. CASTOR. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I am pleased to yield the customary 30 minutes to my colleague from the Rules Committee, Mr. HASTINGS from Washington. All time yielded during consideration of the rule is for debate only, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I also ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 1174.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. CASTOR. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 1174 provides for consideration of H.R. 5818, the Neighborhood Stabilization Act of 2008, under a structured rule. The rule provides 1 hour of general debate controlled by the Committee on Financial Services. The rule makes in order seven amendments listed in the Rules Committee report, each of which is debatable for 10 minutes. The rule also provides for one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the Neighborhood Stabilization Act of 2008 and this rule. This New Direction Congress, led by Democrats, understands the impact of this unfortunate Bush economy on neighborhoods throughout America. In order for our country to recover from this economic downturn, it is critical that we stabilize housing for our neighbors and rebuild communities with more affordable housing.

In fact, Federal Reserve Chairman Ben Bernanke urged Congress to take

action earlier this week. He stated in part, summarized in this news report, ''The reasons behind surging late payments and foreclosures can vary, and that needs to be taken into account when developing solutions. For instance, in parts of New England, States in the Great Lakes, including Minnesota, Michigan and Wisconsin, show increased mortgage delinquencies and notable increases in unemployment rates. California, Florida, and parts of Colorado, on the other hand, saw delinquencies rise during a period when unemployment generally decreased but the value of homes declined.''

He said, ''A widespread decline in home prices, by contrast, is a relatively novel phenomenon, and lenders and servicers will have to develop new and flexible strategies to deal with this issue. Rising foreclosures add to the glut of unsold homes, and that put more downward pressure on prices, aggravating the housing slump. More rapid declines in house prices could have an adverse impact on the broader economy.''

See, this affects us all, and it affects the stability of the financial system overall. So it is vitally important that we bring this package today, this first bill, the Neighborhood Stabilization Act and more to come because of the record number of foreclosures facing our neighbors back home.

Under President Bush's economic policies, the number of families entering into foreclosure has increased from over 700,000 to 1.5 million last year, but today, we're going to bring new hope to our communities through revitalized neighborhoods and targeted affordable housing to families that need it most.

The Neighborhood Stabilization Act of 2008 provides our local communities with the tools they need to purchase and rehabilitate vacant and foreclosed homes. Now we all know a vacant, deteriorated, foreclosed home in our neighborhood has a devastating impact. We've all seen them. We've driven by them. They're overgrown. They are not paying the taxes like everyone else in the neighborhood is paying. They're causing a drain on services and local governments.

Our initiatives today will help these nonprofit agencies and our local governments purchase those properties, turn them around, rehabilitate them and make them available to families that need them most, and in order to see that families with the greatest needs receive housing first, these new loans and affordable homes will be targeted especially to middle class families and those hardworking families back in our communities.

I know this will help families in my home State of Florida which has been among the Nation's hardest hit States, particularly in my community in the Tampa Bay area. In fact, it was not long ago that one of my neighbors called to tell me that he recently lost his home to foreclosure, and he was dealing with the repercussions from that loss, trying to find another affordable place to live for him and his family.

He was pleased to know, however, that this Congress had already acted on a mortgage forgiveness debt relief act signed into law last year, and because of that act, he will not suffer a double whammy and get hit with an unaffordable tax bill to accompany the loss of his home.

This legislation will help families from my community and communities across this Nation to rebuild and create more affordable housing. I am proud that this Congress has been so proactive and taken so many steps to combat the housing crisis. Millions of Americans will be helped because of the proactive leadership of Chairman BARNEY FRANK on the Financial Services Committee and Chairwoman MAXINE WATERS.

I am pleased to witness firsthand that this new Democratic Congress has made the lives of folks in my neighborhood and my community a whole lot better. Today, we will continue to move forward by passing the Neighborhood Stabilization Act and follow on that with the American Housing Rescue and Foreclosure Prevention Act. These efforts reflect the continued work of this New Direction Congress and offer the most comprehensive response yet to the American mortgage crisis. We are providing much-needed help to hardworking families in this unfortunate Bush economy.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from Florida (Ms. CASTOR) for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. HASTINGS of Washington asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, this is an oppressive rule, written to restrict debate in the House and to strip away rights from the minority.

This rule makes in order four Democrat amendments and only three Republican amendments. This means that 80 percent of requested Democrat amendments were made in order, but just 33 percent, or one-third, of Republican amendments filed with the Rules Committee were made in order. Mr. Speaker, this isn't balanced. It's restrictive and not in the tradition of having an open debate on important issues.

Last night at the Rules Committee, Financial Services Committee Chairman FRANK said that he supported allowing debate on an amendment relating to illegal immigration and legitimate concerns of ensuring that persons illegally present in this country do not benefit from the new Federal program created by this bill.

Rules Committee Democrats responded by making in order the least substantive, most meaningless and unenforceable immigration amendment possible. A Republican amendment by Representative GINNY BROWN-WAITE. of Florida had very clearly and explicitly made certain that anyone illegally present in this country cannot rent or buy a house from this new government program. That amendment was not made in order. Every Democrat on the Rules Committee voted to deny the House voting on this meaningful amendment.

Mr. Speaker, when Democrat leaders aren't totally shutting down debate, they are giving the House window dressing instead of substance on important issues. Not content with blocking two-thirds of Republican amendments and restricting the opportunity of every Member of this institution to come to the House floor and offer amendments to improve, fix or alter this bill, House Democrat leaders went even further to shut down the minority, squelch dissent and take away their parliamentary rights.

Section 2 of this rule takes away the right of any Member of this House to make a motion that the House rise out of the Committee of the Whole and places it solely in the hands of the Democrat majority leader or the Democrat chairman of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. Speaker, the new majority promised to run the most open, honest House in history. Instead of keeping their promises to the American people, Democrat leaders are acting with impunity as they shed any semblance of openness, fairness or regular order.

I don't believe many of the freshmen Democrat Members who were elected in the last election came to Congress to block debate and prohibit Members from offering amendments on the House floor. Yet, Mr. Speaker, they have joined lock-step with Speaker PELOSI in stooping to a level of oppressive partisanship that far exceeds the sins of any previous Congresses. It's a shameful record that shatters the promise Democrat leaders made to the American people to run an open, honest House.

Mr. Speaker, all this is being done to pass a bill that would create a brand new, Big Government, $15 billion Federal program to buy, remodel, resell or rent thousands and thousands of houses across the country. Who will profit from this new $15 billion government program are the lenders who made the bad loans and then foreclosed on families who didn't make their mortgage payments. It's a bailout for home lenders that knowingly took risks.

It's terribly unwise and wasteful of taxpayer dollars to create a new government program that invites other lenders to take gambles on home loans because the American taxpayer will come along and wipe away their bad decisions. Mr. Speaker, why should American taxpayers be footing the bill for calculated mistakes made by others? Why should American taxpayers,

who are making their mortgage payments each month or who are paying rent, have to come along and fund billions of dollars to give away grants and zero interest loans for those who speculated, gambled and lost? Mr. Speaker, taxpayers should not take this hit.

Now I recognize that this bill is titled the Neighborhood Stabilization Act and that its stated intent is to help rehabilitate neighborhoods in metropolitan cities and urban communities that have multiple foreclosed homes sitting vacant and empty. But, Mr. Speaker, why should rural and middle America be forced to have their tax dollars used to bail out lenders in big cities and urban areas? I believe, Mr. Speaker, we should work to find incentives for people to purchase these homes and improve these neighborhoods.

□ 1230

But we should oppose a new $15 billion spending program so the Federal Government can be involved in flipping houses or renting out homes.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose this oppressive rule and the bad underlying bill.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. CASTOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning in support of this very, very important measure.

Today, this House of Representatives will vote on the most comprehensive response yet, bringing badly needed help to this Nation's troubling mortgage crisis.

These House measures we will debate today will help in several areas: Number one, it will help families facing foreclosures to keep their homes; two, it will help families avoid foreclosures in the future; and three, it will help the recovery of communities in cities and towns across this Nation who are harmed by empty houses that are caught in the foreclosure process. And that's why I rise to support this bill today.

This is our first bill out of the gate on this important measure. And it is extraordinarily important, Mr. Speaker, and that's why I support this rule.

As we look across the landscape of America today, in neighborhood after neighborhood, homes empty, buildings empty, vandalism on high, violent crime on high, neighboring homes' property values going down, and right today, mortgages that are higher than the actual value of the property. And my good friends on the other side of the aisle question, why are we moving? Why is this a bailout? This is not a bailout. If anything, my dear friends, this is a bail-in. This is a bail-in to save communities.

Some of the same arguments that I heard on this side were heard during when we had other disasters. This is a disaster, just as we had Katrina, just as we had tornados, just as we had unforeseen circumstances. I even heard some say, when Katrina was coming, well, they knew the hurricane was coming, why didn't they get out of the way? This country needs help, and they're looking for their government to do what government is supposed to do, help their country in a moment of greatest need. And there is no greater need today than to help in this mortgage crisis.

And foremost for that help is to get into these communities, give our State and local governments, whose fire departments, whose police departments, already strained, are overstrained, and to help those neighboring homes who are going down in value because these properties are standing there idle and empty and are nothing but havens for crime. That's why, Mr. Speaker, this bill is so important.

I commend Ms. WATERS and Chairman FRANK for putting together the leadership of this bill, which I'm proud to be a cosponsor of, because it goes to the heart of the matter, and that is, saving America's communities. Fifteen billion dollars spread in two fashions, 7.5 for loans, 7.5 for grants. It's an excellent idea whose time has come.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that each side get an additional 2 minutes so I can engage the gentleman and so he can have the time to yield to me.

Ms. CASTOR. Mr. Speaker, I object. I do not yield for that purpose.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman does not yield for that request.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentlelady from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO), a member of the Financial Services Committee.

Mrs. CAPITO. I thank the gentleman for recognizing me.

I am on the Financial Services Committee. And we have debated and had many hearings on what we all share is an issue before us with great urgency. We are facing serious challenges here in the housing market, and I think our committee has done great work on a bipartisan basis to pass numerous measures and to listen to the concerns all across the board.

But I think the greatest concern for me and for all of us here should be that individual in that home who stays up late at night or can't sleep at night because they can't figure out how they're going to stay in their house and afford to keep their home, keep their family safe in their home, and meet the challenges of either an adjustable rate or a house that maybe has devalued so much that they feel like their only option may be to walk away from their mortgage.

So we have two bills before us today. Later on, we're going to be considering H.R. 5818, which is the Neighborhood Stabilization Act of 2008. This doesn't help that individual who can't sleep at night who we're most concerned about. The aim is to help big cities and other urban areas that have foreclosed properties, to revitalize that. That's an issue for another day. In my view, the issue we need to debate today is how we're going to help that individual who can't meet the challenges and wants to stay in their home.

And so on the larger bill that we're going to be considering later, unfortunately the bipartisan tone of our committee sort of broke down in the process. We had, I think, very spirited debates in front of our committee where our philosophies were shared and we actually found a lot of common ground, which is the way it should be. Because when an originator came forward with a bad loan or didn't ask for financials or didn't ask for background information on a potential buyer, they didn't ask, are you a Republican or a Democrat? This isn't a partisan issue. That's why I think we should have a full and open debate here, and that's why I advocated for an open rule in front of the Rules Committee.

So the solutions that we're offering today are going to be diluted because we're not going to be able to hear the debate on the floor because the Rules Committee has decided, in their infinite wisdom—and I'm a former member of a Rules Committee, so I can say that—that the majority is using a seldom used rule that will really prevent our side from offering even a motion to recommit, where we can at least have our voice heard on this floor.

So I'm very disappointed that at this day in time, when we have that person at night staying up, that family wondering how they're going to stay in their home that night, they are not going to be able to see the choices that are before us as a body where we can say, we think this is more helpful, or we think this direction is the way we should go. For that I'm tremendously disappointed, especially in light of the committee that I serve on, Financial Services, where we did have this debate and we had ideas that came forward and more ideas that could come forward on this House today.

With that, I oppose this rule.

Ms. CASTOR. Mr. Speaker, we're going to do everything we can in our power to help American families across this Nation that, yes, are facing foreclosure. In this package we bring today we will help the folks who are facing those adjustable rates and keep them out of foreclosure. But I don't think we should turn a blind eye to the significant increase in foreclosures, the rate of foreclosures that has happened since 2003 under the Bush Administration. In 2003, 734,000 foreclosures; 2004, 835,000 foreclosures. More in 2005 and 2006. 2007, a record-breaking 1.5 million foreclosed homes in America. This Neighborhood Stabilization Act will address those vacant foreclosed homes in our neighborhoods.

I am going to call upon my colleague from the Rules Committee, Ms. MATSUI from California, to further address the

issue. I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Florida for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the rule and the underlying legislation.

The housing crisis has had an unprecedented effect on our economy. Our families, our neighborhoods, our communities are facing daily challenges, seeing increased foreclosures and vacancies everywhere they turn.

My own hometown of Sacramento is among the hardest hit in this country. Just last quarter, nearly 5,300 homes were foreclosed on. And sadly, there is no end in sight. My district is fifth in the Nation in adjustable rate mortgages, many of which are reset to higher rates in the near future.

To make matters worse, Forbes magazine ranks Sacramento among the highest in homeowner debt. Twenty-eight percent of homeowners in my district hold second mortgages and/or home equity lines of credit, making it much more difficult for them to save their homes.

This crisis is affecting everyone; homeowners who are in danger of foreclosure, renters who are being forced to move, and even families who are secure in their mortgages are seeing their home values fall, and increased neighborhood blight.

Mr. Speaker, this year I have met with many Sacramento families that are struggling with their mortgages in today's volatile economy. I have seen the sadness in their eyes and the emotional toll this crisis has taken on them. It is truly devastating. I met Susan at a foreclosure workshop. She had a traditional mortgage that was in good standing. Then, after repeated calls, she was steered by a lender to refinance her traditional loan into an adjustable rate loan so she could do home improvements. Now the loan is scheduled to reset soon, and she will have a difficult time making ends meet.

Another constituent, Jeanie, e-mailed me just last week. She has been forced to move twice already this year because the homes she was renting were foreclosed on. Without some stability in the housing market, Jeanie and her family, including their young daughter, will be forced to move again.

Mr. Speaker, we need to help these honest, hardworking homeowners immediately. This legislation is a step in the right direction. I urge support of this rule and this legislation.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN).

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule that brings this bill to the floor and to this $15 billion bailout bill, and I thank the gentleman from Washington for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I think up here we lose sight of how much $15 billion really is. Fifteen billion dollars would operate the entire State government of Tennessee for almost 1 year, our education, our medical care, our prisons, our roads, our parks. And Tennessee is almost dead on average, statistics-wise, in regard to all the States.

Over 95 percent of the people are paying their mortgages on time. Consistent with that, about 95 percent of the people who have contacted my office or spoken to me about this bill, they don't want us to bail out people who have taken out loans that they couldn't afford. But even worse than that, the $15 billion that's in this bill, even worse, we're going to pass later today a $300 billion housing bill that we really can't afford. Tomorrow we're probably going to pass a $250 billion supplemental appropriations bill. That's $565 billion in 2 days. And all three of these bills are outside the regular or don't even count the regular appropriations bills that we'll be taking up.

Next week, we're going to pass an almost $300 billion farm bill. A couple of weeks ago it came out that the Pentagon has had $295 billion in cost overruns on just their 72 largest weapons systems, not counting the cost overruns that would be in all the thousands of other large and medium size and small contracts.

Last week, we rejected an effort by the administration to save $50 billion over the next 10 years on the Medicaid rules even though payments to hospitals under the Medicaid program have gone up two to three times the rate of inflation every year for the last 15 or 20 years.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. DUNCAN. What I'm getting at, Mr. Speaker, is this: This Congress is going to go down as the most fiscally irresponsible Congress in the history of this Nation if we keep spending at this rate. No one can legitimately call themselves a fiscal conservative if they vote for all these bills.

David Walker, who just retired as the head of the GAO, respected by both sides, said that even worse than the $9 trillion national debt that we have is the 53 to $54 trillion in unfunded future pension liabilities. It's not going to be many years, Mr. Speaker, before we're not going to be able to pay all our Social Security and veterans pensions and all the other things we promised our people if we keep spending in the reckless manner that we're doing so today and in the days ahead.

Ms. CASTOR. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to an outspoken advocate for the hardworking families of Ohio and all Americans, Ms. KAPTUR of Ohio.

Ms. KAPTUR. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding to me, and I rise today in reluctant opposition to the rules on both housing bills that are before us because they are not coming up before us in regular order. Neither one is an open rule on such an important subject.

I truly want to thank Chairman FRANK and Congresswoman WATERS for their efforts to improve these bills as they move forward. But on a matter so serious, the membership should be afforded the respect our offices bestow to represent their people and be allowed to amend and be heard in this body.

□ 1245

Every day, between 7,000 and 8,000 American households lose their homes to foreclosure. Meanwhile, the banks responsible are being rescued by the Federal Reserve, an instrument of our government. Today, the major bills before us to assist with foreclosures will unleash the power of the taxpayer-insured Federal Housing Administration to catch some of the homeowners in its rescue net. But these bills do nothing to hold the lenders and servicers responsible.

Despite the promise of rescue hotlines and Federal and State government compacts, Federal action to help homeowners being foreclosed lacks bite. It is voluntary. It pushes to the FHA what the private sector should be making whole.

The two plans to be considered today, again, ask mortgage servicers to voluntarily, and I underline that word voluntarily, enter into an agreement with the FHA to insure these troubled loans if servicers offer modest loan concessions. The problem: The voluntary aspect of the program leaves homeowners yet again at the mercy of the mortgage loan holder.

Take Countrywide. The CEO of that company had his compensation approach over $200 million, with salaries, bonuses, options, and everything over the last 5 years. Yet the Federal Reserve still rewards Countrywide as one of its privileged primary dealers trading in U.S. Government securities. The FHA rescue plan promises to save maybe 500,000 homeowners, or half a million Americans. That equals maybe 25 percent of the more than 2 million additional homeowners still at risk of foreclosure. Let me ask, is helping 25 percent, perhaps, of homeowners at risk the best America can do? Because the bills are not being considered under an open rule with the ability to amend, we cannot perfect this legislation.

So it's fair to ask, where have these voluntary rescue plans gotten us so far? Housing counselors in my area tell me dozens of servicers refuse even to come to the table and return phone calls, for heaven's sake. Not restructuring the loan is one thing but not picking up the phone is another. When servicers refuse to answer the phone, no degree of local government effort or foreclosure prevention counseling can be effective.

Who is not picking up the phone? Some of these characters:

CitiFinancial, HSBC/Beneficial, Chase Mortgage, Countrywide, Sovereign Bank, Indymac Bank, Popular Mortgage, GMAC, NovaStar, EMC Mortgage.

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

Ms. KAPTUR. May I have an additional minute?

Ms. CASTOR. We have a list of additional speakers, so at this time I cannot yield additional time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman 1 minute of my time.

Ms. KAPTUR. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

To continue . . . ASC Servicing, HomeEq, Wilshire, Nationalstar, EquiFirst, Litton Loan, Flagstar, and Saxon Mortgage Services.

In fact, the Federal Reserve still has among its privileged list of primary Treasury security dealers Countrywide, HSBC, and Citigroup, some of the very companies that aren't answering the telephone.

Banks and mortgage servicers should be mandated to disclose contact information, phone numbers, and lay services for their loss mitigation departments. Citizens attempting to do workouts on loans must have these recalcitrant institutions at the table.

In addition, as I've said for months, forthcoming improvements to the bill should include a short-term foreclosure moratorium, perhaps 3 months, to help hundreds of thousands of Americans avoid foreclosure. And, most importantly, Congress should vote again on allowing judges the flexibility to modify the terms of mortgage loans in bankruptcy court proceedings. Frankly, the Senate should filibuster on this issue. In other words, do for the homeowner what the Federal Reserve has done for the big banks.

Without enacting tougher legislation, a ''no'' vote on this rule and the one to follow will allow for a more effective set of bills to come before us that will really address the comprehensive foreclosure needs of the American people. I'm glad to see the progress we've made, but we could go so much further.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS).

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

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the ranking member a question on what's really going on in Florida.

One of the reasons we are objecting to this is because of the previous question. Can you mention the previous question?

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. If the gentleman will yield, I am going to ask my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the previous question so that we can address another issue of tremendous import in this country that has hit every family, and that's the high prices of gasoline. So I will ask my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the previous question so we can address issues, allow Members on the floor to be able to debate the issue of lower gas prices.

Mr. SHIMKUS. So a ''no'' vote on the previous question allows us to debate lowering energy costs in this country; is that correct?

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. It would give us the opportunity to do that because there are some ideas here. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. SHIMKUS. And that would be in conjunction and probably would meet with the Speaker's promise in 2006 that Democrats have a commonsense plan to help bring down skyrocketing gas prices. She made that quote. That would allow us to bring that plan to the floor, would it not?

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. If the gentleman will yield, the gentleman is correct.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Likewise, JIM CLYBURN said, ''House Democrats have a plan to help curb rising gas prices.'' That would allow us to find out what that plan is; am I correct?

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. If the gentleman will yield, the gentleman is correct.

Mr. SHIMKUS. And when STENY HOYER said, ''Democrats believe we can do more for the American people who are struggling to deal with high gas prices,'' that would allow us to address the majority leader's plan to help bring down energy prices; is that correct?

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. If the gentleman will yield, the gentleman is correct.

Mr. SHIMKUS. And it's tied to this debate, and I know my colleague who just spoke, it would probably be important for her to vote ''no'' on the previous question so that some of her concerns would be aired; would that be correct?

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. If the gentleman will yield, I think every Member should allow every Member the opportunity to address these issues.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Well, Mr. Speaker, high energy costs really affect this debate because high energy costs are causing people to make tough decisions where they can't meet their bill payments.

Just last year the cost for natural gas for an individual homeowner went up 5.9 percent. Just last year the price for home heating increased 37.2 percent. The cost for propane increased 22.2 percent. The cost for electricity increased 4.3 percent. Why? We have no plan. The Democrat plan to lower energy costs was no plan.

There was a plan. It did this: Crude oil was at $58.31 when the Democrats came into the majority. Today, $121. Yesterday it hit $122. I've been doing this for 4 weeks. It hasn't gone down; it keeps going up.

What has that done at the pump? When Democrats came into control, $2.33. What is it today? On average, $3.60. That's no plan. That's a plan to fail. That's higher costs.

If you want people to be able to meet their mortgage payments, let's lower energy costs. Let's lower the price of a gallon of gasoline.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Now bring in climate change. On average, climate change is going to add 50 cents to a gallon of gas. That would raise the price to $4.16. Nobody wants to pay that.

How can we solve this problem, Mr. Speaker? Let's go after our natural resources in the Outer Continental Shelf. Billions of barrels of oil, billions of cubic feet of natural gas right on the OCS. Democrats keep blocking the ability to get that. Let's do coal-to-liquid technologies. Go after our coal reserves, 250 years' worth in Southern Illinois alone, and turn that into liquid fuel.

Let's lower the cost for homeowners so that we don't have to rely on bailouts, we don't have to rely on government. My individuals want independence from government. They want independence on fuel costs. They want to pay lower costs.

Democrats can bring a bill to the floor. They promised it in 2006. We have yet to see it.

Ms. CASTOR. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS).

Mr. CUMMINGS. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the rule and in strong support of H.R. 5818, as well as H.R. 5830 and H.R. 5720, which together constitute a comprehensive package of legislation that will help us address our Nation's housing crisis by providing assistance to those who are suffering the most.

The numbers characterizing this crisis are truly staggering. The National Association of Realtors reports that median home prices fell in 2007 by nearly 2 percent. RealtyTrac reported last week that in the first quarter of 2008, 1 in every 194 homeowners faced a foreclosure notice.

The loss of a home, or value in a home, is a loss of an asset which many Americans often work their entire lives to own, and it is a loss of a dream that many may never again have the chance to achieve for the rest of their lives.

Further, the decline of the housing market has pulled our economy to the brink of recession. Our Nation has lost some 260,000 jobs since January of this year, and economic growth slowed in the first quarter of 2008 to less than 1 percent.

The reality is that many Americans long ago entered their own personal recessions. And the legislation before us today finally begins to provide the aid that our Nation's families so urgently need to get back on their feet.

Together, these pieces of legislation will do the following:

Provide mortgage refinancing assistance to keep families from losing their homes and protect the values of neighboring homes; expand FHA assistance so that borrowers in danger of losing their homes can refinance into lower-cost, government-insured mortgages they can afford to repay; and provide States $10 billion in additional tax-exempt bond authority in 2008 to refinance subprime loans and refinance the building of affordable and rental housing.

I applaud Chairman FRANK and Chairwoman WATERS for their determined leadership and for these great pieces of legislation, and I urge the adoption of each of these measures.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, how much time remains on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOLDEN). The gentleman from Washington has 13½ minutes remaining, and the gentlewoman from Florida has 12½ minutes remaining.

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to adjourn.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. 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 144, nays 250, not voting 39, as follows:

[Roll No. 272]

YEAS—144

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachus
Barrett (SC)
Barton (TX)
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Chandler
Coble
Cole (OK)
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis, David
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeGette
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Emerson
English (PA)
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Forbes
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gallegly
Gerlach
Gingrey
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Hall (TX)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Keller
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
LaHood
Lamborn
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCrery
McHenry
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shays
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Tancredo
Thornberry
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Wamp
Westmoreland
Whitfield (KY)
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman (VA)
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—250

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Altmire
Arcuri
Baca
Bachmann
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Becerra
Berkley
Berry
Biggert
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Butterfield
Buyer
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Castor
Cazayoux
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis, Lincoln
DeFazio
Delahunt
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Donnelly
Edwards
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fortenberry
Foster
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett (NJ)
Giffords
Gillibrand
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Gordon
Graves
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Hulshof
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Jordan
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
Lampson
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCotter
McDermott
McHugh
McIntyre
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Nunes
Obey
Ortiz
Pallone
Pastor
Payne
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Platts
Poe
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Reyes
Rodriguez
Rogers (MI)
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sali
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Skelton
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tiahrt
Tierney
Towns
Tsongas
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Weller
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—39

Andrews
Bean
Berman
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Boucher
Burton (IN)
Campbell (CA)
Conaway
Cubin
DeLauro
Doggett
Doyle
Fossella
Gilchrest
Grijalva
Hinchey
Hunter
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McGovern
Moran (VA)
Oberstar
Olver
Pascrell
Peterson (PA)
Renzi
Reynolds
Richardson
Ross
Rush
Salazar
Slaughter
Speier
Udall (CO)
Weldon (FL)
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Wynn

□ 1318

Messrs. JACKSON of Illinois, FRANK of Massachusetts, MCDERMOTT and RYAN of Ohio changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

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

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5818, NEIGHBORHOOD STABILIZATION ACT OF 2008

Ms. CASTOR. Mr. Speaker, we have just completed our third motion to adjourn the business of the House today, in addition to other procedural motions to delay action.

While we will not be deterred, we are going to continue to fight for families throughout America who are suffering in this housing crisis. We are going to provide the tools that our communities need to purchase these foreclosed homes and turn them into affordable housing for families.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK), the Chair of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I want to address both the procedural and substantive objections.

First, procedurally, I understand there are some legitimate concerns about the second rule that we will deal with. But as to this rule, I will say categorically I was the ranking member on the Committee on Financial Services for 4 years. The rule today gives more scope to the minority's amendments than any rule under this committee's jurisdiction when they were in the majority.

The gentleman complained about an amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE). There is an amendment on the subject of illegal immigrants and their benefits in this bill. There were four such amendments. One was made in order. Putting in order duplicative amendments serves no purpose.

But when the Republicans were in power, we had situations where motions adopted in committee were changed by the Rules Committee, and we were not given an opportunity to vote an amendment and discuss that on the floor. That was on the GSE bill. There was never a time when, under the Republican rule, we had as much ability to offer ours.

There are three substantive amendments offered here. Five were already adopted in committee.

Now as to the substance. The notion that this helps lenders is bizarre. This is one that is strongly urged for mayors, Governors, police chiefs and municipal officials. Property already foreclosed used to pay taxes. It now absorbs taxes. There are fire hazards, there are nuisances, there are threats in terms of sanitation.

The problem is that many of the cities that have this problem of foreclosed property don't have the financial wherewithal to buy up the property precisely because they have lost tax revenues. They are in a vicious cycle. We are offering this money, and it is a need-based formula. The money goes to where there is the most foreclosed property.

Now it is true that it is $15 billion for the entire United States. We are in a terrible crisis, and this bill would provide $15 billion to elected local and State officials to buy up property. That's an awful lot of money. It is half what this administration offered to the counterparties of Bear Stearns.

Now I thought that the $30 billion offer to the counterparties of Bear Stearns was an unfortunately necessary request. But how, Mr. Speaker, do people in an administration that gave $30 billion of taxpayers' money, put that at risk for the counterparties of Bear Stearns, object when half of that is made available to all of America to abate fire high hazards and to preserve neighborhoods from serious problems?

The lenders don't benefit from this. In fact, we have a later bill in which we are going to be accused of not doing enough to put you into foreclosures. This bill says that when the property has already been foreclosed for at least 60 days, the cities and States may work with profit or nonprofit groups to make it available for affordable housing, to make it available for local employees. I guess when you don't have a serious argument, you just make things up. This one is totally unconnected to reality. We have been asked by local officials and worked with them. There is a great deal of property that has been foreclosed upon.

By the way, to anyone who says this is an incentive to foreclose property, there isn't enough money in this bill to begin to buy up all that's already been foreclosed. No one who hasn't yet done it is going to get any benefit from this, but let's get back to the basics.

Thirty billion dollars of public money has been made available for the counterparties of Bear Stearns, I think, of necessity, to avoid greater danger. But how, having done that, do you denounce half that amount of money for the whole country to cities and States to buy up foreclosed property that is blighting neighborhoods?

Then the gentleman from Washington said, well, why should the rural areas be forced to deal with this when it's a city problem because there is foreclosed property in many places? But that kind of rhetoric that sets one against the other, I don't think is very productive.

I guess I would say this: Why should the people of Detroit and Cleveland pay subsidies to farmers who make hundreds of thousands of dollars a year? We are going to pass an agricultural bill that's going to ask people in the cities to pay for agricultural subsidies. I don't think it is very sensible to start this kind of thing. We are going to bring forward housing dealing with rural housing.

America is in a terrible financial situation brought about by irresponsible economic activity unchecked by reasonable regulation. This is one small piece of dealing with it, and it is far less expensive than other pieces these people have supported.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from Florida (Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE).

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule.

H.R. 5818, quite frankly, is a bailout bill, and it is not even a bailout bill to homeowners, it's a bailout bill to lending institutions.

While I appreciate the merits of the bill and what the sponsor was trying to accomplish, it is what it is. If we're going to provide a bailout, Congress should ensure that at least we are bailing out lending institutions that lent to Americans, not illegal aliens.

Yesterday I offered an amendment in rules to do that, an amendment that actually had some teeth. Instead, the Rules Committee decided to allow a similar amendment but one that lacked the teeth that mine had. My amendment prohibited States from using any of the funds to purchase homes that were owned by illegal aliens. If States used the funds under this bill to provide affordable housing to its residents, my amendment prohibited them from providing that housing to illegal aliens. However, my amendment required documentation, which only included a Social Security card with a photo ID or a REAL ID identification. That would be the proof of the pudding.

If Congress wants to use taxpayers' dollars to bail out lenders, let's make sure it's only benefiting the people who pay taxes and live here legally. I am saddened that once again the majority wants to pass legislation that will accomplish nothing but provide political cover.

I just checked with my office to see if we have heard from one municipality. While I respect the gentleman from Massachusetts, we have not heard from one mayor, not one city council member, not one county commissioner and, as of the last time I checked, we still had not heard from one State official.

For this reason I am going to vote against the rule and encourage other Members to do so.

Ms. CASTOR. Mr. Speaker, I would note for the record that the Committee on Financial Services heard from local government officials and housing experts across this country during committee markup and after that. There is no secret that communities across this country need a little bit of help in turning those dilapidated, empty, foreclosed homes into productive, safe, secure housing for families.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON).

Mr. KINGSTON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose the rule, because there are so many amendments that could have improved this bill and saved the taxpayers money, but they were ignored by the Rules Committee, not allowed on the floor of the House, which isn't totally unlike the situation we are in with the supplemental appropriation bill.

Here we are about to pass a $200 billion—that's billion with a B—the largest supplemental appropriation bill in the history of Congress, and supplemental appropriation bills aren't anything new. They go back to the second Congress that ever existed because, so often, when you have a war, there are unanticipated costs associated with it, as there are with disasters and other things that might occur during the course of the year. So supplemental appropriation bills are normal. But what isn't normal is the size of this bill.

□ 1330

And what isn't normal is the Democrat Party who even has on Speaker PELOSI's Web page, as I speak, a promise to the American people that every bill would be vetted properly and passed through proper order.

And we all know from our eighth grade social studies class that proper order is that a bill is introduced; ding. It is sent to subcommittee; ding. The subcommittee has hearings, it has a markup in which amendments are allowed and where endorsements and where statements are made. Then it goes to full committee; ding. And full committee again repeats the process, possibly with hearings, certainly with debate, always with amendments, always with the minority and the majority party putting aside partisan differences on a committee level before the final product goes to the floor. And then again, ding, the bill goes to the floor where again people are allowed to amend a bill. People are allowed to make speeches on it.

But instead, what we have from what can only be called a ruthless, iron-fisted majority, an air-dropped bill. Yes, Mr. Speaker, an air-dropped bill, a bill that has bypassed, leapfrogged over the regular subcommittee and committee process.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. KINGSTON. May I have another 30 seconds?

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. KINGSTON. Again, Mr. Speaker, this bill is thrust upon Members of the House who will not have read it. In fact, I will take a poll right now.

Is there anybody who has read, there are a lot of Members of Congress on this floor, have any of you read this $200 billion supplemental appropriations bill of which we will be voting on tomorrow? Not one hand goes up. I rest my point. This bill has not been vetted.

It should go through regular order which means subcommittee, full committee and then on the floor. Members should have the opportunity to read a $200 billion bill and they should have the opportunity to amend it.

Ms. CASTOR. Mr. Speaker, just for purposes of clarifying the record, I think it is important to note that a number of amendments were considered in the full committee, the Committee on Financial Services. And indeed, in the Rules Committee, we considered a number of amendments, and have accepted consideration of seven amendments in this bill that will be voted on later on. Three are Republican amendments.

Now I know the other side has focused a lot on delaying tactics and procedural maneuvers today, and they would love to open this up and have hundreds of amendments considered. A number of amendments filed with the Rules Committee were duplicative. We have tailored this structured rule in a fair manner.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from California, the distinguished ranking member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding, and I was seeking to get the floor from my very dear friend from Florida to simply say that all we were asking for was nine amendments. Unfortunately, the process that was so eloquently outlined by our friend from Savannah, Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON) is exactly the process that is being used on the next foreclosure bill that we have. Having completely denied the opportunity for the hearing process, and as we go through every single step that should be part of this measure, the minority is going to, unfortunately, not have a chance whatsoever to offer its motion to recommit.

We are not asking for hundreds of amendments, Mr. Speaker, we are simply asking on this bill for nine amendments. When only a third of our amendments were made in order, three-quarters of their amendments were made in order, let's have a little more fairness.

Ms. CASTOR. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois, a classmate of mine, Mr. LAHOOD.

Mr. LAHOOD. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I rise to say that I wish as a member of the Appropriations Committee, that the same procedure that is being followed for helping the housing industry whereby the Committee on Financial Services held hearings, allowed members to offer amendments, allowed members to read the bill, allowed members to have their say about the bill, we on the Appropriations Committee would be accorded the same opportunity when it comes to a bill that will be considered by the House tomorrow, a $200 billion bill that will appropriate money to help our troops and to fund our troops and to provide them the equipment they need.

Now as a member of the Appropriations Committee, none of us will have the chance to read the bill, to look at the bill, and those of us who have been around this House for some time, and members of the committee know that the devil is in the details. We know what happens when bills are brought to the floor when Members haven't had a chance to read them. Things are inserted, words are inserted, dollars are inserted that become a great embarrassment for people as they vote on these bills.

And so tomorrow when this bill comes to the floor, the appropriation bill, the $200 billion appropriation bill, I encourage Members to vote against it because they will not know what is in it. They won't know what words are in it or what money is in it because the Appropriations Committee has been shut out from the opportunity to have their say, to offer amendments, to offer an opportunity to change the language in the bill.

And really it is disingenuous, I think, to our committee to allow this kind of procedure to take place. We have two very experienced people on the Appropriations Committee in the chairman from Pennsylvania and the ranking member from Florida of the Defense Appropriation Subcommittee who will have little or nothing to say about the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. LAHOOD. Now I talked to two of the Democratic leaders about this, and I tried to persuade them, let's go through the regular procedure. You've got the votes to pass the bill. You're going to pass the bill. Why not give all of us a chance to have our say and to at least read it and offer amendments and have our say. What are you afraid of?

Mr. Speaker, this is not the way to run the House. This is unprecedented that a bill of this magnitude would come to the House like this. I urge the Speaker and the leadership to give us a chance, as members of the Appropriations Committee, to have our say, to read the bill, to offer amendments.

Ms. CASTOR. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, how much time remains on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Washington has 6 minutes remaining and the gentlewoman from Florida has 5½ minutes remaining.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CULBERSON).

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Speaker, let's be clear. It is not we Members who are shut out, it is the constituents that we represent. On this Financial Services bill, those constituents that we represent have been shut out in committee and not offered an opportunity to offer an amendment.

On the Appropriations Committee, the war funding bill, life or death for our troops, the most important question facing our Nation, our survival as a Nation and the war on terror, the 19 million Americans that we represent on the Republican side have been shut out of the process and denied an opportunity to offer amendments in debate on the survival of the Nation in the war on terror, on life and death of our soldiers in the field.

I, for one, had an amendment to make the Iraqi Government pay more of their own share of this reconstruction and make sure that with oil at $120 a barrel, the Iraqi Government, sitting on the world's third-largest supply of oil, I have an amendment to require the Iraqi Government, that I was going to offer in committee, to make the Iraqi Government pay for the reconstruction of roads, utilities, schools, job training and economic development. Because we have a record debt and deficit in this country, that amendment is an important piece of the debate in the appropriations bill to pay for the war.

This is not just any bill that the American people have been shut out of the debate on. It is the bill paying for the lives and safety of our troops in the field.

I would, frankly, think that the Democrat leadership of this House would be embarrassed to deny the American people an opportunity to have their elected representatives participate in this debate. When we started this Congress, the Speaker promised the most ethical and open Congress in the history of the Nation. We don't see it in the process. Over and over again these bills come to the floor without an opportunity to debate them or offer amendments on the floor.

Don't forget, it is not just the Republicans that are shut out, Mr. Speaker, but the Democrat members of the Appropriations Committee have been shut out, just like the members of the Financial Services Committee have been shut out. The American people have been shut out of this process, and the Democrat leadership ought to be embarrassed for bringing a bill to fund the war without giving us all an opportunity.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, clearly there is enough to talk about here, and so I ask unanimous consent that each side have an additional 5 minutes.

Ms. CASTOR. Mr. Speaker, I do not yield for that purpose.

I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman does not yield for that purpose.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I inquire of my colleague from Florida if there are any more speakers on the other side.

Ms. CASTOR. I am the last speaker for my side, so I will reserve the balance of my time until it is my turn to close.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleague if she would be willing, since she has time and she is the last speaker, if she would yield time to us so we may control that time for the speakers we have.

Ms. CASTOR. Mr. Speaker, we have suffered through delaying and procedural tactics today, and the business of the American people in this housing crisis should be delayed no longer. I do not yield additional time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, how much time remains on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Washington has 4 minutes remaining and the gentlewoman from Florida has 5½ minutes remaining.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California, the ranking member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 30 seconds, if I might, to the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Financial Services.

Mr. BACHUS. Let me introduce into the RECORD a letter that 16 Republicans, including myself and SCOTT GARRETT, sent to Chairman FRANK asking for hearings on the Bear Stearns matter and his response in which he said that he had much greater confidence in the decision to fund the bailout of the counterparties of Bear Stearns. So the chairman at that time expressed his support, and we expressed our concern.

So now he seems to have changed his opinion and is criticizing the administration for something he defended in these letters. We will be having hearings on this matter, on Bear Stearns I can assure you, because our side is concerned about that bailout.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, April 7, 2008.

Hon. BARNEY FRANK,
Chairman, Committee on Financial Services, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN FRANK: We are writing to respectfully request you hold a hearing of the full Financial Services Committee regarding the recent collapse of the investment bank Bear Stearns and the subsequent actions taken by the Federal Reserve to facilitate Bear Stearns' sale to J.P. Morgan Chase. These steps have had an immediate impact on the financial markets and are also expected to have a long-term effect on our financial regulatory structure.

For the first time since the Great Depression, the Fed voted to open its discount window to primary dealers. While this authority has been available to the Fed since 1932, the decision to use it at this time has raised questions about whether and when the Fed should intervene to help a particular industry or firm in the name of market stability.

With the Fed approving the financing arrangements of the sale of Bear Stearns to J.P. Morgan Chase as well as guaranteeing $29 billion in securities currently held by Bear Stearns, the Fed has possibly exposed the American taxpayers to unknown amounts of financial loss and established a precedent that could lead to future instances of companies in similar financial trouble expecting the same assistance.

These extraordinary actions have raised a number of complex and multifaceted questions. As members of the committee of jurisdiction over our nation's financial markets and the regulatory bodies that oversee them, we feel it is imperative to have a full and public vetting of this unique situation. Therefore, we strongly urge you to convene a hearing on this subject of the Financial Services Committee on the soonest possible date.

Thank you for your consideration of this request.

Sincerely,

Scott Garrett, Spencer Bachus, Donald Manzullo, Walter B. Jones, Michele Bachmann, Ginny Brown-Waite, Randy Neugebauer, Tom Feeney, Tom Price, Ron Paul, Adam Putnam, Thaddeus McCotter, Jeb Hensarling, Steve Pearce, Geoff Davis, Judy Biggert, Dean Heller.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, April 14, 2008.

Hon. SCOTT GARRETT,
Congressman, House of Representatives, Longworth House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. GARRETT, I received the letter signed by you and sixteen of your Republican colleagues on the Financial Services Committee expressing your concern that the recent actions by the top financial appointees of the Bush administration in the matter of Bear Stearns have ''possibly exposed the American taxpayers to unknown amounts of financial loss and established a precedent that could lead to future instances of companies in similar financial trouble expecting the same assistance.'' It does occur to me as I read your letter that I have somewhat more confidence in the judgment exercised by Secretary of the Treasury Paulson and his aides and Federal Reserve Chairman Bernanke and other officials of the Federal Reserve System than you appear to have, but that is no reason for us not to give this the fullest possible airing, So I do agree that we should be thoroughly examining this matter.

Where we may disagree is the context in which this happens. That is, I agree with you that we should have a ''full and public vetting of this'' matter, but I do not think it is necessary that we have the hearing ''on the soonest possible date.'' I say this for two reasons.

First, the Committee, as you know, is now engaged in serious consideration of the appropriate response to the foreclosure crisis that now confronts us. I realize that there are some who believe that we should take no action at all, but I think the recent movement by the Bush administration to expand the reach of the FHA, even though I do not agree with it in all respects—is recognition of the need for some action. I therefore believe that it is important that the Committee continue its efforts on dealing with the current crisis, in cooperation with our Senate colleagues who as you know in a bipartisan way have also moved forward on legislation, although I do not agree myself with all aspects of it. My intention is to ask that the Committee continue to focus on this for the next several weeks.

Secondly, I do believe it is important for the Committee to begin an investigation, including hearings, into the Bear Stearns issue, but not in isolation. It is important that we look at what happened with regard to Bear Stearns, not primarily as a matter of hindsight because in fact we cannot undo what was done, but rather from the standpoint of anticipating what the public response should be in similar matters going forward. This includes of course discussing whether or not these specific actions taken in the Bear Stearns case were the best ones from the public standpoint, but also beginning the very important issue of what we might do in Congress to make it less likely that a situation of this sort will recur. You correctly note in your letter that what the Bush Administration did in this case did establish ''a precedent that could lead to future instances of companies. . . expecting the same assistance.'' I think it is important that we therefore empower some federal entities to take actions that may make this less likely, and would also allow them to accompany any such intervention if it should later be decided to be necessary with appropriate remedial matters.

In summary, I agree that the Committee should be looking into this, not from the standpoint of rebuking Chairman Bernanke or Secretary Paulson, but rather as part of a serious consideration of the causes of the current crisis and more importantly, what we can do to make a recurrence of the events that led up to the Bear Stearns response much less likely in the future.

BARNEY FRANK.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for his helpful contribution.

We have heard countless members of the Appropriations Committee come to this floor and demonstrate their outrage. And why? Well, for the first time in the history of this institution, 219 years old, for the first time in the history of the institution, we are bringing up tomorrow, in the Rules Committee I suspect today, I don't know if we have a meeting scheduled or not, we are bringing up a wartime supplemental under a process which doesn't ask, as my friend from Tampa said, for hundreds and hundreds of amendments. We are simply asking for one simple bite at the apple, Mr. Speaker, a motion to recommit which was promised at the beginning of this Congress which was designed to be a great, new, open Congress with an opportunity for regular order to proliferate and succeed. And, unfortunately, what we are doing with this process is completely obliterating the right, as my friend from Houston said, of millions and millions of Americans to be heard.

We have seen the committee process completely abrogated as we look at this wartime supplemental, and now here we are saying that there won't

even be an opportunity to consider, that sacrosanct one opportunity for Members of the minority to be heard. It is an absolute outrage that this would proceed, and that is why so many of our Members have demonstrated their concern.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I again inquire of my colleague from Florida if there are any more speakers on her side.

Ms. CASTOR. I am the last speaker on my side, so I will reserve the balance of my time to close.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time.

Mr. Speaker, 2 years ago Speaker NANCY PELOSI promised Americans a Democrat plan to lower gas prices at the pump. Democrats have controlled Congress for 16 months but we have still not seen the plan. Meanwhile, the cost of gas has gone so high it is setting record after record.

Since Democrats took control of Congress in January of 2007, the cost of gasoline has gone up by more than 50 percent. In fact, the cost of gasoline has gone up more in 16 months than it had gone up in the prior 6 years.

Despite Speaker PELOSI's promise of a ''commonsense plan'' to ''lower the price at the pump,'' this Democrat Congress has put forward no plan, taken no action, and passed no bills to lower gas prices.

It is time for the House to debate ideas for lowering prices and it is time for Democrats to reveal their promised plan.

By defeating the previous question, I will move to amend the rule to allow any amendment to be made in order on the underlying bill that ''would have the effect of lowering the national average price of gasoline.''

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have the text of the amendment and extraneous material inserted in the RECORD prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, on April 21, CNNMoneyline.com had a poll, and the things that Americans were most concerned about from a financial standpoint were: the cost of gasoline, 65 percent; the cost of food, 16 percent; the cost of health care, 13 percent; and the cost of housing, 6 percent.

Mr. Speaker, that makes the case in my view for defeating the previous question so we can respond to the 65 percent of Americans who are concerned about the rising price of gasoline. This will give the House of Representatives an opportunity to debate ideas to reduce the cost of gasoline. So I urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question so we can consider this vitally important question for American families, for workers, truckers, small businesses, and for the entire economy.

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

Ms. CASTOR. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the Neighborhood Stabilization Act of 2008 and this rule today so that we can provide our communities with the tools they need to protect our neighborhoods during these economically turbulent times.

And I urge my Republican colleagues not to turn a blind eye to the hardworking families across America that are being squeezed, and your delaying tactics and your procedural maneuvers that are simply delaying our efforts to address the housing crisis for America's hardworking families.

I salute the leadership of Chairman FRANK and Chairwoman WATERS during this housing crisis and our swift action through this comprehensive housing package that has been encouraged by Federal Reserve Chairman Ben Bernanke and under Democratic leadership. This demonstrates that we are committed to ensuring that families across America can obtain and keep the American dream of homeownership in a safe and secure neighborhood.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule and the underlying bill to H.R. 5818, the Neighborhood Stabilization Act of 2008.

This legislation will provide $15 billion in HUD-administered loans and grants for the purchase and rehabilitation of owner-vacated, foreclosed homes.

This bill is a win-win for our communities. Not only will it help provide a bottom for local housing markets: by removing foreclosed properties that continue to drag down the housing values of whole neighborhoods, this program will allow for the creation of much needed affordable housing.

Our communities are looking to us to help provide a solution to the subprime mortgage meltdown. They need relief now.

I support the rule. This bill is the best vehicle for direct relief. I urge its adoption.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 1174, the Rule Providing for Consideration of H.R. 5818, the "Neighborhood Stabilization Act of 2008", introduced by Congresswoman MAXINE WATERS, of California. I would also like to thank Chairman BARNEY FRANK for his leadership on the Financial Services Committee.

As evidenced by the numerous housing and financial services bills introduced this Congress, we are in economic turmoil. I have been concerned over recent developments in the housing and mortgage markets and worked with my colleagues to ensure that not only are my constituents' needs addressed but that all Americans are able to get relief.

Bills such as H.R. 3019, the Expand and Preserve Home Ownership Through Counseling Act by Congresswoman JUDY BIGGERT, and H.R. 3666, the Foreclosure Prevention and Home Ownership Protection Act by Congresswoman BETTY SUTTON, include sections that speak specifically about foreclosures. These bills would authorize studies on current defaults and foreclosures, as well as possible causes.

I am pleased to support this much needed legislation from fellow Congressional Black Caucus member, Congresswoman MAXINE WATERS. H.R. 5818, the Neighborhood Stabilization Act of 2008, establishes a loan and grant program, administered by the Department of Housing and Urban Development, to help States purchase and rehabilitate foreclosed homes to stabilize as many properties as possible.

AMENDMENT LANGUAGE AND PURPOSE

I had offered an amendment to H.R. 5818 that would provide for those who have been struggling to keep up with the rising price of gas, the downturn of the housing market, and the incredible cost of healthcare. My amendment would not exclude from eligibility, individuals and families based solely on credit ratings or their credit histories.

Many individuals and families have credit ratings and histories that are less than required for the most-advantageous lending terms. These individuals should not be faulted for their struggle to make ends meet in these troubling economic times.

They have less than stellar credit due to the financial stress they have experienced trying to save their home from foreclosure. As a result, they have marred their credit. Families who have struggled to decide between paying their mortgage or paying for healthcare, families who have struggled to balance their need for shelter with their need for food are rarely able to maintain a credit score that qualifies them for a basic credit card, let alone a home or rental property.

At least 50 percent of the grant money must be targeted to house families at or below 50 percent of AMI, and not less than half of this money must target families at or below 30 percent of AMI. Most of the people covered under this bill and at these income levels will not qualify if it is not clearly stated that they can be considered even with less than stellar credit.

This bill already gives preference to homeless persons, but I ask you, how many homeless people will qualify under this program if we do not make it clear that States can and should consider them even with credit histories that are not perfect. My amendment may appear to state the obvious in the preferences sections, but it adds clarity to the Act and I believe is necessary to ensure that ALL Americans are truly aided by this bill.

BILL BACKGROUND

The bill would establish a $15 billion, HUD-administered loan and grant program for the purchase and rehabilitation of owner-vacated, foreclosed homes with the goal of stabilizing and occupying them as soon as possible. $7.5 billion of the funds would be for loans, and the other $7.5 billion would be for grants.

Each State's loan and grant authority would be based on the State's percentage of nationwide foreclosures over the last four calendar quarters, adjusted to account for the State's relative median home price. States could allocate funds to government entities (e.g., housing authorities) and nonprofits for the purchase, rehabilitation, and resale of homeownership housing and the purchase, rehabilitation, and operation of rental housing. A State would be required to direct funds to a city within its bounds if that city is one of the 25 most populous in the Nation according to a formula based on the city's share of total State foreclosures and relative home prices.

Loans would be non-recourse, zero-interest loans to finance acquisition and rehabilitation costs. The federal government would be paid

back from resale or, in the case of rental properties, refinance proceeds. Grant funds could be used toward property taxes and insurance during the pre-occupancy phase; operating costs such as property management fees, property taxes, and insurance during the period a property is rented; property acquisition costs; and State and grantee administrative costs. Grants could also cover closing costs.

Homes purchased for resale must be sold to families having incomes that do not exceed 140 percent of area median income (AMI). Properties purchased for rental must serve families having incomes at or below AMI.

However, States would be required to give preference to activities serving the lowest income families for the longest period and homeowners whose mortgages have been foreclosed.

Thank you, Congressman FRANK and Congresswoman WATERS, for this timely housing legislation. I urge my colleagues to support H. Res. 1174 providing for consideration of H.R. 5818.

□ 1345

I urge a ''yes'' vote on the previous question and on the rule.

The material previously referred to by Mr. HASTINGS of Washington is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 1174

OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF WASHINGTON

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 4. Notwithstanding any other provision of this resolution or the operation of the previous question, it shall be in order to consider any amendment to the substitute which the proponent asserts, if enacted, would have the effect of lowering the national average price per gallon of regular unleaded gasoline. Such amendments shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for thirty minutes 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 except those arising under clause 9 of rule XXI.

SEC. 5. Within five legislative days the Speaker shall introduce a bill, the title of which is as follows: ''A bill to provide a common sense plan to help bring down skyrocketing gas prices.'' Such bill shall be referred to the appropriate committees of jurisdiction pursuant to clause I of rule X.

(The information contained herein was provided by Democratic Minority on multiple occasions throughout the 109th Congress.)

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Democratic majority agenda and a vote to allow the opposition, at least for the moment, to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives, (VI, 308–311) describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as ''a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge.'' To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that ''the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition'' in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R–Illinois) said: ''The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition.''

Because the vote today may look bad for the Democratic majority they will say ''the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever.'' But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the definition of the previous question used in the Floor Procedures Manual published by the Rules Committee in the 109th Congress, (page 56). Here's how the Rules Committee described the rule using information form Congressional Quarterly's ''American Congressional Dictionary'': ''If the previous question is defeated, control of debate shifts to the leading opposition member (usually the minority Floor Manager) who then manages an hour of debate and may offer a germane amendment to the pending business.''

Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled ''Amending Special Rules'' states: ''a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate.'' (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon.''

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Democratic majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. 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, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to adjourn.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. CULBERSON. 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, this 15-minute vote on the motion to adjourn will be followed by 5-minute votes on motions to suspend the rules on House Resolution 1113 and H.R. 5937.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 138, nays 272, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 273]

YEAS—138

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachus
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boustany
Broun (GA)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Cannon
Cantor
Carter
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis, David
Davis, Tom
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Emerson
English (PA)
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Forbes
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gilchrest
Gingrey
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Hall (TX)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Keller
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
LaHood
Lamborn
Latham
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCrery
McHenry
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Saxton
Scalise
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shays
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Tancredo
Thornberry
Turner
Upton
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Wamp
Westmoreland
Whitfield (KY)
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman (VA)
Young (AK)

NAYS—272

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Altmire
Arcuri
Baca
Bachmann
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Butterfield
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Castle
Castor
Cazayoux
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Cooper
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Lincoln
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doyle
Edwards
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Foster
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Gerlach
Giffords
Gillibrand
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Gordon
Graves
Green, Al

Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Hulshof
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Jordan
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Kingston
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
Lampson
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
LaTourette
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Nunes
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Pickering
Platts
Poe
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Reyes
Rodriguez
Rogers (MI)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sali
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Tsongas
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Weller
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—23

Andrews
Bishop (NY)
Bonner
Burton (IN)
Campbell (CA)
Conaway
Conyers
Costa
Cubin
Davis (KY)
Deal (GA)
Fortenberry
Fossella
Paul
Peterson (PA)
Reynolds
Richardson
Rush
Skelton
Speier
Udall (CO)
Weldon (FL)
Young (FL)

□ 1410

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas and Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

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

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 273, had I been present, I would have voted ''no.''

SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF MOTHER'S DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROSS). The unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, H. Res. 1113.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1113.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 412, noes 0, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 274]

AYES—412

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Altmire
Arcuri
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Carter
Castle
Castor
Cazayoux
Chabot
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cohen
Cole (OK)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Fallin
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson
Filner
Flake
Forbes
Foster
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gingrey
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hobson
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Jordan
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Lampson
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Nunes
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sali
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Wexler
Whitfield (KY)
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman (VA)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—21

Andrews
Bishop (NY)
Bonner
Burton (IN)
Campbell (CA)
Conaway
Cubin
Deal (GA)
Farr
Fortenberry
Fossella
Hinchey
Murphy, Patrick
Paul
Peterson (PA)
Richardson
Rush
Skelton
Speier
Udall (CO)
Watson

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining on this vote.

□ 1419

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Mr. Speaker, on roll-call No. 274, H. Res. 1113, had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, I move to reconsider the vote.

MOTION TO TABLE OFFERED BY MS. CASTOR

Ms. CASTOR. Mr. Speaker, I move to lay the motion to reconsider on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to table.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 237, noes 178, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 275]

AYES—237

Ackerman
Allen
Altmire
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Castor
Cazayoux
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, David
Davis, Lincoln
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Fattah
Filner
Foster
Frank (MA)
Giffords
Gillibrand
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Heller
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Jordan
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Klein (FL)
Kucinich
Lampson
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Reyes
Rodriguez
Roskam
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Tsongas
Udall (NM)
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NOES—178

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachmann
Bachus
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, Tom
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
English (PA)
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gilchrest
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Hall (TX)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Keller
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Latham
LaTourette
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Tim
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Radanovich
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Saxton
Scalise
Schmidt
Sessions
Shadegg
Shays
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Tancredo
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield (KY)
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman (VA)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—18

Abercrombie
Andrews
Bishop (NY)
Burton (IN)
Campbell (CA)
Conaway
Cubin
Deal (GA)
Farr
Fossella
Paul
Putnam
Richardson
Rush
Speier
Udall (CO)
Van Hollen
Yarmuth

□ 1427

So the motion to table was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to adjourn.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote will be followed by resumed 5-minute voting.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 146, noes 276, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 276]

AYES—146

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boustany
Boyd (FL)
Broun (GA)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Davis, David
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Emerson
English (PA)
Everett
Fallin
Ferguson
Flake
Forbes
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gilchrest
Gingrey
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Hall (TX)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Keller
King (NY)
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
LaHood
Lamborn
Latham
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCrery
McHenry
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Pastor
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Radanovich
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Saxton
Scalise
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shays
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Sullivan
Tancredo
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Upton
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Westmoreland
Whitfield (KY)
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—276

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Bachmann
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Buchanan
Burgess
Butterfield
Buyer
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Castle
Castor
Cazayoux
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis, Lincoln
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doyle
Edwards
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Engel

Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Feeney
Filner
Fortenberry
Foster
Frank (MA)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gillibrand
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Graves
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Heller
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Hulshof
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Jordan
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (IA)
Kingston
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
Lampson
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
LaTourette
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Platts
Poe
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Putnam
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Renzi
Reyes
Rodriguez
Rogers (MI)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sali
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Wittman (VA)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—11

Bachus
Bishop (NY)
Campbell (CA)
Conaway
Fossella
Paul
Richardson
Rush
Speier
Udall (CO)
Weller

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are less than 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1446

Messrs. FRANK of Massachusetts, HILL, and BUTTERFIELD changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

FACILITATING PRESERVATION OF CERTAIN AFFORDABLE HOUSING DWELLING UNITS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 5937.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5937.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 345, noes 73, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 277]

AYES—345

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Alexander
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Barton (TX)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Blumenauer
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Camp (MI)
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Castle
Castor
Cazayoux
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole (OK)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doolittle
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Fortenberry
Foster
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gerlach
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gordon
Graves
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hobson
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Keller
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (NY)
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Lampson
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lynch
Mack
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Marshall
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
Peterson (PA)
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sali
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield (KY)
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Wittman (VA)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth
Young (FL)

NOES—73

Aderholt
Akin
Bartlett (MD)
Biggert
Blackburn
Blunt
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Burgess
Calvert
Cannon
Cantor
Carter
Chabot
Coble
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Deal (GA)
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Everett
Feeney
Flake
Forbes
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Garrett (NJ)
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Granger
Hoekstra
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Jones (NC)
Jordan
King (IA)
Kingston
Kirk
Lewis (KY)
Lungren, Daniel E.
Marchant
McKeon
Miller (FL)
Moran (KS)
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Petri
Poe
Price (GA)
Radanovich
Regula
Royce
Scalise
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shimkus
Shuster
Stearns
Sullivan
Tancredo
Thornberry
Walberg
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Westmoreland
Wilson (SC)
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—15

Bishop (NY)
Campbell (CA)
Conaway
Drake
Fossella
Kaptur
Linder
Matheson
Paul
Peterson (MN)
Richardson
Rush
Speier
Terry
Udall (CO)

□ 1456

Messrs. FORBES, KIRK, CHABOT, and Mrs. MUSGRAVE changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I move to reconsider the vote.

MOTION TO TABLE OFFERED BY MR. WELCH OF VERMONT

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, I move to lay the motion to reconsider on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to table.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 225, noes 190, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 278]

AYES—225

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Castor
Cazayoux
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Lincoln
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Donnelly
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Foster
Frank (MA)
Giffords
Gillibrand
Gonzalez
Goode
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Klein (FL)
Kucinich
Lampson
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Perlmutter
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Reyes
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Tsongas
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth

NOES—190

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachmann
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doggett
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
English (PA)
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gilchrest
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Graves
Hall (TX)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
LaHood
Lamborn
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy, Tim
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Saxton
Scalise
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shays
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Sullivan
Tancredo
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield (KY)
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman (VA)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—18

Bachus
Bishop (NY)
Campbell (CA)
Conaway
Fossella
Granger
Kuhl (NY)
Linder
Paul
Peterson (MN)
Rangel
Richardson
Rush
Speier
Stearns
Tauscher
Terry
Udall (CO)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining on this vote.

□ 1504

So the motion to table was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to adjourn.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. CALVERT. 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 137, nays 260, not voting 36, as follows:

[Roll No. 279]

YEAS—137

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boustany
Boyd (FL)
Broun (GA)
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Crenshaw
Cubin
Davis, David
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Emerson
English (PA)
Everett
Fallin
Ferguson
Flake
Forbes
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gilchrest
Gingrey
Goode
Goodlatte
Hall (TX)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Keller
King (NY)
Knollenberg
LaHood
Lamborn
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Marchant
McCaul (TX)
McCrery
McHenry
McKeon
Miller (FL)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rothman
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Saxton
Scalise
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shays
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Sullivan
Thornberry
Tiberi
Upton
Walden (OR)
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Westmoreland
Whitfield (KY)
Wilson (NM)
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—260

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Bachmann
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Buchanan
Burgess
Butterfield
Buyer
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Castle
Castor
Cazayoux
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (KY)
Davis, Lincoln
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doyle
Edwards
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Fattah
Filner
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gillibrand
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Graves
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Heller
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey

Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hulshof
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Jordan
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (IA)
Kingston
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
Lampson
Langevin
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Nadler
Napolitano
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Perlmutter
Peterson (PA)
Platts
Poe
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Rahall
Ramstad
Reyes
Rodriguez
Rogers (MI)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sali
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Skelton
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tiahrt
Tierney
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Weller
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Wittman (VA)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—36

Bachus
Bishop (NY)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Conaway
Cooper
Cummings
Davis (IL)
Farr
Feeney
Fossella
Gordon
Granger
Hoyer
Kaptur
Kirk
Larsen (WA)
Linder
McMorris Rodgers
Murtha
Neal (MA)
Paul
Peterson (MN)
Rangel
Richardson
Rush
Sestak
Slaughter
Speier
Tancredo
Udall (CO)
Walsh (NY)
Waxman
Wilson (SC)
Wynn

□ 1523

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF SENATE AMENDMENTS TO H.R. 3221, FORECLOSURE PREVENTION ACT OF 2008

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1175 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1175

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 3221) moving the United States toward greater energy independence and security, developing innovative new technologies, reducing carbon emissions, creating green jobs, protecting consumers, increasing clean renewable energy production, and modernizing our energy infrastructure, and to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax incentives for the production of renewable energy and energy conservation, with the Senate amendments thereto, and to consider in the House, without intervention of any point of order except those arising under clause 10 of rule XXI, a motion offered by the chairman of the Committee on Financial Services or his designee that the House concur in the Senate amendment to the text with each of the three amendments printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. The Senate amendments and the motion shall be considered as read. The motion shall be debatable for three hours, with two hours equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services and one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to its adoption without intervening motion except that the Chair shall divide the question among each of the three House amendments.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of the motion specified in the first section of this resolution, a motion that the House concur in the Senate amendment to the title shall be considered as adopted.

SEC. 3. During consideration of the motion to concur pursuant to this resolution, notwithstanding the operation of the previous question, the Chair may postpone further consideration of the motion to such time as may be designated by the Speaker.

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

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS). All time yielded during consideration of the rule is for debate only.

Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I also ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 1175.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 1175 provides for consideration of the Senate amendments to H.R. 3221, the American Housing Rescue and Foreclosure Prevention Act of 2008.

The rule makes in order a motion by the chairman of the Committee on Financial Services, Mr. FRANK, to concur in the Senate amendments with three House amendments. The rule provides 3 hours of debate on the motion, with 2 hours controlled by the Committee on Financial Services and 1 hour controlled by the Committee on Ways and Means. The rule also provides for a division of the question on the adoption of the three House amendments listed in the Rules Committee report.

Mr. Speaker, I think we all know why this rule and the underlying bill are so important. Millions of Americans are confronting the growing prospect of losing their home. Hundreds of thousands, if not millions, have already lost their home in a foreclosure epidemic that is the legacy of the subprime mortgage crisis.

According to recent reports, the most severe real estate recession in decades is going to continue to weigh down the economy, the pace of foreclosures is going to continue to rise, and homes continue to lose their value at increasing rates. This foreclosure epidemic has spread to virtually every major city in the United States.

What the Committee on Financial Services has done here is brought us a bill that addresses this problem directly. It's not a bill that intends to lay blame. There is plenty of that to go around. It's a bill that's intended to solve a problem.

Here are some of the sobering facts about the problem:

The number of homes entering foreclosure in the first 3 months this year was double the same period as last year.

One in every 194 homes received a foreclosure filing in the first quarter of this year.

And home prices are down, on average, 12.7 percent, which is basically the first time that's happened since the Great Depression in the early 1930s.

As the foreclosure trends intensify, the problem can only get worse. As foreclosure signs go up in neighborhoods, the value of the property in that neighborhood declines, even if the creditworthiness and the ability to pay of the homeowner is as strong as ever.

□ 1530

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is about, as I mentioned, solving a problem. It creates opportunity for the lenders and the mortgage servicers to minimize their loss; it provides an opportunity for homeowners to stay in their homes, but it shares the pain as well as the opportunity. In order for lenders to take advantage of the opportunity presented in this bill, they are going to have to write down the value of the loan consistent with the current appraisal value. In order for homeowners to have an opportunity to participate in this program, they are going to have to give up the equity that they thought they had, including any moneys they had paid in downpayments.

House Resolution 1175 provides for the consideration of three House amendments to the Senate amendment to H.R. 3221, the American Housing Rescue and Foreclosure Prevention Act of 2008.

Amendment No. 1 includes H.R. 5830 regarding the FHA refinancing, H.R. 1852 regarding FHA modernization, H.R. 1427 regarding government-sponsored entity reform, those being Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, and H.R. 1066 regarding community development investments, among other bills. Each

piece of legislation in this amendment has already been passed by the House so we are really going over work that this entire body has considered before, or it has been rigorously debated and amended through the committee process in Financial Services and Ways and Means.

Amendment No. 2 includes H.R. 5720, the Housing Assistance Tax Act of 2008 under which middle-class families would be eligible for a loan of up to $7,500 toward the purchase of a new home, and homeowners filing jointly would receive an additional deduction from their property taxes of $700. States will also receive a temporary increase in low-income housing tax credits and $10 billion of additional tax exempt bond authority for low-interest loans to build low-income rental housing and to refinance certain subprime mortgages.

One of the underlying causes of the subprime crisis was that more and more Americans who wanted to rent couldn't and had to get themselves housing by getting into loans they couldn't afford.

Amendment No. 3 is a bipartisan amendment offered by Congressman MILLER and Congressman LATOURETTE regarding the preemption of State laws regulating foreclosure.

The centerpiece of this legislation is H.R. 5830, the FHA Stabilization and Homeownership Retention Act included in amendment No. 1. That bill would enact a voluntary program, voluntary, for homeowners and lenders, and I emphasize voluntary, nothing is being forced on anyone except the opportunity to work this out. The process would begin with a homeowner or servicer of an existing eligible loan with an FHA-approved lender, and the FHA-approved lender would then determine the size of the loan that meets the requirements of the program and that the borrower could reasonably repay. The plan targets a group of homeowners who would be able to stay in their homes if they had a reduction in principal and monthly servicing charges.

The Congressional Budget Office says that this legislation could save 500,000 mortgages from foreclosure. Other estimates put that number much higher, at over a million.

Just as important as keeping Americans in their homes, this legislation protects American taxpayers. The government's liability under this program is limited and only applies if a borrower defaults and the amount recovered in foreclosure is below the outstanding debt still owed. This is a program that will be paid for largely by the folks participating in it and benefiting from this option as an alternative to foreclosure, and that is through a series of financing and copayments that will be assessed at the time of closing as the life of the loan continues through fees for a period of about 5 years.

There are going to be about $300 billion made available under this bill for guarantees, but the CBO scored the legislation as having an outside risk to taxpayers of about $2.4 billion. And I would like to have my colleagues think about that for a moment in the context of the $29 billion that was made available to back the rescue of the investment banks when Bear Stearns collapsed.

The biggest cost to the taxpayer would be to let the economy unravel, to let neighborhoods decay, and to let thousands if not millions of homes go into foreclosure.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5830 and other critical parts of this legislation provides an avenue to stability, to restoring economic stability to our neighborhoods, to our working families in this country, and to our lenders. We all thank the excellent leadership of the Committee on Financial Services and the Committee on Ways and Means for working together, Republicans and Democrats, to bring this legislation to the floor for consideration.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend from Vermont for yielding me this time to discuss the proposed rule for consideration of this omnibus package of legislation being returned from the Senate.

On behalf of the Republican Conference, Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this closed rule and to this entirely closed process which is being manipulated for the sole purpose of silencing 430 Members of Congress and denying the Republican minority a motion to recommit.

I want every single Member to understand what today's vote really does mean. It means a vote for this rule is going to give only Ways and Means Chairman CHARLES RANGEL, Financial Services Chairman BARNEY FRANK, and Speaker NANCY PELOSI the opportunity to determine the shape of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, that means that for anyone who is tuning in to watch today's debate on C–SPAN who is not sitting in Harlem, New York City; New Bedford, Massachusetts; or San Francisco, California, your vote is being silenced by the new majority's rule.

A vote for this rule is also a vote to once again break the Democrat leadership's numerous campaign promises to provide this House with regular order, including the bare minimum that can be done to protect minority rights through the inclusion of a Republican substitute.

I wish I could say that this disavowal of last year's campaign promises is precedent setting. Unfortunately, breaking these promises to the House and to the American people has become all too common in what has officially become the ''most closed Congress in history.''

What is precedent setting about this rule is that it directly contradicts the past statements of the chairman of the Committee on Financial Services, Chairman FRANK, who prior to today's rule had an unblemished record of at least asking for his party leadership and the Rules Committee to stick to their word.

In the past Rules Committee hearings, Chairman FRANK has advocated allowing this House to debate amendments:

(1) where there is a genuine issue of public policy;

(2) that allow for debate of a significant issue; and

(3) when amendments are germane and not duplicative.

Despite the fact that the broken promises Democrat majority made it clear that no amendments, not even significant, genuine, germane and unique ones would be considered by this House, 10 Republicans brought amendments to the Rules Committee that would have met each and every one of these prior requirements.

Unsurprisingly, all of these thoughtful amendments were summarily denied by the Rules Committee last night in what might well be renamed the ''Graveyard of Good Ideas Committee'' in the House of Representatives.

So despite the fact that there is no policy reason for completely shutting down the legislative process and even going so far as denying the minority a basic motion to recommit in moving this unvetted omnibus through the House, the Democrat majority has once again taken the path of least political resistance. And in doing so, they have again diminished this institution and the rights of the overwhelming Members who have a privilege to serve in this body.

Because the Republican Members of this House overwhelmingly oppose this lock-down rule that denies our party any substantive input into this process, including any amendments from a taxpayer bailout that may or may not solve the problems that it claims to, I have a number of Members who are interested in speaking up against this rule. I plan to save the majority of my time for them to provide their own thoughts on the shortcomings of this bill.

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

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, this is the most important issue facing the American people today, and it is so important that the American people are watching this debate to see, as we are focusing our energies on this and to also, Mr. Speaker, take a look at the other side and the unfortunate distractions. We are not dealing with the war supplemental here. We are dealing with the issue that is on the minds of the American people. The American people are hanging on by their fingernails to their houses. Millions of families are losing their homes. An average of 7,500 people every day in this country are filing for foreclosure on their homes. As we debate this bill in this one hour

alone, there will be 875 people who will file for foreclosure in each hour we are debating. That is important, Mr. Speaker.

There is nothing more important on the American people's minds than to do something that brings some reasonable end to this miserable nightmare we are in as a result of this mortgage-foreclosure issue.

Millions of families are seeing their home values drop. Trillions of dollars of household wealth and property values have been lost. Homeowners now owe more on their mortgages than their homes are worth, and the housing mortgage crisis has caused businesses to lay off workers. Hundreds of thousands of Americans have lost their jobs. This is what is at stake, Mr. Speaker.

In terms of liquidity, we are in the worst economic times since the Great Depression, and that is why it is important that we lay this backdrop so the American people can see what we are doing to respond to this issue that is before us today in H.R. 5830 which is a very thoughtful, which is a very responsive response to this very, very serious issue. H.R. 5830, the FHA Housing Stabilization Homeownership Retention Act is the answer to this problem. I commend Chairman BARNEY FRANK for having the foresight in our Committee on Financial Services to put it forward.

Essentially what it does is it gives just $300 billion in authority, not cost, Mr. Speaker. It is very important because I know the other side is going to come and talk about a $300 billion bailout. This is a bail-in that is going to cost the American taxpayers just $2.7 billion that has been outlaid and scored by the Congressional Budget Office.

Later in the debate we will explain exactly what these costs are. And what this bill will do, it will ensure a refinancing of loans for borrowers who are struggling to afford their current mortgages. Participation is voluntary. The mortgage holder would have to agree to a substantial reduction of the current loan's outstanding principal and provide new loans that that borrower can afford.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. I yield the gentleman an additional 1½ minutes.

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. That is what is important here, Mr. Speaker. What we are seeing on our side as what is critical is keeping people in their homes. And in order to do that, we are simply offering that we extend the FHA ability to authorize and simply place a guarantee of loans up to $300 billion which in fact is a $300 billion reinvestment in our economy. And again as I mentioned, the cost is only $2.7 billion.

To help defray the government's cost and prevent unjust enrichments such as borrowers' flipping, the bill requires that the borrower shares with the government a substantial position of any profits from selling or refinancing homes.

Mr. Speaker, I come from the State of Georgia which is suffering dramatically because of home foreclosures. The State of Georgia ranks number eight in home foreclosures.

□ 1545

It is at the top of my agenda to make sure that we bring some relief, certainly to the people of my beloved State of Georgia, but certainly the 13th District, which even has a greater preponderance of foreclosures because of the subprime mortgage meltdown. This is extremely important.

And, Mr. Speaker, as I conclude, let me just say this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. I will continue that point in the debate.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, for 17 months this new Democrat majority has led this country down their pathway of what they want, higher taxes, more spending, which has resulted in the gasoline crisis that we have today by cutting off supplies that would come to make America energy independent. And here we are now with a housing crisis. After all the years that we've had a growing economy, no wonder our country's in trouble. The new Democrat majority has taken over.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from San Dimas, California, the ranking member of the Rules Committee, Mr. DREIER.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding, and I want to begin by saying that I agree with many of the points that my dear friend from Atlanta, Mr. SCOTT, has made. He has put forth some very thoughtful arguments. And he is absolutely right. He comes from Georgia. I come from California. We're in the midst of a very serious housing crisis. In fact, the foreclosure issue is one that has impacted my State of California, and I know it has impacted Georgia and other segments of the economy.

But I have to say, as I listened to my friend's remarks, I was really struck with the fact that he failed, Mr. Speaker, he failed to look at the overall picture. It is true, there are Americans who are hurting. But to describe the economic challenges that we face today as the worst economic times since the Great Depression is, at least, a slight exaggeration.

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DREIER. I would be happy to yield to my friend.

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. It has been made clear, my good friend from California, by the Federal Reserve, by noted economists from my beloved school of Wharton, as well as Harvard, that in terms of liquidity, we are in the worst times of depression.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, if I could reclaim my time, let me recognize the gentleman did describe this as that.

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Liquidity.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, the second point that he made, which I think is a very important one, is to say that this is the number one issue facing Americans.

Now in the debate on the last rule, our friend from Pasco, Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) pointed to a survey that was done, I think it was a CNN survey or some other survey, in which they talked about the priority issues.

Guess what issue number one is? Its the issue that our friend from Dallas was just talking about, gasoline prices. That happens to be, Mr. Speaker, the number one issue, and you have to go down the list to get to this as a priority issue.

All I'm arguing, and I'm not saying that this isn't, Mr. Speaker, a very, very important issue. It impacts the people whom I'm honored to represent here in a very negative way. But what needs to be recognized is, we have to look at where we are. We had anemic growth the last quarter, six-tenths of 1 percent. What that means is that while we may be possibly at the beginning of an economic recession, while we had anemic growth, it was not negative growth, which it takes, as my friend, Wharton-educated, has just pointed out, two quarters of negative economic growth for us to be in the midst of an economic recession. That is not to in any way diminish, Mr. Speaker, the pain that so many of our fellow Americans are feeling at this point.

Now let me just say about this issue. The President of the United States very much wants, as he said to Republican Members today, to have a bill that he can sign. And I've just spoken with my very good friend, the ranking member of the Financial Services Committee, who last night in the Rules Committee came forward with a very thoughtful alternative. That alternative focuses on strengthening a number of the very important existing programs that we have. They include, reform of the Federal Housing Administration, FHA reform legislation which we've worked on; the government-sponsored enterprises, GSE reform, very, very important; the FHA secure program; Hope Now. There are a wide range of programs that are out there.

And we've regularly encouraged our constituents who are facing the challenge of foreclosure to call that 800 number that has been put forward, because I know full well, from having spoken with many lenders, there is a desire not to take back these homes. My friend from Atlanta was absolutely right when he closed his statement by saying that the priority is to make sure that these Americans are able to stay in their homes. We want to make sure that they stay in their homes.

And guess what? To the surprise of many, these lenders don't want to take these homes backs. They don't want the responsibility of being saddled with them. And so the issue of forbearance is something that I know for a fact

lenders want to engage in with these borrowers.

But as my friend from Dallas has pointed out very well, we have before us a structure which is very unfortunate. Yes, we know we went through the committee process. We know that we have seen a very fair process by the chairman of the Financial Services Committee. But, unfortunately, what we're doing here is taking up a Senate amendment.

So while tomorrow, if we consider this wartime supplemental, for the first time ever we are going to be completely ignoring the committee process, the subcommittee, committee process. And, of course, we'll look at the prospect of taking a shell bill here and denying the minority an opportunity for a motion to recommit. That's why so many members of the Appropriations Committee have been here demonstrating their outrage on this process. But on this bill what we're bypassing is floor consideration of the measure because we're simply taking a Senate amendment.

Now what does that do, Mr. Speaker? Just as the proposed plan to deal with the supplemental appropriations bill, it denies the members of the minority a right to offer that very important cherished motion to recommit.

And so I have to say, Mr. Speaker, I'm very, very troubled with this process, and I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the rule.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN).

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. I thank the gentleman for yielding the time. I'd like to thank the chairman, BARNEY FRANK, for this outstanding piece of legislation.

Let me quickly say that Hope Now is good, which is what my friend referenced. Hope Now is good. However, help now is better.

We didn't give Penn Central hope now. We gave Penn Central a $7 billion bailout. Lockheed Martin got a $250 million bailout. Franklin National Bank, $1.7 billion bailout. Chrysler, $1.5 billion bailout. Continental Illinois, $4.5 billion bailout. Farm Credit System, $4 billion bailout. First Republic, $1 billion bailout. Major airlines, $5 billion bailout. Steel companies, $7 billion bailout. And Bear Stearns, if we talk about the bare facts, $29 billion, plus a $13 billion loan through J.P. Morgan, which makes a total of $42 billion, if we talk about the bare facts.

This is a good piece of legislation, Mr. Speaker. This piece of legislation is voluntary, as has been indicated. But more importantly, it is a guarantee, not a loan. It does allow FHA to guarantee loans, about $300 billion, and that's going to help a lot of families to stay in homes. But it will also help this economy.

This economy is right now in a credit crisis. And in this credit crisis we've got to realize that there is interconnectivity. There's an interconnectedness, that we are living in a world wherein we are related to each another in a certain way. In this crisis, Mr. Speaker, when one home in a community has a for sale sign up, it impacts other homes in the community. It impacts the tax base of the community. It impacts the lives of children who are going to school in the community. So this piece of legislation will help us to keep people in their homes, but it will help to maintain the community. We sleep in houses and live in neighborhoods. This legislation helps neighborhoods.

I would also add that flippers don't benefit because you have to be a resident of the property. The government maintains a lien on the property. And there's an amendment in this bill, the Watt-Velázquez-Green amendment, which will help those persons who are being evicted, who happen to be tenants. Many persons who have their rent paid, their rent is paid, but they're being evicted because the owner of the property was foreclosed on. This amendment will help them to stay in their homes.

I ask that my colleagues please support this amendment, and please remember that we bailed out a lot of companies in this country. This is a hand up for a lot of people who are suffering and who may lose their homes, others who have their rent paid but who are about to be evicted.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama, the ranking member of the committee, Mr. BACHUS.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Vermont, who is leading the debate of the opposition, I would like to appeal to the gentleman from Vermont.

Our constituents today are under a lot of stress because of the high cost of energy, gasoline prices, heating bills this winter. And Vermont, and I congratulate Vermont. Seventy-three percent of their electricity is powered by nuclear energy. Seventy-three percent. That compares to 19 percent in all other States. So I congratulate y'all.

Nuclear energy is a source of very cheap energy, very cheap electricity. It could really wean us off our dependency on foreign oil. I would appeal to the Vermont delegation, both Mr. SANDERS, Senator SANDERS, yourself, we need more nuclear power plants. And we would just urge our representatives from Vermont to stop voting ''no'' and allowing other States to have a source of low-cost energy. So just on a personal basis, I'd appeal to you.

Now we find ourselves in a very serious situation, a crisis—it's not too strong a word—in America. We have high food prices. We have high energy prices. And many of our citizens are under stress in paying their mortgages. Fifty-four million American families make a mortgage payment each month. An additional 34 million American families make a rent payment every month. I would say that a great percentage of those are under stress. There's 25 million Americans who own their own home or don't have a mortgage, and some of them are under stress.

Now we all agree that foreclosures are serious. They're bad for the community. But we fundamentally disagree in how we address the problem. I, for one, most of my colleagues, say let's not take from the 34 million American families who are renting, let's not take their tax dollars. Let's not take from the 51 million American families who are paying a mortgage payment. Many of them struggling under high gas prices, high food prices. Let's not take from those other 25 million American families who don't have a mortgage on their home, let's not take from them and reward lenders who unwisely extended credit, because that's what this bill is about. It's not about benefiting borrowers because the guarantee doesn't go to borrowers. It goes to lenders.

Three years ago we started an effort to rein in subprime lending abuses, and the lenders came before us and they lobbied and they killed our efforts to bring some structure and some control over the mortgage market. They said, thanks but no thanks. You stay out.

But, now, now that the chickens have come home to roost, they've come back in and said, bail us out. And they're turning to 110 million American families and saying, we need $300 billion. These are speculators. Many of them speculated. Many of them are investors on Wall Street who bought high-risk, high-yield, structured investment vehicles containing these mortgages. And now they're saying, we're in trouble. And they're saying, we want to offload these bad loans on to the government.

And we'll decide today whether we take from 110 million American families, take their hard-earned money, and we bail out these lenders and these speculators, many of which are guilty of criminal, fraudulent acts. They trapped people into these loans, and when the loans have become illiquid, they've asked for the taxpayers to come in and stand behind it.

This program is, and y'all have said to us, or you have said, it's a voluntary program. Absolutely, it's voluntary. The lender can choose which loans he offloads on the Federal Government. Which loans will he offload? He'll offload his bad loans. He'll offload the very worst of the loans.

□ 1600

And the American taxpayers, those I represent who are making those rent payments, who are making those mortgage payments, and don't assume that those 51 million American families who are making their mortgage payment, don't assume they're not under stress. When you say, We're going to share the pain, why would you ask a renter or an American family that's paying their bills to share the pain? They have enough pain.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I will be happy to engage my good friend from Alabama and both of us go to the Department of Justice, the SEC and begin to file legal action against the unscrupulous investors on Wall Street who took these mortgages knowing that they had a cheap deal. If he will join me, we will walk down to the Department of Justice right now to get the Attorney General to begin filing major litigation against these scandalous, unscrupulous individuals, if that's what he would like to do.

But right now on the floor of the House we have major legislation that is going to address the question of the suffering of Americans. And I'm going to take this brief opportunity to acknowledge the bill sponsored by my good friend and colleague, Congresswoman WATERS, on H.R. 5818. We've passed the rule, but I want to support the underlying premise that once we get through with the major reconstruction, that the bill that we are now discussing and the rule that we're now discussing, we will have $15 billion to go into these communities and be able to buy back these properties and to take them off of the streets and to make sure that low-income individuals that need affordable houses, families that are broken because of the foreclosure scandal will be able to get back into their community. This is good legislation.

Now, as we move forward on the FHA stabilization on the Senate amendments that we're now discussing, the American Housing Rescue and Foreclosure Prevention Act, let us put this in the right perspective. We lost 20,000 jobs in April. We have the bailouts of corporate America everywhere you can see. Airlines are merging, Bear Stearns got $42 billion or more to bail them out, and yet my good friends on the other side of the aisle are not interested in having us do things that the President wants us to do.

He wants us to have, if you will, the government sponsored enterprise reform. He wants us to fix Freddie Mac. He wants us to fix Fannie Mae. He wants to make sure that we provide for disabled veterans. He wants us to be able to invest in the important housing matters, and he wants to make sure that we put Americans back in their houses and put them right side up.

We're not in a recession; we're moving towards a 1929 depression. And I don't know why the other side cannot wake up. This is a good rule for a good bill.

As we make this march toward passing this legislation, I hope that we will also include that those who have lost good credit ratings because they suffered a foreclosure will be able to get back into the good credit rating by being eligible for these programs. Let us not punish those that fell victim to foreclosure because of unscrupulous practices that we're fighting against and their credit score went down to keep them from getting another house. Let's make sure we work that out. That is an idea and an amendment that I have, and I look forward to working with the committee so that as we move forward, we can get this done.

Again, if you can bail out Tom, Dick and Harry, you can at least bail out Mrs. Jones, Mrs. Smith and Mr. Garcia, because these are the hardworking Americans. I stand with them.

Let them stand with the big, rich guys all the time.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 1175, the Rule Providing for Consideration of H.R. 3221, the "American Housing Rescue and Foreclosure Prevention Act of 2008."

I am pleased to support this much needed Housing and Urban Development legislation, to help States purchase and rehabilitate foreclosed homes to stabilize as many properties as possible.

All Americans—homeowners, lenders, communities—indeed our entire economy is worse off when a foreclosure occurs and when significant quantities of homes are foreclosed in a short amount of time.

H.R. 3221 responds directly to the current crisis facing middle class Americans while providing the tools to prevent a repeat of these problems. Modernizing the FHA and reforming the Government Sponsored Entities, GSEs, will provide crucial liquidity to our mortgage markets now, and also strengthen regulation and oversight for the future.

This legislation will begin to repair not bailout the economy, restoring confidence in the markets, limiting the damage to families and neighborhoods, and rejuvenating the communities with new affordable housing.

TEXAS

There are five steps in the foreclosure process: Step 1: delinquency; Step 2: Notice to cure, where the lender notifies borrower of delinquency and gives him 20 days to amend the problem; Step 3: Default notice and posting—in Texas, foreclosure sales occur on the first Tuesday of the month; Step 4: Foreclosure sale—if borrower is unable to cure default, the property is sold; and Step 5: Active foreclosure.

While there are five steps there are only two stages: Preforeclosure and active foreclosure. In looking at those two stages we see where Texas stands. Last year, Texas ranks fourth behind California, Florida, and Illinois in preforeclosures. Active foreclosures are foreclosed properties sold at auction and now in the lenders' real estate owned accounts. Texas held the top seat in 2007 for active foreclosures. While being number one is something Texans usually strive for, in this case we'd prefer to be much farther down the list.

Texas reported 13,829 properties entering some stage of foreclosure in April, a 16 percent increase from the previous month and the most foreclosure filings reported by any State. The State documented the Nation's third highest State combined foreclosure rate—one foreclosure filing for every 582 households.

Dallas County documented the most new foreclosure filings of any county in the region and a foreclosure rate of one foreclosure filing for every 320 households, an 18 percent increase from the previous month.

TEXAS AND WHAT HUD IS DOING

In March, the Department of Housing and Urban Development, HUD, announced the Texas State Program and the cities of Houston and New Braunfels will receive a total of $234,868,077 to support community development and produce more affordable housing. HUD's annual funding will also provide downpayment assistance to first-time homebuyers; assist individuals and families who might otherwise be living on the streets; and offer real housing solutions for individuals with HIV/AIDS.

The funding announced includes: Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds; HOME Investment Partnerships (HOME) funding; American Dream Down payment assistance; Emergency Shelter Grant (ESG); and, Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS (HOPWA).

AMENDMENT I

Title I—The FHA Housing Stabilization and Homeownership Retention Act—Creates a voluntary FHA program to provide mortgage refinancing assistance to allow families to stay in their homes, protect neighborhoods, and help stabilize the housing market.

Program—if the current lender agrees to take a substantial write down on the existing mortgage, the FHA lender will pay off the current lender and issue to the borrower a new FHA-insured mortgage at that lower amount.

Profit-sharing—to help defray the Government's costs and prevent unjust enrichment, e.g., borrower flipping, will require the borrower to share with the Government a substantial portion of any profits from selling or refinancing the house.

No speculators—only owner-occupied primary residences will qualify for the program, which also contains protections to exclude persons who have committed mortgage fraud.

Risk reduction—to further protect the Government: The FHA will charge higher fees to build up a loss reserve; the new FHA loan will substantially reduce the borrower's monthly payments, thus reducing default and foreclosure risk; and in addition to other underwriting requirements, riskier borrowers must make at least 6 months of payments at the new rate before closing on the new FHA mortgage.

Sunset—program expires in 2 years (with possible 6-month extensions not to exceed 2 years).

Additional provisions—creates an Office of Housing Counseling within HUD and authorizes additional FBI and DOJ funds to combat mortgage fraud.

TITLE II—FHA MODERNIZATION

Loan limits—makes permanent the temporary FHA loan limit increases in the economic stimulus bill, setting FHA limits at the lower of (a) 125 percent of the local area median home price, or (b) 175 percent of the nationwide GSE conforming limit.

Fee protections for lower income and lower credit borrowers—directs HUD to serve borrowers with slightly higher credit risk, raises fees to cover the additional risk, and provides for a refund if borrower makes 5 years of on-time payments.

Reverse mortgages—expands FHA reverse mortgage loan program by authorizing a nationwide loan limit equal to 132 percent of the current GSE conforming loan limit; capping and reducing loan origination fees; and adding consumer protections.

FHA personal property manufactured home loans—modernizes and rejuvenates the FHA manufactured loan program for personal property manufactured homes.

FHA condo and manufactured home loans—makes changes to rules to make these loans more flexible, while retaining basic underwriting protections.

Maximum FHA loan term—extends the maximum FHA term from 35 to 40 years.

Integrity of appraisals—strengthens protections against inflated appraisals, authorizing penalties on parties to FHA loans who improperly try to influence appraisal values.

Borrowers lacking sufficient credit history—creates a pilot program for credit-worthy borrowers that lack a credit history through the normal credit reporting process.

Downpayment simplification—Simplifies the basic FHA downpayment calculation, while generally preserving the current FHA loan to value, LTV, levels.

Foreclosed FHA multifamily properties—preserves the affordability of such properties, by requiring FHA to use accurate appraisals reflecting the cost of rehabilitating the units.

TITLE III—GOVERNMENT SPONSORED ENTERPRISE (GSE) REFORM

Includes the House-passed bill to reform prudential and mission oversight of Fannie Mae, Freddie Mac, and the 12 Federal Home Loan Banks (the ''GSEs'').

Strong independent regulator—brings GSEs under a single independent regulator with broad safety and soundness powers, including conservatorship and receivership authority.

Enhanced housing mission—enhances Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac's housing mission through improvements in targeting of their affordable housing goals and duties in underserved markets.

New affordable housing fund—establishes a new affordable housing fund modeled on the Affordable Housing Programs of the Federal Home Loan Banks.

Increased loan limits—makes permanent the increases in conforming loan limits included in the Economic Stimulus Act of 2008. Limits in high cost areas would be set based on area, rather than national prices, with conforming loan limits for each area set at 125 percent of the local area median, capped at 175 percent of the national median.

TITLE IV—CASTLE/KANJORSKI FACILITATION OF LOAN MODIFICATIONS

H.R. 5579, The Emergency Loan Modification Act of 2008, adopted by the Financial Services Committee on April 23, 2008:

Provides clarity for servicers, consistent with existing servicing contracts, about their duties when making loan modifications for troubled mortgages.

Provides protection from investor lawsuits to servicers who make specified long-term loan modifications.

Does not limit other loss mitigation efforts by servicers, and does not prevent borrowers from pursuing claims against lenders, services, or others involved in the mortgage process.

TITLE V—MISCELLANEOUS HOUSING PROVISIONS

Protecting disabled veterans in bankruptcy from discrimination—ensures that a governmental unit that has a mortgage loan program may not deny a disabled veteran the benefits of such program because the veteran is or was a bankruptcy debtor. The Bankruptcy Code currently prohibits various forms of discrimination against bankruptcy debtors by governmental units and others, including a denial of a student grant, loan, loan guarantee, or loan insurance to someone because he or she is or was a bankruptcy debtor.

Public welfare investments—the bill broadens the types of permissible public welfare investments for national and state member banks, restoring the pre-2006 standard for eligible types of affordable housing and community and economic development investments. It also grants thrifts similar authority to make public welfare investments of up to 15 percent of their capital and surplus.

AMENDMENT 3

Brad Miller-LaTourette Amendment—affirms the right of States to prevent abusive foreclosure practices and to establish rules concerning the foreclosure process by clarifying that this Act, the National Bank Act and the Home Owner's Loan Act do not preempt State laws regulating the foreclosure of residential real property or the treatment of foreclosed property.

CONCLUSION

Thank you, Madam Speaker, for your leadership in this area, I urge my colleagues to support H. Res. 1175 providing for consideration of H.R. 3221.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, my good friends on the other side need to bone up on their language, I believe. A recession is confirmed when there are two quarters where the economy is down. We have not even reached that point yet, and yet already we find out on the floor that the Democrat Party is willing to say we're in a complete crash equal to 1929. My gosh. Let's at least tell the American people the truth.

We can get over the problems that we have in this country, but let's not make things worse than what they already are. Let's not lie to the American people. Let's tell them the truth. Let's provide leadership. Let's show them the right way. Let's have an open bill. Let's get the things done that need to be done.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SESSIONS. I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Were you referring to my remarks? I have great respect for the gentleman. I assume that he was not suggesting that I am a liar.

Mr. SESSIONS. I did not suggest that at all.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I would appreciate not having the words drawn down, but I am yielding to the gentleman to just correct the record.

Mr. SESSIONS. I will be point blank to the gentlewoman. The gentlewoman said, We are headed to a recession like 1929.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. But are you calling me a liar?

Mr. SESSIONS. And that is not a true statement.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Well, I am just asking you if you are calling me a liar. If the gentleman will yield.

Mr. SESSIONS. It's not a true statement.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Is the gentleman calling me a liar on the floor of the House?

Mr. SESSIONS. We have not blown through any sort of recession.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Is the gentleman calling me a liar?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. BALDWIN). The gentleman will suspend. The gentlewoman will suspend.

The gentleman from Texas controls the time.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, at this time I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE).

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Madam Speaker, the American people are fair people. And they expect their representatives to remain cognizant of and reflect that fairness in all actions.

This House has moved from fairness, from deliberation and from proper recognition that would allow all Members the opportunity to actively represent their constituents to repeated tyranny of the Majority. Madam Speaker, there is a crisis of leadership by this majority.

Every person in America has the right to have his or her voice heard. No Member of Congress should be silenced on the floor guaranteeing that the voices of the people are heard.

Do you recognize those words, Madam Speaker? You should, for they are yours. And they're being violated.

The minority possesses their equal rights, which equal law must protect and to violate would be oppression. Recognize those words, Madam Speaker? You should. They were spoken by Thomas Jefferson and quoted by you and they are being violated. Why? It's either political expediency or a broken promise, one or the other, neither of which the American people support because they are a fair people.

Madam Speaker, I submitted four thoughtful, substantive amendments which deserve the consideration of all 435 Members of this house. But they were denied that opportunity by this restrictive and unfair process. Madam Speaker, the American people understand that the rules aren't rules if you follow them only when you want to. Democrats promise to use fair and open rules for everything, but they're breaking rules and they're breaking promises to the American people.

I urge the Speaker and the majority to be true to their word. Stop playing politics. Stop breaking promises. Allow the Members of this House to represent their constituents. What idea, what amendment is so scary that it couldn't be considered on this floor? I call on

my colleagues not to destroy the very fiber of our representative democracy.

Vote ''no'' on this rule so that we may have an open and fair debate. The American people deserve no less.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY).

(Mrs. MALONEY of New York asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his leadership on this very important rule, and I rise in strong support of the rule and for the underlying bill, a housing stimulus package that will provide real relief for struggling homeowners and will bring certainty to the markets.

We are at a critical juncture in the subprime mortgage crisis. All of the data we have clearly demonstrate the severity of the problem. We have seen the perfect storm of stagnant wages, rising mortgage payments, and decreased home values, all of which have led to a record level of delinquencies and foreclosures. One recent study by the Pew Charitable Trust has found that one in two New York homeowners is projected to face foreclosure, primarily in the next 2 years, due to the subprime crisis.

This same study documents the ripple effect this crisis is having on our entire economy. Their analysis found that 52 percent of all homeowners will likely feel the ripple effect of foreclosures from the subprime loan crisis. Communities are negatively affected as foreclosures drive down home prices overall, diminishing homeowners' equity in entire neighborhoods. Costs also accrue to our local government in the form of lost tax revenue and direct expenses for securing, policing, and disposing of abandoned properties.

This is why this housing stimulus package is so terribly important. This is a well-crafted package which includes an expanded FHA Refinance Program totaling $300 billion. This voluntary program would permit FHA to provide up to $300 billion in new guarantees to help refinance at-risk borrowers into viable mortgages.

The only way we are going to solve this problem is through a multi-prong strategy. We have fully engaged the regulators, industry is working with homeowners; but we also need sound public policy that allows for many of these unaffordable subprime loans to be refinanced into viable mortgages homeowners can afford.

Another key part of this package includes the FHA and GSE modernization bills which we have already passed in this House but has yet to pass the Senate. The FHA bill will modernize the program opening it up to new homeowners and providing opportunities for long-term fixed mortgages. The modernized FHA will be the new financing option of many previous subprime borrowers, and it will be done in a way to ensure borrowers are receiving viable and affordable loans. The GSE bill will provide for a strong dependent regulator for Freddie Mac and Fannie Mae and the 12 Federal home loan banks.

Again, this is a well-crafted package. I ask permission to revise and extend to include all of the important parts of this package.

I urge a ''yes'' vote on this underlying bill.

I rise in support of a housing stimulus package that will provide real relief for struggling homeowners and will bring certainty to the markets.

We are at a critical juncture in the subprime mortgage crisis. All of the data we have clearly demonstrates the severity of the problem.

We have seen the perfect storm of stagnant wages, rising mortgage payments and decreased home values. All of which have led to a record level of delinquencies and foreclosures.

One recent study by the Pew Charitable Trust has found that one in 32 New York homeowners is projected to face foreclosure, primarily in the next two years, because of subprime loans.

This same study documents the ripple effect this crisis is having on our entire economy. Their analysis found that 52% of all homeowners will likely feel the ripple effects of foreclosures from subprime loans.

Communities are negatively affected as foreclosures drive down home prices overall, diminishing homeowners' equity in entire neighborhoods. Costs also accrue to local governments in the form of lost tax revenue and direct expenses for securing, policing and disposing of abandoned properties. That is why this housing stimulus package is so important.

This is a well crafted package which includes an expanded FHA Refinance Program totaling $300 billion.

This voluntary program would permit FHA to provide up to $300 billion in new guarantees to help refinance at-risk borrowers into viable mortgages.

They only way we are going to solve this problem is through a multi-prong strategy. We have fully engaged the regulators, industry is working with homeowners, but we also need sound public policy that allows for many of these unaffordable subprime loans to be refinanced into viable mortgages homeowners can afford.

Another key part of this package includes the FHA and GSE modernization bills that we have already passed the House, but have yet to be passed by the Senate.

The FHA bill will modernize the program opening it up to new homeowners and providing opportunities for long-term, fixed mortgages. The modernized FHA will be the new financing option of many previous subprime borrowers and it will be done in a way to ensure borrowers are receiving viable and affordable loans.

The GSE bill will provide for a strong independent regulator for Freddie Mac, Fannie Mae and the 12 Federal Homeloan Banks. It will also enhance Freddie and Fannie's mission to provide affordable housing. This bill will also make permanent the increased loan limits passed as part of the economic stimulus package. This increase is incredibly important in high-cost areas such as New York City in ensuring these products are available to our constituents.

Again, this is a well crafted package and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. NEUGEBAUER), a member of the Committee on Financial Services.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Madam Speaker, for nearly 35 years prior to coming to the United States Congress, I was involved in the housing business in one form or the other. I've built housing for sale, I've built housing for rent. And one of the things that you learn very quickly and housing and how to make sure that the American people have safe, affordable housing, whether it's to own that housing or to rent that housing is you have jobs and opportunity because when people, the American people have jobs and opportunity, they don't have trouble making their payments or making their rental payments.

And so I would think that the 110 million people that are paying their rent or making their house payments today are wondering why this Congress is not down on the floor today debating an energy policy that lowers the cost of gasoline, that lowers the cost of electricity so that American families can have more money, so that they can have more money to pay on their rent or pay on their mortgage payment.

But more importantly, they will wonder why we're not down on this floor talking about how we have a tax code in this country that promotes jobs and opportunity that allows small businesses to thrive and to create jobs. Small businesses are our number-one job creators. You know what? When people have jobs, they're able to make their mortgage payments. When people have jobs, they're able to make their rental payments.

So it's frustrating to me and others to see we have a process today, as other Members have pointed out, that lock us out of the process. We swore in two new Members of Congress in the last 24 hours. Unfortunately, neither one of those gentlemen will be able to participate in this debate because they've been locked out of thoughtful consideration of this bill.

Madam Speaker, we need to be down on this floor doing policy that will impact the American people. Fifty-one million Americans have a mortgage in this country, 94 percent of them are making their mortgage payments. The 110 million people that are scraping and making sure that they are a step up and make their payments, are wondering why we're down on the floor asking them to make the payments for those who can't.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. SCOTT.)

□ 1615

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I just wanted to correct an

item. I made the statement about us having the worst times since the Depression. I want to bear those facts out. So I want you to know that I am telling the truth.

In this statement from the Joint Economic Committee, it says mortgages exceed equity in homes with falling housing prices. More than 10 percent of homeowners now owe more on their mortgages than their homes are worth. Homeowners' debt on their houses exceeds their equity in their homes for the first time since 1945. In terms of liquidity, money in the marketplace, it is the worst time since the Depression.

Now the important thing to understand as we move forward is to understand the seriousness of the condition. You bring up gas prices. We bring up food prices. We've got all of these problems, but today, the American people are expecting us to deal with the housing crisis.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Let us deal with the housing crisis. We've got several problems to deal with. And simply because we're dealing with the housing prices, you come down here and want to throw up the gas prices as if to say we've got to deal with that, then the other. We're going to deal with each of those items.

But today, this day, we have housing bills that are on this floor, and we owe it to the respect of the American people to give it the integrity, to give this issue the respect and the seriousness that they demand of this House, and let us stop playing games.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, at this time, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT).

Mrs. BIGGERT. I thank the gentleman for yielding and, Madam Speaker, I rise to speak in opposition to the rule.

I was very disappointed that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle couldn't resist the temptation to shut out all the Republican amendments during the debate on the rule. Like Chairman FRANK did in the committee, calling up Republican amendments, they could have allowed at least one Republican amendment to be offered to this bill.

Speaker PELOSI has said that the Democrats are advancing a New Direction for America. However, I would argue that denying House Republicans from offering any amendments to this bill is the wrong direction.

Our voices have been silenced. It's a sad day when people who represent about half the population of the United States don't have the opportunity to bring solutions to the table during debate on this important issue. I hope that this wasn't a calculated maneuver for political gain.

Congress is yet to send a single bill to the President that might begin to address the turbulence in the housing market, and I know that this is important. Ranking Member BACHUS and I had planned to offer an amendment that contains cost-effective reforms that can start helping homeowners and the economy now.

According to the Congressional Budget Office, our substitute amendment would decrease the deficit by $25 million over 10 years. Instead of outbidding each other on how much taxpayer funding should be spent on bailouts, House and Senate leaders should have chosen to move the good, commonsense, bipartisan ideas that are right in front of them in our amendment, and many have been passed before.

The amendment represents the very best elements of housing reforms that Congress has been debating over the last several years and none of the bad ones. It includes FHA reform which alone could help an additional 250,000 homeowners refinance through the FHA Secure program.

Our amendment would strengthen the national oversight of the GSEs, Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, as well as reform these entities.

These reforms would infuse much needed liquidity into the flailing housing market.

It would add funding for housing counseling; enhance appraisal standards; require mortgage originator registration; provide resources to crack down on mortgage fraud; enhance disclosure; and provide liability protection for lenders that help struggling homeowners to refinance and eventually repay their loans.

It also provides returning veterans with foreclosure protection and temporarily raises loan limits on mortgages backed by the Department of Veterans Affairs.

Notably absent from our amendment is a high price tag. That's because it doesn't reward speculators, fraudsters, or those who engaged in inappropriate or recklessly irresponsible behavior. Several components of our amendment, including FHA and GSE reform, already have passed in one or both Chambers.

I understand that some—but not all—of our good provisions will be included in the Frank amendment. We need to break the logjam on these commonsense reforms. Counselors can help prevent foreclosures by guiding homeowners into a loan that best meets their budget and needs. And FHA and GSE reform will add much-needed liquidity to the market while providing more consumers with an alternative to bad, subprime loans.

Most importantly for Chicago and other urban communities, our amendment addresses mortgage and appraisal fraud, which has skyrocketed in Chicago and devastated communities.

I wish my colleagues could have had the opportunity to vote on our Republican commonsense, cost-effective substitute amendment. This could have been the bipartisan alternative to the bill we will vote on today, which is littered with controversial provisions.

However, my colleagues from the other side of the aisle chose to shut out our clean alternative and shut out the voices of millions of Americans who want a cost-effective solution to jump-start the housing market and get our economy back on track.

Again, I urge my colleagues to vote against the rule.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Madam Speaker, at this time, I will continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, if I could inquire of the time remaining for both sides, please.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 8 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Vermont has 6½ minutes remaining.

Mr. SESSIONS. I thank the Speaker.

Madam Speaker, at this time, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Dallas, Texas (Mr. HENSARLING).

Mr. HENSARLING. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I've heard some very eloquent comments from my friends on the other side of the aisle about the pain the American people are feeling at this time. They speak with some credibility. They helped cause it.

After 18 months of being in control of the economic policies of our Nation, what do we have? We have gasoline approaching $4 a gallon, milk already over $4 a gallon, people struggling, struggling to put groceries on the table, and seemingly our friends on the other side of the aisle said that is unrelated to people trying to pay their mortgages and keep their home.

The biggest enemy that we have to the American Dream of homeownership is a shrinking paycheck. What has been done by the Democrat majority to shrink the paycheck?

Well, number one, they passed a budget that has the single largest tax increase in American history. Over a 3-year period, we will see an extra $3,000 tax burden put on a family of four while they're struggling to pay their mortgage payments.

We were told that somehow under their watch gasoline prices would come down. Instead, they have gone up. We see food prices absolutely unaffordable, and yet they see no connection to the home mortgage challenge that we have today.

Many of them have decried Wall Street bailouts, but what do they do? They bring a bailout bill to the floor, up to $300 billion of taxpayer exposure, and all a lender has to do is say, you know what, as long as he agrees to a 15 percent haircut, we will take his risk and put it on the taxpayers. When you're struggling to pay your own mortgage, you shouldn't have to bail out the speculators, those who engaged in mortgage fraud. You shouldn't have to bail out somebody else. There's a better way to do it, and it is not this humongous bailout bill.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, at this time, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART).

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Madam Speaker, last night, I offered an amendment to the Rules Committee and it was turned down. It was

not even allowed to be brought up today, and it will not be brought up on this bill.

And what is this amendment that the majority feared so much, that they won't even have it discussed on the floor of the House? It would have simply increased the property tax deduction for homeowners.

Now, look, all of us in Florida have received calls, letters, faxes from constituents asking for relief from their property taxes. Now we all know that ad valorem taxes are not a Federal issue. We don't control property taxes, but there's something that we can do right now to help the American people and that is increasing this deduction for property taxes. We can do that right now.

Is it that crazy? Well, no. On April 10 of 2008, 84 Senators from both sides of the aisle voted to do just this, to increase the deduction, to help people to be able to afford their mortgages. It would benefit everybody. It would benefit the economy, in particular all Americans who are struggling to pay their mortgages.

You see, Madam Speaker, there is no good reason to not allow this commonsense amendment to be discussed, to be debated on the floor of the House. There's no good reason to not allow other commonsense amendments to be discussed. Why are people so scared, so afraid of just debating ideas on the floor of the House?

Again, for that reason, Madam Speaker, I obviously will have to object to this rule.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. I continue to reserve my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, I would like to inquire of my colleague if he has any additional speakers. I have one additional speaker, then our close.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. I have at least one, and some who have requested but who have not yet arrived on the floor.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, at this time I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE).

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

Mr. PENCE. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule and, more to the point, in opposition to the housing omnibus package, $300 billion bailout, corporate welfare in this country.

It is extraordinary, after having endured the first three terms of my career in Congress and oftentimes being castigated for those aspects of the Republican agenda to try and promote business and try and encourage corporate investment in this country, how many times I and my colleagues were chastised for corporate welfare on the floor of this Congress, and yet we come here today with this extraordinary bailout for Wall Street, disguised as housing assistance for hurting Americans.

Now, let me say, I have great sympathy for those affected by the current housing crisis. I'd like to see our housing markets and our neighborhoods stabilized, but a $300 billion taxpayer bailout to lenders and speculators who made poor decisions is not the answer, and it's not fair to millions upon millions of Americans who have sat down month after month at the kitchen table and figured out how to make those mortgage payments, who have taken on a second job and sometimes a third job to make the mortgage payment. And it's not fair to nearly one-third of the American public that rents.

When my wife and I first got started out, I remember we rented our first place. We saved our pennies to be able to make that down payment, to get that FHA loan and to get our dream started. Now along comes Congress with this enormous handout, which, as the gentleman from Texas said, says to lenders, if you'll take a 15 percent haircut, a 15 percent hit, we'll move your liability on to the taxpayers, on to taxpayers who have rented, who have saved, who have scrimped.

They ought not to be required to pay this bailout for Americans. There are alternatives that we should support.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I thank the gentleman and I thank him for his leadership.

We will address the question of our differences when we vote and when I review the transcript, but I think it's important to note that my words spoke directly to conditions that we're in, that is, a recession that might move toward a depression.

And I thank the gentleman from Georgia who mentioned from the Joint Economic Committee, Americans have much of their savings in their homes. Families in a majority of States will lose more than $2.6 trillion. That sounds like a recession and a depression to me.

A housing crisis affects the broader economy. We're going to be losing $166 billion in foreclosures. We have got to act.

And so we may have a difference, but there is no lying or untruth when we talk about a recession and a depression, and I know my good friend from Texas did not intend to misrepresent that those of us who have a difference of opinion, while we're on this floor to help save the homes of millions of Americans and to help provide engine to the economic activity, are wrong.

We're right and the documentation shows it, and it is not an untruth, and it certainly is not a lie.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, I want to inquire of my colleague if he has any additional speakers or where he is in that process, as I am to close the next time I use my time.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. I thank my friend from Texas. We have no additional speakers at this time, and I will be the last speaker.

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to adjourn.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam 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 138, nays 263, not voting 32, as follows:

[Roll No. 280]

YEAS—138

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachus
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boustany
Boyd (FL)
Broun (GA)
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Crenshaw
Cubin
Davis, David
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Emerson
English (PA)
Everett
Fallin
Flake
Forbes
Franks (AZ)
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Hall (TX)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Keller
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
LaHood
Lamborn
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCrery
McHenry
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Saxton
Scalise
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shays
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Sullivan
Tancredo
Thornberry
Tiberi
Upton
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Westmoreland
Whitfield (KY)
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman (VA)
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—263

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Altmire
Arcuri
Baca
Bachmann
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Castle
Castor
Cazayoux
Chandler
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (KY)
Davis, Lincoln
DeFazio
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Edwards
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Feeney
Filner
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foster

Foxx
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Gerlach
Giffords
Gillibrand
Gingrey
Gonzalez
Gordon
Graves
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Heller
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Hulshof
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Kingston
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
Lampson
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Platts
Poe
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Reyes
Rodriguez
Rogers (MI)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sali
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tiahrt
Tierney
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Udall (CO)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Weller
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu

NOT VOTING—32

Andrews
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Campbell (CA)
Clarke
Conaway
Davis (IL)
DeGette
Doyle
Ferguson
Gilchrest
Gohmert
Gutierrez
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hunter
Jones (OH)
Kaptur
McCollum (MN)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Peterson (PA)
Reynolds
Richardson
Rush
Smith (NJ)
Speier
Spratt
Udall (NM)
Watson
Wynn
Yarmuth

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members have 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1651

Messrs. ALLEN and BAIRD, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Messrs. SCOTT of Georgia and CARNAHAN, and Ms. SUTTON changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. HINOJOSA. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 280, had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF SENATE AMENDMENTS TO H.R. 3221, FORECLOSURE PREVENTION ACT OF 2008

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, I will be asking each of my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the previous question to this rule. If the previous question is defeated, I will amend the rule to make it in order for the House to consider any amendment that would actually do something to reduce gas prices for consumers and to require the Speaker of the House to submit a plan for lowering gas prices.

Madam Speaker, back on April 24, 2006, over 2 years ago, Speaker NANCY PELOSI released the following statement, which I quote: ''Americans this week are paying $2.91 a gallon on average for regular gasoline, 33 cents higher than last month and double the price than when President Bush first came into office.''

Madam Speaker, most Americans would consider it a blessing if they were only paying $2.91 per gallon of gasoline. And the only thing that they really can't afford is the Head-in-the-Sand Democrat Congress's refusal to consider to do anything to help America achieve its energy independence.

In that same press release, Speaker PELOSI went on to claim, and I quote: ''Democrats have a commonsense plan to help bring down skyrocketing gas prices.''

Well, I'm not exactly sure what they are waiting for right now because even after passing the ''no energy'' energy bill through this House a number of times, the cost of the ''Pelosi Petroleum Price Increase'' continues to rise, with the average cost of a gallon of gasoline at over $3.60 now, hitting consumers at the pump every single time they fill up their cars.

By voting ''no'' on this previous question, Members can take a stand against high prices and demand to see this secret plan to reduce gas prices that the Democrat majority has been hiding from the American people since taking control.

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have the text of the amendment and extraneous material appear in the RECORD just prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, I encourage a ''no'' vote on the previous question.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. I thank my good friend from Texas.

Madam Speaker, this 110th Congress has to decide, as does every Congress, whether it's going to focus its collective energies on devising practical solutions to real problems or will this Congress use the practical problems that everyday Americans face as fodder for endless debate on irresolvable, ideological disputes.

Our Financial Services Committee, with cooperation on both sides, and our Ways and Means Committee have made a very clear decision to focus their energies on the resolution of practical problems. They have taken note of something that we all are well aware of: We do have a foreclosure crisis in this country. Eight thousand families a day are receiving a foreclosure notice. And the decision that our committees made was to bring forward to this body for its consideration a practical approach that is going to provide some relief to creditors, it's fair to them; a bill that's fair to borrowers, it's fair to them; and a bill that's going to be good for the economy to provide stability that we need in order to get back on our feet.

This is a very practical bill. If it's going to give an opportunity to homeowners who are facing foreclosure, they are going to pay the price of losing their equity that they had achieved or thought they had. If it's going to be fair to the creditors, it's going to require some sacrifice on their part because they're going to have to write down the value of their loan to reflect what the current appraisal value is. But already it's having a positive effect on the economy.

We're going to hear plenty about the pros and cons of this bill in the 2 hours or 3 hours of debate that will follow. But there's another element to this story that's really quite remarkable and I think something which we all can take heart from. This bill is a product principally of three people from extraordinarily different backgrounds: a war hero in Korea, African American from Harlem; a Massachusetts so-called Democratic liberal; and a man from Wall Street who probably is one of the most successful capitalists and entrepreneurs in the history of this country, the Secretary of the Treasury. They made a decision to focus on the practical and urgent needs. They had a capacity, each of them, to have some understanding of the pain and fear that a mom and dad would experience when their child was coming in wanting to know if they were going to the Little League game that night and they were poring over a foreclosure notice and trying to figure out how they were going to keep that household together. And those men, the three of them, from totally different backgrounds, probably with completely different ideological perspectives on the world, decided they had to find a way to help that mother and father and that family stay in their home.

□ 1700

And what they did is they came up with a practical solution not just because they cared about that family, but they cared about the security and the future of this American economy.

The bill that they have helped put together, again, for our collective consideration, is one that is hopeful for America. It is not about finding blame

and fault about how we got here. And we all have our theories on this. But we know there was a large element of agreed. But instead of focusing, by looking in the rearview mirror and playing the blame game, we have people of different backgrounds, different ideologies who said they were united in the common objective to help American families and to stabilize the American economy. And I believe that all of us can be proud of their willingness to help each other.

What they have shown us with the work that they did was that there is redemptive power in cooperation. And the beneficiaries of that can be families of this country that we all love.

Madam Speaker, I urge a ''yes'' vote on the rule and on the previous question.

The material previously referred to by Mr. SESSIONS is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 1175 OFFERED BY MR. SESSIONS OF TEXAS

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 4. Notwithstanding any other provision of this resolution or the operation of the previous question, it shall be in order to consider any amendment to the motion specified in Section 1 which the proponent asserts, if enacted, would have the effect of lowering the national average price per gallon of regular unleaded gasoline. Such amendments shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for thirty minutes 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 except those arising under clause 9 of rule XXI.

SEC. 5. Within five legislative days the Speaker shall introduce a bill, the title of which is as follows: ''A bill to provide a common sense plan to help bring down skyrocketing gas prices.'' Such bill shall be referred to the appropriate committees of jurisdiction pursuant to clause 1 of rule X.

(The information contained herein was provided by Democratic Minority on multiple occasions throughout the 109th Congress.)

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Democratic majority agenda and a vote to allow the opposition, at least for the moment, to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives, (VI, 308–311) describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as ''a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge.'' To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that ''the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition'' in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: ''The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition.''

Because the vote today may look bad for the Democratic majority they will say ''the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever.'' But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the definition of the previous question used in the Floor Procedures Manual published by the Rules Committee in the 109th Congress, (page 56). Here's how the Rules Committee described the rule using information from Congressional Quarterly's ''American Congressional Dictionary'': ''If the previous question is defeated, control of debate shifts to the leading opposition member (usually the minority Floor Manager) who then manages an hour of debate and may offer a germane amendment to the pending business.''

Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled ''Amending Special Rules'' states: ''a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate.'' (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: ''Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon.''

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Democratic majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on adoption of H. Res. 1175, if ordered; ordering the previous question on H. Res. 1174; and adoption of H. Res. 1174, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 226, noes 198, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 281]

AYES—226

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Carter
Castor
Cazayoux
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Lincoln
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Foster
Frank (MA)
Giffords
Gillibrand
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Klein (FL)
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Tsongas
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth

NOES—198

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachmann
Bachus
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Castle
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
English (PA)
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gilchrest
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Hall (TX)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger

Hill
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Lampson
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marshall
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Tim
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Scalise
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shays
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Tancredo
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield (KY)
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman (VA)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—9

Bishop (NY)
Campbell (CA)
Conaway
Costello
Jones (OH)
Richardson
Rush
Saxton
Speier

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members have 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1723

Messrs. COURTNEY and CARTER changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. CARTER. Madam Speaker, I move to reconsider the vote by which the previous question was ordered on the resolution.

MOTION TO TABLE OFFERED BY MR. WELCH OF VERMONT

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Madam Speaker, I move to lay the motion to reconsider on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to table.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. CARTER. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 225, noes 192, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 282]

AYES—225

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carney
Carson
Castor
Cazayoux
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Lincoln
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doyle
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Foster
Frank (MA)
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Hastings (FL)
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Klein (FL)
Kucinich
Lampson
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Tsongas
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth

NOES—192

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachmann
Bachus
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
English (PA)
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Hall (TX)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Tim
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Saxton
Scalise
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shays
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Tancredo
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield (KY)
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman (VA)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—16

Berkley
Bishop (NY)
Burgess
Campbell (CA)
Carnahan
Conaway
Edwards
Harman
Jones (OH)
Linder
Melancon
Renzi
Richardson
Ros-Lehtinen
Rush
Speier

□ 1730

Mr. ADERHOLT changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the motion to table was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 224, nays 198, answered ''present'' 1, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 283]

YEAS—224

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Castor
Cazayoux
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Lincoln
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Ellsworth

Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Foster
Frank (MA)
Giffords
Gillibrand
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Hastings (FL)
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Klein (FL)
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Spratt
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Tsongas
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth

NAYS—198

Akin
Alexander
Bachmann
Bachus
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
English (PA)
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gilchrest
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Hall (TX)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hill
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Lampson
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Tim
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Saxton
Scalise
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shays
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Tancredo
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield (KY)
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman (VA)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—1

Kaptur

NOT VOTING—10

Bishop (NY)
Campbell (CA)
Conaway
Harman
Jones (OH)
Richardson
Rush
Sánchez, Linda T.
Speier
Stark

□ 1739

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

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Madam Speaker, I move to reconsider the vote on adoption of the resolution.

MOTION TO TABLE OFFERED BY MR. WELCH OF VERMONT

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Madam Speaker, I move to lay the motion to reconsider on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to table.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. ADERHOLT. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 227, noes 196, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 284]

AYES—227

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Castor
Cazayoux
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Lincoln
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Foster
Frank (MA)
Giffords
Gillibrand
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Klein (FL)
Kucinich
Lampson
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Tsongas
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth

NOES—196

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachmann
Bachus
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
English (PA)
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gilchrest
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Hall (TX)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Tim
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Paul
Pearce

Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Saxton
Scalise
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shays
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Tancredo
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield (KY)
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman (VA)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—10

Bishop (NY)
Campbell (CA)
Conaway
Jones (OH)
Lewis (GA)
McCaul (TX)
Richardson
Rush
Sires
Speier

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members have 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1747

So the motion to table was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to adjourn.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to adjourn will be followed by resumed 5-minute voting.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 111, noes 311, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 285]

AYES—111

Akin
Alexander
Bachmann
Bartlett (MD)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boyd (FL)
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Camp (MI)
Cannon
Cantor
Carter
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Emerson
English (PA)
Everett
Flake
Forbes
Gallegly
Gilchrest
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Hall (TX)
Hastings (WA)
Herger
Hobson
Hunter
Issa
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Keller
King (IA)
King (NY)
Knollenberg
LaHood
Lamborn
LaTourette
Latta
Linder
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
McCaul (TX)
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Myrick
Nunes
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Radanovich
Regula
Reichert
Renzi
Rogers (AL)
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Saxton
Scalise
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shays
Shimkus
Shuster
Smith (TX)
Souder
Sullivan
Taylor
Thornberry
Upton
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Young (AK)

NOES—311

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Barton (TX)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Butterfield
Calvert
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Castle
Castor
Cazayoux
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Lincoln
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doyle
Drake
Edwards
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson
Filner
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foster
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gillibrand
Gingrey
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Graves
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Hulshof
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jordan
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Kingston
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
Lampson
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Musgrave
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Platts
Poe
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Putnam
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Rehberg
Reyes
Reynolds
Rodriguez
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shadegg
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sutton
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tiahrt
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Weller
Westmoreland
Wexler
Whitfield (KY)
Wilson (OH)
Wittman (VA)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—11

Bishop (NY)
Boehner
Campbell (CA)
Conaway
Jones (OH)
Richardson
Ruppersberger
Rush
Speier
Tiberi
Tierney

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members have 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1817

Mrs. McCARTHY of New York, Messrs. WESTMORELAND, NEUGEBAUER, INGLIS of South Carolina, WHITFIELD of Kentucky, PUTNAM, SMITH of Nebraska, McKEON, FRELINGHUYSEN, REHBERG, HENSARLING, BARTON of Texas, CALVERT, HAYES, LEWIS of California, KLINE of Minnesota, Ms. FOXX, Messrs. ADERHOLT, SHADEGG, Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS, Messrs. DAVIS of Kentucky, SIMPSON, LATHAM, KINGSTON, HOEKSTRA, ROGERS of Kentucky, LEWIS of Kentucky, BARRETT of South Carolina, DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee, REYNOLDS, BILIRAKIS, Ms. FALLIN, Messrs. ROHRABACHER, HELLER of Nevada, FEENEY, BOUSTANY, McCARTHY of California, FRANKS of Arizona, FERGUSON, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mrs. DRAKE, Messrs. GINGREY, WALBERG, PLATTS, CAPUANO, and GARRETT of New Jersey changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Mrs. BACHMANN, Messrs. SALI, BROUN of Georgia, McHUGH, MICA, BRADY of Texas, PRICE of Georgia, BISHOP of Utah, BURTON of Indiana, SULLIVAN, CULBERSON, BRADY of Texas, PEARCE, MACK and KING of Iowa changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. HOYER. Ladies and gentlemen of the House, I understand that there is substantial angst among the minority. I empathize with that angst. I've been there.

Having said that, I do not empathize with the abuse of process. And because

I do not empathize with the abuse of process, as I have said before, I am going to ask the Speaker to limit the time in which voting is allowed to that which is provided for in the rules. You did that; we're now going to do it.

Somebody said, ''About time.'' I agree with you. Abuse of process is when, and everybody knows this could be done. On our side in the minority we could have kept open for 2 hours with having every 30 seconds somebody come down the aisle. We all know that's possible. I've known that was possible for some period of time. We try to accommodate people who want to change their vote. We try to accommodate people who want to vote. We try to accommodate people who are late.

The problem with accommodating people who are late, if we make it in order in effect, not because of the rules but because of the comity of the House, to allow what just happened, we can, you're correct, in effect do a filibuster by vote changing. We don't have filibusters in the House. They have it in the Senate. I don't think the Senate works particularly well.

You can have your motions. I haven't said anything. Our Members haven't said anything. You're certainly entitled to that. But what just happened, as I said, in my opinion, is an abuse of the Chair's forbearance. The Chair has the responsibility to determine when the vote is concluded.

The vote changing on a motion to adjourn, I know that probably all of you did polls on that and focus groups on whether or not you should vote ''aye'' or ''nay'' on that vote and that led to your changing your vote one way or the other, sometimes maybe twice because you were having difficulty deciding.

But I just want to let everybody know that while we cannot nor are we going to preclude you from doing your motions to adjourn, what just happened is not appropriate for the House, for either side, to simply use a device of changing votes, of voting late, of lining up in the aisle and coming down every 30 seconds or so with a ''one more vote.'' That, in my opinion, is not appropriate for the House to pursue.

Mr. Gingrich sent out a letter, as we have said before, said he was going to call votes 15 minutes and 2 minutes later. You've all heard from Mr. Gingrich lately. He has a lot of advice and counsel. I don't always follow it. But on this, he made the point that I'm making, that we have now had, I don't know, 20, 25 motions to adjourn in which we voted on, reconsiderations to be voted on. Nobody has said anything about that.

But I want to tell my friend, the minority leader, that, as I have said before, my inclination at this point in time will be to ask the presiding officer to limit the votes to the 17 minutes, the 15 minutes that is provided and 2 minutes which have been historically accorded.

I yield to my friend.

Mr. BOEHNER. I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

I know this has been a difficult several days, but I just want to remind everyone that there are some serious process fouls that are going on. And the majority leader, the Speaker, members of the majority during 2005 and 2006 made significant efforts to be critical of the then-majority, some of it, frankly, earned.

But what is happening here, the process that's being used for the big housing bill, the process that's being discussed for the supplemental spending bill closes the minority out of any amendments and any motion to recommit.

I just hope that the majority leader and the members of the majority understand, and I think many of you who have been here for some time understand clearly, the grievance that we have. We don't have many ways to express our grievance on the housing bills because we have no amendment that we can offer. We have no substitute that we're allowed to offer, no motion to recommit. As a result, all we're asking for is to be treated fairly.

The gentleman will know, and other members of the majority and minority will remember, that in 1994 when we took the majority, some of our leaders wanted to treat the minority the way they had been treated. I argued to no end that we should treat the minority the way that we had asked to be treated when we were in the minority. I didn't always win, I'll be the first one to admit that, but I would suggest that given the statements that have been made in 2005 and 2006 about how the then-minority was treated, all I would suggest to you is just treat us the way you asked to be treated, simple as that.

Mr. HOYER. As I indicated at the outset, I understand your feelings. I said angst, but I understand your feelings. My point is that I understand while you have been making motions to adjourn and making your points, you've made it every time you've stood up, I have made the point that I remember voting on omnibus appropriation bills numerous times, 4 months, 5 months after the appropriations process should have been concluded, long after the year began, which were omnibus bills which we could not change. So we understood that that was, we didn't think, fair.

We understood that we sat here for an hour and 45 minutes while we were winning a vote, and no vote ever changed during an hour and 45 minutes, and the vote was not closed down until, in fact, you changed votes on your side and we lost. We understood that. We didn't like that. We thought that was unfair. I didn't think it was against the rules. I've said that. But I thought it was unfair.

All I am saying to my friend, the minority leader, and to my friends on the minority side, that what just occurred is not an acceptable, in our opinion—my opinion, forget about our opinion, I haven't talked to anybody else—in my opinion, way for us to operate the House. The motions, yes, but simply changing votes for the purpose of delay could take an hour, could take 2 hours depending upon how many times people wanted to change.

Mr. Gingrich, we don't hold to it, we understand that, but he said 15 minutes plus 2. I have said that before and some people cheered. Fifteen minutes plus 2, or 5 minutes plus 2 if it's a 5-minute vote, is what we have set as the norm and the comity and the fairness to individuals to exercise their deliberative judgment.

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOYER. I would be glad to yield to my friend.

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Mr. Leader, most of us are institutionalists here, and we have great regard for this body, and I think we're all a bit discouraged when the regular order does not proceed, and my friend, the minority leader, spoke eloquently of what he feels to be a process that's been limited.

But the concern that many of us have is that for 6 years at the Ways and Means Committee, the minority could not pass one amendment. Not one amendment passed in what should be the most deliberative committee in this House, and there were no protestations from the other side that were ever raised.

In this instance here on the housing bill, there were two Republican amendments that were accepted. The vote was 30–5, I believe, or 35–5. So there was a process. Actually, people got to talk at the Ways and Means Committee who disagreed with the outcome of the bill, and I understand how the minority feels in this instance.

But I wish that there had been some voices raised during those years about what was happening to shut down the process in the Ways and Means Committee, and Mr. MCCRERY has moved vigorously to change the tone, as Mr. RANGEL has included him in everything at the committee level.

Mr. HOYER. Reclaiming my time, it was not my purpose to stand here and exchange recriminations or look at history. I think both sides could do that.

It was my purpose to stand and say what we have just done we cannot allow because we would stop the business of the House. We're slowing down the business of the House, and that's allowable, but we're not going to allow the business of the House to be stopped by, we believe, conduct inconsistent with the rules.

Dilatory tactics are not allowed under the rules. Dilatory tactics are specifically provided for as being conduct which need not be countenanced by the House.

Mr. BOEHNER. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOYER. I would be glad to yield to my friend.

Mr. BOEHNER. With all due respect, the minority in this House has a right to be heard.

Mr. HOYER. That's correct.

Mr. BOEHNER. No amendments, no substitutes, no motions to recommit. Last night, we get rid of all the Special Orders. At some point, the majority has an obligation to treat the minority with respect. It is not happening, and that's why we're going to continue to wage this fight to be heard on this floor and represent nearly half of the American people that we're here to represent.

□ 1830

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his comments. I think my comments go as spoken. I expect you to continue to follow those actions which you think are necessary, but I did want to put you on notice because I don't want anything to happen that you're not on notice of.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOYER. I yield to my friend.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I thank the majority leader for yielding.

Under the rules of the House, the Members have the right to vote if they're in the well. You're certainly not suggesting that the presiding officer or the Speaker is going to not abide by that privilege that a Member has when they're in the well of the House.

Mr. HOYER. I don't want to shock anybody on this floor. My belief is that comity requires that, not the rules. I believe comity ought to be followed to that extent. But if your contention is that you can have 200 people stand in that aisle and one every 20 seconds come in and take 20 seconds to change their vote and submit it and the Speaker is hostage to the 199 people waiting to step into the aisle while they're standing there, the answer to your question is yes, I believe the Speaker has the authority under the good order of the House, and I believe the presiding officer has the absolute authority.

Mr. LINDER, who is sitting here, shut down a vote. I think he was within the rules. There were two people in the well. Now, that was changed——

Mr. LINDER. I would object.

Mr. HOYER. You object to the action or the assertion?

Mr. LINDER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOYER. I certainly will.

Mr. LINDER. As a matter of fact, I was in the Chair and I was accused of shutting down the vote while people were in the well seeking to vote. And the next day the C–SPAN tapes proved you were wrong and I was right. The people coming in to vote were not even not only in the well, they were not even on the floor. They were shouting ''one more.'' But Dick Armey reviewed the tapes to critique me and concluded that you were wrong and I was right.

Mr. HOYER. Let me correct my statement. They were not in the well. They were coming down the aisle. But I think the point is the same. Somebody was seeking to vote. Mr. LINDER decided the vote was over. I think Mr. LINDER acted within the rules.

I yield back the balance of my time.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5818, NEIGHBORHOOD STABILIZATION ACT OF 2008

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on House Resolution 1174, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. KINGSTON. Madam Speaker, point of order. On that, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. KINGSTON. On resuming with 5-minute voting, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That order was entered some time ago. No objection was heard.

Mr. KINGSTON. Reserving my right to object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's objection is not timely.

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mr. KINGSTON. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to adjourn.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. KINGSTON. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote will be followed by 5-minute votes.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 143, noes 272, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 286]

AYES—143

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachmann
Bachus
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boustany
Boyd (FL)
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Chabot
Clay
Coble
Cole (OK)
Crenshaw
Cubin
Davis, David
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Emerson
English (PA)
Everett
Fallin
Ferguson
Flake
Forbes
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gilchrest
Gingrey
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
LaHood
Lamborn
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
McCarthy (CA)
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shays
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Tancredo
Taylor
Thornberry
Tiberi
Upton
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Wamp
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield (KY)
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—272

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Buchanan
Burgess
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Castle
Castor
Cazayoux
Chandler
Clarke
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis, Lincoln
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doyle
Edwards
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Feeney
Filner
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gillibrand
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Gordon
Graves
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Heller
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Hulshof
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
Lampson
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Nunes
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor

Payne
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Platts
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rodriguez
Rogers (MI)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sali
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tiahrt
Tierney
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Wittman (VA)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—18

Berry
Bishop (NY)
Campbell (CA)
Conaway
Foster
Hall (TX)
Hunter
Jones (OH)
Keller
LaTourette
McMorris Rodgers
Poe
Richardson
Ruppersberger
Rush
Saxton
Speier
Weldon (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. TAUSCHER) (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1851

Mr. HOYER changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Mr. WELLER of Illinois changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5818, NEIGHBORHOOD STABILIZATION ACT OF 2008

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on House Resolution 1174, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will report the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 220, nays 187, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 287]

YEAS—220

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Castor
Cazayoux
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Lincoln
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Foster
Frank (MA)
Giffords
Gillibrand
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Klein (FL)
Kucinich
Lampson
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Reyes
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Tsongas
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth

NAYS—187

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachmann
Bachus
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Cole (OK)
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
English (PA)
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Graves
Hall (TX)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hill
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Latham
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Tim
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Porter
Price (GA)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Scalise
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shays
Shimkus
Shuster
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Tancredo
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield (KY)
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman (VA)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—26

Berry
Bishop (NY)
Campbell (CA)
Coble
Conaway
Gilchrest
Granger
Gutierrez
Hunter
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
LaTourette
Linder
Maloney (NY)
Moore (KS)
Payne
Peterson (PA)
Pryce (OH)
Rangel
Renzi
Richardson
Ruppersberger
Rush
Saxton
Speier
Velázquez

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining on this vote.

□ 1901

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. SIMPSON. Madam Speaker, I move to reconsider the vote by which the previous question was ordered on the resolution.

MOTION TO TABLE OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF FLORIDA

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I move to lay the motion to reconsider on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to table.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. SIMPSON. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 226, noes 186, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 288]

AYES—226

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Castor
Cazayoux
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Lincoln

DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Foster
Frank (MA)
Giffords
Gillibrand
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Kingston
Klein (FL)
Kucinich
Lampson
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Tsongas
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Westmoreland
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth

NOES—186

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachmann
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
English (PA)
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gilchrest
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Hall (TX)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Latham
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Tim
Musgrave
Myrick
Nunes
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Saxton
Scalise
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shays
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stearns
Sullivan
Tancredo
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Wamp
Weller
Whitfield (KY)
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman (VA)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—21

Bachus
Becerra
Berry
Bishop (NY)
Campbell (CA)
Conaway
Hinojosa
Hooley
LaTourette
Linder
Maloney (NY)
Melancon
Peterson (PA)
Renzi
Richardson
Ruppersberger
Rush
Souder
Speier
Spratt
Weldon (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining on this vote.

□ 1912

Messrs. KINGSTON, WESTMORELAND and NEUGEBAUER changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the motion to table was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 223, nays 192, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 289]

YEAS—223

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Castor
Cazayoux
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Lincoln
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Foster
Frank (MA)
Giffords
Gillibrand
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hinchey
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Klein (FL)
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Tsongas
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth

NAYS—192

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachmann
Bachus
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
English (PA)
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gilchrest
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Hall (TX)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hill
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Lampson
Latham
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Tim
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam

Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Saxton
Scalise
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shays
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Tancredo
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield (KY)
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman (VA)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—18

Berry
Bishop (NY)
Campbell (CA)
Conaway
Hinojosa
Hooley
Kirk
LaTourette
Linder
Maloney (NY)
Meeks (NY)
Mollohan
Peterson (PA)
Radanovich
Renzi
Richardson
Rush
Speier

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are less than 2 minutes remaining on this vote.

□ 1919

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. KIRK. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 289, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

Mrs. EMERSON. Madam Speaker, I move to reconsider the vote on adoption of the resolution.

MOTION TO TABLE OFFERED BY MR. WELCH OF VERMONT

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Madam Speaker, I move to lay the motion to reconsider on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to table.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mrs. EMERSON. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 212, noes 183, not voting 38, as follows:

[Roll No. 290]

AYES—212

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Castor
Cazayoux
Chandler
Clarke
Clyburn
Cohen
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Lincoln
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Filner
Frank (MA)
Giffords
Gillibrand
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Hastings (FL)
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Klein (FL)
Kucinich
Lampson
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Skelton
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Tsongas
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth

NOES—183

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachmann
Bachus
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boustany
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Emerson
English (PA)
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gilchrest
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Hall (TX)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Latham
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Tim
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Saxton
Scalise
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shays
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Sullivan
Tancredo
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield (KY)
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman (VA)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—38

Berkley
Berry
Bishop (NY)
Blunt
Brady (TX)
Buyer
Campbell (CA)
Clay
Cleaver
Conaway
Conyers
Costello
Cubin
DeFazio
Ehlers
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Harman
Hinojosa
Hooley
LaTourette
Linder
Maloney (NY)
McCarthy (CA)
Moran (VA)
Peterson (PA)
Porter
Radanovich
Renzi
Richardson
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Slaughter
Speier
Stearns
Van Hollen
Watson

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining on this vote.

□ 1926

So the motion to table was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. EHLERS. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 290, I stepped off the floor for a meeting, and returned to the floor just a few seconds after the voting board had been closed. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Ed Thomas, one of his secretaries.

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mr. WALSH of New York. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to adjourn.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. WALSH of New York. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 140, noes 264, not voting 29, as follows:

[Roll No. 291]

AYES—140

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachmann
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boustany
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Cantor
Carter
Chabot
Chandler
Clay
Coble
Cole (OK)
Crenshaw
Cubin
Davis, David
Deal (GA)
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
English (PA)
Everett
Fallin
Ferguson
Flake
Forbes
Franks (AZ)

Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gilchrest
Gingrey
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Hall (TX)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
LaHood
Lamborn
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Price (GA)
Putnam
Radanovich
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sanchez, Loretta
Saxton
Scalise
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shays
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Tancredo
Taylor
Thornberry
Tiberi
Upton
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Whitfield (KY)
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman (VA)
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—264

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Buchanan
Burgess
Butterfield
Cannon
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Castle
Castor
Cazayoux
Clarke
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis, Lincoln
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doyle
Edwards
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foster
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Gerlach
Giffords
Gillibrand
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Gordon
Graves
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Hastings (FL)
Heller
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Hulshof
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Jordan
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Kingston
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
Lampson
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Manzullo
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Platts
Poe
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Reyes
Rodriguez
Rogers (MI)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sali
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Skelton
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tiahrt
Tierney
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Westmoreland
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—29

Bachus
Berkley
Berry
Bishop (NY)
Campbell (CA)
Cleaver
Conaway
Costello
Davis, Tom
DeFazio
Dicks
Emerson
Feeney
Harman
Hinojosa
Hodes
Hooley
LaTourette
Linder
Maloney (NY)
Marchant
Musgrave
Peterson (PA)
Pryce (OH)
Renzi
Richardson
Rush
Slaughter
Speier

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1944

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Madam Speaker, earlier today I travelled back to my district and was honored to participate in a ceremony dedicating a memorial to Lieutenant Michael P. Murphy, a Long Island native and constituent who was killed while serving in Afghanistan and posthumously awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor. Had I been here, I would have voted in the following manner:

Rollcall vote No. 267, I would have voted "nay";

Rollcall vote No. 268, I would have voted "aye";

Rollcall vote No. 269, I would have voted "aye";

Rollcall vote No. 270, I would have voted "aye";

Rollcall vote No. 271, I would have voted "nay";

Rollcall vote No. 272, I would have voted "nay";

Rollcall vote No. 273, I would have voted "nay";

Rollcall vote No. 274, I would have voted "aye";

Rollcall vote No. 275, I would have voted "aye";

Rollcall vote No. 276, I would have voted "nay";

Rollcall vote No. 277, I would have voted "aye";

Rollcall vote No. 278, I would have voted "aye";

Rollcall vote No. 279, I would have voted "nay";

Rollcall vote No. 280, I would have voted "nay";

Rollcall vote No. 281, I would have voted "aye";

Rollcall vote No. 282, I would have voted "aye";

Rollcall vote No. 283, I would have voted "aye";

Rollcall vote No. 284, I would have voted "aye";

Rollcall vote No. 285, I would have voted "nay";

Rollcall vote No. 286, I would have voted "nay";

Rollcall vote No. 287, I would have voted "aye";

Rollcall vote No. 288, I would have voted "aye";

Rollcall vote No. 289, I would have voted "aye";

Rollcall vote No. 290, I would have voted "aye";

Rollcall vote No. 291, I would have voted "nay."

ANNOUNCEMENT OF INTENTION TO OFFER MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 2419, FOOD AND ENERGY SECURITY ACT OF 2007

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, under rule XXII, clause 7(c), I hereby announce my intention to offer a motion to instruct on H.R. 2419.

The form of the motion is as follows:

Mr. Shimkus moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the Senate amendment to the bill H.R. 2419 (an Act to provide for the continuation of agricultural programs through fiscal year 2012) be instructed to recede to the provisions contained in section 9021 of the Senate amendment (relating to the E 85 Fuel Program).

ANNOUNCEMENT OF INTENTION TO OFFER MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 2419, FOOD AND ENERGY SECURITY ACT OF 2007

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, under rule XXII, clause 7(c), I hereby announce my intention to offer a motion to instruct on H.R. 2419.

The form of the motion is as follows:

Mr. Terry moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the Senate amendment to the bill H.R. 2419 (an Act to provide for the continuation of agricultural programs through fiscal year 2012) be instructed to recede to the provisions contained in section 12312 subtitle C of title XII of the Senate amendment (relating to a cellulosic biofuel production tax credit).

ANNOUNCEMENT OF INTENTION TO OFFER MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 2419, FOOD AND ENERGY SECURITY ACT OF 2007

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, under rule XXII, clause 7(c), I hereby announce my intention to offer a motion to instruct on H.R. 2419.

The form of the motion is as follows:

Mr. Upton moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the Senate amendment to the bill H.R. 2419 (an Act to provide for the continuation of agricultural programs through fiscal year 2012) be instructed to recede to the provisions proposed to be added to Section 9001 of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 in the form of a definition of ''Renewable Biomass.''

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS TO COMMISSION ON THE PREVENTION OF WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION PROLIFERATION AND TERRORISM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SERRANO). Pursuant to section 1853(a) of the Implementing Recommendations of the 9/11 Commission Act of 2007 (P.L. 110–53), and the order of the House of January 4, 2007, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following members on the part of the House to the Commission on the Prevention of Weapons of Mass Destruction Proliferation and Terrorism:

Mr. Timothy J. Roemer, Great Falls, Virginia

Ms. Wendy R. Sherman, Bethesda, Maryland

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. WATERS. 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. 5818, and to insert extraneous material thereon.

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

There was no objection.

NEIGHBORHOOD STABILIZATION ACT OF 2008

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1174 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. 5818.

□ 1950

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. 5818) to authorize the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to make loans to States to acquire foreclosed housing and to make grants to States for related costs, with Mrs. TAUSCHER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) and the gentlewoman from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Chairman, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Madam Chairman, I would like to first thank Chairman FRANK and all of the members of the Financial Services Committee, and particularly those members who serve on the subcommittee that I chair, the Subcommittee on Housing and Community Opportunity. I'm thanking Members on both sides of the aisle for helping to bring this bill to the floor today.

H.R. 5818, the Neighborhood Stabilization Act, authorizes a $15 billion HUD administrative grant and loan program to State and local governments to purchase, rehabilitate and resell or rent foreclosed homes. To understand the urgent need to enact this legislation, one need only consider the sobering figures on foreclosures recently released by RealtyTrac, which show that foreclosure filings during the first quarter of 2008 are 112 percent higher than 1 year ago, and that actual bank repossessions of homes during March were a shocking 129 percent above March 2007.

The human reality behind these numbers is revealed if you visit, as I have the past year, cities and communities in cities like Cleveland, Ohio; Detroit, Michigan; or the San Bernardino and Stockton metropolitan areas in California, where block after block is dotted by foreclosed properties, many of them suffering from neglect or actual vandalism. These abandoned and foreclosed properties drag down the value of homes still occupied by working families, and contribute to a cascade effect whereby plummeting home prices erode the tax base of State and local governments and cause real estate related industries such as the construction trades to suffer.

States and most local governments must balance their budgets each year and, as a result, 20 States have already had to make or are proposing budget cuts due largely to revenue losses resulting from the subprime crisis, which further reduces demand in the economy and deepens the recession.

On April 10, the Financial Services Committee heard from Mayor Thomas Menino of Boston, Governor Martin O'Malley of Maryland, and others, that despite severe physical constraints, many States and cities are already dedicating their own shrinking tax revenues to purchase foreclosed properties and attempt to stabilize these neighborhoods. But they are overwhelmed by the scale of the problem in comparison to their shrinking tax revenues. For this reason, the National Governors Association has stated that a ''one-time Federal funding commitment to support the acquisition and rehabilitation for foreclosed properties is vital.''

The Governors are joined in their support for the stimulus contained in H.R. 5818 by the U.S. Conference of Mayors, National Association of Counties, National Association of Local Housing Finance Agencies, and the National Council of State Housing Finance Agencies. H.R. 5818 is also endorsed by nearly 40 civil rights, community development, labor and low income housing groups, including the AFL–CIO, Catholic Charities, Lutheran Services of America, the NAACP, the National Urban League, the National Low Income Housing Coalition, and the National Foreclosure Prevention and Neighborhood Stabilization Task Force.

This bill targets assistance where it is most needed. The $7.5 billion in grants and $7.5 billion in loans would be allocated to States based on two factors: The number of foreclosures, and the number of subprime loans 90 days delinquent. This is then subject to a limited adjustment for median home prices, a bipartisan compromise that was worked out in mark-up with the committee's members from Ohio, which, like many midwestern States, has faced skyrocketing foreclosures but did not experience an extraordinary run up in housing prices.

Second, the bill puts flexible resources in the hands of government with the capacity to address the crisis and put funds on the street quickly enough to stimulate the economy. Rather than expect HUD to process plans from 1,200 entitlement jurisdictions, the balance we struck at mark-up was to allocate funding to States and to the Nation's largest 100 cities, largest 50 counties, and cities over 50,000 with especially high foreclosure rates. The areas of States outside of those cities and counties would be addressed in the State's plans.

Under the bill's timelines, fund obligation must begin within 6 months of enactment, be completed within a year, and fully spent within 2 years of enactment. This is no ''big government,'' immortal program, as our colleagues across the aisle suggest. Rather, it is a timely, targeted and temporary shot in the economy's arm, exactly where one is needed.

Indeed, using well-accepted construction activity multipliers, the National Foreclosure Prevention and Neighborhood Stabilization Task Force calculates that the bill's proposed $15 billion investment will generate at least $38 billion in direct and ripple effect economic activity nationwide, employ about 120,000 people, and restore nearly $225 million per year in local real estate tax collections.

Some Republicans have tried to frame this bill as a bailout bill for investors. This simply is not so. Government and their nonprofit partners will drive a hard bargain with property owners because they are highly incentivized to make this money go as far as possible in their efforts to stabilize neighborhoods where many of them have been working for years, and because they must pay the government back any funds used to purchase homes.

In no event, moreover, can they pay more than 110 percent of the average

home sale price in the area. Creaming of properties and ''sweetheart'' deals are prevented by the requirement that properties sit for 60 days before they are eligible.

What H.R. 5815 does make possible is for States, cities and counties to stabilize a few neighborhoods, especially low income ones, that are in serious danger of an overcorrection and rapid deterioration past the tipping point, where it becomes very difficult to turn them around.

I urge Members to hear the pleas of the Nation's governors, mayors, community-based organizations and ordinary citizens to provide this critical relief to stabilize neighborhoods and stimulate the economy.

The administration and my friends on the opposite side of the aisle in this Chamber argue that we cannot afford to respond. I would like to just remind this body of what Mr. FRANK said earlier today, we afforded $30 billion to bail out Bear Stearns, and certainly we can afford half of that amount, $15 billion for the entire country. We simply cannot afford not to.

I urge passage of the Neighborhood Stabilization Act.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. CAPITO. Madam Chairman, today I want to thank, first of all, the chairwoman of the Subcommittee on Housing, of which I'm the ranking member, for her good hard work and dedicated service. We've had a lot of hearings and a lot of information, and I think we all want to try to achieve help for the homeowners or those who are on the edge.

But today I rise in opposition to H.R. 5818, the Neighborhood Stabilization Act of 2008. We all recognize that we are experiencing a sharp increase in foreclosure statistics and starts. Over the past year alone, approximately 550,000 homeowners with subprime loans began the foreclosure process.

However, we shouldn't rush to act. We must guard against adopting policies which create moral hazards and unintended consequences.

□ 2000

Unfortunately, we believe H.R. 5818, the Neighborhood Stabilization Act of 2008, is a bill which does both. H.R. 5818 is an unnecessary government intervention in the housing market which will bail out real estate speculators, servicers, and lenders while doing nothing to assist hardworking Americans struggling to make their mortgage payments. This bill will not keep one person in their mortgage or in their home.

The bill does this through a $15 billion authorization for grants and loans to be used to purchase already foreclosed homes from lenders, servicers, and speculators who have made bad loans or unwise investments. The Neighborhood Stablization Act will allow investors and servicers to unload their foreclosed properties to the government with the taxpayer footing the bill. Servicers and investors might even be encouraged to pursue foreclosure if this bill is enacted.

Instead of incentivizing foreclosure, Congress should be encouraging services to engage in voluntary loan workouts and modifications. Furthermore, this bill calls on States and local governments to convert foreclosed properties into affordable rental and single-family housing. The increase in housing supply and decrease in prices creates housing affordability without government intervention.

I'm also concerned that the overly broad income targeting provisions in this bill, which will allow families making 100 percent and 140 percent of area median income respectively, to rent and purchase properties acquired with funds from this act. It is not appropriate for the government to provide housing assistance to individuals who can afford market-rate housing.

Congress should focus its efforts on keeping hardworking Americans in their homes. We should not unnecessarily intervene in the housing market in the process of adjustment after years of what has proved to be unsustainable growth. It is imperative that we recognize the primary beneficiaries of this bill will not be the thousands of Americans struggling to hold on to their home, but the lenders, servicers and speculators who bear much of the responsibility for the current housing slump.

Putting aside the issue of how massive this new program would be, the bill's ultimate beneficiaries, as I said, could be our lenders and investors and speculators; and indeed the FHA commissioner, Brian Montgomery, stated in testimony before our committee that ''this legislation may have the unintended consequences of making foreclosure a more attractive option for lenders thereby compounding the very problem of rising foreclosures that the bill purports to address.''

Madam Chairman, I oppose this bill, and I would like to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Chairman, I yield to the chairman of the Financial Services Committee 3 minutes.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. A former President once unfairly characterized a leader of this House as someone who couldn't walk and chew gum at the same time. The gentlewoman from West Virginia extends, frankly, that insult to the whole House. She suggests we can't do two bills in one night. She says we should work to try to help avoid foreclosure. I agree. That's the next bill which we will get to after all of this useless temper tantrum is over, we will get to it at 3 o'clock in the morning, but we will get to it.

That bill will help avoid foreclosure. I know the gentlewoman agrees. She voted for that bill in committee although a majority of her colleagues were against it.

But I do not understand how anybody could argue that doing this bill now interferes with that bill later. They are totally not in conflict.

So the notion that this bill doesn't keep people out of foreclosure is true. It doesn't combat global warming. It doesn't get troops out of Iraq. It won't help me lose weight. There are a lot of things this bill won't do that I very much want to do. None of them are a reason to vote against a bill that doesn't do what it doesn't say it's going to do but does what it does.

What it does is to go to the aid of cities that have been victimized by the deregulation run rampant, perpetrated by this administration, which has led to the subprime crisis. We have vacant property everywhere in these areas.

Now the argument that this is going to award speculators and be an incentive to do foreclosures is also flatly wrong. This is $15 billion. People will tell you it's a lot of money, and it is. Do you know how much money this is? This is half of the money that this administration made available to buy up the debts of Bear Stearns. Now, I think they had to do that. I think they were forced to do it. But I think we have to do this as well.

I do think that the whole country, under this administration's calculation, ought to get at least half of what Bear Stearns got. That's all that this does.

Now, unfortunately, it's not nearly enough to buy up the property that's foreclosed. So anyone who says, I'm going to foreclose today because I want to get in on this, would be nuts because there is already property ahead of them. And even when this bill becomes law, if it does, there's a 60-day wait, and I hope it will be part of the stimulus.

Property that was once paying taxes because of this subprime crisis now eats taxes. It bites neighborhoods. And, yes, some of the people who foreclose may benefit here. But we are telling the cities and the States to be careful with this money. They have to buy it for affordable housing. That will put limits on what they will pay.

And you can say, well, why don't the cities do it on their own? Because the very cities that need help here have lost revenue because of this foreclosure. These properties are fire traps; they attract people who break the law; they attract sanitary nuisances. They lead to water hazards.

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Ms. BALDWIN). The gentleman's time has expired.

Ms. WATERS. I yield an additional minute to the gentleman.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I always feel good when people make arguments against legislation that won't really deal with the legislation. The notion that the problem with this bill is that it doesn't help avoid foreclosure, when it was not the bill intended to avoid foreclosure, shows well, there's a dearth of arguments against it.

The argument that it's going to reward the speculators, this will go to

cities dealing with property that is causing them problems. Do we not trust the cities and States of this country to take this money and use it judiciously and wisely to prevent neighborhood decay?

I don't understand the animus that motivates so many of my Republican colleagues that say, Oh, no, let's not have government intervention here. Well, we heard that a while ago, and people on the other side successfully blocked government intervention in regulating subprime mortgage origination outside of the banks. It was this religion of never intervening that brought us here. A limited intervention to undo the negative consequences is what this bill calls for.

Mrs. CAPITO. I would like to make a comment in reference to the chairman's comments.

I live in a small community, just barely over 50,000. And we have local government and State programs in effect right now that deal with foreclosed or blighted projects. They work together with the local nonprofits, with the local land owners and realtors, and we have problems that are moving forward.

So to say that we're not in favor of programs that would deal with foreclosure-blighted neighborhoods I think is factually incorrect.

I would like now to yield some time to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FEENEY), a member of the Financial Services Committee, 3 minutes.

Mr. FEENEY. I thank the gentlewoman.

I would say this bill tonight proves at least two maxims about Congress: One is that we have two speeds: zero and that we overreact; and the other is that the law of unintended consequences means that often the adverse or the harmful consequences of the things we do in Congress are much more meaningful than the positive things that we would like to accomplish.

Let me give one example. Back in the early sixties and seventies and eighties, and all the way through the nineties, Madam Chairman, there were lots of complaints that low- and middle-income people, especially minorities, didn't have access to loans, that they didn't get the same opportunity that other people of above-modest means had to own a home in America. And there were complaints, and there were all sorts of animosity, to use the Chairman's word from a few minutes ago, towards lenders for being discriminatory against low- and middle-income people again, especially minorities.

So the Community Redevelopment Act was enacted in 1977, and at that time one of the things that Congress had the power to do was to oversee and look at every single lender in America in order to determine that they were aggressively making loans in low and poor and minority neighborhoods so that we could measure those institutions so we could insist that there be more access to homeownership.

We got exactly what we asked for, and part of that was the subprime loan crisis. And part of that was zero-document loans where people could literally line up without any proof of income. Part of that was instead of making it a 70-percent loan or 75-percent loan, which almost never fails, making 100-percent, or 110-percent loans. Part of that was teaser interest rates to get people into a home at 3 percent, which they could afford to make an $800 or $900 a month payment, and when that teaser rate readjusted to 7 or 8 or 9 percent, all of a sudden what used to be an $800 payment became a $2,000-a-month payment, and they couldn't make it. They got exactly what we anticipated.

Countrywide is now bankrupt. Countrywide in 2005 got the Best in Minority Lending Award from the Lending Industry Diversity Conference. This Congress had great intentions. We wanted to make more money available so that everybody could have the American Dream. In fact, as of 2 years ago, America had an all-time high, approaching 69 percent of Americans that owned their own homes. That's great.

The truth of the matter is because of easy money from the Feds, because of investor imprudence, because of greedy Wall Street speculators, we have now got a crisis because of a bubble that is collapsing.

Who is being bailed out by this bill? The $15 billion will eventually end up, after it goes to the cities and counties, in the pockets of the investors and holders of these mortgages that went seeking higher profits that put people in homes that they couldn't afford. We are doing exactly what economists want us not to do: creating a moral hazard. It is going to make it more likely, rather than less, that foolish loans are made in the future.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Chairman, I recognize for 1 minute the gentleman from Massachusetts to straighten out the gentleman on the opposite side of the aisle who does not know the history of CRA.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Of all of the unfair accusations, the one that blames the Community Reinvestment Act for this is the strongest.

The Community Reinvestment Act was passed in 1977. This subprime crisis, of course, did not appear until nearly 30 years later; but more important, the subprime loans that caused problems were overwhelmingly made by institutions not covered by the Community Reinvestment Act. It covers depository institutions: banks and thrifts and credit unions. Credit unions aren't covered. Banks and thrifts.

If only those institutions, deposit-taking, regulated institutions covered by CRA had made these loans, we wouldn't have had the crisis. The loans were made by institutions not covered by CRA 30 years, 28 years after CRA was passed.

Mr. FEENEY. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. FEENEY. Perhaps the chairman didn't take my point. The point is that it has been aggressive policies by Congress including evaluating everybody under the Community Reinvestment Act.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

Ms. WATERS. I yield the gentleman an additional minute.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. The gentleman is wrong to say that we evaluated everybody under CRA. We have evaluated banks and thrifts under CRA. Mortgage brokers, mortgage bankers were not evaluated——

Mr. FEENEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. No. Not until I finish this factual statement.

Mr. FEENEY. I didn't say what the chairman said I said.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FEENEY. I didn't say what the chairman said I said. I said that it has been the policy of many in this Congress for about 40 years now to criticize lenders all over the spectrum for not pushing more money into low- and moderate-income areas. I think the chairman will agree with me.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I will take back my time.

First of all, I thought I heard the gentleman talk about the Community Reinvestment Act. It's been late. I keep hearing, ''I move to adjourn.'' Maybe my ears got a little curdled.

I thought the gentleman said, and we'll check the record later. If he didn't mention the Community Reinvestment Act, I will apologize.

But no. I for one have been saying that we should not be pushing people into homeownership when they can't handle it, and part of the problem here was killing affordable rental housing.

But let's have the record clear. There is no rational way to blame the Community Reinvestment Act passed in 1977 and not cover the nondepository institutions for this crisis caused by the nondepository institutions.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN), who serves on our committee, for 1 minute.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Thank you, Madam Chairman.

I have to say this. I have to apologize to the gentleman, too, because for a moment, I thought I heard a disjointed syllogism because I couldn't make that connection.

This bill is needed by this country. This bill is going to help neighborhoods maintain their integrity.

And I have to ask one question: Where was the moral hazards argument when Penn Central got $7 billion? When Lockheed Martin was bailed out? When Franklin National Bank was bailed out? When Chrysler was bailed out? Continental Illinois? When Bear Stearns received its $29 billion plus a $13 billion loan? Where was the moral hazards argument?

It seems that this argument surfaces whenever poor people or whenever people who are living in the streets of life, whenever people who have not found their way into the well-off, the well-heeled, and the well-to-do, it seems that it tends to surface. I think that it's time for us to do for others what we can do for these major corporations.

□ 2015

Ms. WATERS. Madam Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Thank you very much, Madam Chairman.

This is an extraordinarily important measure. If we don't learn from history, we're doomed to repeat it. Around 1929, we had another crisis that happened as a result of one of our financial legs coming out from under us. At that time, there was a Republican administration that fostered so much of that. Franklin Delano Roosevelt, in a Democratic administration, had to come and realize that government had to act.

We're not doing this because we don't have anything else to do. We're doing this because we have an economic crisis of soaring magnitude before us. The derivatives of this magnitude are affecting communities and neighborhoods where these foreclosures are leaving these empty homes, many of them in $200,000, $300,000, $400,000 neighborhoods. They're taking down the residential value of communities around them, and these communities in these cities and towns are already strapped with their own financial pressures, much like my own city of Atlanta, and they need help in rescuing these communities. We're coming to their rescue.

Mrs. CAPITO. Madam Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to a member of the Financial Services Committee, Mr. ROSKAM from Illinois.

Mr. ROSKAM. I thank the gentlelady for yielding and for the time.

One of the underlying issues as it relates to this bill is I think the way in which it was contemplated. I'm not making a process argument, but what I am making is an argument that suggests there's a very serious oversight.

And the oversight was the committee's rejection of the McHenry amendment. The McHenry amendment basically said, look, if you're going to have these grants and loans and there's going to be properties that are going to be purchased, there should be an open process, there should be a bidding process, and it should be something that everybody has access to. And I think the failure of the majority in this case was to dismiss that and put it aside.

I've heard cities tonight described as victims. The chairman a minute ago said he has great confidence, and I'm paraphrasing, but great confidence that cities are going to use the money judiciously and wisely. Well, my congressional district falls in the shadow of a city with a different reputation that doesn't have a judicious and wise reputation always. Let me read you just a couple of headlines within the past couple of weeks about some of the schemes that have happened from a corruption point of view about the very people that you're contemplating entrusting $15 billion to.

Here's one this month: ''Witness Details Pay-To-Play Schemes'' or ''Ex-Illinois Official Pleads Guilty to Lying'' or ''Corruption Firmly Entrenched in State'' or ''Illinois: Corruption on Parade'' or ''Top Aide to Illinois Governor Is Indicted in Kickback Inquiry.''

We have got deep troubles in northern Illinois, and what is conspicuously absent in this bill, and I've read it, I've looked at it all, within this bill there is no requirement of any kind of disclosure, no requirement of any kind of notice, no requirement of anything whatsoever. So, in other words, if you're a corrupt official working for an agency that has been entrusted with this $15 billion, there's absolutely nothing, nothing that prohibits you from selling this to a friend for whatever you want to sell it for. The bill is absolutely silent.

Now, is the majority trying to be complicit in a nefarious scheme? Of course not. But was it a gross oversight on the part of the majority in the committee to reject the McHenry amendment? I think so, and I think for that fundamental flaw alone, notwithstanding all the underlying policy questions, that fundamental flaw alone brings a great deal of skepticism to voters in my congressional district. And for that reason, I urge a ''no'' vote.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

The gentleman from Illinois evidently has not read the bill. As a matter of fact, they have to have a plan that is adopted or accepted, reviewed by HUD. And so in the plan, all of the disclosure, everything that needs to be known about that city's plans will be reviewed.

In addition to that, the amendment that the gentleman is referring to is an amendment that would bog down this ability to get money into the neighborhoods and on the street very quickly for the economic stimulus that we anticipate.

I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. HIGGINS) 1 minute.

Mr. HIGGINS. Madam Chairman, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 5818, the Neighborhood Stabilization Act. I want to thank Chairman FRANK and Chairwoman WATERS for their persistent efforts to address the issue of how foreclosures and subprime lending contribute to the vacant and abandoned housing problem in cities like Buffalo.

Buffalo and western New York are facing a vacant and abandoned housing crisis that gets progressively worse every day as more and more homes fall into foreclosure. While the City of Buffalo has been dealing with the negative effects of home foreclosures for some time, recent events have made their situation worse, necessitating this relief.

Vacant homes wreak havoc on the neighborhoods in which they exist. These homes often serve as a haven for crime, endangering children and making entire neighborhoods dangerous. They also serve as a drain on local governments, which must deal with decaying homes long after owners and banks have abandoned them. Perhaps most distressing, abandoned homes discourage investment and influence urban flight.

H.R. 5818 would provide immediate relief to these neighborhoods in several ways. It would empower local officials to take control of vacant and abandoned properties and increase homeownership.

Local governments could use loan funds to purchase and rehabilitate vacant homes for sale to working families who otherwise may not be able to afford quality housing. If homes are beyond repair and within neighborhoods prone to vacancy and abandonment, local governments could use grant funds to demolish them. Both the loan and grant initiatives will provide a much needed and immediate injection of resources into these neighborhoods that have been hard hit by the foreclosure crisis, so that these communities will have a better chance to get back on their feet and move forward.

It is highly dismaying to note that the housing market has gotten progressively worse in the last 12 months, creating the need for the stimulus provided in this bill.

Mrs. CAPITO. Madam Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ROSKAM) 2 minutes.

Mr. ROSKAM. I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

And in response to the chairman's question, yeah, no question about it. There's a plan requirement on page 3, section 4 of the bill, but the plan requirement doesn't prohibit the type of conduct that I just described, a plan as it relates to goals for the sale to different groups, accessibility to different groups, but the plan is silent as it relates to this potentially corrupt practice.

I think it's a flaw and I don't think it's a flaw that can't be redeemed. It can be very easily corrected. It doesn't help the underlying policy objections to the bill.

But $15 billion put out there without any requirement whatsoever as it relates to a prohibition against self-dealing, a member of the housing development authority of a particular municipality calling up a cousin and saying, hey, come on by here, we just purchased this foreclosed property for $100,000, I'll sell it to you for $75,000, there's nothing in here. Notwithstanding the plan language, notwithstanding any other declaration of the majority, it is silent, and we can do much, much better.

Ms. WATERS. I yield to myself 30 seconds.

I'm glad the gentleman found the plan in the bill that I had advised him about because there is a plan, and perhaps it does not have 101 things that he

would like, and I'm sure you could add a lot more to it, but there is a plan. And the situation that he just described could not happen. As a matter of fact, you have to pay back the money that you get through the loan.

Madam Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY) 2 minutes.

Mr. CLAY. Let me thank Chairwoman WATERS for yielding and also for her leadership on this issue in getting this bill out of committee and to the floor.

As an original cosponsor of this legislation, I support its speedy passage through the legislative process. This bill is sorely needed to help stabilize neighborhoods in various types of communities that have high incidences of housing foreclosures.

This act establishes a loan and grant program administered by the Department of Housing and Urban Development to help States purchase and rehabilitate owner-vacated, foreclosed homes with the goal of stabilizing and occupying them as soon as possible, either through resale or rental to qualified families.

I raised concerns about the distribution of loans and grants to Chairwoman WATERS, and the bill's funds were originally designed for distribution to States with priority for the 25 most populated cities in the country.

My concern was that many of us had districts that had higher density of foreclosures than many of the top 25 cities in population. Additionally, we needed to ascertain that housing was provided for low- and moderate-income families, inclusive of those who had already suffered foreclosures.

My staff and I worked closely with Chairwoman WATERS and her committee staff and placed provisions in the bill that address these concerns. My district, the First Congressional District of Missouri, has alarmingly high foreclosure rates and large numbers of low- and moderate-income families. The bill now mandates a priority for addressing this high foreclosure level area and others like it across the country.

Again, I want to thank Chairwoman WATERS for her leadership on this.

Mrs. CAPITO. Madam Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING), a member of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. HENSARLING. I thank the gentlelady for yielding, and I certainly rise in opposition to this bill. I have no doubt that it is certainly good-hearted but it is certainly wrongheaded.

There is a great challenge in our housing markets today, but I come here with some interest and amusement to see how many of my friends on the Democratic side of the aisle bemoaned the Bear Stearns bailout by the Federal Reserve, only to come here and offer a bill that, ultimately, using the States and localities as a conduit, is going to bail out Wall Street. It's going to bail out the investors, the people who own these properties in the first place, the people who made bad debts.

I wish somebody would introduce a bill to bail me out of my bad debts. Perhaps next time I invest in real estate or the stock market or the commodities, somebody will come here and say, if I failed, we will get the taxpayer to come in and bail me out.

Second of all, it misses the point of what the true challenge is. The true challenge in our housing markets is a shrinking paycheck, and I know as much as our friends on the other side of the aisle wish to come and blame all the economic woes of our Nation on us, the truth is elections have consequences. They've been in charge of the economic policy of this Nation for almost 18 months now. And what have they done in 18 months?

Number one, they passed a budget that has the largest single tax increase in American history, largest single tax increase in American history. After 3 years fully phased in, it's going to be a $3,000 average burden on the American family. That shrinking paycheck causes people not to be able to pay their mortgage bills.

We know what's happened to gasoline prices, almost $4 a gallon. Shrinking paycheck. Now supposedly they were going to bring the price of gas down when they were elected. The American people know differently, and it's not just gasoline that's $4 a gallon. Milk. I've got a 6-year-old and a 4-year-old back home in Dallas, Texas. They drink a lot of milk. Milk's expensive. The cereal they like, it's expensive, all happening under their watch. A shrinking paycheck.

How are people supposed to afford their mortgage when they're having to pay historic high gasoline prices, historic high food prices and pay an extra $3,000 in taxes? Madam Chairman, that's the real challenge that America's families are facing now.

And here's another problem with this particular piece of legislation that I find. It ignores the greater crisis in America, and that is the spending crisis, the one that is ignored on a daily basis here. Already we notice that when the new Member from Louisiana was sworn in today, we all saw that he had his baby in his arms, and, I don't know, it might have been a 1-year-old or 2-year-old child, but that child already has inherited a debt of almost $200,000 because Congress after Congress keeps on spending money and sends the burden to future generations.

So, you know, what is it? It's $7.5 billion for grants here and $7.5 billion for loans there. Well, Madam Chairman, sooner or later we're talking about real money.

□ 2030

We're on the verge of being the first generation in America's history to leave the next generation with a lower standard of living. And it's not just me that's saying it, it's the Congressional Budget Office, the Office of Management and Budget, the General Accountability Office. And yet again, the Democrat majority ignores that true crisis.

I also find it quite interesting that while the Federal Government continues to be awash in the sea of red ink in passing on unfunded obligations to future generations, that almost every State and municipality in the Nation is running a surplus.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mrs. CAPITO. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. HENSARLING. So we're taking money away from a treasury that has none to supplement treasuries that do have some. We have a great challenge in our Nation.

And clearly predatory lending took place, I might add, so did predatory borrowing. And so we need to help people, but the way to help them when people are struggling to pay their mortgages is not to raise their taxes and force them to pay the mortgages of their neighbor, particularly a number of neighbors and Wall Street investors who speculated, who might have engaged in fraud.

But Madam Chairman, back to the States and localities. For example, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts spends $11 million a year on their Office of Tourism. If we're having a great housing crisis, maybe they could cut back a little on the tourism budget and help the people in need for housing.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has again expired.

Mrs. CAPITO. I yield the gentleman another 2 minutes.

Mr. HENSARLING. Again, if this is such a great priority for the States and they're crying out for these loans and grants, why does the State of Massachusetts continue to spend $760,245 for pools and spray pools under the control of the Department of Conservation and Recreation?

Michigan, $9.4 million to enhance public boating access and dock facilities. I have no doubt, Madam Chairman, that this is important. But again, if we have a housing crisis, maybe the good people of Michigan could cut back a little on their boating access facilities.

State of Ohio. They apparently have a wonderful ''Discover Ohio'' tourism and marketing campaign, $8.2 million. Maybe they could use some of that money to assist the people in their State.

How about some of the municipalities? According to the Daily News, Los Angeles spends a half a million dollars, $550,000 to be exact, for calligraphers to decorate proclamations and honors. I'm sure that those proclamations are very handsome, but again, if we're having a housing crisis, maybe people in Los Angeles can cut back on the calligraphy to assist the people in need. And yet the Democrat majority—and the gentlelady from California who perhaps

is familiar with the calligraphy—has decided instead to take the money away from the Federal Treasury, help raise taxes on hardworking American families while they're trying to fill up their cars to take their children to school, to try to go to work, so that ultimately we're subsidizing Ohio tourism, L.A. calligraphy, water boating access in Michigan, and the list goes on and on. Surely we can find something that is more fiscally responsible and more creative than yet another grant and loan program to States and localities that ultimately bail out investors and Wall Street.

This is bad legislation. It should be defeated.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota, a member of our committee, both the subcommittee and Financial Services, Mr. KEITH ELLISON.

Mr. ELLISON. Madam Chairman, let me start by thanking Chairman FRANK and Chairwoman WATERS for bringing this critical and much-needed legislation to the floor. I'm proud to have worked with both of them on this important legislation which represents the most comprehensive response yet in the American mortgage crisis.

The package of housing measures that we will vote on today and that I proudly support will help thousands of families facing foreclosure keep their homes. This bill will ultimately help other families avoid foreclosures in the future and help recovery of communities harmed by empty homes caught in the foreclosure crisis.

This legislation comes before us at an important time in the mortgage foreclosure and housing crisis. The Pew Center has stated that between seven to eight thousand people per day are filing for foreclosure. Hennepin County alone, which is the largest county in the Fifth District of Minnesota that I represent, has experienced a 54 percent increase in foreclosures from the year before. Statewide foreclosures have risen by 39 percent.

The legislation we're considering today establishes a $15 billion HUD-administered loan and grant program for the purpose of rehabilitation of vacant, foreclosed homes with the goal of occupying them as soon as possible.

Madam Chairman, let me just say this: The fact of the matter is that for the people who paid every single mortgage payment and were never late even one time, they are suffering because of this mortgage crisis because they live on a block with foreclosed homes.

This bill saves money. Can you imagine the cost to a city, in terms of fire, police and public works resources, just to be able to deal with a home that's foreclosed on a block? This is saving money. This is actually improving the quality of life for people all over America. And this amount of money that we will spend on this bill will pay thousand-fold in terms of quality of life for people all over this country.

And so I'm proud to be able to associate myself with this bill, proud to be able to say that when the people of America face a serious foreclosure crisis that is affecting not just the victims of foreclosure, but others, we responded.

Mrs. CAPITO. Madam Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE), who is also a member of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I thank my good friend from West Virginia for her leadership on this and for cogently bringing the debate forward and stating why this is the wrong bill at the wrong time.

I am pleased to hear from my friend, though, from Minnesota who said that this was going to save America money. If we keep saving money at this rate, our deficit ought to disappear in short order, $15 billion chunks going out the door. I'm not sure how that math adds up, but I'm certain that it works somewhere.

I want to commend my friend from Illinois for raising the point, as I know that the chairwoman acknowledged, and that is that there was no bidding process. There is really no accountability in this bill. Yes, there are plans that have to be proposed and submitted, but there's no oversight, there is no oversight of this money. Fifteen billion dollars could go to anybody, truly, who was a friend or a crony of any official in a State or a city. And we're going to trust the cities, as the chairman said, it was important that we trusted the cities. And I believe primarily that that is important that we do trust cities. If we trusted cities so much, though, then why would we not adopt an amendment that I proposed in committee that said that we ought to let the city do with the property what they deemed appropriate? But we haven't done that. We said oh, no, even if this facility, this housing facility is public housing and is absolutely dilapidated, you couldn't demolish it. Oh, no, we wouldn't want that to happen. We wouldn't want the city to make a decision that they could do something better with that property. In fact, this bill precludes that opportunity.

I heard the chairwoman say that she wouldn't want to add an amendment that would provide for that accountability or that oversight because it might bog down getting the money to the cities. Well, Madam Chairman, I'll tell you what will bog down getting money to the cities, if people were really sincerely interested in that, and that's a veto. And this bill will be vetoed by the President of the United States for appropriate reasons because it is irresponsible and it is not appropriate to spend the kind of money that we're talking about without any oversight and without any accountability. Remember, $15 billion.

I am constantly surprised, truly, by my friends on the other side of the aisle who don't seem to remember where this money comes from. Where does this money come from? It comes from hardworking Americans. And I would suggest, Madam Chairman, as my friend from Texas said, that hardworking Americans have a significant challenge right now in some aspects of their life, trying to make certain that they can afford the increase in gas prices under this majority, for the increasing prices for commodities under this majority. And so it would be appropriate that we remember that, and that we allow more Americans to keep more of their hard-earned money.

Now what is the solution? Well, I would suggest, Madam Chairman, that a couple of programs that are in place right now and are working diligently to make certain that people can stay in their homes, FHA Secure is a program that is administered by the Federal Housing Authority that provides greater flexibility for refinancing homes for hundreds of thousands of Americans. The Hope Now Alliance was a program that was put into place, a private sector cooperative effort that actually makes it so that struggling homeowners can get the kind of counseling and guidance to assist them to refinance their mortgages. More than 1.4 million Americans, Madam Chairman, have been shown the opportunity to be able to stay in their home.

These are positive and productive programs that make it so that individuals can stay in their home. They aren't a bailout that is being proposed by the other side. They aren't taking $15 billion of hard-earned taxpayer money and saying, ''It's okay. We'll cover it. Don't worry about that. The American people's pocketbook is absolutely endless.''

This is a bad bill, wrong bill, wrong time. I urge my colleagues to vote ''no.''

Ms. WATERS. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio, a member of the Financial Services Committee, Mr. CHARLIE WILSON.

Mr. WILSON of Ohio. Madam Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 5818. As a Member from Ohio, one of the States that has been hardest hit by foreclosures, I know how important it is for us to pass this bill.

Thirty-six percent of all the homeowners in Ohio will feel the effects of what's going on in the subprime crisis. The pain isn't limited to just the families losing their homes, but also the neighbors and the neighborhood around. What happens is homeowners are projected to each lose as much as $2,000 in property value during this crisis. And because of that, the State of Ohio will lose approximately $3 billion in tax base. These are truly scary numbers.

H.R. 5818 will help Ohio and America begin to heal. The flexible bill will give loans and grants directly to the States. States will then be able to clean up the blight, help families stay in their homes, and rehabilitate long vacant and decrepit homes. States will be able to stabilize their entire neighborhoods that are hurting from foreclosures.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

Ms. WATERS. I yield the gentleman 30 additional seconds.

Mr. WILSON of Ohio. I would like to thank Congresswoman WATERS for her hard work, for working with me on this vitally important issue. And I'm proud to support H.R. 5818 and urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mrs. CAPITO. Madam Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining on each side.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from West Virginia controls 7½ minutes. The gentlewoman from California has 7½ minutes remaining.

Mrs. CAPITO. I would like to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California, Ms. BARBARA LEE.

Ms. LEE. Let me thank Chairwoman WATERS for continuing to take on the tough issues as she once again is taking on this tough issue of the foreclosure crisis with this bill. I want to thank her for her leadership and also Chairman FRANK.

This bill will give HUD the tools to work with States and local governments to identify distressed neighborhoods and purchase and rehabilitate vacant houses before they become a blight on their neighborhoods.

There are entire neighborhoods in my district in Oakland, California that are threatened, quite frankly, with complete collapse. The longer homes stay empty, the more likely they will further destabilize already fragile communities, discourage investment, depress home values, and create a spiraling cycle of foreclosures.

This bill provides $15 billion in loans and grants to directly relieve these neighborhoods. This is just half of what this administration has already spent on bailing out Bear Stearns. Thank goodness Congresswoman WATERS has provided this plan to help stabilize communities.

I urge an ''aye'' vote.

Ms. WATERS. I yield 1 minute to one of our newest Members, and a member of the Financial Services Committee, Mr. ANDRÉ CARSON.

Mr. CARSON of Indiana. Madam Chairman, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 5818, the Neighborhood Stabilization Act of 2008.

This bill is extremely important to me as a representative from Indiana's Seventh Congressional District. My district has suffered with disproportionately high rates of foreclosures. In fact, Indiana has consistently rated among the top 10 States nationally for foreclosures, along with Michigan and Ohio.

We frequently hear how housing vacancies have had a negative impact on property values, but as someone who has spent their career in law enforcement, I know that vacancies can also foster violence and theft in our neighborhoods.

This bill could help communities rebuild property value and maintain stability in our neighborhoods. I want to thank Congresswoman MCCARTHY and Congressman CAPUANO for working with me on an amendment in committee to include first responders to those States that may establish preferences in their housing priorities.

□ 2045

I see firsthand the dedication and passion these firefighters, emergency medical service providers, and police officers have for others. They put their lives at risk every day for the safety of those in our city.

This bill is responsible and thoughtful, and I want to thank Congressman FRANK and Chairwoman WATERS for their outstanding work on H.R. 5818.

Mrs. CAPITO. Madam Chairman, I would like to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT), a member of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. I thank the gentlewoman for the time.

Madam Chairman, I come to the floor optimistic inasmuch as I have heard, I think, where maybe five or six Members on the other side of the aisle raised the issue of exactly what transpired with regard to Bear Stearns and that circumstance some 2 months ago. I come optimistic but at the same time somewhat perplexed because, as I say, this did occur with regard to the Federal Reserve some 2 months ago, and immediately thereafter my office contacted the full body of our committee, both Republicans and Democrats, saying should not our committee be investigating what transpired there? And we extended a hand to the other side to say let's do two things: First, let's contact the Federal Reserve and Secretary Paulson to raise the issues that are now being raised at this belated date by the other side of the aisle. We came through at that time with a list of upwards of nine pertinent questions, questions such as, the SEC states that it monitored Bear Stearns' capital and liquidity positions on a regular basis and that levels of both capital and liquidity appeared adequate right up into the week of March 11, but given the subsequent rapid deterioration in Bear Stearns' financial condition, does the SEC have the capacity and authority it needs to assess these risks? Secondly, why wasn't the loan made in a traditional manner? If, as stated in President Geithner's testimony to the Senate Banking Committee that the Federal Reserve did not have the authority to acquire interest, what authority does it have now?

These were the questions that we were posing that should have been answered several months ago. We extended the opportunity to the other side at that time to join with us in this letter to make this investigation. Oddly enough, at that time no one on the other side of the aisle found a need to do so.

Also what is odd with regard to the investigation in this matter, the committee of jurisdiction looking into what the Federal Reserve did would be the Financial Services Committee. Once again, our side of the aisle suggested to the chairman that we should be delving into the issues that the other side is raising tonight, belatedly. We extended the opportunity to send a letter to Chairman FRANK, with signatures of most Members on our side of the aisle to the chairman, saying should we not be looking at these issues, these nine issues that I just referenced before to the Federal Reserve and also Paulson? Should we not be looking into this in Financial Services? Two months ago no one from the other side of the aisle saw it as pertinent. Tonight, as we go into it here and from the rhetoric that comes to the floor, they all say that they are interested in examining what the Federal Reserve is doing.

That's why I say I come to the floor optimistic and a little bit happy because now I believe that when I leave the podium tonight, I can go to the other side of the aisle and I will be more than happy to do two things: To make an addendum to our questions to Secretary Paulson and the Federal Reserve and to make an addendum to Chairman FRANK to say that in both cases we should be investigating it and that we would ask that Chairman FRANK schedule hearings forthwith, immediately, so that we can go into the matters that you are raising and that I have raised as well to see what authority the Federal Reserve has to conduct these activities.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Chairman, I would like to yield to the gentlewoman from Cleveland, Ohio (Mrs. JONES) 1½ minutes and remind her that it was 2 years ago when I was in her city that she asked me to come to a town hall meeting where this issue was being discussed at that time and most of us really didn't understand the depth of it.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Chairman WATERS, I want to salute you and the work you've done in the housing area in Financial Services. Everybody knows that the Housing Subcommittee under your leadership has focused on issues important to everyday people, and I want to thank you for that leadership.

And, Madam Chairman, you know what is the most amazing thing when I sit on the floor of this House? All the superfluous stuff that is discussed when a piece of legislation that's sorely needed by the people of America comes to the floor.

Now it was a Republican administration for the past 8 years that has oversight on oil. If they wanted to do something about it, they could have done it by now. Why are they bringing it up on the housing legislation? Let's talk about oversight of all those billions of dollars that got lost in that truck in Iraq. This Republican administration.

But before I get lost, let me come to why I'm standing here. I stand here to

support the legislation because the city of Cleveland is in desperate straits around this particular problem: Housing and foreclosures. I am so pleased that I have been able to add an amendment that would simplify the Federal historic rehabilitation tax credit in the process of this so that we can use some of this historic housing to be able to make some changes in the lives of the people.

It's just an amazing thing. I know the people of America are out there listening, and they're looking at who is it that is stepping up for them when they're in trouble? Who is it that understands that they need to pay their homeowner costs, their costs for their housing? And who is it to say, no, we're going to wait to try to figure out something else, add a new law. Come on now.

Vote for this legislation.

Mrs. CAPITO. Madam Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT) 1 additional minute.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Madam Chairman, actually at this time I'd just like to put into the RECORD the letter that was signed by Members from our side of the aisle to Chairman FRANK back on April 7, which would have been a month ago now, requesting an expedited hearing with regard to the Financial Services situation with regard to the Federal Reserve and the Financial Services hearing. Also, I will put in the RECORD a letter dated April 16 to Secretary Paulson from the Department of Treasury and Chairman Bernanke of the Federal Reserve as well, itemizing the nine particular questions with regard to their authority and activity; and also the letter in response dated April 14 from Chairman BARNEY FRANK with regard to not setting forth a date for any hearing going forward.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, April 7, 2008.

Hon. BARNEY FRANK,
Chairman, Committee on Financial Services, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN FRANK: We are writing to respectfully request you hold a hearing of the full Financial Services Committee regarding the recent collapse of the investment bank Bear Stearns and the subsequent actions taken by the Federal Reserve to facilitate Bear Stearns' sale to J.P. Morgan Chase. These steps have had an immediate impact on the financial markets and are also expected to have a long-term effect on our financial regulatory structure.

For the first time since the Great Depression, the Fed voted to open its discount window to primary dealers. While this authority has been available to the Fed since 1932, the decision to use it at this time has raised questions about whether and when the Fed should intervene to help a particular industry or firm in the name of market stability.

With the Fed approving the financing arrangements of the sale of Bear Stearns to J.P. Morgan Chase as well as guaranteeing $29 billion in securities currently held by Bear Stearns, the Fed has possibly exposed the American taxpayers to unknown amounts of financial loss and established a precedent that could lead to future instances of companies in similar financial trouble expecting the same assistance.

These extraordinary actions have raised a number of complex and multifaceted questions. As members of the committee of jurisdiction over our nation's financial markets and the regulatory bodies that oversee them, we feel it is imperative to have a full and public vetting of this unique situation. Therefore, we strongly urge you to convene a hearing on this subject of the Financial Services Committee on the soonest possible date.

Thank you for your consideration of this request.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, DC, April 16, 2008.

Hon. HENRY M. PAULSON,
Secretary, Department of the Treasury, Washington, DC.

Hon. BEN S. BERNANKE,
Chairman, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, Washington DC.

DEAR SECRETARY PAULSON AND CHAIRMAN BERNANKE: We are writing regarding the recent collapse of Bear Stearns and the subsequent actions taken by the Federal Reserve to facilitate Bear Stearns' sale to J.P. Morgan Chase. These steps have had an immediate impact on our nation's financial markets and have the potential to drastically alter the future regulatory structure of our entire financial system.

For the first time since the Great Depression, the Federal Reserve voted to open the discount window to primary dealers. While it has been suggested that this authority has been available to the Federal Reserve since 1932, the decision to use it at this time has raised questions about whether and when the Federal Reserve should intervene to help a particular industry or firm in the name of market stability.

With the Federal Reserve approving the financing arrangements of the sale of Bear Stearns to J.P. Morgan Chase, as well as guaranteeing $29 billion in securities currently held by Bear Stearns, the Federal Reserve has possibly exposed the American taxpayers to a tremendous amount of financial loss. We have concerns that this will establish a precedent that could lead to future instances of companies in similar financial trouble expecting the same government intervention.

We know the long-term health of our economy is of the utmost importance to you both. However, these extraordinary actions have raised a number of complex questions. Below, we have included a list of some of the specific questions that we believe highlight areas of significant importance.

QUESTIONS

1. In testimony before the Senate Banking Committee on April 3, 2008, it was indicated that the assets the Federal Reserve will accept as collateral for the $29 billion loan are highly-rated, that J.P. Morgan Chase will keep the riskiest and most complex Bear Stearns assets, and that the Federal Reserve set parameters for the quality of assets that it would or would not accept. What was the minimum threshold for asset quality?

2. The Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) states that it monitored Bear Stearns' capital and liquidity positions on a regular basis, and that levels of both capital and liquidity appeared adequate going into the week of March 11–17. Given the subsequent rapid deterioration in Bear Stearns' financial condition, does the SEC have the capability and/or authority it needs to assess risk in systemically-important broker/dealers, especially at the holding company level?

3. Now that primary dealers are granted the privilege of borrowing directly from the Federal Reserve (through the Primary Dealer Credit Facility), should they be subject to the same oversight that commercial banks must undergo to be eligible to borrow at the discount window? What are the possible negative implications of such regulations?

4. Bear Stearns has been described by some as ''too interconnected to fail,'' as opposed to ''too big to fail.'' How can regulators identify which firms are too interconnected to fail? Also, some administration participants have justified federal involvement with this transaction by suggesting that one interconnected company could unilaterally bring down our country's entire financial markets system. How would that be possible in this instance?

5. Why wasn't the ''loan'' made as a traditional discount window loan to J.P. Morgan Chase? If, as stated in President Geithner's testimony to the Senate Banking Committee, the Federal Reserve did not have the authority to acquire an equity interest in J.P. Morgan, Chase or Bear Stearns, what authority allows it to create and finance an LLC to purchase assets?

6. If the $29 billion is not to be made available to J.P. Morgan Chase until the merger with Bear Stearns is completed, why is the loan necessary at all? Why is J.P. Morgan Chase unwilling to hold assets that have been priced at current market value and are highly rated?

7. In 1991, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation Improvement Act (FDICIA, P.L. 102–242, 105 Stat. 2236) set a limit on the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation's (FDIC) ability to borrow from Treasury at $30 billion. The statute establishes certain standards, including rate of interest standards but leaves other terms to the Secretary of the Treasury and the FDIC. At the pertinent part it reads:

The Corporation is authorized to borrow from the Treasury, and the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to loan to the Corporation on such terms as may be fixed by the Corporation and the Secretary, such funds as in the judgment of the Board of Directors of the Corporation are from time to time required for insurance purposes, not exceeding in the aggregate $30,000,000,000 outstanding at anyone time, subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury. . . . Any such loan shall be used by the Corporation solely in carrying out its functions with respect to such insurance. . . . (12 U.S.C. §1824)

Did this $30 billion limit have any role in the Bear Stearns negotiations? How did that figure emerge?

8. A separate provision of the FDIC Act added by FDICIA requires the FDIC to resolve failed institutions on the basis of least cost to the insurance fund but permits the suspension of that requirement when following the least cost standard ''would have serious adverse effects on economic conditions or financial stability . . . and . . . any action or assistance [beyond what would be the least cost resolution] would avoid or mitigate such adverse effects.'' [12 U.S.C. §1823(c)(4)(G)(i).] This authority may not be invoked, however, without consultation with the President and the written recommendations from the FDIC and the Federal Reserve Board.

Was the President consulted? Were there any written findings by the Federal Reserve or the Department of the Treasury or any documents projecting the potential adverse effects without the intervention and the mitigation that would be effectuated by the intervention?

9. Is there any known information regarding any potential conflicts of interest of any of the parties involved in this transaction?

We appreciate your service to the country and look forward to working with you closely on these issues as we move forward. Thank you for attention to these concerns.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, April 14, 2008.

Hon. SCOTT GARRETT,
Congressman, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. GARRETT: I received the letter signed by you and sixteen of your Republican colleagues on the Financial Services Committee expressing your concern that the recent actions by the top financial appointees of the Bush administration in the matter of Bear Stearns have ''possibly exposed the American taxpayers to unknown amounts of financial loss and established a precedent that could lead to future instances of companies in similar financial trouble expecting the same assistance.'' It does occur to me as I read your letter that I have somewhat more confidence in the judgment exercised by Secretary of the Treasury Paulson and his aides and Federal Reserve Chairman Bernanke and other officials of the Federal Reserve System than you appear to have, but that is no reason for us not to give this the fullest possible airing. So I do agree that we should be thoroughly examining this matter.

Where we may disagree is the context in which this happens. That is, I agree with you that we should have a ''full and public vetting of this'' matter, but I do not think it is necessary that we have the hearing ''on the soonest possible date.'' I say this for two reasons.

First, the Committee, as you know, is now engaged in serious consideration of the appropriate response to the foreclosure crisis that now confronts us. I realize that there are some who believe that we should take no action at all, but I think the recent movement by the Bush administration to expand the reach of the FHA, even though I do not agree with it in all respects—is recognition of the need for some action. I therefore believe that it is important that the Committee continue its efforts on dealing with the current crisis, in cooperation with our Senate colleagues who as you know in a bipartisan way have also moved forward on legislation, although I do not agree myself with all aspects of it. My intention is to ask that the Committee continue to focus on this for the next several weeks.

Secondly, I do believe it is important for the Committee to begin an investigation, including hearings, into the Bear Stearns issue, but not in isolation. It is important that we look at what happened with regard to Bear Stearns, not primarily as a matter of hindsight because in fact we cannot undo what was done, but rather from the standpoint of anticipating what the public response should be in similar matters going forward. This includes of course discussing whether or not these specific actions taken in the Bear Stearns case were the best ones from the public standpoint, but also beginning the very important issue of what we might do in Congress to make it less likely that situation of this sort will recur. You correctly note in your letter that what the Bush Administration did in this case did establish ''a precedent that could lead to future instances of companies . . . expecting the same assistance.'' I think it is important that we therefore empower some federal entities to take actions that may make this less likely, and would also allow them to accompany any such intervention if it should later be decided to be necessary with appropriate remedial matters.

In summary, I agree that the Committee should be looking into this, not from the standpoint of rebuking Chairman Bernanke or Secretary Paulson, but rather as part of a serious consideration of the causes of the current crisis and more importantly, what we can do to make a recurrence of the events that led up to the Bear Stearns response much less likely in the future.

At this time I again will extend a hand, and I will yield to the other side to identify which Members from the other side of the aisle will be willing to sign onto the letter to Chairman FRANK or to Chairman Bernanke, if there is anyone from the other side who is willing to sign onto the letters. If not, I will be waiting and I will be glad to do an addendum.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. CAPITO. Madam Chairman, could I inquire of how much time we have remaining.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from West Virginia controls 3½ minutes. The gentlewoman from California controls 4 minutes.

Mrs. CAPITO. Madam Chairman, I am ready to close. I have no additional speakers as well.

I think we have heard a stark difference in opinion on this bill. I would like to make a distinction, as we have heard the discussion going back and forth, and I think the good-natured way that the debate has gone forward but also the intent of this bill is unquestionably a good intent.

But I would like to clarify to those who are listening that this bill is separate and apart from that person who can't sleep at night, that family who stays up at night trying to figure out how to meet the high cost of gas, how to meet the higher cost of food, and how to make their mortgage payment. We've been working with FHA to get people to refinance and to redo their loans so they can stay in their house, and I don't want there to be confusion concerning this bill and the next bill that we are going to be considering shortly after this.

This bill, separate and apart, is not going to help that family who can't figure out in the middle of the night how they are going to stay in their home, how they are going to pay their mortgage. These properties that we're also discussing are already foreclosed-upon properties. They're owned by investors, speculators, and financial institutions. And that's our objection. I don't believe we are in a position, and I don't think any of the speakers on our side believe we're in a position for a costly bailout for the lenders, servicers, and real estate speculators who have made risky bets on the housing market and who are now going to off-load their properties into a government program. I think that penalizes every single taxpayer, and it really penalizes that person at night who can't figure out how they're going to get up and pay their mortgage the next day, and that's the person we desperately need and we want to help and it's proper that we should help.

So I believe that H.R. 5818 is overly broad. It's a new government program that is going to end up creating a moral hazard, and it's going to end up benefiting not individuals, not people who are having trouble making their mortgage payments, not people who find themselves upside down in their house. It's going to end up benefiting, at the cost of the taxpayers, and I repeat again, lenders, servicers, and real estate speculators.

And with that, I urge a ''no'' vote on H.R. 5818.

Madam Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Chairman and Members, I would like to thank all of the Members who have come to the floor today in support of this legislation because they understand the devastation to neighborhoods all over this country.

I have listened very carefully to the arguments from the opposite side of the aisle, and none of them rise to the merit of being able to oppose this bill because they're substantive arguments.

First of all, I have heard Members on the opposite side of the aisle talk about taxes. They have talked about gasoline. They have talked about everything except what we are here to talk about: the fact that there has been a subprime meltdown in this country and many neighborhoods are devastated. We have homes that are being stripped of the copper. We have homes that have been boarded up with vandals inside those homes, oftentimes living inside those homes, with the weeds growing up in many of these properties, and the value of the homes in the neighborhood where people are attempting to maintain their homes is going down every day.

We had one Member on the opposite side of the aisle talk about how flush these cities are with money. Evidently, he has not looked at what is going on in the cities and States. Many of them are in deficit situations. They're in deficit situations because we're in this recession, this nonperforming economy under the leadership of the President of the United States where the price of food has risen, gasoline prices are up, and the subprime mess is fueling the problems of our economy. And with all of this that has taken place under this President and this administration, you would think that the Members on the opposite side of the aisle would want to come to the aid of their constituents.

We have talked about the $30 billion bailout under the Fed Chairman that was appointed by this President. And I am sure, since we did not get a call in the middle of the night to even discuss with us that the bailout was going to take place, I'm sure that the Fed Chairman called the President that appointed him. And I would give anything—I would place money on the line—to tell you that the President approved of that bailout. And so why not bail out the people who deserve to be helped? People, many of them who got into loans that were lured into these loans, lured into these mortgages by unscrupulous real estate brokers who

told them to just sign on the dotted line, by unscrupulous folks representing some of the financial institutions who said get into this ARM and when it resets, I will be there to help you refinance it, and, of course, they're not there. These people, many of them have lost these homes through no fault of their own.

But the neighborhoods are being devastated. We have information here that tells us how much crime will be fostered on the neighborhoods. As a matter of fact, what we have learned is that when there is one foreclosure, it leads to not only vandalism that affects the entire neighborhood, but it also increases the crime. This has all been documented.

I would think that the representatives who have been sent here by the people who have voted for them would want to be able to go home and say to their constituents, I understand what's going on in the neighborhoods; to say to their mayors and to say to their Governors and to say to their county commissioners, ''We are here to help.'' Yes, we are spending a lot of money on other things. As a matter of fact, many of the Members on the opposite side of the aisle, in a matter of hours, are going to vote for over $107 billion in supplemental funding to continue the war in Iraq.

□ 2100

Many of these Members have voted to give tax increases to the richest 1 percent in America. The least they could do is vote for the citizens and for their cities.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the bill shall be considered as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule and shall be considered read.

The text of the committee amendment is as follows:

H.R. 5818

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE AND TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''Neighborhood Stabilization Act of 2008''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title and table of contents.
Sec. 2. Congressional purposes.
Sec. 3. Loans and grants to States.
Sec. 4. Qualified plans.
Sec. 5. Allocation of amounts.
Sec. 6. Loans.
Sec. 7. Grants.
Sec. 8. Eligible housing stimulus activities.
Sec. 9. Shared appreciation agreement.
Sec. 10. Spending requirements.
Sec. 11. Servicer contact.
Sec. 12. Accountability.
Sec. 13. Definitions.
Sec. 14. Funding.
Sec. 15. Regulations and implementation.

SEC. 2. CONGRESSIONAL PURPOSES.

The purposes of this Act are—

(1) to establish a loan and grant program administered by the Department of Housing and Urban Development to help States, metropolitan cities, and urban counties purchase and rehabilitate owner-vacated, foreclosed homes with the goal of stabilizing and occupying them as soon as possible, either through resale or rental to qualified families;

(2) to distribute these loans and grants to areas with the highest levels of foreclosure and delinquent subprime mortgages;

(3) to provide incentives for States, metropolitan cities, and urban counties to use the funds to stabilize as many properties as possible; and

(4) to provide housing for low- and moderate-income families, especially those that have lost homes to foreclosure.

SEC. 3. LOANS AND GRANTS TO STATES.

The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall, subject to the availability of amounts under section 14, make grants under section 5(a) to qualified States and make loans under section 6 in accordance with the approved plans of qualified States, for use to carry out eligible housing stimulus activities under section 8.

SEC. 4. QUALIFIED PLANS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may make a grant under this Act only to a State, and may allocate a loan authority amount under this Act only for a State, that has submitted to the Secretary a plan that meets the requirements under this section and has been approved under this section. A State shall reallocate amounts under subsection (f) or (g) of section 5 only to a qualified metropolitan city or qualified urban county, respectively, that has submitted to the Secretary a plan that meets the requirements under this section and has been approved under this section.

(b) CONTENTS.—A plan under this section for an allocation recipient shall—

(1) designate a housing finance agency of the allocation recipient, or other agency, department, or entity of the allocation recipient, or any other designee, as the allocation recipient administrator to act on behalf of the allocation recipient for purposes of this Act;

(2) describe the housing stimulus activities under section 8 to be carried out with assistance under this Act for the allocation recipient by the entity identified pursuant to paragraph (1) of this subsection;

(3) prioritize the allocation of funds to low- and moderate-income neighborhoods with high concentrations of foreclosures and describe how such activities will help restore or improve the viability of such neighborhoods by providing for purchase or occupancy of qualified foreclosed properties as soon as practicable and in a manner that will facilitate repayment of the loans provided under this Act for carrying out such activities;

(4) set forth the procedures that the allocation recipient will use to allocate grant and loan amounts and monitor for compliance with the requirements of section 8;

(5) provide that grant and loan amounts provided under this Act for the allocation recipient will be used only for eligible housing stimulus activities under section 8 that are eligible under such section for assistance with grant or loan amounts, as applicable;

(6) contain such assurances as the Secretary shall require that the housing stimulus activities to be carried out with assistance under this Act shall not result in a significant net loss in rental housing in an area in which such activities are undertaken;

(7) give priority emphasis and consideration to metropolitan areas, metropolitan cities, urban areas, rural areas, low- and moderate-income areas, census tracts and other areas having the greatest need, including those—

(A) with the greatest percentage of home foreclosures;

(B) with the highest percentage of homes financed by subprime mortgage loans over 90 days delinquent; or

(C) identified by the State, qualified metropolitan city, or unit of general local government as likely to face a significant rise in the rate of home foreclosures.

(8) provide preference for activities that serve the lowest income families, who otherwise meet the income requirements under section 8, for the longest period and homeowners, who otherwise meet such income requirements, whose mortgages have been foreclosed;

(9) provide preference for use of grant and loan amounts in connection with acquisition of qualified foreclosed properties that are acquired no earlier than 60 days after the owner of the property described in section 13(7)(B) acquired such ownership;

(10) describe any other preferences the allocation recipient may establish, such as housing for first responders, for veterans, for nurses serving underserved areas or homeless persons, or for homeless persons in accordance with the 10-year plan of the State to end homelessness, or providing housing for public school teachers or workforce who are employed by the city or locality in which the housing is located;

(11) provide for obligation and outlay of grant amounts, and for loan commitments and disbursement, in accordance with the requirements under section 10; and

(12) in the case of any grant or loan amounts that will be invested with the possibility of a return on investment, provide for use of any return on such investment only for one or more eligible housing stimulus activities under section 8.

(c) SUBMISSION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall provide for allocation recipients to submit plans under this section to the Secretary and shall establish requirements for the contents and form of such plans. Except in the case of plan resubmitted pursuant to subsection (d)(3), the Secretary may not accept or consider a plan unless the plan is submitted to the Secretary before the expiration of the 30-day period beginning upon the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) PUBLIC APPROVAL.—An allocation recipient may not submit a plan to the Secretary unless the plan is approved by the chief executive officer of the allocation recipient after a public hearing on the plan held pursuant to reasonable public notice.

(d) REVIEW AND APPROVAL.—

(1) TIMING.—The Secretary shall review, and approve or disapprove, each plan submitted or resubmitted pursuant to paragraph (3) in compliance with the requirements established under this section before the expiration of the 30-day period beginning upon the submission of the plan. If the Secretary does not approve or disapprove a plan that is submitted or resubmitted in accordance with the requirements under this section before the expiration of such 30-day period and notify the allocation recipient of such approval or disapproval, the plan shall be considered approved for purposes of this section.

(2) STANDARD FOR DISAPPROVAL.—The Secretary may disapprove a plan only if the plan fails to comply with the requirements of this Act.

(3) RESUBMISSION.—If the Secretary disapproves the plan of an allocation recipient, the Secretary shall submit to the allocation recipient the reasons for the disapproval, and the allocation recipient may, during the 15-day period that begins upon notification of such disapproval and the reasons for such disapproval, submit to the Secretary a revised plan for review and approval in accordance with this subsection.

SEC. 5. ALLOCATION OF AMOUNTS.

(a) GRANTS.—From the total amount made available under section 14(a) for grants under this Act, the Secretary shall make a grant to each qualified State in the grant amount determined under subsection (c) of this section for the qualified State.

(b) LOANS.—From the aggregate amount of authority for the outstanding principal balance of loans made under this Act pursuant to section 14(b)(1), the Secretary shall allocate such authority for loans under this Act for each qualified State in the loan authority amount determined under subsection (c) of this section for the qualified State.

(c) GRANT AMOUNTS AND LOAN AUTHORITY AMOUNTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The grant amount or loan authority amount for a qualified State shall be the foreclosure grant share or foreclosure loan share, respectively, for the State determined under subsection (d), as such share is adjusted in accordance with an index established or selected by the Secretary to account for differences between qualified States in the median price of single family housing in such States.

(2) LIMITATION ON ADJUSTMENT.—If such adjustment would result in a grant amount or loan authority amount for any State that exceeds 125 percent of the foreclosure grant share or foreclosure loan share, respectively, for the State, the grant amount or loan authority amount for the State shall be 125 percent of foreclosure grant share or foreclosure loan share, respectively, for the State and the Secretary shall increase the grant amounts or loan authority amounts for all other States on a pro rata basis, except as provided in paragraph (3), by the amount necessary to account for the aggregate of any such decreases in grant amounts or loan authority amounts for States to comply with the 125 percent limitation.

(3) LIMITATION ON REALLOCATION.—No increase in the grant amount or loan authority amount for any State from amounts reallocated pursuant to paragraph (2) shall result in the grant amount or loan authority amount for any State exceeding 125 percent of the foreclosure grant share or foreclosure loan share for the State, respectively.

(4) PRIORITY PREFERENCE FOR UNUSED AMOUNTS.—States which have their grant or loan amounts reduced under paragraph (2) shall be granted a priority preference for any loans or grants which may be reallocated under subsection (i) (relating to reallocation of funds).

(d) FORECLOSURE SHARES.—For purposes of this section:

(1) GRANT SHARE.—The foreclosure grant share for a qualified State shall be the amount that bears the same ratio to the total amount made available under section 14(a) as the number of foreclosures on mortgages for single family housing and subprime mortgage loans for single family housing that are over 90 days delinquent, occurring in such State during the most recently completed four calendar quarters for which such information is available, as determined by the Secretary, bears to the aggregate number of such foreclosures and such delinquent subprime mortgage loans occurring in all qualified States during such calendar quarters.

(2) LOAN SHARE.—The foreclosure loan share for a qualified State shall be the amount that bears the same ratio to the aggregate amount of the principal balance of loans that may be outstanding at any time under this Act pursuant to section 14(b)(1) as the number of foreclosures on mortgages for single family housing and subprime mortgage loans for single family housing that are over 90 days delinquent, occurring in such State during the most recently completed four calendar quarters for which such information is available, as determined by the Secretary, bears to the aggregate number of such foreclosures and such delinquent subprime mortgage loans occurring in all qualified States during such calendar quarters.

(e) DISTRIBUTION OF FULL AMOUNT.—The Secretary shall establish the index referred to in subsection (c) and the grant and loan authority amounts for the qualified States in a manner that provides that—

(1) the aggregate of the grant amounts for all qualified States is equal to the total amount made available under section 14(a); and

(2) the aggregate of the loan authority amounts for all qualified States is equal to the aggregate amount of authority for the outstanding principal balance of all loans made under this Act pursuant to section 14(b)(1).

(f) REQUIREMENT TO ALLOCATE TO QUALIFIED METROPOLITAN CITIES.—Of any grant amounts and loan authority amounts allocated pursuant to this section for a State, such State shall allocate for each qualified metropolitan city located in such State a portion of such grant amounts and such loan authority amounts that bears the same ratio to such grant amounts and loan authority amounts, respectively, allocated for the State as the number of foreclosures on mortgages for single family housing and subprime mortgage loans for single family housing that are over 90 days delinquent, occurring in such qualified metropolitan city during the most recently completed four calendar quarters for which such information is available, as determined by the Secretary, bears to the aggregate number of such foreclosures and such delinquent subprime mortgage loans occurring in the State during such calendar quarters. A State may adjust such allocation to account for differences between median single family housing prices in the State and in qualified metropolitan cities in the State.

(g) REQUIREMENT TO ALLOCATE TO QUALIFIED URBAN COUNTIES.—Of any grant amounts and loan authority amounts allocated pursuant to this section for a State, such State shall allocate for each qualified urban county located in such State a portion of such grant amounts and such loan authority amounts that bears the same ratio to such grant amounts and loan authority amounts, respectively, allocated for the State as the number of foreclosures on mortgages for single family housing and subprime mortgage loans for single family housing that are over 90 days delinquent, occurring in such qualified urban county during the most recently completed four calendar quarters for which such information is available, as determined by the Secretary, bears to the aggregate number of such foreclosures and such delinquent subprime mortgage loans occurring in the State during such calendar quarters. A State may adjust such allocation to account for differences between median single family housing prices in the State and in qualified urban counties in the State.

(h) ALLOCATION EXCEPTION.—If the aggregate grant and loan authority amount to be allocated pursuant to subsection (f) or (g) to a qualified metropolitan city or qualified urban county is less than $10,000,000, a State may, but is not required to, allocate such grant and loan authority amount to such qualified metropolitan city or qualified urban county, and the allocation for such State shall be increased by the grant and loan authority amount not allocated to such qualified metropolitan city or qualified urban county.

(i) REALLOCATION OF UNUSED AMOUNTS.—The Secretary shall recapture any grant amounts and loan authority amounts allocated to a State that are not used in a timely fashion in accordance with section 10, as the Secretary shall prescribe, and shall reallocate such amounts among all other qualified States in accordance with the provisions of this Act for allocation of grant amounts and loan authority amounts.

SEC. 6. LOANS.

(a) REQUIREMENT OF LOAN AUTHORITY AMOUNT.—The Secretary may make a loan under this Act for use in the area of an allocation recipient only to the extent and in such amounts that loan authority amounts for such allocation recipient are available.

(b) REVOLVING AVAILABILITY OF LOAN AUTHORITY AMOUNT.—The loan authority amount allocated for each allocation recipient shall—

(1) upon the Secretary entering into a binding commitment to make a loan under this Act for use in the area of such allocation recipient, be decreased by the amount of the principal obligation of such loan; and

(2) upon the repayment to the Secretary by any borrower of any principal amounts borrowed under a loan this Act for use in the area of such allocation recipient, be increased by the amount of principal repaid.

(c) ASSISTED ENTITIES.—The loan authority amount of an allocation recipient may be used for activities described in section 8(a) undertaken by—

(1) the allocation recipient;

(2) a unit of local government or a local governmental entity; or

(3) any other entity, as provided in the approved plan of the allocation recipient under section 4.

(d) LOAN TERMS.—Each loan provided under this Act from the loan authority amount of an allocation recipient shall—

(1) bear no interest;

(2) have a term to maturity of—

(A) 3 years, in the case of any loan made to purchase or finance the purchase of qualified foreclosed housing for use under section 8(a)(1) for homeownership; and

(B) 5 years, in the case of any loan made to purchase or finance the purchase of qualified foreclosed housing for use under section 8(a)(2) for rental;

(3) not provide for amortization of the principal obligation of the loan during such term;

(4) be non-recourse;

(5) require payment of the original principal obligation under the loan only upon the expiration of the term of the loan; and

(6) have such other terms and conditions as the Secretary may provide.

(e) PROCEDURE.—A qualified State or, upon its election, a qualified metropolitan city or qualified urban county shall—

(1) enter into a loan agreement on behalf of the Secretary on terms established under this Act and any other terms such State, qualified metropolitan city, or qualified urban county determines appropriate;

(2) disburse the loan amount in accordance with such terms, subject only to the absence of sufficient loan authority amount for such State, such qualified metropolitan city, or such qualified urban county;

(3) monitor such loans; and

(4) collect and transmit to the Secretary any loan repayments.

(f) ELIGIBILITY FOR REPEAT LENDING.—A loan under this Act may be made to an entity that has previously borrowed amounts under a loan under this Act only if such entity has repaid 90 percent or more of the amounts due under all previous such loans. The Secretary may waive such requirement upon a request by an allocation recipient if the borrower has demonstrated satisfactory progress in utilizing outstanding loans and sufficient capacity to utilize additional loan amounts effectively.

(g) SUNSET.—The Secretary may not enter into any commitment to make a loan under this Act, or make any such loan, after the expiration of the 48-month period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 7. GRANTS.

The grant amount of an allocation recipient may be used under section 8(b) by the allocation recipient, a unit of local government or a local governmental entity, or a nonprofit organization.

SEC. 8. ELIGIBLE HOUSING STIMULUS ACTIVITIES.

(a) LOAN AMOUNTS.—Amounts provided under a loan under this Act for an allocation recipient shall be used, in accordance with the approved plan of such allocation recipient, only for the following activities:

(1) HOMEOWNERSHIP HOUSING PROVISION.—To purchase or finance the purchase of qualified foreclosed housing for resale as housing for

homeownership to families having incomes that do not exceed 140 percent of the median income for the area in which the housing is located.

(2) RENTAL HOUSING PROVISION.—To purchase or finance the purchase of qualified foreclosed housing for use as rental, lease-purchase, or rent-to-own housing, subject to the following requirements:

(A) QUALIFIED TENANTS.—All dwelling units in the housing purchased or financed using any loan amounts shall be available for rental only by families whose incomes do not exceed 100 percent of the median income for the area in which the housing is located.

(B) RENTS.—Rents for each dwelling unit in the housing purchased or financed using any loan amounts shall be established at amounts that do not exceed market rents for comparable dwelling units located in the area in which the housing is located and in accordance with such requirements as the Secretary shall establish to ensure that rents are established in a fair, objective, and arms-length manner.

(3) HOUSING REHABILITATION.—To rehabilitate qualified foreclosed housing acquired with assistance provided pursuant to this subsection, to the extent necessary to comply with applicable laws, codes, and other requirements relating to housing safety, quality, and habitability, or to make improvements to the housing to increase the energy efficiency or conservation of the housing or provide a renewable energy source or sources for the housing, for the purpose of reselling the housing, to the extent possible, during the 3-month period that begins upon completion of rehabilitation and at a price that is as close as possible to the acquisition price of the housing.

(b) GRANT AMOUNTS.—Grant amounts provided under this Act to an allocation recipient shall be used, in accordance with the approved plan of such allocation recipient, only for the following activities:

(1) OPERATING AND HOLDING COSTS.—For costs of holding and operating qualified foreclosed housing acquired pursuant to subsection (a), including costs of management, taxes, handling, insurance, and other related costs.

(2) COSTS RELATING TO PROPERTY ACQUISITION.—For incidental costs involved in acquiring qualified foreclosed housing pursuant to subsection (a), including reasonable closing costs, except that grant amounts may not be used to pay any portion of the purchase price for the housing under section 13(7)(C).

(3) ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS.—For costs of the allocation recipient in administering loan authority amounts and grant amounts under this Act, except that the amount of grant amounts provided under this Act to an allocation recipient that may be used under this paragraph shall not exceed the amount equal to 8 percent of the sum of the grant amounts provided to the allocation recipient pursuant to subsection (a), (f), or (g) of section 5, as applicable, and the loan authority amount allocated to the allocation recipient pursuant to subsection (b), (f), or (g) of section 5, as applicable.

(4) PLANNING COSTS.—For planning costs of the State in connection with this Act, except that the amount of grant amounts provided under this Act to an allocation recipient that may be used under this paragraph shall not exceed the amount equal to 2 percent of the sum of the grant amounts provided to the allocation recipient pursuant to subsection (a), (f), or (g) of section 5, as applicable, and the loan authority amount allocated to the State pursuant to subsection (b), (f), or (g) of section 5, as applicable.

(5) HOUSING REHABILITATION.—For activities set forth in subsection (a)(3), except that an allocation recipient shall not use more than 20 percent of a grant amount allocation for such activities.

(6) DEMOLITION.—For costs of demolishing qualified foreclosed housing that is deteriorated or unsafe, but amounts may be used under this paragraph only if the Secretary determines that the neighborhood or other area in which the housing is located has a high incidence of vacant and abandoned housing (or other vacant and abandoned structures) and is experiencing a significant decline in population.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this subsection, grant amounts provided under this Act may not be used to provide assistance of any kind (including grants, loans, and closing cost financing) to provide amounts for downpayments for any homebuyers of single family housing.

(c) PROHIBITED USES.—The Secretary shall, by regulation, set forth prohibited uses of grant or loan amounts under this Act, which shall include use for—

(1) political activities;

(2) advocacy;

(3) lobbying, whether directly or through other parties;

(4) counseling services;

(5) travel expenses; and

(6) preparing or providing advice on tax returns.

(d) INCOME TARGETING REQUIREMENT.—

(1) VERY LOW-INCOME FAMILIES.—Not less than 50 percent of the total grant amounts an allocation recipient makes available under this Act shall be used for activities under subsection (b) in connection with providing housing for families whose incomes do not exceed 50 percent of the median income for the area in which the housing is located.

(2) EXTREMELY LOW-INCOME FAMILIES.—Not less than 50 percent of the total grant amounts an allocation recipient makes available under paragraph (1) shall be used for activities under subsection (b) in connection with providing housing for families whose incomes do not exceed 30 percent of the median income for the area in which the housing is located.

(3) WAIVER.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may establish a percentage for purposes of paragraph (2) that is less than 50 percent if an allocation recipient certifies that, in addition to any other requirements the Secretary may establish—

(i) such allocation recipient has attempted to use all other federally related resources available to it in combination with the resources available under this Act to meet the requirements of paragraph (2); and

(ii) the failure to comply with paragraph (2) will not result in an overall loss of housing affordable to families whose incomes do not exceed 30 percent of area median income in the area of such allocation recipient.

(B) CONSIDERATION OF HOUSING NEEDS.—In establishing an alternative percentage for purposes of paragraph (2) for an allocation recipient that meets the certification requirements of subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall take into consideration the housing needs in the area of such allocation recipient of families whose incomes do not exceed 30 percent of area median income.

(e) USE FOR RURAL AREAS.—An allocation recipient receiving any grant or loan amounts under this Act that includes any rural areas shall use a portion of its grant and loan authority amount for eligible activities located in rural areas that is proportionate to the identified need for such activities in such rural areas.

(f) SECURITY.—A qualified State, or at its election, a qualified metropolitan city or qualified urban county, shall record a lien in the name of the Secretary on any qualified foreclosed housing purchased or financed with a loan under this section in the amount of the principal obligation under the loan and interest due under the loan.

(g) QUALIFIED HOMEOWNERS.—This Act may not be construed to prevent the resale of qualified foreclosed housing to a prior owner or occupant of such housing who meets the income requirements of this Act.

(h) VOUCHER NONDISCRIMINATION.—

(1) PROSPECTIVE TENANTS.—A recipient of amounts from a loan or grant under this Act may not refuse to lease a dwelling unit in housing assisted with any such loan or grant amounts to a holder of a voucher or certificate of eligibility under section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f) because of the status of the prospective tenant as such a holder.

(2) CURRENT TENANTS.—In the case of any qualified foreclosed housing for which funds made available under the Act are used and in which a recipient of assistance under section 8(o) of the U.S. Housing Act of 1937 resides at the time of acquisition or financing, the owner and any successor in interest shall be subject to the lease and to the housing assistance payments contract for the occupied unit. Vacating the property prior to sale shall not constitute good cause for termination of the tenancy unless the property is unmarketable while occupied or unless the owner or subsequent purchaser desires the unit for personal or family use. This paragraph shall not preempt any State or local law that provides more protection for tenants.

(i) EFFECT OF FORECLOSURE ON PREEXISTING LEASE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In the case of any foreclosure on any dwelling or residential real property acquired with any amounts made available under this Act, any successor in interest in such property pursuant to the foreclosure shall assume such interest subject to—

(A) the provision, by the successor in interest, of a notice to vacate to any bona fide tenant at least 90 days before the effective date of the notice to vacate; and

(B) the rights of any bona fide tenant, as of the date of such notice of foreclosure—

(i) under any bona fide lease entered into before the notice of foreclosure to occupy the premises until the end of the remaining term of the lease or the end of the 6-month period beginning on the date of the notice of foreclosure, whichever occurs first, subject to the receipt by the tenant of the 90-day notice under subparagraph (A); or

(ii) without a lease or with a lease terminable at will under State law, subject to the receipt by the tenant of the 90-day notice under subparagraph (A), except that nothing under this subparagraph shall affect the requirements for termination of any federally subsidized tenancy.

(2) BONA FIDE LEASE OR TENANCY.—For purposes of this subsection, a lease or tenancy shall be considered bona fide only if—

(A) the mortgagor under the contract is not the tenant;

(B) the lease or tenancy was the result of an arms-length transaction; or

(C) the lease or tenancy requires the receipt of rent that is not substantially less than fair market rent for the property.

(j) PROHIBITION OF DEMOLITION OF PUBLIC HOUSING.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, amounts from a grant or loan under this Act may not be used to demolish any public housing (as such term is defined in section 3 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437a)).

SEC. 9. SHARED APPRECIATION AGREEMENT.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, no amounts from a loan or grant under this Act may be used under section 8 for any qualified foreclosed housing unless such binding agreements are entered into, in accordance with such requirements as the Secretary shall establish, that ensure that the Federal Government shall, upon any sale or disposition of the qualified foreclosed housing by the owner who acquires the housing pursuant to assistance under this Act, receive an amount equal to 20 percent of the difference between the net proceeds from such sale or disposition and the cost of such acquisition of the housing pursuant to assistance under this Act, after deductions for expenditures paid or incurred after the date of such acquisition that are properly chargeable to capital

account (within the meaning of section 1016 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986) with respect to such housing. In the case of a for-profit owner, this section shall be applied by substituting ''50 percent'' for ''20 percent''.

SEC. 10. SPENDING REQUIREMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Each allocation recipient that receives a grant under this Act or is allocated loan authority amounts under this Act pursuant to section 5(b) shall—

(1) commence obligation of such grant amounts and commitment of such loan authority amounts not later than the expiration of the 120-day period that begins upon approval of the approved plan of allocation recipient;

(2) obligate all such grant amounts and enter into commitments for all such loan authority amounts not later than the expiration of the 180-day period beginning upon such approval; and

(3) except as provided in subsection (b) of this section, outlay all such grant amounts and disburse all such loan authority amounts not later than the 24-month period that begins upon such approval.

This subsection shall not apply to loan authority amounts of an allocation recipient attributable, pursuant to section 6(b)(2), to repayment of principal amounts of loans under this Act.

(b) EXCEPTION TO SPENDING REQUIREMENT.—If an allocation recipient in good faith makes a request, in the plan submitted to the Secretary pursuant to section 4 or otherwise after approval of such plan, for extension of the period referred to in paragraph (1), (2), or (3) of subsection (a) of this section, the Secretary may extend the period for not more than 5 months.

SEC. 11. SERVICER CONTACT.

The servicer of a federally related mortgage loan (as such term is defined in section 3 of the Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act of 1974 (12 U.S.C. 2602)) shall notify the unit of general local government in which the property securing the mortgage is located upon becoming responsible for a qualified foreclosed property and provide such unit of general local government with the name and 24-hour contact information of a representative authorized to negotiate purchases.

SEC. 12. ACCOUNTABILITY.

(a) REPORTING.—Each allocation recipient that receives a grant or allocation of loan authority amount under this Act shall submit a report to the Secretary, not later than the expiration of the 12-month period beginning upon the approval of the qualified plan by the Secretary, regarding use of such amounts which shall contain such information, including information about the location and type of assisted properties and the income of families purchasing or renting housing assisted under this Act, as the Secretary shall require.

(b) MISUSE OF AMOUNTS.—If the Secretary determines that any amounts from a grant or loan under this Act for an allocation recipient or other recipient of grant or loans funds has been used in a manner that is in violation of this Act, any regulations issued under this Act, or any requirements or conditions under which such amounts were provided, the Secretary shall require the allocation recipient or other recipient of grant or loans funds to reimburse the Treasury of the United States in the amount of any such misused funds.

(c) HOLD HARMLESS.—Notwithstanding subsection (b), a State shall not be required to reimburse the Treasury of the United States for any misused funds such State is required to allocate to a qualified metropolitan city or qualified urban county under subsection (f) or (g) of section 5, respectively.

SEC. 13. DEFINITIONS.

For purposes of this Act, the following definitions shall apply:

(1) ALLOCATION RECIPIENT.—The term ''allocation recipient'' means—

(A) a qualified State;

(B) a qualified metropolitan city; and

(C) a qualified urban county.

(2) ALLOCATION RECIPIENT ADMINISTRATOR.—The term ''allocation recipient administrator'' means the entity that is designated, pursuant to section 4(b)(1), in the approved plan of the allocation recipient to act for the allocation recipient for purposes of this Act.

(3) APPROVED PLAN.—The term ''approved plan'' means a plan of an allocation recipient that has been approved pursuant to section 4.

(4) COVERED MULTIFAMILY HOUSING.—The term ''covered multifamily housing'' means a residential structure that consists of 64 or fewer dwelling units.

(5) LOAN AUTHORITY AMOUNT.—The term ''loan authority amount'' means, with respect to an allocation recipient, the amount of loan authority available pursuant to section 14(b)(1) that is allocated for the allocation recipient pursuant to subsection (b), (f), or (g) of section 5, as applicable, as such amount may be increased or decreased pursuant to section 6(b).

(6) NONPROFIT ORGANIZATION.—The term ''nonprofit organization'' has the meaning given such term in section 104 of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act (42 U.S.C. 12704).

(7) QUALIFIED FORECLOSED HOUSING.—The term ''qualified foreclosed housing'' means housing that—

(A)(i) is single family housing that is not occupied by an owner, pursuant to foreclosure or assignment of the mortgage on the housing or forfeiture of the housing; or

(ii) is covered multifamily housing;

(B) is owned by a lender, mortgage company, investor, financial institution, or other such entity, or any government entity, pursuant to foreclosure or assignment of the mortgage on the housing or forfeiture of the housing; and

(C) has a purchase price—

(i) in the case of single family housing, that does not exceed 110 percent of the average purchase price for single family housing in the area in which the housing is located, as determined by the Secretary.

(ii) in the case of covered multifamily housing, that does not exceed the dollar amount limitation, for housing of the applicable size located in the area in which the housing is located, on the amount of a principal obligation of a mortgage eligible for insurance under section 207 of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1713), as in effect on the date of the enactment of this Act pursuant to such section 207(c)(3)(A) and section 206A of such Act (12 U.S.C. 1712a).

(8) QUALIFIED METROPOLITAN CITY.—The term ''qualified metropolitan city'' means an incorporated place, for which there is an improved plan, that—

(A) is among the 100 most populous incorporated places in the United States, as determined according to data from the most recent decennial census that is published before the date of the enactment of this Act; or

(B)(i) has a minimum population of 50,000, as determined according to data from the most recent decennial census that is published before the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(ii) has a foreclosure rate that exceeds 125 percent of the foreclosure rate for the entire State

(9) QUALIFIED STATE.—The term ''qualified State'' means a State for which there is an approved plan.

(10) QUALIFIED URBAN COUNTY.—The term ''qualified urban county'' means an urban county (as such term is defined in section 102 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5302)), for which there is an approved plan, that is among the 50 most populous urban counties in the United States, as determined—

(A) according to data from the most recent decennial census; and

(B) excluding the population of any qualified metropolitan city within such urban county, unless such metropolitan city has agreed to have its population included with the population of the county for the purposes of this Act.

(11) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

(12) SINGLE FAMILY HOUSING.—The term ''single family housing'' means a residential structure consisting of from one to four dwelling units.

(13) STATE.—The term ''State'' means any State of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, Guam, the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, and other territory or possession of the United States.

SEC. 14. FUNDING.

(a) GRANTS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of the Treasury $7,500,000,000 for grants under this Act.

(b) DIRECT LOANS.—

(1) LOAN COMMITMENT AUTHORITY LIMITATION.—Subject only to the availability of sufficient amounts for the costs (as such term is defined in section 502 of the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990 (2 U.S.C. 661a)) of such loans and the absence of qualified requests for loans, the Secretary shall enter into commitments to make loans under this Act, and shall make such loans, in an amount such that the aggregate outstanding principal balance of such loans does not at any time exceed $7,500,000,000.

(2) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR COSTS.—There is authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for costs (as such term is defined in section 502 of the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990 (2 U.S.C. 661a)) of loans under this Act.

SEC. 15. REGULATIONS AND IMPLEMENTATION.

(a) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary shall issue any regulations necessary to carry out this Act.

(b) IMPLEMENTATION.—Pending the effectiveness of regulations issued pursuant to subsection (a), the Secretary shall take such action as may be necessary to implement this Act by notice, guidance, and interim rules.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. No amendment to the committee amendment is in order except those printed in House report 110–621. Each amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent of the amendment, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MS. WATERS

The Acting CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 110–621.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Chairwoman, I have an amendment at the desk that has been made in order under the rule.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 1 offered by Ms. WATERS:

Page 3, line 10, after ''**STATES**'' insert ''**, METROPOLITAN CITIES, AND URBAN COUNTIES**''.

Page 3, line 13, after ''States'' insert ''and under subsections (f) and (g) of section 5 to qualified metropolitan cities and qualified urban counties, respectively,''.

Page 3, line 15, after ''States'' insert '', qualified metropolitan cities, and qualified urban counties''.

Page 3, line 19, after ''State'' insert '', metropolitan city, or urban county''.

Page 3, line 20, after ''State'' insert '', metropolitan city, or urban county''.

Strike ''A State'' in line 23 on page 3 and all that follows through page 4, line 2.

Page 12, line 16, strike '', such State'' and insert ''the Secretary''.

Page 13, line 4, strike ''A State may'' and insert ''The Secretary shall''.

Page 13, line 23, strike ''A State may'' and insert ''The Secretary shall''.

Page 14, line 4, strike ''a State'' and insert ''the Secretary''.

Page 16, lines 18 and 19, strike ''or, upon its election''.

Page 16, line 19, strike ''or'' and insert '', and a''.

Page 19, line 24, strike ''costs of'' and insert ''expenses incurred operating housing assisted under this Act with respect to the administration, maintenance, repair, security, utilities, fuel, furnishings, equipment,''.

Strike line 23 on page 32 and all that follows through page 33, line 2, and insert the following:

(i) in the case of single family housing, that does not exceed the lesser of—

(I) 110 percent of the average purchase price for single family housing in the area in which the housing is located, as determined by the Secretary; or

(II) the current appraised value of the property;

except that in the case of any such housing that has an appraised value that is less than 110 percent of the average purchase price for single family housing in the area in which the housing is located, an allocation recipient may appeal such appraisal to the Secretary and the Secretary may determine that the average purchase price shall operate as the cap on the purchase price; and

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 1174, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Chairman, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

This manager's amendment is in the nature of a perfecting amendment that makes a few changes to the bill that I hope will be relatively uncontroversial.

First, as this bill has moved through the process, we have moved from a program that allocated all of the funds to States to administer to one that, as I described in my opening statement, distributes funds to States, certain metropolitan cities and large urban counties.

This amendment simply removes the State as the middle person in allocations to qualifying cities and counties which would instead receive direct allocations from HUD. This will expedite the distribution of funds which is critical in the context of economic stimulus.

Second, the amendment brings a definition of operating costs of housing purchased under the program, which is an eligible use under the grant component in line with similar uses in other HUD programs such as the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act. This just clarifies what is and is not an eligible expense when an entity is operating a purchase property as rental property or preparing it for resale.

Finally, to further address the concerns that this bill somehow provides a bailout to lenders, the amendment caps the purchase price of foreclosed properties at the appraised price or 110 percent of the average local single family home price, whichever is less. This guards against property owners gaming the system to obtain inflated prices under the program.

I urge my colleagues to vote for this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. CAPITO. Madam Chairman, I would like to claim time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from West Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CAPITO. Thank you.

While I appreciate the chairwoman's amendment, and I do believe that it does go in a direction that is much better for the bill, I still have, as I have voiced in the earlier debate, serious concerns about the bill in terms of the cost and in terms of taxpayers' dollars bailing out investors and lenders. This does not go to individual homeowners. It does not help somebody in foreclosure, an individual family in foreclosure.

And so with that, I would urge a ''no'' vote on the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Chairwoman, I was hopeful that the ranking member of the subcommittee would offer support for this amendment. I know that there are some differences that she has and others have on this bill.

However, the attempts that we have made to make sure that it is a bill that can operate efficiently, such as identifying those 100 cities, those 100 counties and those 50 cities of a certain size would be the kind of amendment that the ranking member and others would understand makes this a better bill and would formulate ways by which it could efficiently and effectively get that money into the communities that are needed.

Madam Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mrs. CAPITO. Madam Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MRS. CAPITO

The Acting CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 110–621.

Mrs. CAPITO. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 2 offered by Mrs. CAPITO:

Page 3, line 16, after the period insert the following: ''The program under this Act shall be administered through the Office of Community Planning and Development of the Department of Housing and Urban Development or any successor office responsible for administering the community development block grant program under title I of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5301 et seq.).''.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 1174, the gentlewoman from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from West Virginia.

Mrs. CAPITO. Madam Chairman, my amendment is really quite simple. As we have heard myself talking and Members on my side of the aisle talking about the difficulties that we have with the bill, I realize that the odds are with it that it may pass out of this House. With that in mind, I would like to offer this amendment to what I think makes the bill better.

My amendment would very simply direct the funds to be administered through the Office of Community Planning and Development of the Department of Housing and Urban Development. This office already oversees the HOME and CDBG programs which we are very familiar with.

One of the concerns that we had with the bill was creating a whole new bureaucracy within HUD to administer this program if it were to go forward. And that is problematic any time you are creating a new bureaucracy, particularly when you are replicating some of the delivery systems that already exist within HUD. Those delivery systems exist in the Office of Community Planning and Development.

So with that, I would like to say that rather than the current language which just merely directs the Secretary to implement the program, I would prefer, and my amendment offers to direct those funds to be administered by the existing Office of Community Planning and Development within HUD which deals, as I said, with the CDBG program which we are all very familiar with working in a lot of our communities.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Chairman, I rise to claim time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WATERS. Although I rise to claim time in opposition, I am not opposed to the amendment.

I think the ranking member of the Housing and Community Opportunity Subcommittee has made a sound addition to the bill here. While, as I mentioned in my opening statement, we did not want HUD to get bogged down in processing 1,200 different plans from all the entitlement jurisdictions in the

HOME and CDBG programs, there is no question that the expertise at HUD to administer this bill's loan and rent program lies in the Community Planning and Development division of the agency. So I urge my colleagues to support Mrs. CAPITO's amendment to ensure that we don't create an unnecessary new bureaucracy if H.R. 5818 is passed into law.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mrs. CAPITO. Madam Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from West Virginia will be postponed.

MOTION TO RISE OFFERED BY MR. SIMPSON

Mr. SIMPSON. Madam Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion to rise.

The question was taken; and the Acting Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. SIMPSON. Madam Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, this 15-minute vote will be followed by 5-minute votes on amendment No. 1 by Ms. WATERS and amendment No. 2 by Mrs. CAPITO.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 184, noes 231, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 292]

AYES—184

Akin
Alexander
Bachmann
Bachus
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Emerson
English (PA)
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Forbes
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gilchrest
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Hall (TX)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Murphy, Tim
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Roskam
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Scalise
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shays
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Taylor
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Upton
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield (KY)
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman (VA)
Wolf
Young (FL)

NOES—231

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bordallo
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Castor
Cazayoux
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Cooper
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Lincoln
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doyle
Edwards
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Faleomavaega
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Foster
Frank (MA)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gillibrand
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Klein (FL)
Kucinich
Lampson
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Norton
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Ramstad
Reyes
Rodriguez
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—23

Aderholt
Bean
Berry
Campbell (CA)
Christensen
Conyers
Costa
DeFazio
Dicks
Fortenberry
Fortuño
Marshall
Paul
Rangel
Reynolds
Richardson
Royce
Rush
Saxton
Speier
Tancredo
Wexler
Young (AK)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members have 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 2132

Messrs. EDWARDS, SERRANO, MCNERNEY, WAXMAN, Ms. WATSON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Mr. SKELTON changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. PORTER, KIRK, WALBERG, and WELLER of Illinois changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the motion to rise was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. ROYCE. Madam Chairman, on rollcall No. 292, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MS. WATERS

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment printed in House Report 110–621 offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 256, noes 157, not voting 25, as follows:

[Roll No. 293]

AYES—256

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bordallo
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Buchanan
Butterfield
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Castor
Cazayoux
Chabot
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Lincoln
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doyle
Edwards
Ehlers

Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Faleomavaega
Farr
Ferguson
Filner
Fortenberry
Fortuño
Frank (MA)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gillibrand
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hayes
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Klein (FL)
Kucinich
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murtha
Musgrave
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Norton
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Platts
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Rahall
Ramstad
Reichert
Reyes
Rodriguez
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth

NOES—157

Akin
Alexander
Bachmann
Bachus
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Cannon
Cantor
Carter
Castle
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Davis, David
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Emerson
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Flake
Forbes
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gilchrest
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Hall (TX)
Hastings (WA)
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
Lamborn
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Tim
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Poe
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Regula
Rehberg
Renzi
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Roskam
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Scalise
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Upton
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Wamp
Westmoreland
Whitfield (KY)
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman (VA)
Wolf
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—25

Aderholt
Berry
Campbell (CA)
Christensen
Costa
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Fattah
Foster
Jones (OH)
Paul
Rangel
Reynolds
Richardson
Royce
Rush
Saxton
Schwartz
Speier
Tancredo
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Wexler
Young (AK)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members have less than 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 2140

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Ms. SCHWARTZ. Madam Chairman, on rollcall No. 293, the Waters/Frank amendment, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

Stated against:

Mr. ROYCE. Madam Chairman, on rollcall No. 293, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MRS. CAPITO

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment printed in House Report 110–621 offered by the gentlewoman from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 425, noes 0, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 294]

AYES—425

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Bordallo
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Carter
Castle
Castor
Cazayoux
Chabot
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cohen
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Faleomavaega
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson
Filner
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fortuño
Fossella
Foster
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gingrey
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hobson
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Jordan
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Lampson
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Norton
Nunes
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)

Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sali
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Wexler
Whitfield (KY)
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman (VA)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—13

Berry
Campbell (CA)
Christensen
Klein (FL)
Paul
Reynolds
Richardson
Rush
Saxton
Speier
Tancredo
Welch (VT)
Young (AK)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised there are less than 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 2150

Mr. BERMAN changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. HOYER was allowed to speak out of order.)

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. HOYER. Ladies and gentlemen, after consultation with the minority leadership, we will not be having any more votes tonight, it is my understanding. That's a happier announcement, I know, so I thought I would make it, trying to even things out here.

We will have a suspension vote at the end of the consideration of the Waters bill. The votes will be rolled until tomorrow, and so that there will be no more votes tonight. There will be a suspension vote, but the minority has indicated that there will not be a vote on that suspension bill.

We will then, tomorrow, finish the votes on the Waters bill, and then go to the Franks housing bill and complete that tomorrow. My expectation is we are probably talking somewhere in the neighborhood of 4 o'clock tomorrow, assuming that things are nice and pleasant and peaceful.

Have a good night's sleep.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. MAHONEY OF FLORIDA

The Acting CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 110–621.

Mr. MAHONEY of Florida. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk made in order under the rule.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 3 offered by Mr. MAHONEY of Florida:

Page 36, after line 2, insert the following:

SEC. 15. PROTECTION OF RIGHT TO BEAR ARMS.

Nothing in this Act shall affect the right to bear arms under the Second Amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

Page 36, line 3, strike ''15'' and insert ''16''.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 1174, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MAHONEY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. MAHONEY of Florida. Madam Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today to offer an amendment to H.R. 5818, the Neighborhood Stabilization Act of 2008. During the past few months, Americans have woken up every morning and encountered headlines in their local newspapers similar to those in my hometown papers. Home sales hit low in February. Late loan payments highest since 1992; and foreclosures skyrocket.

I'd like to thank Chairwoman WATERS and Chairman FRANK for their commitment to address the housing market crisis gripping our Nation and of my beloved Florida. With their leadership, the legislation we're going to pass in the coming days brings hope to millions at home who are being hit especially hard, as much of Florida's economy is dependent on home construction and property development.

Right now, thousands of Floridians are out of work and unable to pay their mortgage, turning an economic downturn into a crisis for working families and their communities.

Florida homeowners are being hit especially hard because of the staggering cost of property taxes, skyrocketing insurance premiums and increased mortgage payments. This toxic cocktail has forced many home owners to make difficult decisions. Our seniors are being forced to decide between paying their mortgages and purchasing lifesaving medications.

Likewise, working families are confronted with the challenges of putting food on the table, supporting their children's education, and paying their mortgage.

In the eight counties I represent, there are approximately 13,500 homes in pre-foreclosure, meaning that homeowners have missed at least one of their mortgage payments. To give you a better perspective, Madam Chairman, how deep the problem is in my district, there are approximately 245,000 single family homes in the area that I represent.

□ 2200

That means about 5½ percent of the homes in my district are in foreclosure. Every foreclosure serves to further drive down the values of every homeowner in the neighborhood. In addition to the personal tragedies faced by families confronting foreclosure or falling home values are States, counties, and towns that are facing another crisis.

According to the Department of Commerce, approximately 200,000 new homes are sitting empty throughout the United States. Harvard University's Joint Center for Housing Studies found that partially completed or vacant developments reduce tax revenue for cities and towns and hurt businesses. Likewise, a report authored by the U.S. Conference of Mayors found that the rising foreclosures and falling property values may cut tax revenues by more than $6.6 billion for the ten States, including my home State of Florida. This means fewer police, firemen, and teachers. It means fewer parks and after school programs.

The crisis has already pushed Florida into a recession, and the State already has to deal with a decrease in tax revenue. The State, which just finished its budget, had to make difficult decisions. Nursing homes in the State charged with taking care of our seniors will face a $163.7 million reduction in what they're paid to take care of residents on Medicaid.

The legislature voted to increase taxes by imposing $200 million in user fees on our State citizens. Likewise, spending on education in Florida will drop by $131 per student. These cuts come at a time when it is more important than ever to invest in our children who will have to compete in the global economy.

H.R. 5818 will establish a $15 billion HUD administered grant program for the purchase and rehabilitation of owner-vacated foreclosed homes with the goal of stabilizing and occupying them as soon as possible. By doing so, we will ensure that the value of the properties and those surrounding them will not continue to free fall.

Madam Chairman, my amendment today is very straightforward. It clarifies that nothing in the underlying bill before us today restricts anyone's right to bear arms under the second amendment. This language ensures that those States, localities, and organizations receiving loans and grants under this law cannot, let me repeat, cannot place any restrictions on the properties they purchase or maintain that would infringe upon a person's second amendment rights.

I ask my colleagues to support this commonsense amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BACHUS. Madam Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition. I am not in opposition, but I plan to speak in the allotted 5 minutes.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from Alabama is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. BACHUS. Madam Chairman, throughout this debate, the Bear

Stearns matter has been invoked by Members of the majority who have called forth the bailout of the Bear Stearns counterparties, not of Bear Stearns but of the counterparties, as a reason to bail out lenders in this case. And basically, what they said time and time again, my colleagues, many of them my friends in the majority, they have said, You Republicans had no problem when the Federal Reserve bailed out Bear Stearns. Now, although you had no problem with that $30 billion, you've got a big problem with the $15 billion under the gentlewoman, the chairman of the subcommittee from California. You have got a big problem with this $15 billion. In fact, that's not the case. I would like to clarify what I think is a misconception.

Immediately following the Bear Stearns, whether you call it a bailout or intervention, it was a $30 billion potential loss to the American taxpayers, I agree with the gentlelady from California. One of our Members, and I think it shows the importance that one Member can make a difference, and that Member was Representative SCOTT GARRETT from New Jersey. Representative GARRETT immediately penned a letter to Chairman FRANK, and I commend Chairman FRANK; he gave a very prompt response to that letter. But in that letter, SCOTT GARRETT raised some questions.

One of the questions was, Should we use taxpayers' money or expose taxpayers to laws to intervene in these situations. He wrote a very carefully crafted letter. He said, I have serious concerns about this, serious concerns about the taxpayer standing behind a $29 billion guarantee. I think these are extraordinary actions that we're taking, and we ought to have a full investigation.

Now, that letter was signed by 17 Members of this body. Now, who were those Members? Were they the Democratic Members who are expressing concerns tonight? Let's see.

There was SCOTT GARRETT; there was SPENCER BACHUS, yours truly; there was DON MANZULLO from Illinois, I believe he is a Republican; WALTER JONES from North Carolina. I congratulate WALTER on his fine victory last night. MICHELE BACHMANN, she is a Minnesota Republican; GINNY BROWN-WAITE, she's from Florida, she's a Republican; RANDY NEUGEBAUER, vice chairman of our side, or vice ranking member; TOM FEENEY, last time I checked he was a Republican unless he switched parties. TOM PRICE. Is there any debate among any of us that he's a very conservative Republican? RON PAUL. Now there's a debate. There's a debate. He may not be a Republican; he may be a Libertarian; certainly not a Democrat. Mr. PUTNAM, member of the Republican leadership. THAD MCCOTTER. He signed his name. We had to do some investigation. He really used his chicken scratch here, but we've identified him as THAD MCCOTTER after some investigation. Mr. HENSARLING. Boy, that's a conservative Republican. Mr. PEARCE from New Mexico; JEFF DAVIS, Kentucky; JUDY BIGGERT, esteemed subcommittee ranking member, and DEAN HELLER.

Seventeen Members, all Republicans, who express real concerns. And I do want to congratulate the chairman of the full committee, because he almost responded yes, we need to look into this; we need to have hearings. He did say, I don't think it's necessary to do it at this time. I think we can postpone it because we need to talk about something that's quite different, and that's the foreclosure prices.

But tonight on this floor, the Democrats have linked the two as bailouts.

Let me tell you what the chairman said. The chairman of the full committee, and I agree with him, I think he's absolutely right. He said we should check into this matter because when you use taxpayer money to guarantee something, here is what he said, ''It sets a precedent that could lead to future instances of companies . . . expecting the same assistance.'' A precedent that could lead to future instances of companies expecting the same assistance. And we shouldn't obligate the taxpayers to make those sort of expenditures because people will begin to think that they will be bailed out.

Absolutely what we face tonight. Madam Chairman, Members of this body, we are creating an expectation tonight on this floor by bailing out irresponsible speculators and lenders.

I thank the Chairman.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, April 7, 2008.

Hon. BARNEY FRANK,
Chairman, Committee on Financial Services, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN FRANK: We are writing to respectfully request you hold a hearing of the full Financial Services Committee regarding the recent collapse of the investment bank Bear Stearns and the subsequent actions taken by the Federal Reserve to facilitate Bear Stearns' sale to J.P. Morgan Chase. These steps have had an immediate impact on the financial markets and are also expected to have a long-term effect on our financial regulatory structure.

For the first time since the Great Depression, the Fed voted to open its discount window to primary dealers. While this authority has been available to the Fed since 1932, the decision to use it at this time has raised questions about whether and when the Fed should intervene to help a particular industry or firm in the name of market stability.

With the Fed approving the financing arrangements of the sale of Bear Stearns to J.P. Morgan Chase as well as guaranteeing $29 billion in securities currently held by Bear Stearns, the Fed has possibly exposed the American taxpayers to unknown amounts of financial loss and established a precedent that could lead to future instances of companies in similar financial trouble expecting the same assistance.

These extraordinary actions have raised a number of complex and multifaceted questions. As members of the committee of jurisdiction over our nations' financial markets and the regulatory bodies that oversee them, we feel it is imperative to have a full and public vetting of this unique situation. Therefore, we strongly urge you to convene a hearing on this subject of the Financial Services Committee on the soonest possible date.

Thank you for your consideration of this request.

Sincerely,

Scott Garrett, Spencer Bachus, Donald Manzullo, Walter B. Jones, Michele Bachmann, Ginny Brown-Waite, Randy Neugebauer, Tom Feeney, Thomas Price, Ron Paul, Adam H. Putnam, T. McCotter, Jeb Hensarling, Steven Pearce, Geoff Davis, Judy Biggert, Dean Heller.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, April 14, 2008.

Hon. SCOTT GARRETT,
Congressman, House of Representatives, Longworth House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. GARRETT, I received the letter signed by you and sixteen of your Republican colleagues on the Financial Services Committee expressing your concern that the recent actions by the top financial appointees of the Bush administration in the matter of Bear Stearns have ''possibly exposed the American taxpayers to unknown amounts of financial loss and established a precedent that could lead to future instances of companies in similar financial trouble expecting the same assistance.'' It does occur to me as I read your letter that I have somewhat more confidence in the judgment exercised by Secretary of the Treasury Paulson and his aides and Federal Reserve Chairman Bernanke and other officials of the Federal Reserve System than you appear to have, but that is no reason for us not to give this the fullest possible airing. So I do agree that we should be thoroughly examining this matter.

Where we may disagree is the context in which this happens. That is, I agree with you that we should have a ''full and public vetting of this'' matter, but I do not think it is necessary that we have the hearing ''on the soonest possible date.'' I say this for two reasons.

First, the Committee, as you know, is now engaged in serious consideration of the appropriate response to the foreclosure crisis that now confronts us. I realize that there are some who believe that we should take no action at all, but I think the recent movement by the Bush administration to expand the reach of the FHA, even though I do not agree with it in all respects—is recognition of the need for some action. I therefore believe that it is important that the Committee continue its efforts on dealing with the current crisis, in cooperation with our Senate colleagues who as you know in a bipartisan way have also moved forward on legislation, although I do not agree myself with all aspects of it. My intention is to ask that the Committee continue to focus on this for the next several weeks.

Secondly, I do believe it is important for the Committee to begin an investigation, including hearings, into the Bear Stearns issue, but not in isolation. It is important that we look at what happened with regard to Bear Stearns, not primarily as a matter of hindsight because in fact we cannot undo what was done, but rather from the standpoint of anticipating what the public response should be in similar matters going forward. This includes of course discussing whether or not these specific actions taken in the Bear Stearns case were the best ones from the public standpoint, but also beginning the very important issue of what we might do in Congress to make it less likely that situation of this sort will recur. You

correctly note in your letter that what the Bush Administration did in this case did establish ''a precedent that could lead to future instances of companies . . . expecting the same assistance.'' I think it is important that we therefore empower some federal entities to take actions that may make this less likely, and would also allow them to accompany any such intervention if it should later be decided to be necessary with appropriate I remedial matters.

In summary, I agree that the Committee should be looking into this, not from the standpoint of rebuking Chairman Bernanke or Secretary Paulson, but rather as part of a serious consideration I of the causes of the current crisis and more importantly, what we can do to make a recurrence of the events that led up to the Bear Stearns response much less likely in the future.

BARNEY FRANK

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MAHONEY of Florida. Madam Chairman, how much time do I have left?

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Thirty seconds.

Mr. MAHONEY of Florida. I will yield that to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I will respond at great length later, but I would say this.

I said I did not oppose, myself, what they did. I was talking primarily about the Bush administration.

Now the ranking member said 17 Republicans out of almost 200 signed this letter. I don't think that's the majority of Republicans. They didn't oppose it. They raised questions about it.

But it was the two highest ranking economic officials appointed by the Bush administration, Chairman Bernanke and Secretary Paulson, who did this; and it's the Bush administration that seems to me to be totally inconsistent here. So yes, I did point to an inconsistency between the Bush administration doing the bailout and their opposing this. I'm setting a precedent. I hope the citizens will think we are setting the precedent of coming to their aid from time to time.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. All time for debate on the amendment has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MAHONEY).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. HENSARLING

The Acting CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in House Report 110–621.

Mr. HENSARLING. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 4 offered by Mr. HENSARLING:

Page 2, line 10, strike ''and grant''.

Page 3, line 1, strike ''and grants''.

Page 3, line 10, strike ''AND GRANTS''.

Page 3, line 13, strike ''make grants under section 5(a) to qualified States and''.

Page 3, lines 18 and 19, strike ''make a grant under this Act only to a State, and may''.

Page 4, line 25, strike ''grant and''.

Page 5, line 3, strike ''grant and''.

Page 5, line 7, strike ''grant or''.

Page 6, line 8, strike ''grant and''.

Page 6, lines 21 and 22, strike ''grant amounts, and for''.

Page 7, line 1, strike ''grant or''.

Strike line 22 on page 8 and all that follows through page 9, line 2.

Page 9, line 9, strike ''GRANT AMOUNTS AND''.

Page 9, line 11, strike ''grant amount or''.

Page 9, lines 12 and 13, strike ''foreclosure grant share''.

Page 9, line 13, strike ''or''.

Page 9, lines 13 and 14, strike '', respectively,''.

Page 9, line 20, strike ''grant amount or''.

Page 9, line 22, strike ''foreclosure grant share or''.

Page 9, line 23, strike '', respectively,'' and ''the grant amount or''.

Page 9, line 25, strike ''foreclosure grant share or''.

Page 10, line 1, strike '', respectively,''.

Page 10, line 2, strike ''grant amounts or''.

Page 10, line 6, strike ''grant amounts or''.

Page 10, line 9, strike ''grant amount or''.

Page 10, line 11, strike ''grant amount or''.

Page 10, line 13, strike ''foreclosure grant share or''.

Page 10, line 14, strike '', respectively''.

Page 10, line 16, strike ''grant or''.

Page 10, line 18, strike ''or grants''.

Strike line 23 on page 10 and all that follows through page 11, line 10.

Page 12, line 3, strike ''grant and''.

Page 12, strike lines 5 through 7.

Page 12, line 14, strike ''grant amounts and''.

Page 12, lines 17 and 18, strike ''such grant amounts and''.

Page 12, line 19, strike ''grant amounts and''.

Page 12, line 20, strike '', respectively,''.

Page 13, line 8, strike ''grant amounts and''.

Page 13, lines 11 and 12, strike ''grant amounts and''.

Page 13, line 13, strike ''grant amounts and''.

Page 13, line 14, strike '', respectively,''.

Page 14, lines 1 and 2, strike ''grant and''.

Page 14, line 5, strike ''grant and''.

Page 14, line 8, strike ''grant and''.

Page 14, line 12, strike ''grant amounts and''.

Page 14, line 17, strike ''grant amounts and''.

Page 17, strike lines 21 through 25.

Strike line 18 on page 19 and all that follows through page 21, line 24.

Page 22, line 2, strike ''grant or''.

Strike line 12 on page 22 and all that follows through page 24, line 4.

Page 24, line 6, strike ''grant or''.

Page 24, lines 7 and 8, strike ''grant and''.

Page 24, line 23, strike ''or grant''.

Page 24, line 25, strike ''or grant''.

Page 27, line 13, strike ''grant or''.

Page 27, line 19, strike ''or grant''.

Page 28, lines 12 and 13, strike ''receives a grant under this Act or''.

Page 28, lines 15 and 16, strike ''obligation of such grant amounts and''.

Page 28, line 20, strike ''obligate all such grant amounts and''.

Page 28, lines 24 and 25, strike ''outlay all such grant amounts and''.

Page 30, line 3, strike ''a grant or'' and insert ''an''.

Page 30, line 13, strike ''grant or''.

Page 30, lines 14 and 15, strike ''grant or''.

Page 30, line 19, strike ''grant or''.

Page 35, strike lines 8 through 10.

Page 35, line 21, strike ''$7,500,000,000'' and insert ''$15,000,000,000''.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 1174, Mr. HENSARLING and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. HENSARLING. Thank you, Madam Chairman.

First, I would like to yield 30 seconds to the ranking member, the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BACHUS. I thank the gentleman from Texas.

And responding to the chairman, first of all, I would say the letter that came back to Mr. GARRETT from the chairman expressed the chairman's opinion that he had much more confidence in this bailout than the Republican Members.

But secondly, he pointed out only 17 Members. In fact, that is the majority of the Financial Services Committee, and as Mr. GARRETT asked earlier of the majority party, how many Democrats signed a letter demanding an investigation into the Bear Stearns matter? The response was none. All Members that have publicly in writing demanded an investigation were Republican Members, the majority of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. HENSARLING. Madam Chairman, I will yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Madam Chairman, I thank the ranking member for his comments and again bringing up what is a very important issue here. And that is fundamentally what we have before us is a Wall Street bailout bill. Now we all know there are some very significant challenges in our housing markets. But the answer is not to be bailing out lenders. They may be good lenders who made bad bets, and maybe they are the predatory lenders that we hear so much about. This bill doesn't make any particular distinction.

The people who can stay in their homes, if they just get a little help, we need disclosure. We need to enforce the law against fraud. There has been a lot of mortgage fraud on the borrowers' side, on the lenders' side.

Most importantly now, Madam Chairman, we need to prevent the single largest tax increase in American history passed by the Democrat majority in their budget which means that people who are struggling to pay their mortgages are going to have to pay more taxes.

The rising fuel cost, that's happened under the watch of the Democrat majority; the rising cost of food happened under the watch of the Democrat majority. They've been in charge of the economic policy of America for almost a year and a half now. It is the shrinking paycheck of the hardworking American homeowner and taxpayer that's at the crux of this problem.

And so what this underlying bill does is take $15 billion of money away from the school teacher in Mesquite, Texas, struggling to pay his mortgage; the guy who works at the Pepsi bottling plant in Mesquite; the rancher out in Athens, Texas; takes money away from

them to bail out all of these bad investors who made these bad bets.

So you can't say that you were concerned about Bear Stearns and then all of a sudden turn right around and have this humongous Wall Street bailout bill.

My amendment is simple. Presently, you have a $15 billion bill, half of which are loans and half of which are grants. The purpose of the amendment is to turn this into strictly a loan program. Now, I don't believe in the purpose of the underlying bill. But, if you're going to bail out Wall Street and use taxpayer money, let's at least, at least try to make it a loan so that there is at least some chance, some chance that the taxpayer who's facing a $3,000-a-year increase in their taxes for a family of four over the next 3 years under the majority budget, that maybe, maybe they have some small chance of recouping some of that money from all of these cities and localities. And by the way, again, the last I looked, almost every single State and municipality in America is running a surplus.

□ 2215

Yet the Federal Government isn't, and so what does the underlying bill do? Hands out more grant money, more grant money on top of the $57 trillion of unfunded obligations that every man, woman and child in America already owes. Well, let's add some more grant money.

Well, if it's that important to States and municipalities, maybe they would want to fund it or maybe they could take the loan money and eventually pay it back so maybe the Democrat majority wouldn't have to raise taxes on the Federal taxpayers quite as much.

So, Madam Chairman, it's a very commonsense amendment. If you're going to do it, at least do loans and don't do grants.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Madam Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. What we see here, Madam Chairman, is a fundamental difference between the Republicans and the Democrats when it comes to responding to the pressing needs of the American people. Let us look at really where we are.

We are in a depressed, recessed economy, which means liquidity is drying up, which means there is a slowing supply and circulation of money, which has been caused chiefly by a meltdown of the subprime mortgage market, and it has had a ricocheting effect throughout every fiber of our economy.

The American people are hanging on by their fingernails. Between 7,000 and 8,000 American families are foreclosing every day, according to the Federal Reserve, not David Scott, not our Financial Services Committee, but according to the Federal Reserve, between 7,000 and 8,000 individuals are declaring foreclosure.

That means communities all across this Nation are impacted. Not only is this a burden upon individuals, homeowners and families, it's devastating enough, but many of these foreclosures, when the property's foreclosed, that means folks are out of them. That means they are left vacant. That means they become fire hazards. That means they become havens to criminals. That means police services, that means fire services, that means a tremendous pressure being placed on already depressed city and county and State budgets.

And Madam Chairman, in every State in this Nation, there's been a 20 percent, at least, increase in foreclosures. So this is a problem of soaring magnitude, and the cities and the counties are already, many of them, moving ahead, but they are overwhelmed with the scale of this problem. And that's where the government comes in.

There is a role for government. We need to respond to the needs of the American people, and nowhere is it more important than in this bill that has been very brilliantly designed by the gentlelady from California and our chairman of this committee.

Now let's speak very briefly about this Hensarling amendment. And, I might add, the gentleman from Texas is a fine person. I consider him a good friend, but he is terribly, terribly wrong with this amendment. This is a terrible amendment because it does what we refer to in the South as, hold still, little fishy, and let me gut you. That's what this amendment does.

It goes at the heart of this bill, because what he wants to do is take away the stimulus package for the local communities, and what he wants to do is to deny a way and a requirement in the bill so that we can help the poor elements where this bill says that you must serve those that meet at least 50 percent of the level of poverty. In order to do that, we must have the grant feature in the bill.

The other point, as I mentioned earlier, a part of our whole concern in this whole economic issue is liquidity, which means we must have a stimulative nature in terms of what we do here in Washington, to stimulate the economy and put money into the economy. That's why we've got this week and leading on starting in next week $600, $300 and $1,200 checks. To do what? To stimulate.

I take great offense from the other side when they constantly want the American people to think we're taking their tax money away and putting it in our pockets or hoarding it. This money is going right back to taxpayers to help to defray the costs of servicing these depressed communities.

The grants are needed, Madam Chairman, in order for us to serve those that are at the lower end of the economic level, which we must do and can only be done through grants. If his amendment is adopted, we won't be able to do that which hurts and almost kills this bill.

The other thing that it does, it does not allow us to apply the stimulus factor to the bill to provide needed input into this. I urge a defeat of this. It might be intentioned, I won't say well, but it is a terrible amendment from the gentleman from Texas.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

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

Well, first, I would say to my friend from Georgia and other friends on that side of the aisle, if loans are so bad, why are they in the bill in the first place?

Second of all, this bill does nothing to stop foreclosures, not a thing. Quite the opposite. Instead, it will increase foreclosures.

What you have is an incentive for these investors to no longer do a workout with the struggling family, but instead, I can get bailed out. I can get bailed out by the Federal taxpayer. This is a bill that will help banks, Wall Street and States and does nothing for foreclosed families. It certainly does nothing for the taxpayer, and if we have a liquidity problem, which we do, let's cut the capital gains tax rate and you will see capital come into this market. I urge adoption.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. All time for debate on the amendment has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. HENSARLING. Madam Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. KUCINICH

The Acting CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in House Report 110–621.

Mr. KUCINICH. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 5 offered by Mr. KUCINICH:

Page 2, line 13, strike ''purchase and rehabilitate'' and insert ''preserve the equity and ensure the safety of the neighbors of homes made vacant by the predatory lending and foreclosure crises, to prevent and reduce the incidence of such vacancies through various means, including purchasing and rehabilitating''.

Page 3, line 3, before the semicolon insert '', and largest increases in the rate of vacant and abandoned single family homes''.

Page 4, line 17, strike ''foreclosures'' and insert ''vacancies, according to the number of census tracts, as determined by the Secretary, to have large increases in the rate of

vacancy during the past eight quarters and significant levels of loans determined to be at risk of foreclosure,''.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 1174, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. KUCINICH. Madam Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The primary beneficiaries of H.R. 5818 are the neighborhoods and neighbors of high concentrations of houses made vacant by the foreclosure and predatory lending crises. Helping those neighborhoods should be a nonpartisan and noncontroversial act. Such neighborhoods are the totally innocent bystanders of the predatory lending and foreclosure crises. Neighbors and neighborhoods are victims of the meltdown of subprime loans that preceded this wave of foreclosures, and there's no moral hazard in helping the neighbors. The Kucinich amendment ensures that the funds authorized by H.R. 5818 are targeted to help the most needy neighborhoods.

When a foreclosure leads to a vacant and abandoned property, this is what happens to the neighborhood: Crime goes up, as the vacant property can become home to criminal activity, drug places, and fire hazards; local government costs for police, fire and building inspections go up; vacancies go up, abandoned properties initiate a chain of events that begets more abandoned properties; neighbors lose equity in their homes, because vacant properties have a strong negative effect on the value of neighboring properties.

My amendment clarifies that the purpose of this legislation is to help State and local governments ''preserve the equity and ensure the safety of neighbors of homes made vacant'' by the foreclosure and predatory lending crises.

My amendment also ensures that the neediest neighborhoods receive priority in the plans developed by States, metropolitan cities and urban counties. The neediest neighborhoods are defined with ''high concentrations of vacancies,'' ''large increases in the rate of vacancy'' in the last 2 years, and ''significant levels of loans determined to be at risk of foreclosure.'' These vacant property statistics have been gathered by the United States Postal Service and analyzed by the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and their use will better target the funds authorized by H.R. 5818.

My amendment is the product of a collaborative effort between my subcommittee, the Domestic Policy Subcommittee, and the Subcommittee on Housing and Community Opportunity and the Financial Services Committee. The amendment draws upon the academic research and input from practitioners in this area.

My amendment is supported by community development professionals and advocates, such as Local Initiatives Support Corporation, the National Vacant Properties Campaign, and Smart Growth America.

I will place their letters of support in the RECORD at this point.

MAY 6, 2008.

Hon. DENNIS KUCINICH,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN KUCINICH: We are writing to support your amendment to the Neighborhood Stabilization Act of 2008 that recognizes the important role vacant and abandoned properties play in the foreclosure crisis and the threat they can pose to communities across the country.

By including the rate of vacancy in the fund distribution formula, this proposal helps to ensure that neighborhoods struggling with high rates of vacant and abandoned homes will receive priority in the plans developed by states, metropolitan areas, and urban counties. High rates of vacant properties put communities at a greater risk for crime, arson, destabilized housing prices, and other neighborhood problems. For many communities, dealing with the foreclosure crisis will mean taking steps to recover and secure growing numbers of vacant homes, as well as figuring out the best ways to prevent these properties from having negative community impacts.

Thank you for your leadership on this issue and we look forward to working with you on this important legislation.

Sincerely,

GEOFF ANDERSON,
President & CEO, Smart Growth America.

JENNIFER LEONARD,
Director, National Vacant Properties Campaign.

LOCAL INITIATIVES SUPPORT CORPORATION,
Washington, DC, May 6, 2008.

Rep. DENNIS KUCINICH,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE KUCINICH: Regarding H.R. 5818, the Neighborhood Stabilization Act of 2008, Local Initiatives Support Corporation (LISC) supports your amendment to focus the bill's resources on communities with rising vacancies.

A primary purpose of H.R. 5818, which LISC also supports more broadly, is to help communities hurt by concentrations of home mortgage foreclosures. A principal indicator of this problem is the number and growth of vacant properties. Concentrations of vacant and abandoned properties have a corrosive affect on neighborhoods. Vacant properties depress the value of nearby properties, reduce the tax base on which states and localities depend, are a magnet for crime, and often undermine promising but fragile progress toward revitalization.

Your amendment is an important refinement to H.R. 5818 because it would direct states to prioritize the allocation of funds under the bill to low- and moderate-income neighborhoods with the highest concentration of vacant properties.

We greatly appreciate your leadership on this most important issue for vulnerable communities and the people who live there.

Sincerely,

BENSON F. ROBERTS,
Senior Vice President for Policy and Program Development.

I urge adoption of the Kucinich amendment which targets funds to the most needy neighborhoods.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Chairman, I rise in support of Mr. KUCINICH's amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Chairman, I rise in strong support of Representative KUCINICH's amendment.

His subcommittee has done an enormous amount of valuable work examining this targeting issue, and I want to thank him for focusing attention on the issue of neighborhoods where there are large and growing concentrations of vacancies resulting from the foreclosure crisis. They're exactly the neighborhoods I mentioned in my opening statement, ones that face the prospect of reaching the tipping point of deterioration from which they may never recover. Stabilizing such neighborhoods is an especially daunting task for community leaders and organizations.

So I think it is entirely appropriate, as this amendment does, to require States, counties and cities in their plans to prioritize these foreclosures and vacancy hotspots.

Finally, I know that this is no academic exercise for Representative KUCINICH in his role as subcommittee Chair. He's bringing hard experience to the table from the neighborhoods within his district in Cleveland.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KUCINICH. Madam Chairman, I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) for a unanimous consent request.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I ask unanimous consent to support this very important amendment by the gentleman from Ohio and as well to enthusiastically support the $15 billion for reclaiming our homes.

With that, I offer to submit my statement for the RECORD.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 5818, the ''Neighborhood Stabilization Act of 2008,'' introduced by Congresswoman MAXINE WATERS, of California. I would also like to thank Chairman BARNEY FRANK for his leadership on the Financial Services Committee. I also support the Kucinich amendment to ensure accurate vacancy statistics.

I find it interesting that we are okay with a bailout of Bear Stearns, the fifth largest investment firm in the amount of 42 million dollars; however we cannot support assistance to the American Homeowners who are struggling to pay their mortgage, fill up at the pump, and get quality healthcare.

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

As evidenced by the numerous housing and financial services bills introduced this Congress, we are in economic turmoil. I have been concerned over recent developments in

the housing and mortgage markets and worked with my colleagues to ensure that all Americans are able to get assistance.

Legislation such as H.R. 3019, the Expand and Preserve Home Ownership through Counseling Act and H.R. 3666, the Foreclosure Prevention and Home Ownership Protection Act, include sections that speak specifically about foreclosures. They authorize studies on current defaults and foreclosures, as well as possible causes.

However, H.R. 5818 provides for action. H.R. 5818 establishes a 15 billion dollar loan and grant program for the purchase and rehabilitation of owner-vacated, foreclosed homes. The Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) will make the allocations to the States; 7.5 billion of the funds would be for loans, and 7.5 billion for grants.

Beyond negotiating with the mortgage company, Americans need to know they have options. Sometimes it is the mortgage company who has given them a bad loan; H.R. 5818 offers some relief to individuals and families who need help, beyond their personal lender.

TEXAS

Nationwide, the number of home foreclosures rose nearly 60 percent from February 2007 to February 2008, while foreclosures in Texas actually decreased 1 percent during the same, period. In fact, state-wide foreclosure filings in Texas dropped 17 percent from January to February.

Despite being such a large state, Texas ranks only 17th in foreclosures, below the national average. One reason is that Texas homeowners enjoy strong constitutional protections under the state's home-equity lending law.

These consumer protections include a 3 percent cap on lender's fees, 80 percent loan-to-value ratio (compared to many other states that allow borrowers to obtain 125 percent of their home's value), and mandatory judicial sign-off on any foreclosure proceeding involving a defaulted home-equity loan.

Even though the rate of increase has showed slowing in the first two months of the year, uncertainties remain. Foreclosures are high and could still beat last year's numbers. Harris County, for example, racked up 2,219 foreclosures during the first two months of the year. That's compared with 1,915 during the same period last year.

AMENDMENT LANGUAGE AND PURPOSE

I had offered an amendment to H.R. 5818 that would provide for those who have been struggling to keep up with the rising prices of gas, the downturn of the housing market, and the incredible cost of health care. My amendment would not exclude from eligibility, individuals and families based solely on credit ratings or their credit histories.

Many individuals and families have credit ratings and histories that are less than required for the most-advantageous lending terms. These individuals should not be faulted for their struggle to make ends meet in these troubling economic times.

They have less than stellar credit due to the financial stress they have experienced trying to save their home from foreclosure. As a result, they have marred their credit. Families who have struggled to decide between paying their mortgage or paying for healthcare, families who have struggled to balance their need for shelter with their need for food are rarely able to maintain a credit score that qualifies them for a basic credit card, let alone a home or rental property.

At least 50 percent of the grant money must be targeted to house families at or below 50 percent of AMI, and not less than half of this money must target families at or below 30 percent of AMI. Most of the people covered under this bill and at these income levels will not qualify if it is not clearly stated that they can be considered even with less than stellar credit.

CONCLUSION

Americans are hurting and they need help. H.R. 5818, provides much needed help to the states and to the families who are facing a housIng downtown. Thank you, Madam Chairman, and thank you, Congressman FRANK and Congresswoman WATERS, for this timely housing legislation. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation and give some relief to American families.

Mr. KUCINICH. Madam Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. MCCOTTER

The Acting CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 6 printed in House Report 110–621.

Mr. MCCOTTER. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 6 offered by Mr. MCCOTTER:

Page 6, after line 2, insert the following:

(8) notwithstanding any other preferences established or authorized under this subsection, provide first priority, in use of amounts from grants or loans under this Act for rehabilitating housing, for providing housing for veterans, members of the Armed Forces on active duty, members of the National Guard or Armed Forces reserves, school teachers, and emergency responders;

Page 6, line 3, strike ''(8)'' and insert ''(9)''.

Page 6, line 8, strike ''(9)'' and insert ''(10)''.

Page 6, line 13, strike ''(10)'' and insert ''(11)''.

Page 6, line 21, strike ''(11)'' and insert ''(12)''.

Page 7, line 1, strike ''(12)'' and insert ''(13)''.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 1174, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MCCOTTER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MCCOTTER. Madam Chairman, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Just a brief description of the amendment which I hope will prove noncontroversial. What I would like to do under the bill, though I'm not particularly a fan of the bill itself and its particulars, I would like to try to help to make it better.

My amendment would, under the bill, require States to give first priority to veterans, active duty military personnel, National Guard, Armed Forces Reserves, schoolteachers and emergency response personnel when selling rehabilitated housing with funds authorized under H.R. 5818.

□ 2230

Importantly, this amendment will not exclude those individuals who are low income, and does not change the underlying low-income eligibility requirements established under the bill.

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Madam Chairman, I rise in as close to opposition as this noncontroversial amendment is likely to engender.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I did note, and I welcome the gentleman from Michigan's affirmation, that this is not simply for banks, investment houses, pirates, lechers and other ill of sordid folk. He is seeking to give preference to veterans, members of the Armed Forces on active duty, members of the National Guard or Armed Forces Reserve, school teachers and emergency responders.

I agree with these priorities. It is, of course, an affirmation that this bill will benefit these people, unless we are to assume that they will be given a preference which is of no benefit to them. But if this bill is of no benefit to anybody but speculators, lenders and riffraff, then why give preference to these people? I agree with the amendment to that extent, and so I would just say that this underlines the point that there are very worthy beneficiaries.

But now I also want to return to the matter of the Bear Stearns issue. I will acknowledge, I did receive a letter from 17 Republicans, which is, by my math, not a huge percentage of 199 or 200 or whatever the declining number of Republican Members of the House is these days, but it is still not a very large number. And even in that letter, while it was not thrilled by the Chairman Bernanke-Secretary Paulson collaboration, it does not have one word in strict opposition to it. Nor does the letter that 24 Republicans—a slightly larger number, but still not even 15 percent—sent to Mr. Bernanke again raising questions.

So, yes, 24 Republicans have raised questions, Members of the House, about this bill. I will repeat that my accusation of inconsistency goes to the Bush administration primarily. They are the ones who engineered the $29 billion. They are the ones who are vehemently opposed to this.

Now some Republican Members did raise a question that said we should look into it and we're skeptical of it. I agreed with that. As I said in the letter, I think we should study it. I did think we should study it a little later for two reasons; first of all, I do believe

the subprime crisis is a crisis, some Members on the other side do not. There are, among the signers of this letter, some of those who, from their very conservative ideology, oppose any action by this Congress regarding the subprime. I mean that quite literally, they oppose any action to deal with this. That's their right. But I would put dealing with the subprime crisis ahead of a backward look, as important as that ultimately will be, at what happened with Bear Stearns.

Secondly, I want to look at what the Fed did there in the context of how can we make it less likely that it will happen again? I wasn't happy that it happened. I think there was a necessity in those circumstances. So what I said in the letter that I sent back to the authors was, yes, we should look at this in the context of the broader question: What powers do we need to give either the Federal Reserve or somebody else to make it less likely that this happens again?

So, yes, I should, we should, look into it, but I think we should look into it not simply from a kind of retroactive bawling them out, but how do we prevent it or diminish the likelihood of it happening? But the inconsistency remains. Twenty-four Republicans said they had questions. On the whole, I haven't heard any Republican opposition to it. I haven't seen any resolution opposing it.

It was the Bush administration, and this is my point: I thought it was unfortunately necessary. The Bush Administration, this is Secretary Paulson and Chairman Bernanke, they were the ones who did this. And I think they have been responsible in trying to deal with this crisis. But for the President who appointed those people to now denounce this because it's going to help, among others—and by the way, let's be clear, if this amendment passes, as I hope it will, we will be giving preference under this bill to veterans, members of the Armed Forces on active duty, members of the National Guard or Armed Forces Reserve, school teachers and emergency responders. So we have a Republican affirmation that these are among the beneficiaries.

And when you talk about bailing out investors and speculators, yes, that's what happened in the Bear Stearns situation. These were precisely the people who had done business with Bear Stearns. Now I believe that years of inadequate supervision of the economy, flawed legislation adopted when we repealed Glass-Stiegel and didn't put in regulations to deal with it at the time, that was supported by the Clinton administration and I voted against it. But when that happened, we invited the kind of problems that the leaders of the economic policy of the Bush administration had to implement. And it is that administration which is therefore being totally inconsistent in this regard.

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McCOTTER. Madam Chairman, I would like to yield 1 minute to the author of one of the letters in question, the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT).

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. I find it amazing and amusing that the chairman raises how many Republicans signed onto the two letters when, in fact, it evidences the fact that zero Democrats signed onto that letter and zero Democrats have done anything with regard to Bear Stearns for the last 2 months since this occurred. If there was even one Member from the other side of the aisle from the committee, when we invited the entire committee to sign onto it, I think the chairman would be in a stronger position, but he is not because none of them signed on then. And even earlier this evening, when I invited them to sign onto an addition to it, none of them have come across to sign onto it.

Secondly, I find it amusing when the chairman's response in the letter was that he has more confidence in Bernanke and the Fed than we do. So if your question is that we did not point out that there were problems with it, your response points out that—as I've said, I'm not quoting because I cannot get a copy of the letter back here—you had more confidence in the decisions and in the actions of the Fed and the administration. So if you had more confidence, maybe that explains why 2 months after the action we are still asking for the chairman to hold a hearing on the matter, and here it is, 2 months later, all we are getting is rhetoric from this side of the aisle.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. May I inquire of the Chairman how much time I have remaining.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Fifteen seconds for the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCOTTER. Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I have said repeatedly that I did not oppose the action. And I am pointing to the hypocrisy on the part of the Bush administration. The gentleman from New Jersey, like Sherlock Holmes, unearthed the fact that I wasn't opposed to it. I said that. I think they were forced into it. So, yes, I did not sign it.

As to not having a hearing right away, that is a done deal. I'm trying to prevent foreclosures now, then we will get back to looking in the rearview mirror.

Mr. McCOTTER. May I inquire as to how much time I have remaining.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 3 minutes remaining.

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

First, I would like to reemphasize the point made by the gentleman from New Jersey. The distinguished chairman of the committee is right, the Republican numbers are declining, and this painful experience with arithmetic has taught us that 17 is still a greater number than zero.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCOTTER. The gentleman may potentially yield, but not at this point.

I would also like to point out that the distinguished chairman is right, the bill, if this amendment is adopted, would not be for speculators, simply for Bear Stearns, for Wall Street, would not be a big, bloated government golden parachute, but again, I think in this town, I think I'm being thanked for adding deserving people to something that may or may not help.

You see, it's not the intent that we are debating, it is how we get to where we all want to go. Do we believe that this is the best way to go? I highly doubt that on our side that we would concur with that. And the reason that we cannot concur with that is, as I believe the gentleman from Georgia pointed out, there are fundamental principles at stake here that we simply differ on. That's all right. We agree on some things, sometimes we don't, but they're a matter of principle. And in the end, the fundamental principle at stake is that our side believes that Americans' prosperity does not come from government, it comes from their own hard work and entrepreneurial investment. And what we want to see with this bill is an appropriate balance for the people that we truly are trying to help, for them who have made no mistakes, for them who have managed to hang on by their fingernails, for them to be able to say that we were compassionate towards our fellow Americans, our tax dollars were wisely used, and yet they were appropriately used. We believe in better government, not necessarily bigger government. And that is the crux of what we are debating today.

All good people on both sides. And as for the chairman, I do believe he is a very honorable man. One of the places we do agree is on the Bear Stearns bailout. A lot of our colleagues on this side of the aisle screwed up their jobs and didn't get to walk away with $61 million. They walked away with far worse. And I think that the Bear Stearns issue, which is being conducted by Bernanke over at the Federal Reserve and the Secretary of the Treasury, both of whom work for the Bush administration—well, one technically does—and who both were, I think on a bipartisan basis, confirmed by the United States Senate. So at least there's one thing we have in common, we aren't to blame for that. So I would look forward to working with him on that.

But again, I appreciate the support for the amendment, and I will yield to the chairman.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I just want to repeat, Members seem to think they're scoring points by saying, oh, they discovered we weren't opposed to it. I've said a dozen times, I thought they did what was necessary. I am not critical of them.

I do want to go back and see how we can prevent this from happening again.

But there is no inconsistency on our part. We didn't say that was the wrong thing to do. The inconsistency is the administration that says yes to $30 billion to Bear Stearns and no to $15 billion here.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. All time for debate on the amendment has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MCCOTTER).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. ALTMIRE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 7 printed in House Report 110–621.

Mr. ALTMIRE. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 7 offered by Mr. ALTMIRE:

Page 36, after line 2, insert the following new section:

SEC. 15. INELIGIBLITY OF ILLEGAL ALIENS FOR ASSISTANCE.

Aliens who are not lawfully present in the United States shall be ineligible for financial assistance under this Act, as provided and defined by section 214 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 1436a). Nothing in this Act shall be construed to alter the restrictions or definitions in such section 214.

Page 36, line 3, strike ''**15**'' and insert ''**16**''.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 1174, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ALTMIRE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

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

Madam Chairman, I offer this amendment to the Neighborhood Stabilization Act to ensure that illegal immigrants are not eligible for the financial assistance we're providing today to individuals adversely affected by the housing crisis.

Section 214 of the Housing and Community Development Act governs the participation of noncitizens in certain HUD programs. It requires valid documentation from the beneficiary, verification of that documentation by the appropriate entity, and outlines who may and may not be eligible for financial assistance.

Under section 214, illegal immigrants are not eligible for financial assistance. Let me repeat that: Under section 214, illegal immigrants are not eligible for financial assistance. And my amendment makes certain that section 214 rules apply to the new programs authorized by the Neighborhood Stabilization Act that we are debating tonight.

With the housing crisis and economic downturn impacting the lives of hardworking Americans throughout the country, we need to make sure that targeted, fiscally responsible assistance that we are providing goes only to law-abiding citizens.

As responsible stewards of taxpayer dollars, it is our responsibility to ensure that every penny is spent wisely and is not used to benefit any illegal immigrants in any way.

I urge all of my colleagues to support this amendment.

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. CAPITO. Madam Chairman, I seek time in opposition, although I am not opposed to the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentlewoman from West Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mrs. CAPITO. I would just like to express my support for his amendment. I think we have had this debate on the floor many times. And I want to say that we want to assure the American public, I think it's always good to reassure the American public that taxpayer funds are not going to help people here who have entered our country illegally and remain here illegally.

I would like to see, as we move forward in this debate on this and other bills, that we tighten down the types of identification that are full proof, that can be used to certify the legality of whoever the resident is residing, whether it's in public housing or in other taxpayer-funded opportunities.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ALTMIRE. Madam Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. All time for debate on the amendment has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ALTMIRE).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. ALTMIRE. Madam Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania will be postponed.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ALTMIRE) having assumed the chair, Ms. BALDWIN, Acting Chairman 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. 5818) had come to no resolution thereon.

□ 2245

CHARLTON HESTON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, H. Res. 1091, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1091, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 2419, FOOD AND ENERGY SECURITY ACT OF 2007

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to instruct at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Cantor moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the Senate amendment to the bill H.R. 2419 be instructed not to agree to the provisions contained in section 12808 of the Senate amendment (relating to qualified forestry conservation bonds).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR) and the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. POMEROY) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

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

I rise around this motion to instruct, which is centered on an objection that I have in the Senate-passed farm bill around one particular provision that certainly raises a lot of questions in my mind and should raise a lot of questions in the minds of my colleagues.

In the bill there is, without question, a $200 million earmark that benefits one wealthy landowner. Section 12808 in H.R. 2419, as passed by the Senate, provides for a tax credit bond program. There is a scheme in this bill that was so narrowly crafted that the bonds authorized thereunder can only be used for the acquisition of one, just one, piece of land in the entire country. This piece of land happens to lie predominantly in the State of Montana and is owned by timber giant Plum Creek. According to press reports, the Nature Conservancy would be allowed to issue $500 million in bonds under this bill and then use the proceeds to purchase the land from the timber giant. Even more egregious is that the provision does not even appear to require the protection of a single additional tree or a single additional fish. If this isn't a tax earmark, I don't know what is. Mr. Speaker, this is the ''bridge to nowhere'' of the farm bill.

Now, I know my colleagues on the other side of the aisle will argue that the Montana bond provision does not fit the definition of an earmark under House rules. Their reasoning will be that many taxpayers will potentially own the Montana bonds and then get tax credits from the Federal Government. But make no mistake. This provision is designed to facilitate one land sale by one landowner.

Now, Mr. Speaker, here's my question: What in the world are we doing here contemplating the expenditure of $200 million in U.S. taxpayer money to fund the purchase of a tract of land that benefits just one wealthy landowner, all the while American families are struggling with skyrocketing gas prices, food prices through the roof, plummeting home prices, and an economy that is barrel, barely growing?

It is time for us, Mr. Speaker, to say ''no'' to these types of backroom deals that have been struck in the middle of the night that benefit a wealthy few. It is time for us, Mr. Speaker, to say ''no'' to business as usual in Washington. And it's time, Mr. Speaker, for us to put the people first.

Think about it. Imagine what we could do with $200 million. It would go a long way to help solving the problems that so many people are facing across this country. This $200 million earmark is exactly what is wrong with Washington and why the American people are demanding change. It's time for all of us to insist that the Federal Government start working for the people again.

Mr. Speaker, my motion is a very simple one. It asks that the House instruct its conferees on the farm bill to reject section 12808 of the Senate-passed bill.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, the point of the farm bill at issue with this motion deals with a concept of public interest. Will private land adjacent to forest land be protected or will it be sold off and developed into very nice, very expensive private lots, taking land out of general public access and enjoyment? That's really the issue.

I believe it's an extremely serious issue, and I'm going to introduce into the RECORD coverage of this that appeared in the New York Times October 13, 2007, under the title ''As Logging Fades, Rich Carve Out Open Land in West.'' This article cites the prospect of vast timber sales by a company named Plum Creek Timber. And I would quote from the article:

''Some old-line logging companies, including Plum Creek Timber, the country's largest private landowner, are cashing in, putting tens of thousands of wooded acres on the market from Montana to Oregon. Plum Creek, which owns about 1.2 million acres in Montana alone, is getting up to $29,000 an acre for land that was worth perhaps $500 an acre for timber cutting.

'''Everybody wants to buy a 640-acre section of forest that's next to the U.S. Forest Service or one of the wilderness areas,' said Plum Creek's president and chief executive, Rick Holley.

''As a result, population is surging in areas surrounding national forests and national parks, with open spaces being carved up into sprawling wooded plots, enough for a house and no noisy neighbors.''

And the article goes on to talk about the extraordinary pressure, development pressure, for the wealthy few that can spend recreation dollars buying up and carving up land adjacent to the Forest Service.

AS LOGGING FADES, RICH CARVE UP OPEN LAND IN WEST

(By Kirk Johnson)

WHITEFISH, MT.—William P. Foley II pointed to the mountain. Owns it, mostly. A timber company began logging in view of his front yard a few years back. He thought they were cutting too much, so he bought the land.

Mr. Foley belongs to a new wave of investors and landowners across the West who are snapping up open spaces as private playgrounds on the borders of national parks and national forests.

In style and temperament, this new money differs greatly from the Western land barons of old—the timber magnates, copper kings and cattlemen who created the extraction-based economy that dominated the region for a century.

Mr. Foley, 62, standing by his private pond, his horses grazing in the distance, proudly calls himself a conservationist who wants Montana to stay as wild as possible. That does not mean no development and no profit. Mr. Foley, the chairman of a major title insurance company, Fidelity National Financial, based in Florida, also owns a chain of Montana restaurants, a ski resort and a huge cattle ranch on which he is building homes.

But arriving here already rich and in love with the landscape, he said, also means his profit motive is different.

''A lot of it is more for fun than for making money,'' said Mr. Foley, who estimates he has invested about $125 million in Montana in the past few years, mostly in real estate.

The rise of a new landed gentry in the West is partly another expression of gilded age economics in America; the super-wealthy elite wades ashore where it will.

With the timber industry in steep decline, recreation is pushing aside logging as the biggest undertaking in the national forests and grasslands, making nearby private tracts more desirable—and valuable, in a sort of ratchet effect—to people who enjoy outdoor activities and ample elbow room and who have the means to take title to what they want.

Some old-line logging companies, including Plum Creek Timber, the country's largest private landowner, are cashing in, putting tens of thousands of wooded acres on the market from Montana to Oregon. Plum Creek, which owns about 1.2 million acres here in Montana alone, is getting up to $29,000 an acre for land that was worth perhaps $500 an acre for timber cutting.

''Everybody wants to buy a 640-acre section of forest that's next to the U.S. Forest Service or one of the wilderness areas,'' said Plum Creek's president and chief executive, Rick Holley.

As a result, population is surging in areas surrounding national forests and national parks, with open spaces being carved up into sprawling wooded plots, enough for a house and no nosy neighbors.

Here in Flathead County, on the western edge of Glacier National Park, the number of real estate transactions, mostly for open land, rose by 30 percent from 2003 to 2006, according to state figures. The county's population is up 44 percent since 1990.

The United States Forest Service projects that over the next 25 years, an area the size of Maine—all of it bordering the national forests and grasslands—will face development pressure and increased housing density.

But the equally important force is the change in ownership. According to a Forest Service study, not yet published, more than 1.1 million new families became owners of an acre or more of private forest from 1993 to 2006 in the lower 48 states, a 12 percent increase. And almost all the net growth, about seven million acres, was in the Rocky Mountain region.

Institutions, pension funds and real estate investment trusts have been particularly aggressive buyers. Over the last 10 years, at least 40 million acres of private forest land have changed hands nationwide, said Bob Izlar, the director of the Center for Forest Business at the University of Georgia. It is a turnover that Mr. Izlar said was unmatched at least since the Great Depression.

Here in the West, questions of clout and class have been raised by the new arrivals.

This year, the conservation group Trout Unlimited, which had been considering ending its involvement in disputes between private landowners and fishermen over public access to fishing streams, backtracked after its members rose up in protest. Some members accused the group of siding with the landowners by not fighting for fishermen's access rights.

In parts of Colorado where communities have committed tax money to preserve open space, conflicts have erupted on the borders of the public lands over whether the programs—which in many cases buy out an owner's right to develop property, but not the property itself—are simply enriching landowners who keep the land and the public off, too.

''When you're there, you're on four million acres,'' said Michael Carricarte, who bought an 800–acre property in Glenwood Springs, Colo., in 2005, and now has the place, bordered on three sides by federal land, up for sale, asking $23.5 million.

''To get to where our property touched public land would take three hours by public road, but from our house it was 10 minutes by four-wheeler or Jeep,'' he said.

Mr. Carricarte, 39, said he was now in the process of selling a conservation easement to the Aspen Valley Land Trust that would lock 600 acres, all bordering public land, into permanent preservation.

Longtime residents tied to the old timber economy are finding it difficult to keep up. In parts of New Mexico and Colorado, the timber industry has all but collapsed; log harvests in the national forests have fallen to about one-fourth of what they were 20 years ago in the Rocky Mountain region, and less than a tenth what they were in the Pacific Northwest.

Some privately owned timberlands have increased production, but in the West, where more than two-thirds of all forest land is publicly owned (compared with about one-sixth in the eastern United States) private owners, even if they want to allow logging, cannot make up the difference.

Ronald H. Buentemeier, a second-generation forester, said he struggled every day to get enough wood to stoke the family-owned mill he runs in Montana, the F. H. Stoltze Land and Lumber Company.

''There's not enough private land out there,'' said Mr. Buentemeier, a blunt-talking 66-year-old with a flat-top crew cut. ''We've been pulling rabbits out of the hat to keep going.''

In ways that would have been unthinkable only a few years ago, environmentalists and representatives of the timber industry are reaching across the table, drafting plans that would get loggers back into the national forests in exchange for agreements that would set aside certain areas for protection.

Both groups are feeling under siege: timber executives because of the decline in logging,

and environmentalists because of the explosion of growth on the margins of the public lands.

One of the most ambitious proposals is here in Montana. It would allow some logging in the Beaverhead and Deerlodge National Forests in the state's southwest corner in exchange for the designation of new areas within the forests as permanent wilderness.

Some timber companies say that gaining conservationists as allies may be the only way to get back into the national forests, and so stay in business. But both sides say that success will require a turn of the historical momentum against logging in the West that began in the early '90s.

A court decision in 1991 involving the northern spotted owl required the Forest Service to manage for more than just timber production. The national forests in the northern Rockies constricted logging, fostering expansion in other forest areas like the South.

''If there's anything the industry should have learned over the years, it's that we can't do this by ourselves,'' said Gordy Sanders, the resource manager at Pyramid Mountain Lumber, one of the mill operators involved in the Beaverhead and Deerlodge negotiations.

Many environmentalists say they have come to realize that cutting down trees, if done responsibly, is not the worst thing that can happen to a forest, when the alternative is selling the land to people who want to build houses.

Stoltze Land and Lumber, for example, which owns about 36,000 acres near the border of Glacier National Park, has said that the failure of the logging industry would leave the company no option but to sell land into the booming development market.

That prospect chills the blood of people like Anne Dahl, the director of the Swan Valley Ecosystem Center, a conservation and education group.

''I'm a former tree hugger who was opposed to everything, every timber sale,'' Ms. Dahl said, ''but now I see that the worst thing you can do is lose it all to development.''

Other new partnerships are emerging. Last year, the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Indian tribes, which have a reservation south of Whitefish, joined with conservationists to buy a square mile of land from Plum Creek that was deemed crucial to the endangered bull trout.

The tribes chipped in $4.8 million, half the purchase price, and the Trust for Public Lands put together the other half. The two parties recently completed a plan to manage the property jointly, said the Salish and Kootenai tribal chairman, James Steele Jr.

Plum Creek, based in Seattle, changed its corporate structure in 1999 to become a real estate investment trust. Some Plum Creek property has been bought by conservation groups, including about 68,000 acres in the Blackfoot Valley northwest of Helena. Negotiations continue for more conservation sales, with money surging into funds organized by groups like the Nature Conservancy and the Trust for Public Lands.

Mr. Holley, the Plum Creek executive, said that his company was committed to both the timber and real estate businesses, but that only a small percentage of its land, perhaps 30,000 acres or so, had the combination of attractions—proximity to public lands but also to other amenities, like shopping and restaurants—to make sale for development feasible.

The Forest Service, meanwhile, is struggling to find its own balance. A spokesman for the agency said that the national forests across the West were increasingly tilting toward recreation and away from logging. But, the growth in population on the forests' edge also means more need than ever to thin the trees, through some logging, if only for wildfire protection.

Tom Tidwell, the regional forester for 25 million acres of national forest that includes Montana, northern Idaho, North Dakota and part of South Dakota, said the Forest Service was eager to keep timber companies in business to help with the thinning.

''We're more in the need of the industry,'' Mr. Tidwell said. ''It's essential that we have someone to do that work so that taxpayers don't have to pay for it.''

One broiling and unresolved issue is who gets to use the land as it changes hands.

Most private timber tracts in the West, including those owned by Plum Creek, have traditionally been open to recreational use, treated as public entry ways into the vast national forests, grasslands and wilderness. areas that in Montana alone add up to nearly 46,000 square miles, about the size of New York State. But in many places, the new owners are throwing up no trespassing signs and fences, blocking what generations of residents across the West have taken for granted—open and beckoning access into the woods to fish, hunt and camp.

''Part of our character is that we have so much big sky and open country,'' said Gov. Brian Schweitzer of Montana, a Democrat who has publicly sparred with Plum Creek about its land sales. ''We're going to have to be creative. There's no textbook written on how to do this.''

So the proposal at issue here is something different. It would provide a new category of tax credit bonds and establish a national program allowing the issuance of $500 million in tax-exempt timber conservation bonds. The way it's structured, the bonds will be issued by a nonprofit organization whose holdings consist primarily of forest lands. Their board of directors would include specified representation of public officials as well as conservation organizations. The funds from the bonds will be used to purchase sizable tracts of forest lands, a minimum of 40,000 acres protected from the kind of development I was referencing earlier. And this acreage would have to be adjacent to U.S. Forest Service lands, basically leveraging the critical area already protected in Forest Service holdings. At least half of the land acquired would be transferred to the Forest Service. The development in previously forest lands not only diminishes substantially the public use and enjoyment potential of this property; it increases significantly the public cost.

We've all seen these forest fires across the West and the lavish homes they have taken out. We've also witnessed the extraordinary taxpayer dollars spent fighting to the very best effort of our talented firefighters, trying to protect these beautiful, extraordinary properties carved into areas that were previously pristine forest.

Now, an issue was raised in terms of whether this was simply too narrow a tax benefit. The bonds sold under this provision would go to numerous holders of qualified forestry conservation bonds; so there's no special earmark-type interest there. And when you consider the fact that half of the holdings have to be transferred to the United States Forest Service, we think everyone in the country is a beneficiary of this provision in that area.

We voted on this once before in the House, debated it as part of the energy bill. It passed 235–181. And at that time a discussion was held. The minority leader raised an issue in terms of whether we ought to be talking about preserving trees and fish or something like that, his argument went, in the context of an energy bill. Well, we decided to at that time—the bill did not ultimately become law; so it's back before us again. But, clearly, there can be no issue raised about its appropriateness for consideration as part of a farm bill. A farm bill is where we address forest issues. General forestry legislation is within the jurisdiction of the Agriculture Committees. We have passed farm bills that have included provisions addressing forestry, especially on private lands. In addition, the U.S. Forest Service is within the jurisdiction of the Department of Agriculture. So we think attaching it to the farm bill certainly makes sense in many respects.

But to be candid, this wasn't a provision that originated in the House. It originated in the Senate. I have been party to discussions now going over the last couple of weeks that have involved many, many issues in difference between the House and the Senate. That's what happens when you reach the final stages of bringing a bill out of conference committee. There are back-and-forth negotiations. And this ended up in the bill, a bill that, in my opinion, was improved in very substantial ways by priorities that we also have in the House. Certainly, the $10.3 billion commitment into nutrition, helping people afford food at a time when the cost of groceries has risen so dramatically, this is going to be a feature directly responsive to priorities we've had in the House. It's all part of the negotiation process. There will be stuff in this bill that I think anyone will like. There will be stuff in this bill that people will be less enthusiastic about. It's a great big bill. But in balance I believe this reasonably is in the package. I like the fact that it addresses this subdividing of this forest land adjacent to the U.S. Forest Service. I like keeping the big tracts and expanding U.S. Forest Service holdings at a time when they're under such extraordinary development pressure, which would take it out of, basically, public access and enjoyment.

So I think that this proposal is fine in the bill, and I would therefore urge a ''no'' vote on the motion to instruct.

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

□ 2300

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the ranking member on the Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from Louisiana, as much time as he may consume.

Mr. MCCRERY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I reluctantly rise to educate the House on a provision that was in the Senate version of the farm bill, and according to reports as being considered for inclusion in the conference report. I say ''reluctantly,'' Mr. Speaker, because my good friend, Mr. BAUCUS, is the sponsor of this provision in the Senate bill, and I certainly respect the right of any Member to try to bring Federal dollars to his district. But that is exactly what this is. And it ought to be exposed for that. It is not a tax provision really. It is a really more like an appropriation.

And my good friend on the Ways and Means Committee, Mr. POMEROY, said that, well, this is not really just for one entity, there will be lots of bondholders, so this money will be spread out among numerous bondholders. That's true. It will be. But that evades the point. The point is that the way the provision is written in the Senate bill would limit the application of these bonds to one specific piece of property in the United States.

Now I will read to you the criteria that lead us to that conclusion. First, ''some portion of the land must be adjacent to United States Forest Service land.'' Well there's lots of parcels of land like that around the United States.

But second, ''at least half of the land acquired must be transferred to the United States Forest Service at no net cost to the United States and not more than half of the land acquired may either remain with or be donated to a State.'' Again that's fine. Nothing wrong with that.

Third, and this is where it begins to tighten, ''the amount of acreage acquired must be at least 40,000 acres,'' a fairly large parcel. And then fourth, ''all of the land must be subject to a native fish habitat conservation plan approved by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service.''

So upon examination of all the parcels of land in the United States, only one meets this criteria. And it happens to be a large piece of land of which about 90 percent of it is in the State of Montana. And it is owned by one landowner in the State of Montana.

So, Mr. Speaker, even though, yes, there will be scores, hundreds, thousands maybe of bondholders, they're not going to be the ones getting $500 million for a piece of property. It is one landowner. And the taxpayers will be footing about $200 million of the bill.

Now that is like an appropriation. That is a $200 million appropriation basically to the Nature Conservancy which will buy the land and give the money to the current landowner. So let's call it what it is. It's an earmark. It's an appropriation disguised very cleverly as a forest tax credit bond.

Now, this provision could have been written to apply to any property in the United States so that anybody who wanted to set aside land could utilize these bonds. But it wasn't. It was restricted to this one piece of property. It's a rifle shot. It's an earmark.

And Mr. CANTOR's intention, I believe, is to educate the House of this and to say, and I agree with him, that this has no place in the farm bill. It ought to be in an appropriations bill. It ought to be clearly defined as an earmark for the purchase of this piece of property.

Now I don't know if $500 million is an appropriate amount of money for this piece of property. I don't know what Nature Conservancy might have offered for this piece of property. But my guess is that when you have a $200 million subsidy from the taxpayers, it just might distort the market. It just might raise the value of land in that particular parcel and all around that parcel.

So I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the gentleman's motion to instruct conferees is well placed. This ought not be in the farm bill. And frankly this farm tax credit idea ought not be used to distort the market for real estate anywhere in the country, and certainly not on a piece of property this big in one location.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I would just say that the Plum Creek Forest tax credit scheme is plumb wrong. This is the ''bridge to nowhere'' of the farm bill. This has no business being in the farm bill. This is clearly, as the gentleman from Louisiana said, an earmark directed at one wealthy landowner. And this is why the American people are sick and tired of the way this town does business.

We owe it to the public. They deserve better. Let's call this what it is. The Plum Creek Forest is plumb wrong. This is a ''bridge to nowhere'' in the farm bill. That is why, Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this motion to instruct the House conferees.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POMEROY. I have enormous respect for each of the speakers, my friends, on the other side. I think they have made their points well. But I would like us to come back to really what's at stake with the issue in front of us. Essentially, we want to avoid a bridge to wealthy development communities placed into pristine forest lands adjacent to U.S. forests. I earlier referenced a New York Times article covering this extraordinary development pressure that's on these lands.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. POMEROY. I would be happy to yield.

Mr. CANTOR. I would ask my good friend from North Dakota, what is the date on that article in the New York Times?

Mr. POMEROY. October 17, 2007.

Mr. CANTOR. So clearly, Mr. Speaker, I would ask the gentleman, I would imagine that the economic times surrounding that article 6, 8 months ago certainly may have been different than they are today. We have been on the floor all day, and will continue to be on the floor tomorrow, talking about the housing crisis and the plummeting real estate values.

Let's face it. If you have got 40,000 acres of land today, and that land was scheduled for development and sale of parcels, that land is not worth what it was in the fall of 2007.

Mr. POMEROY. Reclaiming my time.

Well, my friend, I think we are talking about a different section of the economy. In fact, economic analysis of the functioning economy shows that there has been extraordinary wage growth of the wealthiest 1 percent, top 10 percent, consumptive patterns have continued unabated at the peak earning levels in our economy. And it is those people that are the customers for this land. This isn't your average Joe deciding, hey, Ma, let's move to Montana and buy a little forest land. No. There's no jobs there other than former timber industry jobs. The economy is in transition there. These are wealthy people that want to have essentially recreational property in areas we can't imagine.

One of the individuals referenced in that article has invested about $125 million in Montana. It talks about his not liking what a logging company was doing. They began logging too much of the view in front of his yard. So he bought the land. He bought all the mountain that they were mining on. That's the kind of guy that we are talking about.

They talk about another guy here. They quoted a man named Michael Carricarte who bought an 800-acre property in Glenwood Springs, Colorado, in 2005. He has got the place bordered on three sides by Federal land. And he is now asking $23.5 million for it.

This isn't the kind of property that is involved with our earlier discussion about the housing crisis. This is quite a different deal entirely. And it is for those reasons that I think it is important that we act to preserve the public interest.

We are in a recession. But it is not a recession that is diminishing the development pressure on forest lands. And we are not going to be in a recession forever. And that pressure, especially as baby boomers age and have this disposable income, is only going to continue. In fact, they talk about the pressure being extraordinary. And again, in Montana, more than 1 million acres are under threat alone.

So basically this provision has been fashioned, and if you think about it, a 40,000-acre minimum, it is entirely protected by Fish and Wildlife plans. Now my friend, Mr. MCCRERY, cites that as a negative thing. I think essentially if the goal of this is to try and preserve property, it might be a good thing. And of course there is a provision for a perpetual conservation easement. So really the aim of this, and I think it will achieve it, is to make certain we don't have private development, little lots with great big houses chunked into the pristine forest. We would like to preserve this. We would like to actually expand the holdings of the U.S. Forest

Service and have the land adjacent to it protected under perpetual conservation easement.

So all in all, there certainly is a sound rationale behind this proposal. It was included in the negotiations back and forth between the House and the Senate. And again it certainly invites the kind of questions and scrutiny that this provision has been put under tonight. But I think when you think about the importance in this country of preserving for general public use and enjoyment, we certainly come down on the right side as compared to dividing this into little lots and having that kind of development in this area.

So I think that we have covered the area. Is the gentleman ready to close? If so, I will wrap up now or I will reserve the time.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I just have one additional comment to make.

Mr. POMEROY. I think that we have discussed this at the end of a long day. I will reserve the balance of my time, but if the gentleman's comments are in the nature of a close, then I'll yield back without saying anything further.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman. And I admire him for his valiant effort to defend this provision in the Senate-passed farm bill. He did a great job.

Mr. Speaker, I just still believe that if we were serious in wanting to preserve land adjacent to Federal forest and parkland, we would have a provision here, maybe not in the farm bill, but a provision in a program authorizing some legitimate awarding of bonds, wherever the program deemed appropriate, not so narrowly drawn that the $500 million could only be used to purchase one particular parcel.

I think anyone looking at this would have to conclude that the aim was to afford the current landowner the ability to sell the land in this difficult climate.

So Mr. Speaker, the Plum Creek Forest and the bond programs associated therewith is plumb wrong. This is a ''bridge to nowhere.'' This is where America, once again, will be let down by the actions of this House if this provision is allowed to stay in.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to instruct.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR).

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. CANTOR. 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, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

□ 2315

CONTINUATION OF NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO SYRIA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 110–109)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice, stating that the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13338 of May 11, 2004, and expanded in scope in Executive Order 13399 of April 25, 2006, and Executive Order 13460 of February 13, 2008, authorizing the blocking of property of certain persons and prohibiting the exportation and re-exportation of certain goods to Syria, is to continue in effect beyond May 11, 2008.

The actions of the Government of Syria in supporting terrorism, interfering in Lebanon, pursuing weapons of mass destruction and missile programs including the recent revelation of illicit nuclear cooperation with North Korea, and undermining U.S. and international efforts with respect to the stabilization and reconstruction of Iraq pose a continuing unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States. For these reasons, I have determined that it is necessary to continue in effect the national emergency declared with respect to this threat and to maintain in force the sanctions I have ordered to address this national emergency.

GEORGE W. BUSH.
THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 7, 2008*.

AGREEMENT WITH CZECH REPUBLIC ON SOCIAL SECURITY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 110–110)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to section 233(e)(1) of the Social Security Act, as amended by the Social Security Amendments of 1977 (Public Law 95–216, 42 U.S.C. 433(e)(1)), I transmit herewith the Agreement Between the United States of America and the Czech Republic on Social Security, which consists of two separate instruments: a principal agreement and an administrative arrangement. The Agreement was signed in Prague on September 7, 2007.

The United States-Czech Republic Agreement is similar in objective to the social security agreements already in force with Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Chile, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Korea, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, and the United Kingdom. Such bilateral agreements provide for limited coordination between the United States and foreign social security systems to eliminate dual social security coverage and taxation, and to help prevent the lost benefit protection that can occur when workers divide their careers between two countries. The United States-Czech Republic Agreement contains all provisions mandated by section 233 and other provisions that I deem appropriate to carry out the purposes of section 233, pursuant to section 233(c)(4).

I also transmit for the information of the Congress a report prepared by the Social Security Administration explaining the key points of the Agreement, along with a paragraph-by-paragraph explanation of the provisions of the principal agreement and the related administrative arrangement. Annexed to this report is the report required by section 233(e)(1) of the Social Security Act, which describes the effect of the Agreement on income and expenditures of the U.S. Social Security program and the number of individuals affected by the Agreement. The Department of State and the Social Security Administration have recommended the Agreement and related documents to me.

I commend to the Congress the United States-Czech Republic Social Security Agreement and related documents.

GEORGE W. BUSH.
THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 7, 2008*.

FORECLOSURES AND CONSUMER CONFIDENCE

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today, we were discussing very important legislative initiatives dealing with the Neighborhood Stabilization Act that would give $15 billion to reclaim foreclosed homes, and an important legislative initiative, the American Housing Rescue and Foreclosure Prevention Act that would revise a number of the GSEs like Freddie Mac and Fannie Mae, all to help the American people.

In my discussion on the floor of the House, I indicated that we are moving

toward a recession and a depression. The gentleman who was then managing the rule, H. Res. 1175, indicated that we as Democrats must stop telling untruths. To that I asked the gentleman whether or not he was calling me a liar.

I wish to read into the RECORD that when that inquiry was made, the gentleman responded, as I said, I assume that he was not suggesting that I am a liar. The gentleman said ''I did not suggest that at all.''

It is important to note that America is suffering. Between 7,000 and 8,000 people a day are filing for foreclosures and that consumer confidence is down. We are moving toward a recession and maybe a depression.

LET MEMBERS HAVE INPUT IN THE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE

(Mr. LEWIS of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express to the House my concern about the fact that Chairman OBEY and Speaker PELOSI are very, very busy these days. If news reports are to be believed, it's apparent that they're going about doing all of the work of the Appropriations Committee as well as the House almost all alone with almost no input from Democrats or Republicans from the House.

Because of that busy schedule, I have been writing to Mr. OBEY of late. I have sent him three letters altogether. Last Thursday, I sent him a letter that was signed by the entire Republican membership of the Appropriations Committee urging him to have regular order and full hearings on the supplemental that is before us that represents a huge portion of our spending, and yet there has been no hearing whatsoever.

Just in case Mr. OBEY hasn't seen this letter because his staff is very busy, I know, working on these projects, I would like to submit that letter for the RECORD and urge the House to urge the leadership to allow us to have public hearings so that Members can have input regarding their districts' needs on this very, very important part of this year's work.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
Washington, DC, May 1, 2008.

Hon. DAVID OBEY,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In the absence of any response from you to my April 21st and April 24th letters, and recognizing Senator Byrd's immediate response to the Republican Senators from his Committee, we are writing to once again express our grave concerns over media reports that your leadership plans to unilaterally, and without Member input, write and take to the House floor the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations bill under a closed rule and bypass full Appropriations Committee consideration. Such action would be an historical and unprecedented abdication of responsibility for the House Appropriations Committee and would be viewed by many in both parties as a shameful power grab by House and Senate leaders.

Senator Byrd, who recognizes the slippery slope involved in circumventing the well-established rules and precedents of the Appropriations Committee, has scheduled a frill Senate Appropriations Committee markup for the week of May 5th. We urge you in the strongest possible terms to follow Senator Byrd's example and schedule a full Committee markup in the House at the earliest possible date.

It is only right and fair that you allow Members of our Committee—Republicans and Democrats—to do the work they were elected to do. We are extremely troubled by the fact that under this scheme no Member of the House will be afforded the opportunity to offer amendments in full Committee or on the House floor while Senators in the other body will be given the opportunity to let their constituent's voices be heard. We must act expeditiously to move through full Committee and onto the floor a clean Emergency Supplemental, free of extraneous funding and policy provisions, to address the urgent needs of our troops and their families.

On October 20, 2006 then Minority Leader Nancy Pelosi wrote in a letter to then-Speaker Hastert: ''We must restore bipartisanship to the administration of the House, reestablish regular order for considering legislation. and ensure the rights of the minority, whichever party is in the minority. The voice of every American has a right to be heard.''

Again, we urge you and Speaker Pelosi to stand by those words. Historical precedent and tradition dictates that this legislation be fashioned in an open and transparent process, and ensure full participation by both parties—not behind closed doors but in the full light of day. As the Speaker stated less than two years ago, every Member of the Appropriations Committee and, indeed, every Member of the House and their constituents deserve to have their voices heard.

We look forward to your timely response.

Sincerely,

Jerry Lewis; C.W. Bill Young; Ralph Regula; Harold Rogers; Frank R. Wolf; James T. Walsh; David L. Hobson; Joe Knollenberg; Jack Kingston; Rodney P. Frelinghuysen.

Todd Tiahrt; Zach Wamp; Tom Latham; Robert B. Aderholt; Jo Ann Emerson; Kay Granger; John E. Peterson; Virgil H. Goode, Jr.; Ray LaHood; Dave Weldon.

Michael K. Simpson; John Abney Culberson; Mark Steven Kirk; Ander Crenshaw; Dennis R. Rehberg; John R. Carter; Rodney Alexander; Ken Calvert; Jo Bonner.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. POE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. WOOLSEY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. JONES of North Carolina addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. WELLER of Illinois addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

SUNSET MEMORIAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FRANKS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Madam Speaker, I stand once again before this House with yet another Sunset Memorial.

It is May 7, 2008, in the land of the free and the home of the brave, and before the sun set today in America, almost 4,000 more defenseless unborn children were killed by abortion on demand. That's just today, Madam Speaker. That's more than the number of innocent lives lost on September 11 in this country, only it happens every day.

It has now been exactly 12,889 days since the tragedy called Roe v. Wade was first handed down. Since then, the very foundation of this Nation has been stained by the blood of almost 50 million of its own children. Some of them, Madam Speaker, died and screamed as they did so, but because it was amniotic fluid passing over the vocal cords instead of air, no one could hear them.

And all of them had at least four things in common. First, they were each just little babies who had done nothing wrong to anyone, and each one of them died a nameless and lonely death. And each one of their mothers, whether she realizes it or not, will never be quite the same. And all the gifts that these children might have brought to humanity are now lost forever. Yet even in the glare of such

tragedy, this generation still clings to a blind, invincible ignorance while history repeats itself and our own silent genocide mercilessly annihilates the most helpless of all victims, those yet unborn.

Madam Speaker, perhaps it's time for those of us in this Chamber to remind ourselves of why we are really all here. Thomas Jefferson said, "The care of human life and its happiness and not its destruction is the chief and only object of good government." The phrase in the 14th Amendment capsulizes our entire Constitution, it says, "No State shall deprive any person of life, liberty or property without due process of law." Madam Speaker, protecting the lives of our innocent citizens and their constitutional rights is why we are all here.

The bedrock foundation of this Republic is the clarion declaration of the self-evident truth that all human beings are created equal and endowed by their Creator with the unalienable rights of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. Every conflict and battle our Nation has ever faced can be traced to our commitment to this core, self-evident truth.

It has made us the beacon of hope for the entire world. Madam Speaker, it is who we are.

And yet today another day has passed, and we in this body have failed again to honor that foundational commitment. We have failed our sworn oath and our God-given responsibility as we broke faith with nearly 4,000 more innocent American babies who died today without the protection we should have given them.

Madam Speaker, let me conclude in the hope that perhaps someone new who heard this Sunset Memorial tonight will finally embrace the truth that abortion really does kill little babies; that it hurts mothers in ways that we can never express; and that 12,889 days spent killing nearly 50 million unborn children in America is enough to find a better way for mothers and their unborn babies than abortion on demand.

So tonight, Madam Speaker, may we each remind ourselves that our own days in this sunshine of life are also numbered and that all too soon each one of us will walk from these Chambers for the very last time.

And if it should be that this Congress is allowed to convene on yet another day to come, may that be the day when we finally hear the cries of innocent unborn children. May that be the day when we find the humanity, the courage, and the will to embrace together our human and our constitutional duty to protect these, the least of our tiny, little American brothers and sisters from this murderous scourge upon our Nation called abortion on demand.

It is May 7, 2008, 12,889 days since Roe versus Wade first stained the foundation of this Nation with the blood of its own children, this in the land of the free and the home of the brave.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MOORE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. MOORE of Kansas addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. RYAN of Ohio addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CANNON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. CANNON addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. SCHMIDT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. SCHMIDT addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. TANCREDO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. TIM MURPHY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. FOXX addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DREIER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BOUSTANY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BOUSTANY addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CARSON of Indiana (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for May 5 and 6.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for May 5 on account of district work.

Ms. KILPATRICK (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for May 5 on account of personal reasons.

Ms. RICHARDSON (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for May 6 after 7:30 p.m. and for the balance of the week on account of death in the family.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for May 5, 6 and before 2:30 p.m. today on account of business in the district.

Mr. CONAWAY (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for after 3:30 p.m. May 6 and today on account of attending a funeral of a soldier killed in action.

Mr. CAMPBELL of California (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for May 5, 6 and today on account of illness.

Mr. CULBERSON (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for May 5 on account of official business.

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for May 5 on account of family business.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for May 5 and 6 on account of the North Carolina primary elections.

Mr. WAMP (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for May 5 on account of a family commitment.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MCCRERY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. POE, for 5 minutes, May 8, 12, 13 and 14.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina, for 5 minutes, May 8, 12, 13 and 14.

Mr. WELLER of Illinois, for 5 minutes, today and May 8.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, for 5 minutes, today and May 8.

Mr. MORAN of Kansas, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CANNON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BILIRAKIS, for 5 minutes, May 8.

Mrs. SCHMIDT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. TANCREDO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania, for 5 minutes, today, May 8 and 9.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, for 5 minutes, today and May 8.

Ms. FOXX, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, today, May 8 and 9.

Mr. DREIER, for 5 minutes, today, May 8 and 9.

Mr. BOUSTANY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. KLINE of Minnesota, for 5 minutes, May 8.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Ms. Lorraine C. Miller, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 3522. An act to ratify a conveyance of a portion of the Jicarilla Apache Reservation to Rio Arriba County, State of New Mexico, pursuant to the settlement of litigation between the Jicarilla Apache Nation and Rio Arriba County, State of New Mexico, to authorize issuance of a patent for said lands, and to change the exterior boundary of the Jicarilla Apache Reservation accordingly, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5919. An act to make technical corrections regarding the Newborn Screening Saves Lives Act of 2007.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Lorraine C. Miller, Clerk of the House, reports that on May 1, 2008, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills.

H.R. 3196. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 20 Sussex Street in Port Jervis, New York, as the ''E. Arthur Gray Post Office Building''.

H.R. 3468. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1704 Weeksville Road in Elizabeth City, North Carolina, as the ''Dr. Clifford Bell Jones, Sr., Post Office''.

H.R. 3532. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 5815 McLeod Street in Lula, Georgia, as the ''Private Johnathon Millican Lula Post Office''.

H.R. 3720. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 424 Clay Avenue in Waco, Texas, as the ''Army PFC Juan Alonso Covarrubias Post Office Building''.

H.R. 3803. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 3100 Cashwell Drive in Goldsboro, North Carolina, as the ''John Henry Wooten, Sr., Post Office Building''.

H.R. 3936. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 116 Helen Highway in Cleveland, Georgia, as the ''Sgt. Jason Harkins Post Office Building''.

H.R. 3988. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 3701 Altamesa Boulevard in Fort Worth, Texas, as the ''Master Sergeant Kenneth N. Mack Post Office Building''.

H.R. 4166. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 701 East Copeland Drive in Lebanon, Missouri, as the ''Steve W. Allee Carrier Annex''.

H.R. 4203. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 3035 Stone Mountain Street in Lithonia, Georgia, as the ''Specialist Jamaal RaShard Addison Post Office Building''.

H.R. 4211. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 725 Roanoke Avenue in Roanoke Rapids, North Carolina, as the ''Judge Richard B. Allsbrook Post Office''.

H.R. 4240. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 10799 West Alameda Avenue in Lakewood, Colorado, as the ''Felix Sparks Post Office Building''.

H.R. 4286. To award a congressional gold medal to Daw Aung San Suu Kyi in recognition of her courageous and unwavering commitment to peace, nonviolence, human rights, and democracy in Burma.

H.R. 4454. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 3050 Hunsinger Lane in Louisville, Kentucky, as the ''Iraq and Afghanistan Fallen Military Heroes of Louisville Memorial Post Office Building'', in honor of the servicemen and women from Louisville, Kentucky, who died in service during Operation Enduring Freedom and Operation Iraqi Freedom.

H.R. 5135. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 201 West Greenway Street in Derby, Kansas, as the ''Sergeant Jamie O. Maugans Post Office Building''.

H.R. 5220. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 3800 SW. 185th Avenue in Beaverton, Oregon, as the ''Major Arthur Chin Post Office Building''.

H.R. 5400. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 160 East Washington Street in Chagrin Falls, Ohio, as the ''Sgt. Michael M. Kashkoush Post Office Building''.

H.R. 5472. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2650 Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. Street, Indianapolis, Indiana, as the ''Julia M. Carson Post Office Building''.

H.R. 5489. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 6892 Main Street in Gloucester, Virginia, as the ''Congresswoman Jo Ann S. Davis Post Office''.

ADJOURNMENT

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 24 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 8, 2008, at 10 a.m.

OATH OF OFFICE MEMBERS, RESIDENT COMMISSIONER, AND DELEGATES

The oath of office required by the sixth article of the Constitution of the United States, and as provided by section 2 of the act of May 13, 1884 (23 Stat. 22), to be administered to Members, Resident Commissioner, and Delegates of the House of Representatives, the text of which is carried in 5 U.S.C. 3331:

> ''I, AB, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God.''

has been subscribed to in person and filed in duplicate with the Clerk of the House of Representatives by the following Member of the 110th Congress, pursuant to the provisions of 2 U.S.C. 25:

STEVE SCALISE, Louisiana, First.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

6443. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Spirodiclofen; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2007-0398; FRL-8362-2] received April 31, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6444. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Pyridalyl; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2004-0306; FRL-8361-4] received April 31, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6445. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Chlorantraniliprole; Pesticide Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2007-0275; FRL-8357-3] received April 31, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6446. A letter from the Chairman, Commission on the National Guard and Reserves, transmitting the Commission's final report entitled, ''Transforming the National Guard and Reserves into a 21st-Century Operational Force''; to the Committee on Armed Services.

6447. A letter from the Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting the 2007 Annual Report regarding the Department's enforcement activities under the Equal Credit Opportunity Act, pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 1691f; to the Committee on Financial Services.

6448. A letter from the Chairman, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting the Board's report pursuant to the Buy American Act, pursuant to 41 U.S.C. 10a(b); to the Committee on Financial Services.

6449. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a draft bill that would eliminate the four-year limitation on contracts for the manufacture of distinctive paper for United States currency and securities; to the Committee on Financial Services.

6450. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a draft bill, ''To authorize United States participation in, and appropriations

for, the United States to contribute to an international clean technology fund''; to the Committee on Financial Services.

6451. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Economic Policy, Department of the Treasury, transmitting two reports entitled, ''Social Security Reform: Benchmarks for Assessing Fairness and Benefit Adequacy'' and ''Social Security Reform: Mechanisms for Achieving True Pre-Funding''; to the Committee on Financial Services.

6452. A letter from the General Counsel, National Credit Union Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Procedures for Debt Collection — received April 18, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

6453. A letter from the Program Manager, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Grants to States for Operation of Qualified High Risk Pools [CMS-2260-F] (RIN: 0938-AO46) received April 24, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6454. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Change of Address for Submission of Certain Reports; Technical Correction [FRL-8563-1] received April 31, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6455. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Revised PM2.5 Motor Vehicle Emissions Budget; State of New Jersey [EPA-R02-OAR-2008-0005; FRL-8562-1] received April 31, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6456. A letter from the Assistant Secretary Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report on International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) technical assistance to Iran during calendar year 2007, pursuant to Public Law 107-228; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6457. A letter from the General Counsel, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting the Office's final rule — Cost Accounting Standards Board; Contract Clauses — received April 9, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6458. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's study report on the Angel Island Immigration Station and the Pacific Coast Immigration Museum; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6459. A letter from the Executive Director, Pacific Fishery Management Council, transmitting the Council's recommendations for international actions to address overfishing of Eastern Pacific Yellowfin Tuna in compliance with Section 304(i)(2)(B) the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6460. A letter from the Assistant Secretary Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's final rule — Visas: Documentation of Nonimmigrants under the Immigration and Nationality Act, as Amended [Public Notice:] received April 29, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6461. A letter from the Acting Administrator, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's report on the foreign aviation authorities to which the Federal Aviation Administration provided services for Fiscal Year 2007, pursuant to Public Law 103-305, section 202; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6462. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Federal Maritime Commission, transmitting the Commission's report on the amount of acquisitions made by the commission from entities that manufacture articles, materials or supplies outside the United States, pursuant to Section 641 of the Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2005; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6463. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Federal Maritime Commission, transmitting the 46th Annual Report of the activities of the Commission for fiscal year 2007, which ended September 30, 2007, pursuant to 46 U.S.C. app. 1118; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6464. A letter from the Vice President, Government Affairs and Corporate Communications, National Railroad Passenger Corporation, transmitting Amtrak's Grant and Legislative Request for FY09 and other materials, pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 24315(a); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6465. A letter from the President and CEO, Pacific Maritime Association, transmitting the Association's 2007 Annual Report; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6466. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's report entitled, ''Department of Energy FY 2006 — FY 2007 Methane Hydrate Report to Congress,'' pursuant to Section 4(e)(5) of the Methane Hydrate Research Act of 2000; to the Committee on Science and Technology.

6467. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's views on H.R. 4847, the United States Fire Administration (USFA) Reauthorization Act of 2007; to the Committee on Science and Technology.

6468. A letter from the Chairman, National Science Board, transmitting the Board's report entitled, ''International Science and Engineering Partnership: A Priority for U.S. Foreign Policy and Our Nation's Innovation Enterprise''; to the Committee on Science and Technology.

6469. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Tier 1 Issue — Section 965 Foreign Earnings Repatriation Directive #2 [LMSB Control No: LMSB-4-0408-021] received April 23, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6470. A letter from the Acting Assistant Director, Directives and Regulations Branch, Office of Regulatory and Management Services, USDA, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — National Forest System Land Management Planning (RIN: 0596-AB86) received April 18, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); jointly to the Committees on Natural Resources and Agriculture.

6471. A letter from the Program Manager, CMM, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's ''Major'' final rule — Medicare Program; Inpatient Psychiatric Facilities Prospective Payment System Payment Update for Rate Year Beginning July 1, 2008 (RY 2008) [CMS-1401-N] (RIN: 0938-AO92) received May 2, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

6472. A letter from the Program Manager, CMS, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's ''Major'' final rule — Medicare Program; Prospective Payment System for Long-Term Care Hospitals RY 2009: Annual Payment Rate Updates, Policy Changes, and Clarifications; and Electronic Submission of Cost Reports: Revision to Effective Date of Cost Reporting Period [CMS-13930f] (RIN: 0938-AO94) received May 2, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

6473. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting an annual report of the Department's Office of Civil Rights and Civil Liberties for fiscal year 2007, pursuant to 6 U.S.C. 345(b); jointly to the Committees on Homeland Security and the Judiciary.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi (for himself and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas):

H.R. 5982. A bill to direct the Secretary of Homeland Security, for purposes of transportation security, to conduct a study on how airports can transition to uniform, standards-based, and interoperable biometric identifier systems for airport workers with unescorted access to secure or sterile areas of an airport, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. LANGEVIN (for himself and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi):

H.R. 5983. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to enhance the information security of the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland (for himself, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. WAMP, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. KIRK, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. HERGER, Mr. GINGREY, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. PITTS, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Ms. FALLIN, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. PETRI, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. PENCE, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. UPTON, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. GERLACH, and Mr. DENT):

H.R. 5984. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the limited continuation of clean energy production incentives and incentives to improve energy efficiency in order to prevent a downturn in these sectors that would result from a lapse in the tax law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRALEY of Iowa:

H.R. 5985. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to clarify the service treatable as service engaged in combat with the enemy for utilization of non-official evidence for proof of service-connection in a combat-related disease or injury; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BURGESS:

H.R. 5986. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to immediately terminate the excise tax on diesel fuel and the tax credits for ethanol and other alcohol fuels; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. DRAKE (for herself and Mr. BILIRAKIS):

H.R. 5987. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to guarantee a pay increase for members of the uniformed services for fiscal years 2010 through 2013 of one-half of one percentage point higher than the Employment

Cost Index; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HINCHEY (for himself, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. LEE, Mr. KUCINICH, and Ms. WOOLSEY):

H.R. 5988. A bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act to impose a cap on the rate of interest that may be charged on consumer credit card accounts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. KENNEDY (for himself and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN):

H.R. 5989. A bill to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to implement a National Neurotechnology Initiative, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MATHESON (for himself and Mr. TERRY):

H.R. 5990. A bill to require ratings label on video games and to prohibit the sales and rentals of adult-rated video games to minors; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. PAUL:

H.R. 5991. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax relief for obtaining transportation worker identification credentials; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHULER:

H.R. 5992. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a refundable credit against income tax for the purchase of real property by a first-time purchaser; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California:

H. Con. Res. 343. Concurrent resolution congratulating the Surety and Fidelity Association of America on its 100th anniversary; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas (for herself, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. KILPATRICK, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. COHEN, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. WYNN, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. HARE, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. SUTTON, Ms. LEE, Mr. KLEIN of Florida, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. KIND, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. SIRES, Mr. ARCURI, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. BACA, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. CARSON, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. WATSON, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Ms. WATERS):

H. Con. Res. 344. Concurrent resolution recognizing that we are facing a global food crisis; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TIBERI (for himself, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. EHLERS, and Mr. GORDON):

H. Con. Res. 345. Concurrent resolution recognizing the 50th anniversary of the signing of the Antarctic Treaty; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FORBES (for himself, Mr. WITTMAN of Virginia, Mrs. DRAKE, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. GOODE, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. CANTOR, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. WOLF, and Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia):

H. Res. 1178. A resolution expressing the sympathy of the House of Representatives to the citizens of Suffolk, Brunswick, and Colonial Heights, Virginia, over the devastating tornadoes of April 28, 2008; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. GALLEGLY:

H. Res. 1179. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the People's Republic of China and all enterprises owned or controlled by the People's Republic of China should make proper disclosures with the Securities and Exchange Commission regarding the selective default status of certain bonds; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. REICHERT (for himself, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. BILBRAY, and Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland):

H. Res. 1180. A resolution recognizing the efforts and contributions of outstanding women scientists, technologists, engineers, and mathematicians in the United States and around the world on Mother's Day, 2008; to the Committee on Science and Technology.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 88: Mr. MCCOTTER.
H.R. 139: Mr. KUHL of New York.
H.R. 154: Mr. ANDREWS.
H.R. 436: Mr. SESSIONS.
H.R. 510: Mr. BILIRAKIS.
H.R. 579: Mr. FORTUÑO and Mr. FEENEY.
H.R. 618: Mr. BACHUS.
H.R. 661: Mr. KNOLLENBERG.
H.R. 769: Mr. GERLACH.
H.R. 826: Mr. ROGERS of Alabama.
H.R. 872: Mr. CARSON.
H.R. 1014: Mr. RAHALL.
H.R. 1022: Mr. SESTAK, Ms. SCHWARTZ, and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 1046: Mr. KIND.
H.R. 1074: Mr. CARSON.
H.R. 1194: Ms. CLARKE.
H.R. 1283: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.
H.R. 1524: Mrs. MUSGRAVE.
H.R. 1540: Mr. FILNER.
H.R. 1589: Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, and Mr. GOODLATTE.
H.R. 1606: Mr. LIPINSKI.
H.R. 1643: Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN.
H.R. 1655: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia and Mr. WALSH of New York.
H.R. 1688: Mr. SIRES.
H.R. 1755: Mr. MICHAUD.
H.R. 1921: Mr. DELAHUNT.
H.R. 2049: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 2221: Mr. LEVIN, Mr. PASCRELL, and Ms. SCHWARTZ.
H.R. 2267: Mr. MILLER of Florida.
H.R. 2268: Mr. HALL of New York, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. KIRK, Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. UPTON, Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. HULSHOF, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. PENCE, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, and Mr. PERLMUTTER.
H.R. 2275: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.
H.R. 2329: Mr. GONZALEZ.
H.R. 2346: Mr. BURGESS.
H.R. 2357: Mr. FATTAH and Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 2458: Mr. FATTAH.
H.R. 2514: Mr. THOMPSON of California.
H.R. 2550: Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. LAHOOD, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. WALBERG, and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.
H.R. 2580: Mrs. CUBIN.
H.R. 2611: Mr. TIERNEY.
H.R. 2677: Mr. MCCOTTER.
H.R. 2734: Mr. KING of New York.
H.R. 2744: Mr. WILSON of Ohio, Mr. HAYES, and Mr. EDWARDS.
H.R. 2809: Mr. DEFAZIO.
H.R. 2838: Mrs. GILLIBRAND.
H.R. 2965: Mr. WEINER.
H.R. 3021: Mr. SESTAK, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. BACA, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. BOREN, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. FARR, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. CARDOZA, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. HALL of New York, Ms. BEAN, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. EMANUEL, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. TOWNS, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. NADLER, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. HONDA, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. FILNER, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. RUSH, Mr. OLVER, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. THOMPSON of California, and Mr. ENGEL.
H.R. 3089: Mr. TERRY, Mr. WESTMORELAND, and Mr. GOHMERT.
H.R. 3094: Ms. SOLIS.
H.R. 3144: Mr. CARTER, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, and Mr. BISHOP of Utah.
H.R. 3167: Mr. UDALL of Colorado.
H.R. 3202: Mr. WU.
H.R. 3205: Mr. FATTAH.
H.R. 3257: Ms. BERKLEY.
H.R. 3267: Mr. STARK.
H.R. 3289: Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida and Ms. WATERS.
H.R. 3544: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. LOEBSACK, and Mr. CARNEY.
H.R. 3822: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
H.R. 3865: Mr. CARSON, Mr. SALAZAR, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, and Mr. UDALL of New Mexico.
H.R. 3904: Mr. GORDON.
H.R. 4055: Mr. FATTAH.
H.R. 4061: Mrs. TAUSCHER.
H.R. 4088: Mr. GALLEGLY.
H.R. 4141: Mr. LATTA.
H.R. 4188: Mr. WEXLER, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. GILCHREST, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. FATTAH, and Mr. SARBANES.
H.R. 4236: Mr. MARSHALL.
H.R.4237: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.
H.R. 4344: Mr. MCHUGH.
4461: Mr. CAPUANO.
H.R. 4544: Mr. KNOLLENBERG.
H.R. 4690: Mr. SIRES.
H.R. 4807: Mr. CONYERS.
H.R. 4838: Ms. SCHWARTZ.
H.R. 4900: Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. CARDOZA, Mrs. CAPITO, and Mr. WELLER.
H.R. 5231: Mr. LOEBSACK.
H.R. 5236: Mr. UPTON and Mr. DOYLE.
H.R. 5447: Mr. FARR, Mr. STARK, Mr. CARNAHAN, and Ms. CLARKE.
H.R. 5461: Mr. COURTNEY.
H.R. 5516: Mr. FOSTER, Mr. SHULER, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. MURTHA, and Mr. DENT.
H.R. 5534: Ms. HIRONO.
H.R. 5573: Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. MARSHALL, and Ms. BORDALLO.
H.R. 5615: Mr. KING of New York.
H.R. 5629: Mr. HOLDEN.
H.R. 5632: Mr. CARNAHAN and Mrs. MYRICK.
H.R. 5648: Mr. MICHAUD.
H.R. 5669: Mr. HAYES.
H.R. 5678: Ms. LEE.
H.R. 5681: Mr. HONDA.
H.R. 5684: Mr. MCINTYRE.
H.R. 5710: Mr. PEARCE.
H.R. 5716: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 5734: Mrs. CUBIN and Mr. BOOZMAN.

H.R. 5740: Mr. WALBERG, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. CRENSHAW, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. GRAVES, Mr. HULSHOF, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Ms. SPEIER, and Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.

H.R. 5741: Mr. ALLEN.

H.R. 5752: Mr. WALBERG.

H.R. 5759: Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida and Mr. PAUL.

H.R. 5760: Mr. KELLER.

H.R. 5761: Mr. GALLEGLY.

H.R. 5762: Mr. KNOLLENBERG and Mr. FILNER.

H.R. 5784: Mr. GERLACH.

H.R. 5785: Mr. FOSTER.

H.R. 5805: Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. KING of Iowa.

H.R. 5825: Mr. DELAHUNT.

H.R. 5841: Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN.

H.R. 5845: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Mr. BRALEY of Iowa.

H.R. 5846: Ms. SOLIS.

H.R. 5847: Mr. LATTA, Mr. HENSARLING, and Ms. FALLIN.

H.R. 5854: Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. BERMAN, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. MARSHALL.

H.R. 5857: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. KUHL of New York, Mr. WAMP, Mr. DENT, Mr. SIMPSON, and Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois.

H.R. 5886: Mr. HOEKSTRA and Mr. CRAMER.

H.R. 5892: Mr. SALAZAR, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr.GONZALEZ, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. ELLSWORTH, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. TIERNEY, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. ARCURI, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. HARE, Mr. KENNEDY, Mrs. LOWEY, and Mr. FILNER.

H.R. 5898: Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. KUCINICH, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. PORTER, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. SIRES, Mr. HELLER, Mr. KELLER, and Mr. SPACE.

H.R. 5903: Mr. POE.

H.R. 5908: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 5917: Mr. TERRY.

H.R. 5944: Mr. GERLACH and Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.

H.R. 5958: Mr. STARK and Mr. PLATTS.

H.R. 5960: Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. DEFAZIO, and Mr. VISCLOSKY.

H.R. 5961: Mr. HENSARLING.

H.R. 5974: Mr. COLE of Oklahoma, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, and Mrs. DRAKE.

H.R. 5976: Mr. SIMPSON, Ms. CASTOR, and Ms. MATSUI.

H.J. Res. 79: Mr. DOYLE, Mr. KUCINICH, Ms. SOLIS, and Ms. WATSON.

H. Con. Res. 2: Mrs. JONES of Ohio and Mr. FORTUÑO.

H. Con. Res. 223: Mr. GOODE and Mr. SOUDER.

H. Con. Res. 268: Mr. SHAYS.

H. Con. Res. 296: Mr. JEFFERSON and Mr. GERLACH.

H. Con. Res. 331: Ms. SPEIER.

H. Con. Res. 334: Ms. FALLIN, Mr. HENSARLING, and Mr. LINDER.

H. Con. Res. 336: Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. KIND, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. KUHL of New York, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. SOUDER, and Mrs. MUSGRAVE.

H. Con. Res. 338: Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. JEFFERSON, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, and Mr. CARSON.

H. Res. 102: Mr. SHERMAN.

H. Res. 353: Mr. CARNEY and Mr. PAYNE.

H. Res. 369: Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas, Mr. FILNER, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. TANNER, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. COHEN, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. WAXMAN, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. MAHONEY of Florida, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. RAMSTAD, Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. ROSS, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. OLVER, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. COSTA, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Ms. WATSON, Ms. SUTTON, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. SHULER, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. BARROW, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. ROTHMAN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. WALZ of Minnesota, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. CAZAYOUX, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. MELANCON, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Ms. HARMAN, Ms. HOOLEY, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. CLARKE, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mrs. CAPPS, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. FARR, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. ELLSWORTH, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. HARE, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. WU, Mr. BECERRA, Ms. CASTOR, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. HOLT, Mr. KIND, and Mr. ISRAEL.

H. Res. 896: Mr. CHANDLER and Mr. INSLEE.

H. Res. 977: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, and Mr. LIPINSKI.

H. Res. 985: Mr. MATHESON, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. TOWNS, and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H. Res. 1012: Mr. BOSWELL and Mr. KING of Iowa.

H. Res. 1017: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. BORDALLO, and Mr. MCINTYRE.

H. Res. 1022: Mr. BARROW, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. HARE, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. UPTON, Mr. WHITFIELD of Kentucky, and Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico.

H. Res. 1026: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas and Mr. FILNER.

H. Res. 1069: Mr. MCCOTTER.

H. Res. 1086: Mr. RANGEL and Mr. ETHERIDGE.

H. Res. 1108: Mr. GERLACH.

H. Res. 1111: Mr. ABERCROMBIE.

H. Res. 1128: Mr. WALBERG, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. CARTER, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. WAMP, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. HELLER, Mr. MCCARTHY of California, Mr. LATTA, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. SALI, Ms. FOXX, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. WITTMAN of Virginia, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. WALZ of Minnesota, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. CANTOR, Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. SHIMKUS, and Mr. CONAWAY.

H. Res. 1132: Mr. SMITH of Texas.

H. Res. 1135: Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SALI, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. DREIER, Mr. CARTER, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. MCCARTHY of California, Mr. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. LATTA, and Mr. ROSKAM.

H. Res. 1143: Mr. WALBERG, Mr. KUHL of New York, and Mr. MCNULTY.

H. Res. 1144: Mr. ARCURI, Mr. BARROW, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BOREN, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. COSTA, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. HALL of New York, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. REGULA, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. WILSON of Ohio, Mr. WYNN, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. NADLER, Mr. BACA, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. WEINER, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. FARR, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. SHULER, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. BONNER, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, and Mr. GERLACH.

H. Res. 1152: Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. SIRES, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. HARE, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. FEENEY, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. MACK, Mrs. BONO MACK, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. KIND, Mr. GINGREY, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. DEGETTE, Mrs. CAPITO, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. PATRICK MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. WILSON of Ohio, Mr. KLEIN of Florida, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. BARROW, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. SHULER, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. COOPER, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. ISSA, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. EVERETT, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. SHADEGG, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. REHBERG, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. BONNER, Mr. KUHL of New York, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. PETRI, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. MELANCON, Mr. ROSS, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. GORDON, Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. HOLT, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. HOYER, and Mr. BOEHNER.

H. Res. 1165: Mr. WALBERG, Mr. PENCE, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. PITTS, Mr. WAMP, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mrs. MYRICK, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. ISSA, Mr. FEENEY, Mr. GINGREY, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. KUHL of New York, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. AKIN, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. MCNULTY, and Mr. CULBERSON.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

OFFERED BY MRS. BONO MACK

Bill Number: H.R. 4841.

Account: Bureau of Indian Affairs, Indian Land and Water Claim Settlements.

Legal Name of Requesting Entity: Soboba Band of Luiseño Indians.

Address of Requesting Entity: P.O. Box 487, San Jacinto, CA 925816.

Description of Request: Within H.R. 4841, funding is authorized for the Soboba Band of Luiseño Indians (Tribe), as well as those that were party to the Settlement Agreement in the legislation, and overseen by Eastern Municipal Water District, as they will submit a plan to the Secretary of the Interior on behalf of the Water Management Plan. The Tribe is requesting the appropriation of $10,500,000, as authorized by the legislation. Specifically, the Tribe requests $5,500,000 to be appropriated in the FY 2010 budget to the

Soboba Band of Luiseño Indians Water Development Fund to pay or reimburse costs associated with constructing, operating, and maintaining water and sewage infrastructure, and other water-related development projects. The Tribe and other local cities and Water Districts also are interested in $5,500,000 being appropriated in the FY 2010 Budget to San Jacinto Basin Restoration Fund to pay or reimburse the costs associated with constructing, operating, and maintaining the portion of the San Jacinto Basin recharge project. These Funds will be established and authorized for appropriation upon final approval of H.R. 4841.

H.R. 4841 was heard by the House Subcommittee on Water & Power on March 13, 2008. Based upon the strong testimony of Majel Russell, Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary of Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior and the statements made by Members of the Subcommittee, it is my hope that the legislation will be favorably reported by the Subcommittee and full Committee on Natural Resources.

Juistification for Inclusion in FY 2010 Budget: There are several reasons why it is important that this authorization moves forward, so that funding could ideally be reflected in the 2010 Budget. First, the groundwater basin to which the settlement applies is in substantial overdraft. Second, this shortage is further aggravated by current severe drought conditions and by new environmental restrictions on imports via the State Water Project and Colorado River Aqueduct. Finally, the Tribe, as well as the Water Districts and local communities, will incur substantial interest and opportunity costs by delays in appropriations.

CURRENT DROUGHT AND ENVIRONMENTAL RESTRICTIONS ARE IMPACTING WATER REPLENISHMENT

These current activities and situations in California will have an adverse impact on water replenishment to the region:

U.S. District Court Judge Oliver W. Wanger's May 25, 2007 determination on the inadequacy of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Agency's Biological Opinion on the Delta Smelt (See Natural Resources Defense Council v. Dirk Kempthorne, 1:05–CV–01207 OWW);

Seven year drought at the Colorado River basin, according to the Bureau of Reclamation (See http://www.usbr.gov/uc/feature/drought.html (last visited March 20, 2008));

Observation of extensive Quagga Mussel growth in the Colorado River Aqueduct system, according to California Science Advisory Panel (See http://www.dfg.ca.gov/invasives/guaggamussel/does/2007–SAP-Report.pdf, last visited March 20, 2008);

Record low rainfalls in the San Jacinto Valley.

These combined occurrences have eliminated imported water replenishment into the San Jacinto Basin.

WATER DISTRICTS, LOCAL COMMUNITIES AND THE TRIBE WILL FACE SIGNIFICANT FINANCIAL AND OPPORTUNITY IMPACTS FROM A THREE-YEAR SCHEDULE

To meet the original December 31, 2007, contained deadline in the Settlement Agreement, Eastern Municipal Water District and Lake Hemet Municipal Water District, initiated discussions with the Cities of Hemet and San Jacinto to determine the equitable share of each local entity for the construction of the recharge facilities. Based on the discussions between these four local entities (which began several years ago) and the urgency to meet the December 2007 deadline set by the original Settlement Agreement, the local entities decided to initiate construction of recharge facilities in March of 2007. The local parties have been in negotiations for several years on how they would pay for these facilities. The project cost is currently estimated at $23 million, in addition to the existing facilities that are already in place. The groundwater utilization as a water supply by the four local entitles also requires the cities of Hemet and San Jacinto to pay for about one third of the costs related to this project. The timing of the project's financing is thus important to my Congressional District.