truck driver. He joined the U.S. Air Force and spent 4 years in Germany and Libya. When he returned to the United States in 1957, Van Buer moved to DeKalb to attend Northern Illinois University, NIU. He earned a B.S. in social science in 1960 and completed a master's degree in economics in 1964. In 1968, Mayor Van Buer earned a Ph.D. in economics from the University of Illinois. He was tenured on the faculty of the Department of Economics at NIU in 1970, and taught there until 1995.

While on the NIU faculty, Mayor Van Buer gave generously of his skills in administration and budgeting. He directed NIU's Office of Budget and Planning, responsible for the administration of annual operating budgets in excess of $100 million. And he traveled around the world, working in developing nations in Africa and Asia to provide technical assistance in planning and budgeting.

Mayor Van Buer was a man of integrity who strongly believed in open government. Mayor Van Buer was first elected by his community to the DeKalb County Board in 2002, and he was re-elected in 2004. He was elected mayor of DeKalb in 2005. During his tenure as mayor, he made it a priority to revitalize DeKalb's urban core.

In addition to his service at NIU and with the city of DeKalb, Mayor Van Buer was active in leadership with the Ben Gordon Mental Health Center and the Kishwaukee Symphony Orchestra.

My thoughts and prayers are with the mayor's family and friends, especially his wife of over 50 years, Mary Beth, their three children, and five grandchildren.

VOTE EXPLANATION

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, I was unavoidably detained during rollcall vote No. 187, a motion to invoke cloture on the motion to proceed to the consideration of S. 3186, the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance bill. Had I been present I would have voted ''nay'' and I ask that the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD reflect that.

FORECLOSURE PREVENTION ACT

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I am aware of and sympathize with families and individuals in Utah and around the country who, through no willful neglect or bad intentions of their own, are in very difficult circumstances as a result of turbulence in the housing market. Others in the housing industry who have also acted with prudence and good faith have also been caught up in the difficulty. We have had many votes on housing legislation over the past several months, and I have supported measures that I thought would help improve the current situation.

I also understand that housing is a significant sector that affects the broader economy. A stable housing market would go a long way to instilling confidence. My expectation is that the housing sector will stabilize and I hope that it does so with as little exposure as possible to taxpayers.

Our last vote on the substance of the Foreclosure Prevention Act took place on July 11. The bill then went to the House of Representatives, and the House made a few changes and one major addition to the bill. It added what some have called a bailout for the government sponsored enterprises, GSEs.

Before the addition of the GSE provisions, we had a comprehensive bill that was the product of lengthy, bipartisan negotiations. It had provisions aimed at correcting some of the current problems, avoiding future problems, and providing incentive for positive activity in the housing market. Given the bipartisan nature of the bill, it contained many provisions that I support, including tax deductions and incentives.

However, this last addition to the housing bill, which we voted on for the first time today, combined with my other reservations, was more than I was willing to support. The CBO estimates that there is ''a greater than 50 percent chance that the government would provide no financial assistance to the GSEs over the next 17 months.'' I hope the chances are greater than that, but this section of the bill accounts for well over half the cost of the bill. It has the potential, perhaps slight, of costing well into the hundreds of billions of dollars.

To touch on a couple other points of concern, this bill will delay the allocation of worldwide interest expensing rules that I championed in 2004. The delay was included to ''pay'' for other provisions of the bill. I am not sure that the tradeoff is static, and the same can be said of so many other efforts to offset spending by delaying or suspending tax incentives.

Finally, this bill will help some people who deserve it, but it will likely also help many irresponsible lenders, brokers, borrowers that do not. The bill now appears to be headed to the President, and he appears to be ready to sign the bill, in spite of his own reservations.

The housing market will recover. Again, I hope that it does so sooner than later and at the least cost possible to taxpayers. I expect that we will come away from the current situation better able to avoid similar problems in the future.

LOW-INCOME HOME ENERGY ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, the Senate has voted on a motion to proceed to a vote on S. 3186, a bill to provide funding for the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program, or LIHEAP. I have a long history of supporting the LIHEAP program and have voted for almost every increase in the program that has been proposed in Congress.

This vote was different. It was not a vote about making sure our low income citizens have the heating and cooling assistance they need because they already do under the existing program. There is $100 million still left in the program, and most of that money was for heating last winter. So what's the emergency here? On top of the existing surplus in the program, the program will also be fully funded for the coming winter when we pass a continuing resolution which will keep all the government programs running at the level they were funded last year. So let's not pretend that LIHEAP is not in place or that it won't be funded for the coming year.

Each year the Congress appropriates the Government funding needs through 13 appropriations bills. Each bill is handled by separate subcommittees of the full Senate Committee on Appropriations. I applaud the Appropriations Committee and its subcommittees, because they have done a good job of preparing and marking up their various appropriations bills.

But there's just one problem. Our majority leader has announced that we will not be passing any of those bills this year, and instead will be passing the continuing resolution I just referred to. Why this announcement? Why can't we pass any appropriations bills this year? Well, I can tell you Mr. President that the Republicans have many amendments prepared for those bills that would allow our Nation to produce more domestic oil, but the anti-oil extremists calling the shots in the Democrat Party cannot allow votes on finding more oil because they know such votes would succeed.

Unfortunately for the Democrat Party, the poor are beginning to wake up that the liberals they have always looked to are behind the war on the poor. By war on the poor I refer to the movement by the anti-oil extremists to close off every good domestic oil resource, which is a direct cause of the high energy prices Americans face.

Democrats in Congress have been forced to choose between the very well funded extreme anti-oil interests and the poor because on energy prices there is no compromise between the two. The Democrats have begun to recognize the position they are in, and were trying to have it both ways with this vote.

Let's be honest about why the Senate brought up this amendment. It is because the Democrats are trying to please the anti-oil extremists by not allowing any votes on oil drilling or on appropriations bills. At the same time the Democrats must pretend that they haven't really sold out the poor by their policies that force high gas prices.

I am not inclined to play their political game and support their effort to shift the debate away from unlocking our nation's energy potential. And I particularly was not inclined to support this vote, because the proposal busted the budget without providing any additional benefit to LIHEAP.