United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 110th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 154 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JANUARY 17, 2008 No. 7

Senate

The Senate was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Friday, January 18, 2008, at 10 a.m.

House of Representatives

THURSDAY, JANUARY 17, 2008

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. SOLIS).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
January 17, 2008.

I hereby appoint the Honorable HILDA L. SOLIS to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, offered the following prayer:

O God, the source of all justice, truth and love. Members of the House of Representatives stand before You as government of the people, seeking Your grace and guidance in their service.

We know we must always be deeply concerned with the human needs that surround us. We cannot be indifferent to suffering, to injustice, error, or untruth. For this reason, again today we are committed to face the risks and problems that confront the people of this Nation.

Help us, Lord, to take all their human concerns to heart; to pray over them, seeking Your guidance; to address them honestly with others so they will be drawn into the awareness of their importance as well.

Enable us to investigate together the forces of destruction and creativity at work within each human concern so we may be led to decisive action that will free people and at the same time bind them together in just law and good policy.

May this work be a blessing upon the Nation. In the end, to You, O Lord, be all glory and honor.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. SMITH of Texas 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.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to five 1-minutes per side.

TRIBUTE TO JIM WENSITS

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

Mr. DONNELLY. Madam Speaker, I would like to rise to honor a reporter's reporter, Mr. Jim Wensits, from the South Bend Tribune, who has recently retired. Jim is a proud graduate of Purdue University from 1966. Three days later, he started with the Tribune; and 40 years later he is retiring, after 20,000 articles and editorials. His hallmarks were integrity, accuracy, and fairness. His life's work made the South Bend Tribune a better paper and made our community a better place.

So on behalf of everyone back home, Jim, we want to say thank you. We wish Jim a great retirement with his family and with his beloved country music. Good luck, Godspeed, and thank you from everyone back home.

ECONOMIC FORECAST CLOUDY?

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

Mr. POE. Madam Speaker, economic forecasters are similar to the weather forecasters: they are the only people who can consistently be wrong about their predictions and keep their jobs, and we listen to them anyway.

The doom-and-gloom economic naysayers have predicted for years that the economy is in trouble, but the last years of economic growth have proved them wrong. Now this year, they say we are headed for a fearful recession. Well, we shall see.

Printed on recycled paper.

In any event, some of these pseudoeconomic forecasters say we need to increase taxes to stimulate the economy. Well, that makes no sense. In fact, we ought to do just the opposite. We need to make the tax cuts permanent because tax cuts historically prove they work. They work to stimulate the economy. They did so under Presidents Kennedy, Reagan, and Bush. Americans need to keep more of their own money, and the economy will prosper. And who benefits from tax cuts? Anybody that pays taxes benefits from tax cuts. Americans who don't pay taxes are not affected.

Cut the fraud and abuse in the Federal bureaucracies, cut wasteful spending, and cut taxes to bring a sunny forecast to our economy.

And that's just the way it is.

SOLAR TAX INCENTIVES: ''MUST PASS'' LEGISLATION IN 2008

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

Ms. GIFFORDS. Madam Speaker, in the week before we adjourned for the holidays, Congress, in a bipartisan effort, passed, and the President signed, the Energy Independence and Security Act. This bill, which is now law, represents a major stride forward towards a clean energy future. I applaud my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for moving this historic and very important legislation.

It was a good first step, but we are not there yet. The real meat of an effective energy package, which was not included in the legislation, must be the extension of critical tax incentives. These are essential for the solar industry to really take root and flourish. This is one of the reasons why I introduced H.R. 3807, the Renewable Energy Assistance Act, to improve and extend vital tax incentives for solar energy. These incentives will spur innovation, decrease our carbon emissions, and reduce our dependency on foreign energy.

In this time of economic uncertainty, it is important that we provide this critical stimulus so that we can move forward on these renewable energy efforts. We have to act this year, before the end of 2008. Doing so will get America back on track and working toward a better and brighter future.

JEANNETTE HIGH SCHOOL STATE FOOTBALL CHAMPIONS

(Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, congratulations to Coach Ray Reitz and the Jeannette Jayhawks football team, who are the Class AA football champions, beating every team they played this year by more than 20 points. Senior quarterback Terrell Pryor, who is also USA Today's Offensive Player of the Year, scored five of the seven touchdowns in their 49–21 win. He is the first player in State history to eclipse both 4,000 yards rushing and 4,000 yards passing.

But Jeannette is champions in the classroom as well, with McKee Elementary being a Blue Ribbon school, and all their schools receiving the Keystone Achievement Recognition this year, and the school district getting the bronze medal. Great accomplishment for a small school district.

Congrats to the Jayhawks for excellence in the classroom and on the field.

SUPPORT HOPE VI

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

Mr. CUELLAR. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3524, the HOPE VI Improvement Reauthorization Act of 2007. I commend Representative WATERS and the members of the Financial Services Committee for supporting a bill with such valuable enhancement and improvement to the HOPE VI grant program.

This legislation reauthorizes a program that represents one of our government's best efforts to provide quality housing for low-income families. Again, I am particularly pleased with one provision of this legislation that will help communities rebuild in the wake of severe natural disasters and emergencies.

For example, in my congressional district there is one particular county public housing unit in Starr County that has been destroyed by flood waters when it rose to dangerous levels. This was not the first time the Housing Authority of Starr County has had to manage severe flooding damage and subsequent resident displacement. In fact, since 1981, this public housing unit has experienced major unit-destroying flooding seven different times.

This legislation gives the Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development the latitude to waive the public housing authority's fund-matching requirements in cases of extreme distress and emergency.

This is a good piece of legislation. I ask for support of this legislation.

KOREAN AMERICAN DAY

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

Mr. ROYCE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Korean American Day, which was held this past Sunday to honor the achievements, to honor the contributions of Korean Americans to our country. Back on January 13 of 1903, the first Korean immigrants came here to the United States; and since that time, Korean Americans have taken root and thrived in this country through their strong ties, their hard work, their commitment to their rich heritage and values, education, and entrepreneurship.

But, Madam Speaker, we have an ally and friend in South Korea, and they have been a friend for the decades. Over this time, South Korea has emerged as a major economic power, our seventh largest trading partner. It is vital that Congress take up and pass the Korean-U.S. trade agreement.

Let me tell you why: this particular agreement, the U.S. International Trade Commission, just released its report. They say this agreement can benefit the economy of the United States of America to the tune of over $10 billion, between $10 billion and $11.9 billion.

We stand to gain if this passes. It's vital that we continue to open up new markets for our goods and services. This agreement accomplishes that.

TRIBUTE TO JACQUELINE MONTEIRO DACOSTA

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

Mr. KENNEDY. Madam Speaker, I rise today to express my sympathies to a wonderful Rhode Island family who has lost a devoted loved one named Jacqueline Monteiro Dacosta, and to briefly share with you the impact that she has had on so many lives here in Rhode Island.

She worked in my office for 11 years, and during that time she touched countless lives who sought her advice and help on a multitude of issues. At the end of it, she always made them feel at ease. She worked in my office and filed many claims and issues; but in the midst of all of it, she made people feel good about themselves, and always did her work. The number of letters I have for her are extensive, and the testament of her good works were in the wake that she had, where thousands of people showed up to pay tribute to her life and celebrate it. Next month, I will take a trip with her family to the islands of Cape Verde, her ancestral homeland, where we will plant a tree in her memory.

I just want to extend my condolences to her family: Jackie's parents, Jose and Adelisa Monteiro; her children, Stephanie and Justin; her siblings, Filomena, Osvaldo, and Jose, Jr., in continuing to honor Jackie's memory and her joyous spirit. We will miss you, Jackie, we love you, and we will never forget you.

SACRED HEART UNIVERSITY MEDIA FAIRNESS POLL

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Madam Speaker, a Sacred Heart University poll released this month found that less than 20 percent of those surveyed believed news media reporting. Almost nine out of 10 Americans believe that the news media attempt to influence public opinion, and about the same number

think the media attempt to influence public policies.

Fewer than one in three Americans give the media positive rating for ''keeping any personal bias out of stories, fairness, presenting and even balance of views, and presenting negative and positive views equally.'' By four-to-one margins, Americans see the New York Times and National Public Radio as having a liberal bias, and by a three-to-one margin, Americans see journalists and broadcasters as having a liberal bias.

We need to encourage the media to adhere to the highest standards of their profession. Only then can we restore Americans' faith in news reporting.

A METRICS APPROACH

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

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, when Congress considers competing proposals to stimulate the economy, why not take a businesslike approach and consider the ''metrics'' of previous efforts? When the current administration took office, the Dow Jones Industrial Average stood at 10,587. Yesterday, it was 12,472, representing a gain of 18 percent over 7 years. Unemployment and poverty rates are higher. Our debt is staggering. Our trade deficit is the highest in history.

During the previous Democratic administration, the Dow Jones Industrials rose 328 percent over an 8-year period. Unemployment fell every year, millions were lifted out of poverty, and we achieved a budget surplus.

So this time around, ask yourself, which model works for me? Which model was better? I think the facts speak for themselves.

□ 1015

WORKING IN A BIPARTISAN MANNER TO STAVE OFF IMPENDING ECONOMIC DOWNTURN

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

Mr. PENCE. Madam Speaker, one year into a liberal Democratic majority in Congress, the economy is struggling. The big government policies of the new majority are taking their toll. High gasoline prices, the subprime market crisis in housing and news that inflation is at a 17-year high all demand a bipartisan stimulus package in the next 30 days. Congress must act, and must act swiftly.

But there will be choices to make. Democrats want an extension of unemployment insurance benefits and tax rebates. Republicans will accept rebates, but they also want incentives for businesses, while avoiding tax increases to offset the package.

I submit that Congress must focus stimulus on the kind of economic stimulus that will create jobs and growth for small business and family farmers. The real antidote to the impending recession is more money in the hands of the wage earner and the wage payer. This is and always has been the pathway to prosperity in the American economy.

I urge my colleagues to work in a bipartisan manner to stave off this impending economic downturn in the best interests of all of the American people.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3524, HOPE VI IMPROVEMENT AND REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2007

Ms. CASTOR. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 922 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 922

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. 3524) to reauthorize the HOPE VI program for revitalization of severely distressed public housing, and for other purposes. 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. During consideration in the House of H.R. 3524 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.

SEC. 3. House Resolution 894 is laid upon the table.

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

Ms. CASTOR. Madam Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my colleague from the Rules Committee, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS). All time yielded is for debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. CASTOR. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 922.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. CASTOR. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, House Resolution 922 provides for consideration of H.R. 3524, the HOPE VI Improvement and Reauthorization Act of 2007, under a structured rule. The rule provides 1 hour of general debate, controlled by the Committee on Financial Services, and the rule also makes in order seven of the eight amendments submitted to the Rules Committee.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support today of the HOPE VI Improvement and Reauthorization Act and this rule. HOPE VI is a partnership between the Feds and local communities that started in the 1990s that revitalizes our communities across this country by replacing old, distressed public housing projects with modern housing and new communities that are healthy, safe and affordable.

Our renewed effort could not come at a more important time, because so many families across America are in the grips of a housing crisis. Foreclosures are way up, and options for safe, clean and affordable housing are down. Just last month in my home county, Hillsborough County, in Florida, there were over 1,000 foreclosures filed, a huge jump from last year. And affordable apartments and housing are few and far between.

The House of Representatives over the past months has been doing a great deal to throw lifelines to our families, our seniors and veterans when it comes to housing. We have passed bills in this House that help homeowners avoid foreclosure, that provide resources to local communities, to build safe and clean affordable housing, and that cracks down on predatory lending.

Families across America also should be aware that the Congress passed a helpful new law that is now in effect for 3 years that relieves homeowners

facing foreclosure from paying income taxes on their discharged mortgage debt, meaning that homeowners who refinance their mortgage will pay no taxes on any debt forgiveness that they receive. Previously, loan forgiveness was often taxed as income.

We are going to keep working to provide families with affordable options for safe places to live through the HOPE VI reauthorization and this rule today.

HOPE VI has been very successful since its inception in the 1990s. HOPE VI has revitalized neighborhoods across the country, including in my hometown of Tampa, Florida. A little public investment can be the linchpin to wider community redevelopment in communities across this great country.

HOPE VI completely transformed the distressed public housing complexes of College Hill and Ponce de Leon Court public housing projects in Tampa into the new Belmont Heights Estates. I attended school when I was younger next to these housing projects, and I saw firsthand what these conditions can do to an area and the folks who live there.

Behind me are posters of before and after, before HOPE VI, and then after the investment of HOPE VI.

So many public housing projects have deteriorated to the point that the health and safety of families is at risk and surrounding businesses and neighborhoods suffer. Since 1992, through HOPE VI, many communities have revitalized and transformed severely distressed housing into safe and livable communities. And 15 years later, this Congress, in a bipartisan way, but led by Democrats, will renew our commitment to safe, clean and affordable housing for families across this great country by building on the success of HOPE VI investment.

Over time, through HOPE VI, we have demolished nearly 135,000 severely distressed public housing units and replaced them with modern, safe and clean neighborhoods that do not concentrate poverty in a single location. What happens on the ground to these neighborhoods? Crime rates decrease, employment rates increase, and fewer folks have to rely on public financial assistance.

In Tampa, demolition started in 1999, and 8 years later we have built 860 rental units. Some are for families who need a little help and others are market rate. We built 74 new safe and clean homes for seniors and mixed in single family homes, some for rental and some for purchase.

More important than the buildings, however, and these were very bad, the new Belmont Heights Estates community made possible by HOPE VI has improved people's lives in the surrounding community and private investment has followed. Families are thriving in their new revitalized neighborhood, and their success stories are remarkable, because, remember, to qualify for that helping hand of an affordable home, most folks are required to improve their own self-sufficiency, like Belkis Rodriguez, who, after completing job training, has been promoted at the day care center where she is employed and she is now on the path to becoming a public schoolteacher. And Patricia Gowins in Tampa, a mother of two, is working on her high school diploma while working at a local hotel since her community has been revitalized. My neighbors and their stories of success are proof that HOPE VI is able to make positive contributions to our communities.

Our update legislation today will make further improvements and ensure that residents who are displaced by revitalization efforts will have the right to return to their neighborhoods. Because of the shortage across America of clean, safe and affordable housing, it is vital that the number of units demolished are replaced so that we do not shortchange our neighbors who have been asked to leave their homes.

We are committed to ensuring that homes built with the help of Federal funds are sustainable and energy efficient, and that helps save money in the long run. Our efforts today will make the American Dream of home ownership possible for more families across this country. And thanks to Chairwoman MAXINE WATERS, Financial Services Committee Chair BARNEY FRANK and Congressman MEL WATT of North Carolina, thanks to them and their leadership and their dedication to safe, clean, affordable housing for our families, we are going to do a great service for families across this great country.

Madam Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to support this rule and the HOPE VI Improvement and Reauthorization Act.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the gentlewoman from Florida yielding me the time. I appreciate the gentlewoman's comments, specifically as they relate to really the author of HOPE VI, who is Jack Kemp, at that time in the early nineties the Secretary of Housing in the United States of America.

□ 1030

I think that today, as we talk about HOPE VI and the wonderful attributes that HOPE VI has brought not only to inner cities but to thousands of people who live in these new areas as opposed to a large housing complex, it is a testament to the dream that, as Secretary, Jack Kemp brought to our great Nation.

Madam Speaker, I rise in reluctant opposition to this restrictive rule and to a number of the provisions included in the underlying legislation in its current form. This legislation, which alters a successful public-private partnership and housing program that encourages public housing authorities to work with the private sector to create more livable public housing, has a number of avoidable, and I repeat, avoidable shortcomings; and I hope that there will be at least some of them that will be corrected during this restrictive rule process as is provided for by the rule.

One of the provisions in this bill particularly threatens the continued participation of private developers in the program, which jeopardizes HOPE VI's continued success. I believe that is part of the success, the public-private partnership, in creating mixed-financed and mixed-income affordable housing.

By mandating compliance with privately developed green building rating systems, rather than providing market-based incentives to reach these goals, this legislation creates additional cost burdens for green compliance and adds further impediments to an already complicated financing structure which could discourage developers from undertaking future projects.

Further, because the legislation makes specific reference to only one green building rating system, this legislation federally mandates winners and losers and stifles future innovation and technology advancement in all aspects of green buildings.

I think it would be a flaw to say that the one standard that has been developed in 2007 and 2008 would be the only model as we move forward in public housing. I certainly would not want that in the free market where, as a user of the free market, I would be told one standard that was developed this year is what we will use. The future is bright, and I wish that our friends on the other side would recognize that there will be many, many more technological advances made in the future; and mandating one standard today is a flaw in this bill.

Thankfully, my former Rules Committee colleague and friend from West Virginia, the gentlewoman SHELLEY MOORE CAPITO, has an amendment to this legislation that will require minimum green building standards, in other words, the floor, not the ceiling, that will make mandatory graded sections of HOPE VI application, requiring a minimum standard for green building, and allowing for developers who build to a more stringent green standard to receive even greater credits. That means that we could exceed the one standard. For instance, if you lived in a very cold area, or very hot area, you could exceed for maximum utilization the opportunity to build the house, up front, properly.

So our friends on the other side who are telling us the one standard is like a one-size-fits-all rather than a minimum standard, however, if a determination is made in the section of the country that might artificially or might otherwise be able to take advantage of a different standard, a different way that might improve economical standards of efficiency, it wouldn't be included.

By utilizing this market-based approach, rather than the one-size-fits-all

standard of our friends in Washington of a heavy-handed government mandate, this amendment achieves the goal of building green without stifling innovation for new and improved green building standards.

I encourage all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, because it will take our friends who are Democrats if we are going to pass this, to please support this commonsense fix to the legislation.

Another aspect of this legislation which requires improvement is the elimination of HUD's current authority to award demolition-only grants, which would prohibit the demolition of unsuitable public housing without the replacement of those units. Mr. Speaker, clearly there may be instances when demolition-only grants are appropriate; for instance, when public housing authorities may have already assembled a financing package to fund redevelopment and replacement housing activities, but are lacking the funds for the demolition itself.

Additionally, because of their age and denigration, it is certainly possible that some distressed public housing sites would not be viable candidates for redevelopment. There are lots of places in this country where something was built 15, 20, 30, 40 years ago that might not be easily accessible to the modern conveniences of today. And these sites, though only partially occupied or completely vacant, because they put a demand in a particular area, would be excluded. In these instances, other forms of housing assistance such as section 8 vouchers may be more appropriate in a community than public housing.

To address this flaw in the legislation, I have introduced an amendment to allow HUD to retain this commonsense authority, rather than trying to tie their hands by taking some of the options that had previously been available to them off the table.

For their part, HUD has noted that these grants have provided housing authorities with resources to raze, or to tear down, distressed developments and relocate impacted families. The result is a cleared site that more readily attracts Federal or private resources for the revitalization of the property. I encourage all of my colleagues to once again support this commonsense amendment to allow HUD to retain the flexibility to respond to individual cases, particularly in those cases where a public housing authority does not even have a HOPE VI renovation grant, leaving it with fewer options in revitalization in its most distressed or otherwise not as easily used sites.

Mr. Speaker, in the last five budget proposals to Congress, this Bush administration has advocated the elimination of the HOPE VI program, citing the completion of the program's mission and ongoing inefficiencies within the programs. These programs have been assessed by the administration's objective Program Assessing Rating Tool, what is called PART, which has deemed HOPE VI to be not performing, inefficient, and more costly than other programs that serve the same population. In addition to these fundamental problems, the PART assessment notes that ''the program has accomplished its stated mission of the demolition of 100,000 severely distressed public housing units.''

I include a copy of this assessment as well as a Statement of Administration Policy on this matter for insertion into the RECORD.

PROGRAM ASSESSMENT: HOPE VI—SEVERELY DISTRESSED PUBLIC HOUSING

The HOPE VI program revitalizes distressed and obsolete public housing, usually replacing it with less dense housing combining a mixture of public and privately owned housing. The program awards grants through a competitive process to State and local public housing agencies for this activity.

NOT PERFORMING: INEFFECTIVE

The program is more costly than other programs that serve the same population. It also has an inherently long, drawn-out planning and redevelopment process.

The program has accomplished its stated mission of demolishing 100,000 severely distressed public housing units.

The program coordinates effectively with related programs in designing a comprehensive program to improve the community.

We are taking the following actions to improve the performance of the program:

Implementing changes to complete projects more quickly. The average time to complete a project after award is being reduced from 8 years to 7 years with further improvement anticipated.

Reducing the average cost per unit of the project. (The average grant award has been reduced from $30 million to $20 million to improve project management.)

Terminating the program since it has completed its mission. The remaining balance of over $2 billion will be spent during the next several years to complete funded projects.

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY—H.R. 3524—HOPE VI IMPROVEMENT AND REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2007

(Rep. Waters (D) CA and 8 cosponsors.)

The Administration is strongly committed to providing safe, decent, and affordable public housing to those citizens least able to care for themselves and recognizes the contribution made by the HOPE VI program toward the revitalization of public housing. However, because the program has proven over time to be less cost-effective and efficient than other public housing programs, the Administration strongly opposes H.R. 3524, the HOPE VI Improvement and Reauthorization Act of 2007.

HUD has awarded $5.8 billion in HOPE VI revitalization funds to public housing agencies through the end of 2007. While the majority of the funds have been used to promote neighborhood revitalization, $1.3 billion remains unspent. The program's complex planning and redevelopment process has resulted in significant delays in the execution and completion of projects, with the average HOPE VI project taking 7 years to complete. Additionally, some public housing authorities lack the capacity to properly manage their redevelopment projects. The Administration believes that sufficient program funds remain available to allow HUD to properly oversee the completion of existing HOPE VI redevelopment projects but does not believe that additional funds should be authorized or appropriated for this program. Indeed, the last five Administration Budgets have proposed to terminate the program in favor of more efficient and cost-effective programs. The Administration's first priority is to place HUD's principal programs, housing approximately 4 million low-income households, on sure footing. In fact, the President's FY 2008 Budget proposed approximately $28 billion for that priority.

The Administration also strongly opposes provisions of H.R. 3524 that mandate one-for-one replacement of any public housing unit that is demolished or disposed of under the HOPE VI program. It is not feasible in many communities to provide mixed-use development, including one-for-one replacement of public housing units, on the location of the demolished public housing project. Further, acquisition of additional land in the surrounding neighborhood for use in implementing a one-for-one replacement strategy may not be possible. Even if such land were available, costs to acquire and develop it would be expected to increase the cost of each HOPE VI unit.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage all of my colleagues to support these commonsense amendments that I have spoken about today on the floor which we believe will better the bill, in some cases keeping the good parts that had been in and other parts allowing flexibility. We believe that, in fact, this can be a wonderful bipartisan agreement that we could reach today. However, we would ask that all of our colleagues support the Neugebauer, Sessions, King, and Capito amendments.

I also encourage every Member of this body to oppose this rule until the Democrat majority provides us with the open rule process that we were promised over a year ago. I ask all of my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the previous question and on the rule.

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

Ms. CASTOR. Mr. Speaker, I urge a ''yes'' vote on the previous question and on the rule. I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

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. 3524, and to insert extraneous material thereon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CUELLAR). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO REDUCE TIME FOR ELECTRONIC VOTING DURING CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3524

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, during consideration of H.R. 3524 pursuant to House Resolution 922, the Chair may reduce to 2 minutes the minimum time

for electronic voting under clause 6 of rule XVIII and clauses 8 and 9 of rule XX.

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

There was no objection.

HOPE VI IMPROVEMENT AND REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2007

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 922 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. 3524.

□ 1041

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. 3524) to reauthorize the HOPE VI program for revitalization of severely distressed public housing, and for other purposes, with Ms. SOLIS 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 such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of H.R. 3524, the HOPE VI Improvement and Reauthorization Act of 2007. As you know, I introduced H.R. 3524 on September 11 of 2007.

I want to thank each of my colleagues both on the Committee on Financial Services and in the House who have joined with me to see that this important legislation passes the House. I want to especially thank Chairman BARNEY FRANK, MELVIN WATT, and CHRISTOPHER SHAYS for their original coauthorship, cosponsorship, and support of H.R. 3524.

In drafting this bill, we worked closely with the minority, resident organizations, housing advocacy groups, public housing agencies, housing developers, bankers, green building experts, and practitioners, and other Members with an interest in the HOPE VI program. The end result is a bill that I believe takes into account the needs of residents, the community, the investors and lenders, and our public housing managers. Most importantly, we have a bill that preserves and revitalizes our public housing stock.

H.R. 3524 reauthorizes and improves the HOPE VI public housing revitalization program by requiring the one-for-one replacement of all demolished public housing units, providing residents with meaningful and substantive involvement in the planning and development of the HOPE VI plan, expanding community and supportive services from 15 percent of grants that amount to 25 percent of grant amount; prohibiting HOPE VI specific screening criteria so that public housing residents and HOPE VI aren't held to a higher standard than non-HOPE VI residents, requiring housing agencies to monitor and track the whereabouts of relocated families, and mandating that developments be built in accordance with green building standards.

Public housing residents, including those not yet impacted by HOPE VI, and housing advocates have said that this bill has been a long time in coming, and I agree with them. I would like to note why the bill before us today is so important.

First, it preserves public housing. The administration eliminated the one-for-one replacement requirement in 1996, effectively triggering a national sloughing off of our Nation's public housing inventory.

Housing authorities have consistently built back fewer units than they have torn down and, as a result, over 30,000 units have been lost as a direct result of the HOPE VI program. Stopping this bleeding was paramount in the drafting of this legislation. One-for-one replacement is not only a part of the bill; it is the heart of this bill. Limiting one-for-one to only occupied units does a disservice to families on waiting lists and to families waiting to get on waiting lists. Public housing is a community resource, and units can be unoccupied because they are not fit for humans to live in. That does not mean that there is no need for them.

Second, because of strict screening criteria, HOPE VI has become limited to the cream of the public housing crop. Some people think that the HOPE VI development represents a new and better community and should have new and better people. However, as a Congress, we must be clear that public housing is for the most in need, not just the easiest to serve.

□ 1045

HOPE VI projects have programs and services that can greatly benefit our neediest families.

In addition, in the drive to separate the wheat from the chaff, public housing agencies have implemented screening criteria that are nothing short of draconian. These criteria include everything from credit checks, home visits, work requirements, and other criteria that many nonpublic housing residents would be unable to meet. We must reject any attempt to continue to punish public housing residents for being poor and must continue to provide them with the tools, through programs like HOPE VI, to assist them in improving their lives.

Lastly, I would like to talk about why green building standards should be mandatory in HOPE VI developments. Our public housing was built poorly and inefficiently. Many of our developments are wasteful and hazardous to the health of the residents, and many investments we make in public housing developments, which will be around for the next 40 years, should ensure that this housing is safe, sound, energy efficient and good for the environment. This is just good public policy. We owe it to our public housing residents and to the environment to make sure that we do not recreate the inefficient and harmful mistakes that went into building many of these developments in the first place.

This bill has the support of over 145 resident organizations: the National Low-Income Housing Coalition, the National Alliance to End Homelessness, the National Housing Law Project, the Community Builders, Bank of America, the Housing Justice Network, the Corporation for Supportive Housing, and others. There are a lot of good things in this bill, and these groups recognize this.

Specifically, regarding the green building provisions, although one group is not supportive, over 30 organizations, including the U.S. Conference of Mayors, the American Public Health Association, the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments, the National Low-Income Housing Coalition, the Council of Large Public Housing Authorities, and others, have voiced their overwhelming support for the green building requirements in the bill.

We have crafted a bill that is good for residents, housing authorities, and communities. I urge you not to be blindsided by threats from third parties and to support our Nation's low-income families and to preserve our housing stock.

Madam Chairman, I would like to say in closing that this should be a bill that receives support from both sides of the aisle. This is the kind of bill that we can truly come together around. Everyone recognizes that it is needed in all communities, rural and urban, suburban, all over the United States.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. CAPITO. Madam Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Today's HOPE VI program is the direct result of the 1992 report submitted to Congress by the National Commission on Severely Distressed Public Housing that said approximately 6 percent of the 1.4 million existing public housing apartments were severely distressed and recommended that they be removed from the housing stock.

Since Congress began appropriating funds for HOPE VI in 1992, the program has been revitalizing and replacing some of the most dangerous and dilapidated public housing units in the country with mixed-income communities. These grants play a vital role in a community's redevelopment and have changed the physical characteristics of public housing from high-rise tenements to attractive, marketable units that blend in with the surrounding neighborhood and help residents attain self-sufficiency.

While the goals of the program are to be commended, and HOPE VI projects remain popular with many Members of Congress, it is not without faults. The HOPE VI program has been criticized by the administration, which argues that grantees spend their money too slowly, and by tenant advocates, who claim the program displaces more families than it houses in new developments. Also, there are those who argue that HOPE VI is not an efficient method for meeting the current and future capital needs of public housing programs.

The bill we are considering today, H.R. 3524, makes several significant changes to the underlying program. I want to commend Chairman FRANK, Chairwoman WATERS, and Congressman SHAYS for their bipartisan work on this bill. I know that Congressman SHAYS has worked hard to address some of the concerns raised by HUD and by those on this side of the aisle regarding the bill. Certainly, the manager's amendment moves in the right direction. However, there are still several areas of disagreement on this legislation, such as the elimination of demolition-only grants, implementing one-for-one replacement requirements, and mandating HOPE VI developers comply with the Green Communities Green Building Rating System.

The HOPE VI program has been a program that has worked. Through public-private partnerships, we have changed the physical shape of public housing by establishing positive incentives for resident self-sufficiency and comprehensive services that empower residents. We must take care not to make this program so prescriptive that developers and nonprofits find the program too difficult in which to participate.

Several years ago, I spoke at the opening ceremonies at Orchard Manor in Charleston, West Virginia. Orchard Manor is now a beautiful complex of townhouses, duplexes and apartments that began its transformation from a rundown public housing project with the removal of 230 out of the existing 360 units under a HUD HOPE VI demolition-only grant. Following the initial demolition, additional units were constructed using replacement housing funds until the complex reached its present state. Orchard Manor is a shining example of the importance and significance of using demolition-only grants as part of HOPE VI. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. NEUGEBAUER) has an amendment that will reinstate HUD's ability to fund demolition-only grants, and I urge its adoption so future successful projects, such as Orchard Manor, can receive that funding.

Finally, I plan to offer an amendment that I believe is a commonsense approach to green building requirements outlined in this legislation. I am concerned that Congress is attempting to mandate this program. Building green is a good thing. Mandating how to do it by a private building standard, I believe there are other ways to do it, which is essentially the heart of my amendment.

Specifically, the green building requirements in the bill could lead to fewer affordable housing units being built. My amendment still requires minimum green building standards, but it directs the Secretary to select an appropriate green building rating system standard or code that addresses environmental soundness but leaves that flexibility for the Secretary to determine other criteria as appropriate.

We are currently experiencing rapid development in our definition of what constitutes a legitimate ''green building standard'' through the competition of differing ideas. This competition is a healthy one, and we should not cut short through a hasty endorsement of one of the competing proprietary standards as our definition.

In closing, the HOPE VI program is not a cure-all for the rehabilitation and capital improvement needs of public housing units. However, this House has the opportunity with this bill, through several amendments, to further develop a program that rehabilitates our public housing into affordable, mixed-income communities.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to Mr. BARNEY FRANK of Massachusetts, the chairman of the Committee on Financial Services.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I thank the gentlewoman who chairs the Housing Subcommittee for the time and for her very creative and diligent work on this bill and others. And I also want to acknowledge our new ranking member of the Housing Subcommittee, the gentlewoman from West Virginia.

Let me begin by noting that obviously in the parliamentary forum we focus on areas of difference. Members should note how small those are relatively in the context of this bill. This is a significant rewrite of the HOPE VI program in which there was not a lot of objection. In fact, I think every amendment but one that was offered was made in order. I disagree with several of the amendments, but I do want to stress the commonality of reform that is in here as we go forward.

There are two basic areas of difference. Two amendments on the other side of the aisle from the two gentlemen from Texas would reduce the requirement that with Federal money we replace low-income units that we destroy. Yes, there are low-income units that should be eliminated as they now exist, but that does not mean that the total number of housing units available for lower-income people ought to be diminished as a conscious Federal policy. And the amendments of my two colleagues from Texas would do that.

The Sessions amendment would allow the Federal Government to give people money simply to tear down all of the houses that poor people live in in a particular area on the grounds that those weren't very nice houses. No doubt in many cases they are not nice houses, but the poor people who live in those houses didn't decide voluntarily to live in bad housing as opposed to nice housing. They had nowhere else to go. And if you tear down where they now are and build zero in its place, you have exacerbated the housing crisis.

Similarly, the amendment of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. NEUGEBAUER) would diminish our capacity. We say if you tear them down, you have to replace them. You don't replace them in the same place. You can do it in a much broader area with more flexibility. You have 4½ years to replace the ones you have torn down and may go to the Secretary of HUD and get a waiver, say there is a court order, there is this land shortage. Some of these were, in fact, so useless. There are a lot of reasons you can go to the Secretary of HUD. So we are not saying that the one-for-one has to be followed in every case. We do say that should be the standard.

Here is the problem with the Neugebauer amendment. He says the housing authorities only have to replace units that they tear down that were occupied. Most people who run housing authorities are diligent, hardworking people in difficult circumstances, but there is incompetence in some housing authorities. People who have incompetently been unable to rent housing for one reason or another shouldn't be rewarded by then being allowed to tear that housing down.

In other words, if housing authorities, who have the obligation to use the money available to house people, refuse to do that or are unable to do that, we should not reward them by saying then you don't have to build those. And there will be places where people don't like poor people living in their community, and the political leadership of that community could then order the housing authority to leave some of those units vacant, and then we will apply for a HOPE VI grant and we will be able to replace far fewer because we will be rewarded for leaving them vacant.

The gentlewoman from West Virginia's amendment, and again there is some common agreement that we should go towards encouraging green building, but here is the difference. I know the homebuilders say this is bad for them, but understand, this is a Federal program with Federal money. We are not talking here about imposing on private-sector developers any requirement whatsoever to do energy efficiency. We are here as the landlord, not as the regulator.

What we are saying is that we are the Federal Government and we will set an example. We will take the money that we, the Federal Government, makes available, and hold ourselves to a high energy efficiency standard. If people think that is inappropriate and it is too expensive, they don't have to apply to come here. That leaves everyone in the private sector free to do as they wish.

Beyond that, one of the strongest advocates of this has been my colleague from Massachusetts (Mr. OLVER), the chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee. He has to fund all of this, and he has to fund it going forward. We don't simply build the HOPE VI projects and walk away. We don't. The builders do. It is not their fault.

If I am the contractor to build the buildings, my obligation is completed the day I have done the building and gotten the money for it. But we, the Federal Government, then have to fund it on an ongoing basis. What we are saying is, as the landlord, we want to build it in a way that makes it energy efficient going forward.

We will take an up-front cost because, over time, over 20 and 30 and 40 years, we will reduce our operating budget. So we are being told that as the landlord we can't make the decision about how efficiently to use funds and how to say we will reduce costs going forward. So I would hope that the gentlewoman's amendment is defeated. It would take it from a mandatory to one factor among many.

We also have an argument about the standard. We do mention one standard. The homebuilders are wrong in their letter where they talk about the LEED standard. That is out of the bill in the manager's amendment.

□ 1100

On the green communities, we do mention the green community standard; but we explicitly give the Secretary of HUD the ability to propose another standard if it is equivalent in energy savings, and that's the key.

So the amendment of the gentlewoman from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) makes this one factor among many, not a required factor, and everything we do with our money to be energy efficient.

And, secondly, she would allow a much weaker standard in many cases than ours does. So we allow flexibility, but flexibility as to how to achieve the goal of energy efficiency, not flexibility as to how much energy efficiency to offer.

I hope the bill, as essentially presented, or a couple of amendments I think are relatively noncontroversial, are accepted.

Mrs. CAPITO. I would like to respond just a little bit to the gentleman's comments on the amendment I'm going to put forward. I don't want the misunderstanding of the Members to think that my amendment would remove green building from any of the HOPE VI projects. It's a different philosophy in how we're putting forth the idea to meet green standards. And he clarified that. His is a mandatory. Mine is a flexible, one among many. But I do believe in the philosophy of building more green and more efficient buildings, we've got new technology coming online. Why tie ourselves to a certain standard?

At this point I would like to recognize Mr. GILCHREST for 3 minutes, the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. GILCHREST. I'm not on the committee of jurisdiction where the HOPE project originated, but I'm interested in this issue because I was born in what would now be called a housing project, 62 years ago. It was a housing apartment complex built many decades ago, a few years before I was born, for young families, for soldiers serving in World War II and certainly then, for the baby boom generation, for military people coming home looking for places to live.

This place was called Cora Place. Now I still don't know to this day whether it was a K or a C, Cora Place. But it was a vast housing unit apartment complex for young families. I was born there 62 years ago, and there's still young families there. That place has still survived all these decades. It was built adequately. It was built with good construction techniques. It was built with good standards. It was not rebuilt. It was not demolished and rebuilt. It was built in a way, in a form, in a complex where it became a community, not an isolated pocket of poverty. It was built for a community. There are small businesses there. The standards of construction were fine. You don't waste heat. You don't waste water. You don't waste electricity. It was built for young American families. It was built for a community where there could be dignity, where there could be small businesses, where people could come together and exchange information and feel like they belonged. That's what we need to do today. That's what HOPE VI is all about. That's what this committee, in a bipartisan fashion, wants to pursue.

I also want to talk about one of the provisions in this bill called ''green buildings and technical assistance.'' And I want to say that what this does to today's communities is what happened 62 years ago. We want to do it right the first time, not the second time. The Federal Government is not requiring one standard. The Federal Government, in this bill, is requiring a standard that is flexible so it can change and provide for new technology.

This is a standard that reduces and eliminates waste. It's a standard that promotes local businesses and local communities. It's a standard that provides adequate housing for those who otherwise would not have adequate housing. The high cost of housing has increased the high cost of renting, and the peripheral outside effect is that it has increased homelessness.

So HOPE VI goes a long way into eliminating that problem in our communities. It is not a mandate to comply with one standard. It does not, this text in this bill, create a monopoly. It does not require certification fees. You save way more energy, way more energy than up-front costs. And it uses standards of efficiency that are off-the-shelf technology. So I encourage my colleagues to vote for the bill.

Ms. WATERS. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey, hardworking member of our subcommittee, Congressman SIRES, 2 minutes.

Mr. SIRES. Madam Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 3524, the HOPE VI Improvement Reauthorization Act of 2007.

As a former mayor in New Jersey, I have a unique perspective of this program. Its impact on local communities is real and is positive. Beyond the obvious impact of cleaning up distressed public housing units and providing people with housing, HOPE VI generates economic activity in the community. New housing brings new residents. New residents bring new infrastructure and spurs new businesses. These new residents shop and dine and invest in their community. The new businesses hire employees, which has a positive impact on the economy.

The benefits of this program do not end there. Research indicates that HOPE VI increases per capita income of residents and decreases unemployment rates. That same research shows that this program decreases the number of households receiving public assistance and decreases violent crimes in surrounding communities.

A reauthorization of this HOPE VI is long overdue. I applaud the efforts of the chairman and Chairwoman WATERS for bringing this to the floor today.

And I will share a story. I recently visited in Elizabeth, New Jersey, part of my district, a program of HOPE VI. I knew that area before, and the transformation is beyond. As I went there the other day, a new restaurant opened up. People were hired to work in that restaurant. So this program does work. Is it perfect? Nothing is perfect, but it certainly works. And I hope that everybody supports this.

Mrs. CAPITO. Madam Chairman, I would now like to yield 9 minutes to the ranking member of the full committee, Mr. BACHUS of Alabama.

Mr. BACHUS. Since HOPE VI, we've had a lot of success. I think the program is a success. How the program has been a success is not as simple as simply replacing units on-site. In fact, most of the residents of these housing projects have actually moved to other communities through vouchers. The main thing, I think, to remember is that it has eliminated some of the most dangerous and distressed public housing in the country and created livable, mixed-income communities; and that's very good.

To date, there have been over 200 HOPE VI grants, and to various housing agencies. Almost all of them have been a success. These grants have been used to fund public/private partnerships that have changed landscapes once populated by failed housing projects and crime-ridden neighborhoods into vibrant mixed-income, mixed-use communities, providing quality, affordable housing for those in need.

I think anybody on the Financial Services Committee who's attended these public hearings has heard the testimony of the living conditions that

these tenants in public housing were living under. High crime areas, vandalism, dilapidated conditions, paint peeling off, lead, plumbing that didn't work, electricity that didn't work, heating that was inadequate, areas where there was such a concentration of crime that many of the youth growing up in those communities really had no or very few role models.

In my home State of Alabama, there are several examples of projects where HOPE VI has made a tremendous difference. For example, Park Place is a 12-block section of downtown Birmingham that a HOPE VI grant has transformed into an attractive, mixed-income housing development. Not only has it decreased the concentration of low-income residents living in a crime-infested area with very few prospects of jobs, but it's also improved the surrounding communities. The surrounding communities, the property values were going down. It was more dangerous. And those areas have been improved. The commercial district downtown has improved. One of the stories that we need to realize is not only the improvement that we see in the community that was replaced or rehabilitated, but the community around it.

But most residents, if you track where they've gone, they have chosen, through vouchers, and a lot of them just by simply turning down housing assistance, they've moved to other communities, and they're doing quite well. They've moved to communities where they think there are better schools. The students of those residents who have actually moved and not returned, they're doing better, on the average, than those residents who chose to return.

In New Orleans, we actually found a lot of people chose not to go back to the original community because they did not trust the public housing authority. And that's one reason that we've tried to advocate not simply replacing these units on a one-by-one basis, and re-duplicating a bad situation.

The Tuxedo Court project in Birmingham is going to replace 488 obsolete units of aging buildings with 331 modern, for-purchase rental homes. All the residents who are not going to relocate there have been given vouchers, or if they qualify, public assistance, and many of them have chosen to move to communities across town.

Our vision, and I think the vision of both Democrats and Republicans on this committee, should be for the residents of those communities to better themselves and better their living conditions, their housing. It should be vibrant, mixed-use communities with good housing, safe streets, strong schools.

In a previous debate, I mentioned a public housing project in downtown Atlanta called East Lake. East Lake was so dangerous that the police refused to patrol it. And it's not alone. Children slept in bathtubs or closets for fear of being hit by random gunfire.

A developer by the name of Tom Cousins proposed replacing this crime-ridden project, where there was very little hope for the residents, very little future for the youth, with a mixed-income community. And that's been done. Today, professionals, accountants, doctors, lawyers, people with good income, are living side by side with families still on subsidized and on public assistance. The end result is a sharp reduction in crime in East Lake. But the more important result is a sharp increase in the level of academic achievement and success among the youth living in that community.

Now, for all the good, we are concerned about this bill. First of all, it eliminates the Main Street Revitalization program, which was for the benefit of smaller communities.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BACHUS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. As the gentleman may know, an amendment is going to be offered to restore that, and I agree with the gentleman that that amendment should be accepted.

Mr. BACHUS. I thank the chairman for that.

Another problem that we have with it is eliminating the demolition-only grants, because on certain occasions we feel like public housing, there may be adequate housing other places, or vouchers or a better system. But I think one of the main causes of concerns we have, and the gentlelady from West Virginia, is the green requirements. While some of the provisions have merit, we believe that they have, number one, the unintended result of reducing the number of affordable housing units that can actually be constructed under HOPE VI.

In fact, I have a letter I would like to introduce from the homebuilders, but also a coalition of National Affordable Housing Management Association. And basically what they say here is that the additional cost burdens of these particular green compliances will greatly discourage the development of these projects and drive up the cost substantially.

JANUARY 14, 2008.

Hon. BARNEY FRANK,
Chairman, Committee on Financial Services, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.
Hon. MAXINE WATERS,
Chair, Subcommittee on Housing and Community Opportunity, Committee on Financial Services, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.
Hon. SPENCER BACHUS,
Ranking Member, Committee on Financial Services, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.
Hon. SHELLEY MOORE CAPITO,
Ranking Member, Subcommittee on Housing and Community Opportunity, Committee on Financial Services, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR COMMITTEE LEADERS: The undersigned organizations, who work collectively in support of affordable housing and promoting sustainability in our nation's housing stock, are writing to express our opposition to H.R. 3524, The HOPE VI Improvement and Reauthorization Act, in its current form. We do appreciate that the forthcoming Manager's amendment will make several important improvements to the bill. For example, we support allowing HUD to grant a waiver to the one-for-one replacement provision under certain circumstances. However, we suggest that HUD also should be able to provide waivers related to funding realities. If one-for-one replacement renders a deal infeasible, there should be enough flexibility to waive that provision. We also believe that extending the period in which all replacement units must be provided after demolition has been completed from 12 to 36 months is very sensible. HOPE VI projects must contend with many variables, from weather conditions, securing local approvals and working extensively with tenant groups. All of these factors can increase construction periods beyond what otherwise might be considered normal.

However, while our organizations have long-supported this important housing program, there are several provisions in the bill which we believe are so onerous that private developers may no longer be able to participate, jeopardizing the very existence of the program. Specifically, our main objection is that the legislation will unfairly and unnecessarily drive up development costs by mandating compliance with privately developed green building rating systems. The additional cost burdens for green compliance adds further impediments to an already complicated financing structure for HOPE VI projects and could greatly discourage developers from undertaking future projects. In addition, there are provisions related to the occupancy of HOPE VI projects that are unclear and could be interpreted to prevent owners from instituting sensible eligibility standards.

GREEN BUILDING MANDATE

Our members are committed to working on increasing the sustainability of affordable housing, as well as keeping housing affordable in all markets. We believe that mandatory green requirements in the HOPE VI program will have unintended consequences that far outweigh any sustainability gains. Dramatic reductions in additional HOPE VI projects is a very real possibility because of increased costs that developers would have to finance based on the proposed provisions in the bill. There is a limited amount of HOPE VI funding, and a developer's ability to leverage a significant amount of additional financing is limited. In addition, total development costs (TDC) are capped. Unless TDCs are allowed to increase (or alternatively, the costs of complying with the green building requirements are excluded from TDC), the developers may be forced to scrimp on other important aspects of these developments to pay for costly green components. Decisions on what aspects of green development can be afforded in these properties should be left to the developers and their partner public housing agencies. HUD has recognized this as a practicable approach, as demonstrated by its implementation of green building incentives in the Mark-to-Market program.

Further, the specific reference to only one green rating system will stifle innovation and technology advancement in all aspects of green building. During a time when green building is growing exponentially and programs are competing to be the ''greenest,'' Congress should not be codifying one inflexible benchmark that cannot adapt to future sustainability needs. Congress should not be

using the HOPE VI program to pick winners and losers in the green building arena.

Keeping green building as flexible and competitive as possible reaps the greatest environmental and economic rewards. Mandating a specific green building requirement for HOPE VI is short-sighted, overly restrictive and costly and is a disservice to community affordable housing needs. Sustainable green design for all housing markets should be protected from government mandates and rigid statutory benchmarks. Green building means something different in every climate zone, just as every market has differing demands for affordable housing.

It is important to understand that opposing a green building mandate in no way signals opposition to sustainability or environmental conservation. Green building should not be driven to the lowest common denominator or serve as a deterrent for development of these vital housing projects. Opposing the green building requirements in this bill demonstrates awareness that green building is an important variable that needs to be incorporated into HOPE VI in a manner that is functional, flexible, and encourages more energy and resource-efficient construction in the future.

ELIGIBILITY PROVISIONS

The Limitation on Exclusion provision (Section 7(m)(2)) could be interpreted to place limits on the public housing agencies' (PHAs) ability to establish reasonable eligibility criteria for occupancy in the new HOPE VI development. The provision says that replacement housing under a HOPE VI plan must be subject to the same policies, practices, standards, and criteria regarding waiting lists, tenant screening (including screening criteria such as credit checks), and occupancy that apply to other housing owned, managed or assisted by the PHA.

However, the provision goes on to say that a household cannot be excluded from the HOPE VI development, except to the extent specifically provided by other provisions of Federal law (e.g., relating to safety and security in public and assisted housing; ineligibility of drug criminals, illegal drug users, alcohol abusers and dangerous sex offenders; as well as preferences for the elderly and disabled; and persons convicted of methamphetamine offenses). This seems to preclude PHAs from screening for credit worthiness or other typical screening criteria.

We support holding all households to the same standards. We note that HUD's Housing Choice Voucher Handbook encourages PHAs and owners to adopt screening policies that take into consideration tenancy history related to payment of rent and utility bills; caring for a unit and premises; respecting the rights of others to the peaceful enjoyment of their housing; drug-related criminal activity or other criminal activity that is a threat to life, safety or property of others and compliance with other essential conditions of tenancy. The proposed provision in H.R. 3524 could be interpreted to undermine HUD's existing policies and create an unfair disadvantage to other eligible tenants who wish to move into a HOPE VI property. Further, it appears that the bill may provide a de facto preference to applicants that have been released from a prison or other correctional facility. It is the responsibility of the owner/landlord to ensure a safe environment for all residents, and such a preference may preclude their ability to honor that responsibility.

The owners of HOPE VI developments must be able to implement good business practices to attract investors and lenders. Otherwise, the developments will be viewed as too risky, and the developer's financing prospects will be in jeopardy. We suggest that these provisions be clarified to ensure that PHAs can continue to set fair and reasonable screening and eligibility standards that are applied to all households.

OTHER

We believe that the provision eliminating HUD's ability to award demolition grants should be revisited. There may be circumstances under which a demolition only is warranted. HUD and PHAs should be allowed to retain this current authority.

SUMMARY

Our organizations are committed to furthering the sustainability of affordable housing and believe that the success of these efforts lies in the ability of the industry to take advantage of the innovations that are constantly occurring in the market. The provisions in H.R. 3524, The HOPE VI Improvement and Reauthorization Act, as currently written, will impede these efforts by mandating the use of one specific system. In addition, owners of HOPE VI properties must be able to establish reasonable and workable occupancy policies that are fair to all prospective tenants in HOPE VI communities.

Our organizations stand ready to work with the Committee to craft an effective and appropriate way to address green building and eligibility standards within the HOPE VI program. Thank you for your consideration of our views.

Institute of Real Estate Management.

National Affordable Housing Management Association.

National Apartment Association.

National Association of Home Builders.

National Multi Housing Council.

More important, and let me close by saying this, and this is a serious problem with this bill, I have a letter from the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America. They say that the standards we're using in this bill, let me quote them:

''If a builder wants to use wood and receive LEED certification,'' that's the program we're using, ''they are largely forced to use wood products grown and manufactured overseas.''

□ 1115

''This puts American workers and American products at a competitive disadvantage.''

UNITED BROTHERHOOD OF CARPENTERS AND JOINERS OF AMERICA,

Washington, DC, January 11, 2008.

Hon. BARNEY FRANK,

Chairman, Committee on Financial Services, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Hon. MAXINE WATERS,

Chairman, Subcommittee on Housing and Community Development, Committee on Financial Services, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Hon. SPENCER BACHUS,

Ranking Member, Committee on Financial Services, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Hon. SHELLEY MOORE CAPITO,

Ranking Member, Subcommittee on Housing and Community Development Committee on Financial Services, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMEN FRANK AND WATERS, AND RANKING MEMBERS BACHUS AND CAPITO: On behalf of the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, I am writing to express our concerns with provisions of H.R. 3524 that would require non-residential construction in HOPE VI grant projects to meet the United States Green Building Council's Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) rating criteria.

For the last four years, the Carpenters have had a great interest in green building legislation as it affects both parts of our union—the part that constructs buildings and the part that harvests and manufactures wood products that are used in them. Therefore, we are strong supporters of green building, but want to ensure that building ''green'' does not result in ''pink'' slips for our members.

Over this time, we have found a number of important flaws in the LEED system that we believe makes it unsatisfactory for the marketplace and should not be the only standard referenced in legislation.

Our primary concern is LEED's failure to recognize all credible, sustainable forestry certification programs in its certified wood credit. LEED only provides credit to builders using forest products certified by the Forest Stewardship Council (FSC). No credits are awarded for wood products produced by other companies independently third party certified to the Sustainable Forestry Initiative (SFI) Program standard or the American Tree Farm System, the two largest sustainable forest management systems in the United States. These two systems account for over 90 million acres of forestland, yet do not qualify for points under LEED. Therefore, if a builder wants to use wood and receive LEED certification, they are largely forced to use wood products grown or manufactured overseas. This puts American workers and American products at a competitive disadvantage.

LEED also discriminates against wood compared to other imported building products. LEED credits builders for using ''rapidly renewable materials,'' which are defined as products originating from plants harvested in a 10-year cycle. As you might expect, construction lumber cannot earn this credit since it takes more than ten years for a tree to grow to a usable size and diameter. Instead, if a builder uses exotic crops such as imported bamboo, they can earn the credit.

As a result of these flaws, we have actively supported other green building systems that are inclusive in regard to the use of wood. One system that we have supported at the national, state and local levels is the Green Building Initiative's Green Globes program. Unlike LEED, it recognizes all the major sustainable forestry programs used in the United States and does not put wood at a disadvantage compared to other building products. Also unlike LEED, Green Globes takes into account the concept of life-cycle analysis, or the cost to operate the building over time.

As a result, Green Globes has been increasingly recognized by federal agencies and state governments. At the federal level, it has been recognized by the Department of Health and Human Services, the Department of the Interior and the Environmental Protection Agency. In addition, 11 states have written Green Globes into their state green building statutes,

Therefore, we request that the legislation be modified in order to specifically include other standards, such as Green Globes. Should any amendments be offered to create a process that gives the government the opportunity to review and select a standard, we request that language be included that gives all eligible and viable green building standards equal consideration and ability to participate in the process. We believe that with these changes, we will produce a piece of legislation that meets all of the legislation's goals.

Sincerely,

DOUGLAS J. MCCARRON,
General President.

Number 1, under the standards you've adopted, we won't be using wood, when it's one of our greatest renewable resources. We won't be using wood. So you will be putting a lot of carpenters and laborers and joiners out of work, the framers.

But second, if you do use wood, you will have to import that wood. So, as an article in Slate magazine said, and it's the reason the University of Michigan in one of their projects is trying to decide whether they want to use this LEED program, LEED, this article in Slate magazine actually pointed out that you can put up a bicycle rack and you get the same credit as if you used an energy efficient heating system. That's wrong.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Chairman, to correct that information, I yield 30 seconds to the chairman, Mr. FRANK.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. The gentleman from Alabama correctly quoted the carpenters' letter. The manager's amendment responds to that. The manager's amendment, which we are now debating, removes reference to the leadership and energy and environmental design. So the objection raised by the carpenters we thought had some validity to it, and the manager's amendment takes care of it.

So there is no reference to that. So two of the points the gentleman made we agree with, and we're correcting, restoring main street and removing any reference to LEED. There will be other differences, but I did want to acknowledge this is an example of how we're trying to work together.

Mr. BACHUS. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BACHUS. Would you continue to work with us to make sure that, in fact, is possible?

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Yes.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Chairman, I yield to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) 2 minutes.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for her leadership and chairing this important subcommittee and her hard work on this bill, along with Chairman FRANK, and I rise in very strong support of the revitalization, reauthorization of an important program, HOPE VI.

This legislation will increase the annual authorization from $100 million to $800 million, and it is really a funding housing crisis, affordable housing crisis in our Nation. This funding and this program is desperately needed.

In New York City alone, over tens of thousands of people are on the waiting list for public housing. This bill requires that all public housing units proposed for demolition be replaced on a one-for-one basis and that any units demolished will be replaced within 36 months. This is tremendously important because people in public housing have no other place to go.

It adds additional tenant protections by requiring public housing agencies to monitor and track all households affected by the HOPE VI revitalization program, as well as develop a relocation plan that provides comparable housing for all relocated residents.

In an effort to be better stewards of our environment, this bill requires all replacement housing and other structures part of the HOPE VI development to be built in accordance with flexible green building standards, and it's appropriate for the government to have high environmental standards. It will be more energy efficient in the future and, in the long run, will save taxpayers dollars.

This bill continues a really important program that revitalizes severely distressed public housing and transforms them into safe, livable communities. And since its creation, it has provided over 560 grants, and Congress has appropriated over $6.6 billion in funding.

It has helped public housing authorities create relationships with the private sector and open up opportunities to bring partnerships that bring in much-needed resources into struggling communities.

For example, by 2004, 92 public housing authorities have used $313 million capital funds to leverage over $1 billion in private investment. These funds have been used to modernize and redevelop public housing.

With the crisis in safe, affordable housing we are seeing in our country, it is my hope that with our reauthorization of this important legislation we can continue the successes of this program.

I really urge my colleagues to support this program that is vitally needed.

Mrs. CAPITO. Madam Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS), who I mentioned in my opening statement had been very integral in reaching what I think is a very good bill, 3 minutes.

Mr. SHAYS. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding. I thank my colleagues on the other side of the aisle for bringing out this legislation and for their willingness to work on a bipartisan basis to get a good bill. And thank you for that.

I am a strong believer in the HOPE VI program because I've seen its unbelievable benefit to my district. We had Southfield Village public housing. We converted it into Southwood Square, with a $26 million Federal grant, leveraging $79 million to reach $105 million. It has 330 units, 160 of low-income and 85 of market rental, but the unique thing is the 160 and the 85 are all the same units. They are really nice units, market rate units.

So, you may have someone paying market rate, and when they leave, the new person may be low-income. There's a guaranteed of the 330 units, 160 are low-income. It has actually a pool. It has a workout area, and it has some wealthy people staying there. They work at successful businesses in the greater Stamford community.

So young kids who have very little income when they see someone getting into a BMW, it's not for a drug deal; it's to go to work where they are paid well. When young children go to work out, what they hear discussed is how someone can make money legitimately.

It is not a place warehousing the poor, but having all our fellow Americans live together, black, white, Hispanic, minorities from all areas of the world, with people who have income, minorities as well who have income and those who don't. It is an incredible thing to see our country come together under a HOPE VI program.

And besides the 85 units of market rental, you have 15 of affordable home ownership. These are townhouses, four-story buildings. And then we have Fairfield Court, $19 million of Federal funds leveraging $80 million, 272 units, 141 of low-income and 131 of affordable rental, market rental and affordable home ownership.

What I see in the HOPE VI grant is a transformation not just of the physical outlay of a community and the upgrading of neighborhoods, but I'm seeing Americans come together, living like we think we should live, together, not separate.

I rise today in strong support of the reauthorization of the HOPE VI program. HOPE VI has transformed rundown housing projects into vibrant communities and changed the face of affordable housing throughout the country.

I am grateful to have worked on this reauthorization and am grateful for all of the hard work and collaboration of this Committee. Specifically, I would like to thank Chairwoman WATERS and Ranking Member CAPITO and their staff for their leadership on this important program.

The mixed income communities created through HOPE VI grants epitomize the power of public-private partnerships. This reauthorization represents a renewed commitment by the Federal Government to revitalize our Nation's most distressed public housing.

Since the creation of HOPE VI, public-private partnerships have leveraged significant commitments from private sector resources. For every dollar the Government commits to this revitalization effort, HOPE VI projects yield three to four in private funding.

In light of a serious shortage of affordable housing in Connecticut's Fourth District and throughout the Nation, it is imperative we encourage the utilization of all available resources to provide quality, safe, and affordable housing for our Nation's neediest citizens.

I have experienced first hand the transformation that HOPE VI grants are capable of making. We have two incredible HOPE VI sites in Stamford, and I wish Members and the administration could see that transformation. If they did, I doubt they would ever dream of eliminating this program.

Southfield Village received a $26 million HOPE VI grant, which leveraged $79 million in funds to create Southwood Square. The development features 330 units, 160 of which are low-income public housing units, 85 are market rate units, and 15 are affordable homeownership units.

In 2004, Fairfield Court received a HOPE VI grant of $19 million that will leverage $80 million. This project will house 141 low-income

units and 131 affordable rental, market rate rental, and affordable homeownership units.

At these mixed-income communities, low-income families and those paying market rent live side-by-side, and have the opportunity to learn and grow from one another. They are safe places to live where children can grow and play together and where residents are involved in the planning and growth of their community.

When the Federal Government demonstrates its interest in improving the housing needs of low income families, the community responds. I call my colleagues today to reaffirm our commitment to this program, which has significantly expanded upon affordable housing options for families throughout the country.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON), a hardworking member of our committee.

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.

The HOPE VI program was developed as a result of recommendations by the National Commission on Severely Distressed Public Housing, which was charged with proposing a national action plan to eradicate severely distressed public housing. The commission recommended revitalization in three general areas: physical improvements, management improvements, and social and community services to address resident needs. As a result, the HOPE VI program was developed in 1993.

Grants are used by public housing authorities to fund capital costs of major rehabilitation, new construction and physical improvements, demolition of severely distressed public housing, acquisition of sites for off-site construction, and community and supportive service programs for residents. Any public housing authority that has severely distressed public housing units in its inventory is eligible to apply.

In each of the past 5 years, the Bush administration has proposed elimination of the HOPE VI program, requesting no money for this successful program, threatening to strand tens of thousands of low-income families and children to live in substandard public housing.

But the Congress, under both Republican and Democratic majorities, has continued to fund the program. In 2006, $100 million was appropriated, and last month, $100 million was included in the Omnibus Appropriations Act. This reauthorization of HOPE VI is long overdue.

In the Fifth Congressional District and in the City of Minneapolis alone, my local public housing authority has estimated that they need over $205 million just to maintain 5,883 public housing units at only a fair condition. Again, let me repeat this. My district needs $205 million to keep these public housing units from not falling below basic standards. The backlog of units in desperate need of refurbishment and rehabilitation is a result of 7 long years of neglect of public infrastructure.

This is why I urge all of my colleagues to vote for this bill. By passing H.R. 3524, we move a step closer to recognizing the rights for all citizens.

Mrs. CAPITO. Madam Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING), a member of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. HENSARLING. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Madam Chairman, President Reagan once said that the nearest thing to eternal life on Earth is a Federal program, and I don't think there is any better case study than perhaps the HOPE VI program. If there was ever a program that cried out for termination, it's this one; termination so that the money used for this program can be returned to hardworking American families.

Many of us are acquainted with the history of the program, begun in 1992 with a very noble purpose of taking 86,000 units of severely distressed public housing and replacing them, demolishing them.

Well, guess what, Madam Chairman; it achieved its mission. But somewhere along the line we had this thing in Washington known as mission creep. What we should have done is probably given all the employees of the program a bonus, throw them a big party and say thank you for doing something good and achieving the mission of your particular program. But instead, somehow the program goes on and on and on.

Now, the Office of Management and Budget has said that this program is ineffective. If you look at their part rating of the Office of Management and Budget and start to study it, they ask very specific questions about the program, one of which is: Does the program address a specific and existing problem, interest or need? And the answer is no. The program has accomplished its primary goal to demolish 100,000 severely distressed public housing units by 2003.

Another question in the part rating of the Office of Management and Budget: Is the program designed so that it is not redundant or duplicative of any Federal, State, local or private effort? The answer again, no. HOPE VI is one of a select number of tools available to housing authorities to revitalize distressed or obsolete public housing.

So again, number one, we had a program that accomplished its original mission. We now have a program that is duplicative of other housing programs. And I know there are many who come to the floor who are very sincere and passionate in their belief that the only way to help low-income people is through government housing programs. I have a different philosophy. I have a different set of principles.

We already have 80-plus Federal housing programs, and the budget for Federal housing programs has almost doubled in the last 10 years, from $15.4 billion to more than $30 billion now.

And this percentage increase, almost double, is a rate, Madam Chairman, a rate of increase that is higher than veterans spending, education spending, energy spending, transportation spending, international affairs spending, and even Social Security over that same time period.

So, relative to our budget priorities, it's very hard to argue that somehow Federal housing programs have been shortchanged. I fear that HOPE VI simply compounds failure. We take failed housing projects, we start to demolish them, and then we fail to get rid of the program.

Again, I understand that some people and many on the other side of the aisle do not agree with my vision. They believe the only way to help is through other government programs, and if so, I would ask this, and I'm sorry that this didn't happen in committee.

I offered an amendment to transfer this money to the section 8 program. I think there are a number of challenges with section 8, but I certainly see it as a superior form of government assistance than these other programs.

□ 1130

And Member after Member on the other side of the aisle has complained that we have insufficient resources for section 8. Well, here's an opportunity. Now, unfortunately, that amendment was not ruled in order. I hope that one day maybe I can work with the majority in finding ways to take less effective government housing programs and perhaps transfer funds to more effective housing programs.

I also find it quite curious that many Members on the other side of the aisle complained about this program in hearings and in markups. So they complained about it and then sit here and reauthorize it.

And there are two other reasons that we should not support this. One is, it puts us on a trajectory to help double-spending to the next generation. Now, sometimes we have to make some tough choices. We are going to double taxes on the next generation if we don't do something about spending today.

And we should never forget that the best housing program is a job. And the greatest threat to jobs today is the threatened tax increases of the majority. That's where we ought to get our affordable housing.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Chairman, this would be an excellent time for me to call on the major cosponsor of this bill, someone who has been consistently involved with HOPE VI ever since it was originated.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina, Mr. MEL WATT.

Mr. WATT. I thank the Chair of the subcommittee for moving me up in the order so that I can address some of the misconceptions that we've just heard.

I'm holding in my hand a report that was authored, in fact one-third of the report that was authored, by HUD in 1996, about 4 or 5 years into the HOPE VI program. And if we thought that this program was only about demolishing distressed public housing, as my colleague who just spoke would have us believe, we should read the report. It did identify 86,000 severely distressed public housing units that needed to be demolished and replaced in a different kind of setting. It went on to say that we needed to address the needs of the residents. And the commission proposed providing increased funding for supportive services, creating a national system to coordinate social and supportive services to enable residents to become self-sufficient, and devising a system that requires public housing agencies to solicit resident input into the solutions.

And the things we have been complaining about, the gentleman is correct, we have been complaining about the HOPE VI program because it has only been about demolishing public housing and not doing any of the services that were originally contemplated by the program. And the amendments in this reauthorization bill are designed to attack those very shortcomings and the original objectives that HOPE VI was designed to accomplish. Number one, not only demolition, but one-for-one replacement is in this bill; input by residents is in this bill; supportive services, increased funding is in this bill.

So the gentleman is absolutely correct: those of us who have been complaining about the program acknowledge that it has not accomplished the objectives that were set for the programs by Republicans, not Democrats, to replace and eliminate severely distressed housing and to provide the kind of support that is necessary for residents of public housing to be successful. That's exactly what this bill does, and I encourage support for the bill.

Mrs. CAPITO. Madam Chairman, I have no further speakers, and I would like to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WATERS. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas, a member of the subcommittee who has never missed a meeting, Congressman AL GREEN.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Thank you, Madam Chairman. I thank you, the ranking member, and all of the other Members on the other side, Members on both sides. This is a bipartisan effort.

Madam Chairman, please let me dispel any notion that there is a surplus of affordable available housing in this country. In fact, in the State of Texas alone, we have a need for 437,000 units, and we are third in the Nation. New York is number two, with 528,000 units needed; California, 830,000 units. There is no surplus of available affordable housing. But we're talking about the public housing units, and there is no surplus of available public housing units.

Let me share a brief vignette with you. I had the privilege and honor, the pre-eminent privilege, if you will, of traveling to New Orleans with our subcommittee Chair, the Honorable MAXINE WATERS. While we were there, we visited the public housing units, and we actually talked to tenants. There were tenants who were pleading with us to give them the opportunity to return to what they called their homes. These were not just pieces of trash to them. These were places where they have memories, where they had hopes, where they had aspirations. And they were being denied access to property that they believed that they could live in. Now, was it to the standard that you and I my might want to live in? No. To the standards of those who live in the sweets of life, they were not; but to the standards of those who live in the streets of life, they were above standard. If you've got a choice of living on the streets or living in units that are not suitable for those who have much, you will choose to live in the units that are available to you.

I regret that some of us seem to think that the best way to help people who are living in conditions that we find unacceptable is to cause them to have no place to live at all. Now, there is something wrong with that kind of thinking. And at some point, we've got to consider what the people need, and not see these as projects. I beg that we support this legislation. Keep people off the streets of life.

Mrs. CAPITO. I would like to recognize the ranking member, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS), for 3 minutes.

Mr. BACHUS. Madam Chairman, Members of this body, let me say that there is a difference of opinion on our side and different opinions on our side. But I do believe that one thing ought to be clarified, and I believe I share this opinion with all my colleagues on this side. We believe the purpose of HOPE VI is not simply to replace a failed housing project model with another public housing project or community. We believe the purpose that all of us have, Republicans and Democrats, is to help those families in those communities have a better life and a better future, and hope.

As I think the Urban Institute and others have found, the majority of those residents, and I don't dispute what the gentleman from Texas said, there are and there will be residents that will say I want to go back to that community. But, hopefully, and one thing HOPE VI does, that community is replaced by a much better community, a much better mixed-income community where there is more hope, there is less crime, there is less poverty, and there are residents in those communities that can actually help those children get jobs. But most, and every study that has looked at this, and maybe someone on your side will correct me, most, if not every, study has shown that the average resident of that community is going to choose not to come back to that same location, but to relocate to another area because in most cases the area they would relocate to is closer to their job, it's closer to a school, or if not a school, it's closer to a higher performing school, and they choose, through a voucher, to relocate. In fact, a substantial minority of those residents relocate to another community, get a better job, get a better income, and move totally off public assistance.

There are a lot of fond memories in those communities, but there are a lot of people trapped in a circle of poverty in those communities and surrounded by criminal elements. And when we do this one-for-one model, I believe we are taking resources where we could give people the choice of relocating elsewhere and reestablishing what we had that we tore down.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from Wisconsin, who has been so much involved in this issue, GWEN MOORE.

Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin. Thank you, Madam Chairman. HOPE VI is not just a tremendously successful housing program; it's a program that revitalizes entire communities.

When you have an area with thousands of people in dense public housing communities, it's essential that we disperse poverty and create communities within mixed-income groups. HOPE VI has had enormous success at doing just that.

I would like to remind my colleagues that HOPE VI is not some liberal Democrat program; it was created under a Republican administration, the previous President Bush. However, for the past 5 years, this President Bush has proposed ending this vital program, claiming that it has already accomplished its goal. Clearly, he's mistaken.

Secondly, I just want to remind the body that we're experiencing a mortgage crisis of gargantuan, indeed, global proportions. The bad actors in the mortgage market have found fertile ground among families who have yearned for decent housing. They have preyed upon these families with these awful mortgage products because of the dearth of affordable rental units. HOPE VI is an answer to prayer for these families who may not be able to achieve homeownership, but deserve decent and affordable housing.

Mrs. CAPITO. May I inquire as to how much time I have remaining.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from West Virginia has 2 minutes remaining.

Ms. WATERS. I would like to inquire as to how much time I have left, Madam Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from California has 4 minutes remaining.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey, Congressman BILL PASCRELL.

Mr. PASCRELL. I rise in strong support of H.R. 3524.

I can provide testimony here. I was a mayor. In fact, in the final years before I came to the Congress of the United States, we built HOPE VI housing. It was successful. And the community decided what that housing would be like and the community decided what the standards would be of living. In the same area, in the same area that I've just heard we should move people out of, you want to lift up. That's what hope is all about. That's what HOPE VI is all about.

So I can testify to the success. Come to Paterson, New Jersey, and see how HOPE VI operates. And we want to provide other areas of buildings that are falling down. Why should tenants have to live in those other buildings in that same situation? We want to give hope to those people as well, to provide better housing.

HOPE VI grants are used by public housing authorities to fund major rehab and demolition. I urge everyone to vote for this legislation.

Ms. WATERS. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. DANNY DAVIS.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chairman, I represent one of the largest concentrations of public housing in the United States of America in the third largest city. And I can assure you that the mayor of the City of Chicago strongly supports HOPE VI. The Governor of Illinois strongly supports HOPE VI. Every member of our delegation from the City of Chicago strongly supports HOPE VI. It gives hope to those individuals who are homeless, who have given up, who are left out.

I strongly urge passage of this legislation. And let's keep the hope in it.

□ 1145

Ms. WATERS. Madam Chairman, I yield 1 minute to a gentleman who has been very much involved in this issue, Congressman ELIJAH CUMMINGS.

Mr. CUMMINGS. I want to thank the gentlewoman for yielding and for her leadership and to you, Chairman FRANK, and all of the members of the committee.

Madam Chairman, this is a very important piece of legislation involving what we have, HOPE VI projects. And I just want to correct Mr. BACHUS. Two of those projects are within six blocks of my house, so I deal with these folks every day. I talk to them. I wish we had more HOPE VI projects because I will never forget when we opened one of them. The area had been drug infested, a highrise, and when we opened it up, literally a lot of residents came back and they were crying because they were going to move in. There were others who couldn't move in because we did not have enough housing. I will never forget that day. I said this is like having Andy of Mayberry in the middle of our community. And it is. Children are able to play. Men staying out late at night playing checkers. People can leave their bikes out. A wonderful life and giving hope. That's what it's all about.

So I want to thank Ms. WATERS and Chairman FRANK for including in this legislation, as part of their manager's amendment, certain items that we included. And I want to thank you very much for your leadership.

Mrs. CAPITO. Madam Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Chairman, I would like to inquire how much time I have left.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman has 1 minute remaining.

Ms. WATERS. I will yield that 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I appreciate the gentlewoman's courtesy and her leadership on this.

Madam Chairman, I come from a community that took almost 500 units of World War II-era public housing and replaced it with almost 1,000 units, including 230 that were unrestricted market rate. It was an anchor for revitalizing the community. It leveraged three-to-one investment from the private sector, and it was built according to environmentally sustainable standards.

I cannot say how strongly I support this legislation to be a blueprint for how HOPE VI can make a difference for public housing and community revitalization around America. I strongly urge support for this legislation and rejection of efforts to water it down. Use this model. Make it work. You will be proud.

Mrs. CAPITO. Madam Chairman, I would like to thank all the speakers for discussing what I think is a good program, HOPE VI. On this side of the aisle, even though the chairmen of the full committee and subcommittee have made great strides in terms of the manager's amendment in terms of answering some of our concerns, but we still have some concerns. And you are going to hear this through the amendment process, whether it's one-on-one replacement, demolition only, and my amendment on the green communities.

So I appreciate HOPE VI's successes. I think we have heard from a lot of Members who have had individual successes in their own districts. I reiterate the success in my district was from a demolition-only grant, and I've seen how the community can benefit and the housing conditions can improve and the quality of life improve at the same time.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Chairman, I rise today in support of the passage of H.R. 3524, the "HOPE VI Improvement and Reauthorization Act of 2007." This bipartisan bill allows public housing agencies to continue to improve the lives of families in public housing through the revitalization of severely distressed public housing. Throughout America, there are tens of thousands of working families who are in desperate need of affordable housing, but are unable to obtain it, due to a shortage of sufficient public housing units. Passage of H.R. 3524 will dramatically improve the lives of those from low and moderate incomes who are having difficulty finding decent and affordable housing.

In Detroit, there are scores of families who are on the public housing waiting list, and are in dire need of affordable housing. Many of these families are forced to stay in homeless shelters, sleep in expensive hotels, or stay with friends and relatives until they can find permanent housing. This bill will provide direct assistance to low-income individuals and families in Detroit who will now have access to more affordable housing units, given that cities and towns across America will have increased federal funding to construct affordable housing units.

H.R. 3524 also ensures that the HOPE VI program does not contribute to the loss of public housing. It requires public housing agencies replace any demolished public housing unit with another comparable unit. Furthermore, the legislation gives agencies flexibility in the location of replacement housing by allowing replacement units to be provided in on-site mixed-income housing developments; and in other areas where the public housing agency has jurisdiction.

One of the most important benefits of H.R. 3524 is that more Americans will receive expanded housing opportunities through ensuring that families are able to move back into replacement housing units by prohibiting unreasonably stringent rescreening policies and making residents who are otherwise eligible for public housing also eligible for a HOPE VI unit.

The bill also encourages resident involvement in the redevelopment planning phases for new affordable housing. This is a critically important provision because it will help ensure that communities impacted by housing redevelopment will have a say in where they are going to live. Also, H.R. 3524 requires the monitoring and tracking of displaced residents by requiring housing authorities to maintain current contact information for each affected household while the mixed-income community is being developed. It is also a progressive bill, in that it implements green building standards in order to provide long-term energy efficiency and savings.

Ms. NORTON. Madam Chairman, I am obliged to speak up on the HOPE VI bill before us today, particularly because of the District's track record has made this city a shining success story, the fourth largest recipient of HOPE VI funding in the Nation, and an innovative leader in HOPE VI projects spurred on by federal funds available until recently, and the District's success in obtaining HOPE VI grants. I have devoted considerable time and effort to help the city obtain these grants. The great success the city has had in the stiff, nationwide competition it has faced in seeking each grant it has won, greatly energized by its own efforts. Even now, the District of Columbia has a grant pending.

HOPE VI has been the functional equivalent of a federal government stamp of approval. The District provides a fabulous example of how a little government money can act as a magnet for private and nonprofit funds that otherwise would not be available. Having received over $140 million in HOPE VI grants, the District has been able to maximize every grant dollar, leveraging the grant awards at a ratio of 1 to 7 to attract unusually large

amounts of public and private funds, $740 million of non-government funding to five HOPE VI sites in the District.

A brief sampling of HOPE VI successes in the city illustrates the incredible economic impact that the grants have had. The H Street Barracks in Ward 6 is the hottest retail strip under HOPE VI. The District's first HOPE VI development, the Town Homes in Ward 6, not far from where we stand today, has been occupied by District residents for over eight years. In its prior life, the Town Homes was known as the Ellen Wilson Dwellings and stood abandoned for eight years, depressing the vibrancy of the surrounding community. However, a $26 million HOPE VI grant, awarded in 1993, transformed the public housing units into 134 cooperative, mixed-income town homes, with 33 families at 0 percent to 24 percent of area median income, AMI, 34 families at 25 percent to 50 percent of AMI, and 67 families at 50 percent to 115 percent of AMI.

One of the most ambitious HOPE VI projects undertaken nationwide is transforming the Arthur Capper/Carrollsburg Dwellings, a 23-acre 758-unit public housing complex near the Washington Navy Yard and the Southeast Federal Center, into a revitalized residential part of general Anacostia waterfront revitalization, one of the largest urban redevelopment areas in the country. The Arthur Capper/Carrollsburg development is the first HOPE VI site in the country to provide one-for-one replacement of demolished public housing units. The $34.9 million grant award has been leveraged to provide a total of over $424 million for the creation of 1,562 rental and home ownership units, replacing the demolished units with 707 public housing units, 525 affordable rental units and 330 market rate homes for purchase, for a total of 1,562 new units, and additional office space, neighborhood retail space and a community center.

One of the best examples of how HOPE VI grants have helped DC communities is the lowest-income ward in the District of Columbia, Ward 8, where HOPE VI developments are transforming an entire ward. Ward 8 leads the city in housing starts and new rental housing. A Giant Food grocery store near the Henson Ridge HOPE VI development is the only supermarket in the ward and the largest in the region. The Henson Ridge HOPE VI across the street gave Giant an immediate customer base and now draws the entire ward.

HOPE VI has been nothing short of a veritable economic engine to drive the reinvigoration of entire communities. It would be a national tragedy for Congress to allow HOPE VI to expire rather than building on the success of the District and other cities. The investment by the government pales in comparison to the return generated. I strongly support H.R. 3524 to reauthorize the HOPE VI program for the next eight years with up to $800 million dollars a year, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Madam Chairman, I strongly support H.R. 3524, the HOPE VI Improvement and Reauthorization Act of 2007. As the name of this program suggests, the revitalization of distressed public housing brings hope to millions of Americans—the hope of living in a community that cherishes family values, the hope of enjoying a stable living environment, and the hope of moving out of poverty and toward self-sufficiency.

The HOPE VI program offers residents the ability to improve their housing opportunities by transforming severely distressed public housing into thriving mixed-income communities. The program has worked well since its inception in 1992 and I am pleased that the bill makes a number of significant improvements to HOPE VI to ensure that it is even stronger into the future. These changes include requiring full replacement for lost units and increased involvement of residents in planning the redevelopment.

Furthermore, HOPE VI promotes the efforts of Congress in supporting a cleaner environment by requiring compliance with green building standards.

In Georgia's Second Congressional District, we have had resounding success with the HOPE VI program. The Housing Authority of Columbus, Georgia was awarded a $20 million HOPE VI grant in 2002. The revitalization plan called for the demolition of 510 units of severely distressed public housing units. At the time of grant award 380 families lived at Peabody.

The end result is a new mixed-income community (Ashley Station), set on a beautifully designed site which incorporates new housing, new parks, and new retail and street improvements. In addition, connections were made that improved access to job training, employment opportunities, education, health care, and other supportive services. HOPE VI allowed for a unique public-private collaboration and more than $5,800,000 in ''in-kind'' services were received by the HOPE VI residents.

Invigorating the HOPE VI program will strengthen families, reduce poverty, and rejuvenate the spirit of American communities throughout the Nation. The program is more than just ''bricks and mortar.'' It will make the American dream a reality for millions of low-income people. I commend my colleagues for bringing this vital piece of legislation to the House floor and I urge their strong support.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 3524, to reauthorize the ''HOPE VI Improvement and Reauthorization Act of 2007,'' introduced by my distinguished colleague from California, Representative MAXINE WATERS. This important legislation will reauthorize and make changes to the HOPE VI public housing revitalization program. I would like to thank Congresswoman WATERS for her consistent and dedicated work on this important issue, as well as to commend Chairman FRANK for his leadership in bringing this bill to the floor today.

Madam Chairman, this legislation reauthorizes, with important changes, the HOPE VI public housing revitalization program. Among other provisions, it provides for the retention of public housing units, protects residents from disruptions resulting from the grant, increases resident involvement, and improves the efficiency and expediency of construction. The HOPE VI program, created in 1992, has worked to improve the Nation's most dilapidated public housing units by providing much needed resources to public housing agencies. These funds have directly benefited countless Americans, particularly the elderly and those with disabilities, partnering with local agencies to improve conditions in public housing units and communities.

In December, we were reminded of the existing problems in our Nation's public housing systems when protesters in New Orleans skirmished with police in New Orleans, as the City Council unanimously voted to destroy 4,500 public housing units. I was appalled that, in the holiday season, the citizens of New Orleans and survivors of Hurricane Katrina were put in a position in which they had to fight to keep a roof over their heads. The residents of New Orleans who saw their homes and livelihoods destroyed by natural disaster two years ago are far from alone in their need for improved public housing; citizens across the country are feeling the acute need for the housing reform delivered by this bill.

My home city of Houston faces unique challenges and opportunities. One of the most important of which is dealing with the impact of taking in nearly 200,000 Hurricane Katrina evacuees, an unprecedented act of generosity for which Houston is famous. According to the 2000 U.S. Census, nearly 2 million people live in Houston, the fourth largest city in America. When the metropolitan area is taken into account, the population swells to approximately 5.2 million. The Houston metropolitan grew in population by more than 950,000 people between 1990 and 2000.

Madam Chairman, according to the American Community Survey (ACS) conducted by the Census Bureau, there are 859,245 total housing units in the City of Houston, of which 748,323 are occupied—347,865 are occupied by owners (2.5 percent vacancy rate) and 400,458 by renters (11.8 percent vacancy rate). Though the average cost of housing and rent in Houston is low by national standards, Houston residents still face a problem when it comes to affordable housing. According to a 2006 study by the Harvard Joint Center for Housing Studies, 28.4 percent of Houston homeowners and 51 percent of renters in the Houston metropolitan area spend more than 30 percent of their monthly pre-tax income on housing costs. This makes them ''housing-cost burdened'' as defined by the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD).

Fully a quarter of Houston renters are ''severely housing-cost burdened,'' meaning they pay more than 50 percent of their income in housing costs. The National Low Income Housing Coalition, in its report Out of Reach in 2006, estimates that in order to afford a 2-bedroom apartment at the FMR, a renter would have to earn $14.77 an hour, more than two and on-half times the minimum wage.

The affordability crisis is most pronounced among Houston's poorest and disabled households. Among the 83,367 renter households in Houston with incomes below 30 percent of the Area Median Income (AMI)—or approximately $18,500 in the Houston metropolitan area—more than half, 56 percent, of them spend more than half of their gross income on housing. Another 1 in 6 devotes more than 30 percent of their gross income for housing.

Moreover, there is little federally subsidized housing available to those in need. The Housing Authority's waiting list for Section 8 Housing Choice Vouchers now has been closed for three years and there are still more than 10,000 people on the list. The average wait time is between 18 months and two years. It is estimated that more than 12,000 people are homeless on any given night in Houston: 6,583 of them are unsheltered and 3,600 of them are chronically homeless.

Madam Chairman, I support this legislation because it will begin to address the serious

housing problems we face in our own local communities, and as a nation. Among its many important provisions, this legislation requires that all public housing units proposed for demolition be replaced on a one-to-one basis, guaranteeing the total availability of public housing. This requirement will serve to protect low income residents under fair housing laws. Further, a mixed-income housing development must be provided on the site of the original public housing location and all replacement housing units must be located in a mixed-income community. The bill requires a third of the units in this development must be public housing units, with limited exceptions. Public housing agencies can build additional units on the site provided the provision of these units does not violate fair housing laws and the number of additional units is determined in consultation with residents, community leaders, and local government officials. Remaining units must be built in the jurisdiction of the public housing agency in low poverty areas and in a manner that affirmatively furthers fair housing.

The bill provides displaced residents with three housing choices: (a) a revitalized unit on the site of the original public housing location; (b) a revitalized unit in the jurisdiction of the public housing agency; or (c) a housing choice voucher, which can be used in areas with lower concentrations of poverty. Public housing residents of the revitalized developments must, under the provisions of this bill, be subject to the same screening criteria used for all public housing units.

This legislation also mandates adequate oversight, requiring public housing agencies to monitor and track all households affected by the HOPE VI revitalization plan. In addition, public housing agencies must develop a temporary relocation plan that provides comparable housing for all relocated residents, protects residents in transitioning to the private rental market with housing choice vouchers, provides for housing opportunities in 7 neighborhoods with lower concentrations of poverty, and extends the voucher search time to 150 days.

Madam Chairman, this legislation also provides for the active involvement and participation of residents in the grant planning process, including public hearings and four notices to residents on (a) the intent to apply for a HOPE VI grant, (b) grant award and relocation options, (c) grant agreement and relocation options, and (d) replacement housing.

The bill includes several provisions designed to increase the rate at which HOPE VI developments are constructed, which will help reduce the time tenants are relocated. The bill requires all new housing to be rebuilt within 12 months from the allocation of low-income housing tax credits or, for those grants that do not use tax credits, within 12 months of demolition or disposition. The bill waives the grant matching requirement for HOPE VI applicants in areas recovering from natural disasters or emergencies. This further helps these communities recover quickly and efficiently. Grantees that do not meet performance benchmarks will be penalized.

Finally, I would like to draw attention to requirements in this legislation mandating that all replacement housing and other structures part of the HOPE VI development to comply with certain energy-efficient green building standards. This Congress has made protecting the environment a priority, and I am pleased to see this provision included in today's legislation.

I strongly urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this extremely important legislation.

Mr. TERRY. Madam Chairman, I rise to express my opposition to H.R. 3524, the HOPE VI Improvement and Reauthorization Act of 2007.

After speaking with the Omaha Housing Authority in my District, I have been informed that the changes in the bill are overly prescriptive and potentially burdensome for the community of Omaha.

In particular the one-for-one replacement of public housing units that is required under this bill is simply not feasible. This legislation requires one-for-one replacement of units that are demolished under the proposed plan on the original site or within the jurisdiction of the public housing authority. H.R. 3524 also mandates that one-third of the units that are constructed as a part of the mixed-income community revitalization plan remain public housing units.

One particular area where the Omaha Housing Authority would like to apply a HOPE IV grant to is the Pleasant View area. I am told that there are 190 units in Pleasant View that are in need of demolition, however, with the overly burdensome regulation of the one-to-one replacement requirement prescribed in this bill, the OHA would not be able to feasibly perform this demolition. These units are currently not occupied, so with the inclusion of Mr. NEUGEBAUER's amendment we would at least have some relief in this area.

I commend my colleague, RANDY NEUGEBAUER, for his amendment that would apply the one-to-one replacement requirement for units demolished under this program only to units that are occupied prior to demolition.

Another very problematic change for the Housing Authority in Omaha included in this legislation would be the compliance with the Green Communities rating system. As you know, this legislation requires the proposed revitalization plan to comply with the mandatory and non-mandatory items of the National Green Community checklist for residential construction and the mandatory and non-mandatory components of version 2.2 of the Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) green building system for New Construction and Major Renovations.

The mandatory green building requirements for Green Communities and the U.S. Green Building Council's (USGBC) Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) will drive up development costs and threaten the viability of this important housing program in Omaha reducing the actual number of units that can be built.

Because of the vital importance of protecting housing affordability and keeping green building flexible, functional and effective, I will be voting against this bill as is and urge a ''no'' vote to my colleagues.

Mrs. CAPITO. Madam Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The 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. 3524

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; REFERENCES; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''HOPE VI Improvement and Reauthorization Act of 2007''.

(b) REFERENCES.—Except as otherwise expressly provided in this Act, wherever in this Act an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437 et seq.).

(c) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; references; table of contents.
Sec. 2. Purposes of program.
Sec. 3. Authority to waive contribution requirement in cases of extreme distress or emergency.
Sec. 4. Prohibition of demolition-only grants.
Sec. 5. Repeal of main street projects grant authority.
Sec. 6. Eligible activities.
Sec. 7. Selection of proposals for grants.
Sec. 8. Requirements for mandatory core components.
Sec. 9. Planning and technical assistance grants.
Sec. 10. Annual report; availability of documents.
Sec. 11. Definitions.
Sec. 12. Conforming amendment.
Sec. 13. Authorization of appropriations.
Sec. 14. Extension of program.
Sec. 15. Review.
Sec. 16. Regulations.

SEC. 2. PURPOSES OF PROGRAM.

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

(1) in paragraph (1), by inserting before ''through'' the following: ''located in communities of all sizes, including small- and medium-sized communities,'';

(2) in paragraph (3)—

(A) by inserting ''low- and'' before ''very low-income''; and

(B) by striking ''and'' at the end;

(3) in paragraph (4), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(4) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(5) promoting housing choice among low- and very low-income families.''.

SEC. 3. AUTHORITY TO WAIVE CONTRIBUTION REQUIREMENT IN CASES OF EXTREME DISTRESS OR EMERGENCY.

Subsection (c) of section 24 is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(4) WAIVER.—

''(A) AUTHORITY.—The Secretary may waive the applicability of paragraph (1) with respect to an applicant or grantee if the Secretary determines that circumstances of extreme distress or emergency, in the area that the revitalization plan of the applicant is to be carried out, directly affect the ability of the applicant or grantee to comply with such requirement.

''(B) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary shall issue regulations to carry out this paragraph, which shall—

''(i) set forth such circumstances of extreme distress and emergency; and

''(ii) provide that such circumstances shall include any instance in which the area in which a revitalization plan assisted with amounts from a grant under this section is to be carried out is subject to a declaration by the President of a major disaster or emergency under the Robert T.

Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act.''.

SEC. 4. PROHIBITION OF DEMOLITION-ONLY GRANTS.

Section 24 is amended—

(1) in subsection (c)(3), by striking ''or demolition of public housing (without replacement)'';

(2) in the first sentence of subsection (e)(3)—

(A) by striking ''demolition only,''; and

(B) by striking the last comma; and

(3) in subsection (e), by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(4) PROHIBITION OF DEMOLITION-ONLY GRANTS.—The Secretary may not make a grant under this section for a revitalization plan that proposes to demolish public housing without revitalization of any existing public housing dwelling units.''.

SEC. 5. REPEAL OF MAIN STREET PROJECTS GRANT AUTHORITY.

Section 24 is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (n) (relating to grants for assisting affordable housing developed through main street projects in smaller communities);

(2) in subsection (a), by striking the last sentence (that appears after and below paragraph (5), as added by section 2(4) of this Act);

(3) in subsection (l)—

(A) in paragraph (3), by striking '', including a specification of the amount and type of assistance provided under subsection (n);'' and inserting ''; and''; and

(B) by striking paragraph (4); and

(4) in subsection (m), by striking paragraph (3).

SEC. 6. ELIGIBLE ACTIVITIES.

Paragraph (1) of section 24(d) is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking ''programs'' and inserting ''plans'';

(2) in subparagraph (G), by striking ''program'' and inserting ''plan'';

(3) by striking subparagraph (J) and inserting the following new subparagraph:

''(J) the acquisition and development of replacement housing units in accordance with subsection (j);''.

(4) in subparagraph (K), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(5) in subparagraph (L)—

(A) by striking ''15 percent'' and inserting ''25 percent''; and

(B) by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(6) by adding at the end the following new subparagraphs:

''(M) necessary costs of ensuring the effective relocation of residents displaced as a result of the revitalization of the project, including costs of monitoring as required under subsection (k); and

''(N) activities undertaken to comply with the provisions of (B)(vii) and (C)(xiii) of subsection (e)(2) and subsection (l) (relating to green developments).''.

SEC. 7. SELECTION OF PROPOSALS FOR GRANTS.

(a) SELECTION CRITERIA.—Section 24(e) is amended by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following new paragraph:

''(2) GRANT AWARD CRITERIA.—

''(A) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary shall establish criteria for the award of grants under this section.

''(B) MANDATORY CORE COMPONENTS.—The criteria under this paragraph shall require that a proposed revitalization plan may not be selected for award of a grant under this section unless the proposed plan meets all of the following requirements:

''(i) EVIDENCE OF SEVERE DISTRESS.—The proposed plan shall contain evidence sufficient to demonstrate that the public housing project that is subject to the plan is severely distressed, which shall include—

''(I) a certification signed by an engineer or architect licensed by a State licensing board that the project meets the criteria for physical distress under subsection (t)(2); and

''(II) such other evidence that the project meets criteria for nonphysical distress under subsection (t)(2), such as census data, crime statistics, and past surveys of neighborhood stability conducted by the public housing agency.

''(ii) RESIDENT INVOLVEMENT AND SERVICES.—The proposed plan shall provide for opportunities for involvement of residents of the housing subject to the plan and the provision of services for such residents, in accordance with subsection (g).

''(iii) RELOCATION PLAN.—The proposed plan shall provide a plan for relocation of households occupying the public housing project that is subject to the plan, in accordance with subsection (h), including a statement of the estimated number of vouchers for rental assistance under section 8 that will be needed for such relocation.

''(iv) RESIDENT RIGHT TO EXPANDED HOUSING OPPORTUNITIES.—The proposed plan provides right of resident households to occupy housing provided under such revitalization plan in accordance with subsection (i).

''(v) ONE-FOR-ONE REPLACEMENT.—The proposed plan shall provide a plan that—

''(I) provides for replacement in accordance with subsection (j) of 100 percent of all dwelling units demolished or disposed of under such revitalization plan, as of the date of the application for the grant, on the site of the original public housing or within the jurisdiction of the public housing agency;

''(II) identifies the type of replacement housing that will be offered to tenants displaced by the revitalization plan;

''(III) contains such agreements with or assurances by the Secretary, State and local governmental agencies, and other entities sufficient to ensure compliance with subsection (j) and the requirements of section 18 applicable pursuant to subsection (p)(1); and

''(IV) contains such assurances or agreements as the Secretary considers necessary to ensure compliance with subsection (i)(2).

''(vi) FAIR HOUSING; LIMITATION ON EXCLUSION.—The proposed plan shall be carried out in a manner that complies with section (m) (relating to affirmatively furthering fair housing and limitation on exclusion).

''(vii) GREEN DEVELOPMENTS.—The proposed plan complies with the requirement under subsection (l) (relating to green developments).

''(C) MANDATORY GRADED COMPONENTS.—The criteria under this paragraph shall provide that, in addition to the requirements under subparagraph (B), the proposed revitalization plan shall address and meet minimum requirements with respect to, and shall provide additional priority based on the extent to which the plan satisfactorily addresses, each of the following issues:

''(i) COMPLIANCE WITH PURPOSES.—The extent to which the proposed plan of an applicant achieves the purposes of this section set forth in subsection (a).

''(ii) CAPABILITY AND RECORD.—The extent of the capability and record of the applicant public housing agency, public partners, proposed private development partners, or any alternative management entity for the agency, for managing redevelopment or modernization projects, meeting performance benchmarks, and obligating amounts in a timely manner, including any past performance of such entities under the HOPE VI program and any record of such entities of working with socially and economically disadvantaged businesses, as such term is defined in section 8(a)(4) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 637(a)(4)).

''(iii) DIVERSITY OUTREACH.—The extent to which the proposed revitalization plan includes partnerships with socially and economically disadvantaged businesses, as such term is defined by section 8(a)(4) of the Small Business Act.

''(iv) EFFECTIVENESS OF RELOCATION AND ONE-FOR-ONE REPLACEMENT PLANS.—The extent of the likely effectiveness of the proposed revitalization plan for temporary and permanent relocation of existing residents, including the likely effectiveness of the relocation plan under subparagraph (B)(iii) and the one-for-one replacement plan under subparagraph (B)(v).

''(v) ACHIEVABILITY OF REVITALIZATION PLAN.—The achievability of the proposed revitalization plan pursuant to subsection (o), with respect to the scope and scale of the project.

''(vi) LEVERAGING.—The extent to which the proposed revitalization plan will leverage other public or private funds or assets for the project.

''(vii) NEED FOR ADDITIONAL FUNDING.—The extent to which the applicant could undertake the activities proposed in the revitalization plan without a grant under this section.

''(viii) PUBLIC AND PRIVATE INVOLVEMENT.—The extent of involvement of State and local governments, private service providers, financing entities, and developers, in the development and ongoing implementation of the revitalization plan.

''(ix) NEED FOR AFFORDABLE HOUSING.—The extent of need for affordable housing in the community in which the proposed revitalization plan is to be carried out.

''(x) AFFORDABLE HOUSING SUPPLY.—The extent of the supply of other housing available and affordable to families receiving tenant-based assistance under section 8.

''(xi) PROJECT-BASED HOUSING.—The extent to which the proposed revitalization plan sustains or creates more project-based housing units available to persons eligible for residency in public housing in markets where the proposed plan shows there is demand for the maintenance or creation of such units.

''(xii) GREEN DEVELOPMENTS COMPLIANCE.—The extent to which the proposed revitalization plan—

''(I) in the case of residential construction, complies with the nonmandatory items of the national Green Communities criteria checklist identified in subsection (l)(1)(A), or any substantially equivalent standard as determined by the Secretary, but only to the extent such compliance exceeds the compliance necessary to accumulate the number of points required under such subsection; and

''(II) in the case of non-residential construction, includes non-mandatory components of version 2.2 of the Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) green building rating system for New Construction and Major Renovations, version 2.0 of the LEED for Core and Shell rating system, or version 2.0 of the LEED for Commercial Interiors rating system, as applicable, or any substantially equivalent standard as determined by the Secretary, but only to the extent such inclusion exceeds the inclusion necessary to accumulate the number of points required under such system.

''(xiii) HARD-TO-HOUSE FAMILIES.—The extent to which the one-for-one replacement plan under subparagraph (B)(v) for the revitalization plan provides replacement housing that is likely to be most appropriate and beneficial for families whose housing needs are difficult to fulfill, including individuals who are not ineligible for occupancy in public housing pursuant to subsection (m)(2), have been released from a State or Federal correctional facility, have not been arrested for or charged with any crime during the period beginning upon probation or parole and ending one year after completion of probation or parole, and for whom affordable housing is a critical need.

''(xiv) FAMILY-FRIENDLY HOUSING.—The extent to which replacement housing units provided through the revitalization plan contain a sufficient number of bedrooms to prevent overcrowding.

''(xv) ADDITIONAL ON-SITE MIXED-INCOME HOUSING.—The extent to which the one-for-one replacement plan under subparagraph (B)(v) provides public housing units in addition to the number necessary to minimally comply with the requirement under subsection (j)(2)(A)(i), including the extent to which such plan provides

sufficient housing for elderly and disabled residents who indicate a preference to return to housing provided on the site of the original public housing involved in the revitalization plan and complies with the requirements of subsection (j)(2)(A)(ii).

''(xvi) OTHER.—Such other factors as the Secretary considers appropriate.''.

(b) TREATMENT OF LOW-INCOME HOUSING TAX CREDIT ALLOCATIONS; MANDATORY SITE VISITS.—Section 24(e), as amended by the preceding provisions of this Act, is further amended by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

''(5) TREATMENT OF LOW-INCOME HOUSING TAX CREDIT ALLOCATION.—In the case of any application for a grant under this section that relies on the allocation of any low-income housing tax credit provided pursuant to section 42 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 as part of the revitalization plan proposed in the application, the Secretary shall not require that the first phase of any project to be developed under the plan possess an allocation of such low-income housing tax credits at the time of such application.

''(6) MANDATORY SITE VISITS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary shall provide for appropriate officers or employees of the Department of Housing and Urban Development to conduct a visit to the site of the public housing involved in the revitalization plan proposed under each application for a grant under this section that is involved in a final selection of applications to be funded under this section. Site visits pursuant to this paragraph shall be used only for the purpose of obtaining information to assist in determining whether the public housing projects involved in the application are severely distressed public housing.''.

SEC. 8. REQUIREMENTS FOR MANDATORY CORE COMPONENTS.

Section 24 is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (h) through (m) as subsections (q) through (v), respectively;

(2) by redesignating subsection (o) as subsection (w); and

(3) by striking subsection (g) and inserting the following new subsections:

''(g) RESIDENT INVOLVEMENT AND SERVICES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Each revitalization plan assisted under this section shall provide opportunities for the active involvement and participation of, and consultation with, residents of the public housing that is subject to the revitalization plan during the planning process for the revitalization plan, including prior to submission of the application, and during all phases of the planning and implementation. Such opportunities for participation may include participation of members of any resident council, but may not be limited to such members, and shall include all segments of the population of residents of the public housing that is subject to the revitalization plan, including single parent-headed households, the elderly, young employed and unemployed adults, teenage youth, and disabled persons. Such opportunities shall include a process that provides opportunity for comment on specific proposals for redevelopment, any demolition and disposition involved, and any proposed significant amendments or changes to the revitalization plan.

''(2) NOTICES.—In carrying out a revitalization plan assisted under this section, a public housing agency shall provide the following written notices, in plain and nontechnical language, to each household occupying a dwelling unit in the public housing that is subject to, or to be subject to, the plan:

''(A) NOTICE OF INTENT.—Not later than the expiration of the 30-day period beginning upon publication by the Secretary of a notice of funding availability for a grant under this section for such plan, notice of—

''(i) the public housing agency's intent to submit such application;

''(ii) the proposed implementation and management of the revitalized site;

''(iii) residents' rights under this section to participate in the planning process for the plan, including opportunities for participation in accordance with paragraph (1), and to receive comprehensive relocation assistance and community and supportive services pursuant to paragraph (4); and

''(iv) the public hearing pursuant to paragraph (3).

''(B) NOTICE OF GRANT AWARD AND RELOCATION OPTIONS.—Not later than 30 days after notice to the public housing agency of the award of a grant under this section, notice that—

''(i) such grant has been awarded;

''(ii) describes the process involved under the revitalization plan to temporarily relocate residents of the public housing that is subject to the plan;

''(iii) provides the information required pursuant to subsection (h)(2) (relating to relocation options); and

''(iv) informs residents of opportunities for participation in accordance with paragraph (1).

''(C) NOTICE OF GRANT AGREEMENT AND RELOCATION OPTIONS.—Not later than 30 days after execution of a grant agreement under this section with a public housing agency, notice that—

''(i) specifically identifies the housing available for relocation of resident of the public housing subject to the revitalization plan;

''(ii) sets forth the schedule for relocation of residents of the public housing subject to the revitalization plan, including the dates on which such housing will be available for such relocation; and

''(iii) informs residents of opportunities for participation in accordance with paragraph (1).

''(D) NOTICE OF REPLACEMENT HOUSING.—Upon the availability of replacement housing provided pursuant to subsection (j), notice to each household described in subsection (i)(1) of—

''(i) such availability;

''(ii) the process and procedure for exercising the right to expanded housing opportunities and preferences under subsection (i)(2); and

''(iii) opportunities for participation in accordance with paragraph (1) of this subsection.

''(E) OTHER.—Such other notices as the Secretary may require.

''(3) PUBLIC HEARING.—The Secretary may not make a grant under this section to an applicant unless the applicant has convened and conducted a public hearing regarding the revitalization plan, including the one-for-one replacement to occur under the plan, not later than 75 days before submission of the application for the grant under this section for such plan, at a time and location that is convenient for residents of the public housing subject to the plan.

''(4) SERVICES.—Each recipient of a grant under this section shall—

''(A) provide each household who is residing at the site of the revitalization as of the date of the notice of intent under subparagraph (A) with comprehensive relocation assistance for a period that is the latter of the two periods referred to in subparagraph (B) with comprehensive relocation assistance; and

''(B) offer, to each such displaced resident and each low-income family provided housing under the revitalization plan, community and supportive services until the latter of—

''(i) the expiration of the two-year period that begins upon the end of the development period under the plan; and

''(ii) the date on which all funding under the grant for community and supportive services has been expended.

''(h) RELOCATION PROGRAM.—Each recipient of a grant under this section shall—

''(1) provide for each household displaced by the revitalization plan for which the grant is made to be relocated to a comparable replacement dwelling, as defined in section 101 of the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 4601), and for payment of actual and reasonable relocation expenses of each such household and any replacement housing payments as are required by the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970;

''(2) fully inform such households of all relocation options, which may include relocating to housing in a neighborhood with a lower concentration of poverty than their current residence or remaining in the housing to which they relocate;

''(3) to the maximum extent possible, minimize academic disruptions on affected children enrolled in school by coordinating relocation with school calendars;

''(4) establish strategies and plans that assist such displaced residents in utilizing tenant-based vouchers to select housing opportunities, including in communities with a lower concentration of poverty, that—

''(A) will not result in a financial burden to the family; and

''(B) will promote long-term housing stability;

''(5) establish and comply with relocation benchmarks that ensure successful relocation in terms of timeliness; and

''(6) notwithstanding any other provision of law, in the case of any tenant-based assistance made available for relocation of a household under this subsection, provide that the term during which the household may lease a dwelling unit using such assistance shall not be shorter than 150 days; if the household is unable to lease a dwelling unit during such period, the public housing agency shall either extend the period during which the household may lease a dwelling unit using such assistance or provide the tenant with the next available dwelling unit owned by the public housing agency.

''(i) RIGHT TO EXPANDED HOUSING OPPORTUNITIES FOR RESIDENT HOUSEHOLDS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject only to paragraph (3), each revitalization plan assisted with a grant under this section shall make available, to each household occupying a dwelling unit in the public housing subject to a revitalization plan that is displaced as a result of the revitalization plan (including any demolition or disposition of the unit), occupancy for such household in a replacement dwelling unit provided pursuant to subsection (j). To exercise such right under this paragraph to occupancy in such a replacement dwelling unit, the household shall respond in writing to the notice provided pursuant to subsection (g)(2)(C) by the public housing agency.

''(2) PREFERENCES.—Such a replacement dwelling unit shall be made available to each household displaced as a result of the revitalization plan before any replacement dwelling unit is made available to any other eligible household.

''(3) REPORTS TO SECRETARY.—The Secretary shall require each public housing agency carrying out a revitalization plan assisted under this section to submit to the Secretary such reports as may be necessary to allow the Secretary to determine the extent to which the public housing agency has complied with this subsection and to which displaced residents occupy replacement housing provided pursuant to subsection (j), which shall include information describing the location of replacement housing provided pursuant to subsection (j) and statistical information on the characteristics of all households occupying such replacement housing.

''(j) ONE-FOR-ONE REPLACEMENT.—Each revitalization plan assisted with a grant under this section under which any public housing dwelling unit is demolished or disposed of shall provide as follows:

''(1) NUMBER.—For one hundred percent of all such dwelling units in existence as of the date of the application for the grant that are demolished or disposed under the revitalization plan, the public housing agency carrying out the plan shall provide an additional dwelling unit.

''(2) LOCATION.—Such dwelling units shall be provided in the following manner:

''(A) ON-SITE MIXED-INCOME HOUSING.—

''(i) ONE-THIRD REQUIREMENT.—A mixed-income housing development shall be provided on the site of the original public housing involved in the revitalization plan in which, except as provided in clause (iii), at least one-third of all dwelling units shall be public housing dwelling units and shall be provided through the development of additional public housing dwelling units.

''(ii) REQUIREMENTS FOR ADDITIONAL ON-SITE UNITS.—If the mixed-income housing development provided pursuant to clause (i) includes more public housing dwelling units at the site of the original public housing than is minimally necessary to comply with such clause, the public housing agency shall consult with residents, community leaders, and local government officials regarding such additional public housing dwelling units and shall ensure that such units are provided in a manner that affirmatively furthers fair housing.

''(iii) EXCEPTION.—If, upon a showing by a public housing agency, the Secretary determines that it is infeasible to locate replacement dwelling units on the site of the original public housing involved in the revitalization plan in accordance with clause (i), all replacement units shall be located in areas within the jurisdiction of the public housing agency having low concentrations of poverty, except that at least one mixed-income housing development shall be provided in such an area within the jurisdiction of the public housing agency and that one-third of all units in such development shall be public housing dwelling units. The Secretary may make a finding of infeasibility under this clause only if—

''(I) such location on-site would result in the violation of a consent decree; or

''(II) the land on which the public housing is located is environmentally unsafe, geologically unstable, or otherwise unsuitable for the construction of housing, as evidenced by an independent environmental review or assessment.

''(iv) DECONCENTRATION OF POVERTY.—All dwelling units provided pursuant to this subparagraph shall be provided in a manner that results in decreased concentrations of poverty, with respect to such concentrations existing on the date of the application for the grant under this section.

''(B) OFF-SITE MIXED-INCOME HOUSING.—Any other replacement housing units provided in addition to the dwelling units provided pursuant to subparagraph (A) shall be provided, in areas within the jurisdiction of the public housing agency having low concentrations of poverty, through—

''(i) the acquisition or development of additional public housing dwelling units; or

''(ii) the acquisition, development, or contracting (including through project-based assistance) of additional dwelling units that are subject to requirements regarding eligibility for occupancy, tenant contribution toward rent, and long-term affordability restrictions which are comparable to public housing units, except that subparagraphs (B) and (D) of section 8(o)(13) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f(o)(13); relating to percentage limitation and income-mixing requirement for project-based assistance) shall not apply with respect to vouchers used to comply with the requirements of this clause.

''(3) TIMING.—All replacement dwelling units provided pursuant to this subsection shall be provided not later than the expiration of the 12-month period beginning upon the demolition or disposition of the public housing dwelling units, except that replacement dwelling units financed with a low-income housing tax credit under section 42 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 in connection with the revitalization plan shall be provided not later than the expiration of the 12-month period beginning upon the allocation of such low-income housing tax credit. To the greatest extent practicable, such replacement or additional dwelling units, or redevelopment, shall be accomplished in phases over time and, in each such phase, the public housing dwelling units and the dwelling units described in subparagraph (B)(ii) of paragraph (2) shall be made available for occupancy before any nonassisted dwelling unit is made available for occupancy.

''(4) FAIR HOUSING.—The demolition or disposition, relocation, and provision of replacement housing units under paragraph (2)(B) shall be carried out in a manner that affirmatively furthers fair housing, as described in subsection (e) of section 808 of the Civil Rights Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3608(e)).

''(k) MONITORING OF DISPLACED HOUSEHOLDS.—

''(1) PHA RESPONSIBILITIES.—To facilitate compliance with the requirement under subsection (i) (relating to right to expanded housing opportunities), the Secretary shall, by regulation, require each public housing agency that receives a grant under this section, during the period of the revitalization plan assisted with the grant and until all funding under the grant has been expended—

''(A) to maintain a current address of residence and contact information for each household affected by the revitalization plan who was occupying a dwelling unit in the housing that is subject to the plan; and

''(B) to provide such updated information to the Secretary on at least a quarterly basis.

''(2) CERTIFICATION.—The Secretary may not close out any grant made under this section to a public housing agency before the agency has certified to the Secretary that the agency has complied with subsection (i) (relating to a right to expanded housing opportunities for resident households) with respect to each resident displaced as a result of the revitalization plan, including providing occupancy in a replacement dwelling unit for each household who requested such a unit in accordance with such subsection.

''(3) REPORTS BY SECRETARY.—Not less frequently than once every six months, the Secretary shall submit a report to the Congress that includes all information submitted to the Secretary pursuant to paragraph (1) by all public housing agencies and summarizes the extent of compliance by public housing agencies with the requirements under this subsection and subsection (i).

''(l) GREEN DEVELOPMENTS REQUIREMENT.—

''(1) REQUIREMENT.—The Secretary may not make a grant under this section to an applicant unless the proposed revitalization plan of the applicant to be carried out with such grant amounts meets the following requirements, as applicable:

''(A) GREEN COMMUNITIES CRITERIA CHECKLIST.—All residential construction under the proposed plan complies with the national Green Communities criteria checklist for residential construction that provides criteria for the design, development, and operation of affordable housing, as such checklist is in effect for purposes of this subsection pursuant to paragraph (3) at the date of the application for the grant, or any substantially equivalent standard as determined by the Secretary, as follows:

''(i) The proposed plan shall comply with all items of the national Green Communities criteria checklist for residential construction that are identified as mandatory.

''(ii) The proposed plan shall comply with such other nonmandatory items of such national Green Communities criteria checklist so as to result in a cumulative number of points attributable to such nonmandatory items under such checklist of not less than—

''(I) 25 points, in the case of any proposed plan (or portion thereof) consisting of new construction; and

''(II) 20 points, in the case of any proposed plan (or portion thereof) consisting of rehabilitation.

''(B) LEED RATINGS SYSTEM.—All non-residential construction under the proposed plan complies with version 2.2 of the LEED for New Construction rating system, version 2.0 of the LEED for Core and Shell rating system, version 2.0 of the LEED for Commercial Interiors rating system, as such systems are in effect for purposes of this subsection pursuant to paragraph (3) at the time of the application for the grant, at least to the minimum extent necessary to be certified to the Silver Level under such system, or any substantially equivalent standard as determined by the Secretary.

''(2) VERIFICATION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall verify, or provide for verification, sufficient to ensure that each proposed revitalization plan carried out with amounts from a grant under this section complies with the requirements under paragraph (1) and that the revitalization plan is carried out in accordance with such requirements and plan.

''(B) TIMING.—In providing for such verification, the Secretary shall establish procedures to ensure such compliance with respect to each grantee, and shall report to the Congress with respect to the compliance of each grantee, at each of the following times:

''(i) Not later than 60 days after execution of the grant agreement under this section for the grantee.

''(ii) Upon completion of the revitalization plan of the grantee.

''(3) APPLICABILITY AND UPDATING OF STANDARDS.—

''(A) APPLICABILITY.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the national Green Communities criteria checklist and LEED rating systems referred to in subparagraphs (A) and (B) that are in effect for purposes of this subsection are such checklist and systems as in existence upon the date of the enactment of the HOPE VI Improvement and Reauthorization Act of 2007.

''(B) UPDATING.—The Secretary may, by regulation, adopt and apply, for purposes of this section, future amendments and supplements to, and editions of, the national Green Communities criteria checklist, the LEED rating systems, and any standard that the Secretary has determined to be substantially equivalent to such checklist or systems.

''(m) FAIR HOUSING; LIMITATION ON EXCLUSION.—

''(1) FAIR HOUSING.—Each revitalization plan assisted under this section shall affirmatively further fair housing, as described in subsection (e) of section 808 of the Civil Rights Act of 1968.

''(2) LIMITATION ON EXCLUSION.—Except to the extent necessary to comply with the requirements of this section, replacement housing provided pursuant to subsection (j) under a revitalization plan of a public housing agency that is owned or managed, or assisted, by the agency shall be subject to the same policies, practices, standards, and criteria regarding waiting lists, tenant screening (including screening criteria, such as credit checks), and occupancy that apply to other housing owned or managed, or assisted, respectively, by such agency. A household may not be prevented from occupying a replacement dwelling unit provided pursuant to subsection (j), or from being provided a tenant-based voucher under the revitalization plan, except to the extent specifically provided by any other provision of Federal law (including subtitle F of title V of the Quality Housing and Work Responsibility Act of 1998 (42 U.S.C. 13661 et seq.; relating to safety and security in public and assisted housing and ineligibility of drug criminals, illegal drug users, alcohol abusers, and dangerous sex offenders), subtitle D of title VI of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1992), (42 U.S.C. 13611 et seq.; relating to preferences for elderly and disabled residents), and section 16(f) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437n(f); relating to ineligibility of persons convicted of methamphetamine offenses)).

''(n) ENFORCEMENT.—

''(1) ADMINISTRATIVE ENFORCEMENT.—If the Secretary determines on the record after opportunity for an agency hearing, pursuant to a request made by any member of household described in subsection (i)(1) who is adversely affected or aggrieved by a violation of subsection (g), (h), (i), (j), (k), (m), or (o), that such a violation has occurred, the Secretary shall issue an order requiring the public housing agency committing such violation to cease and desist for such violation and to take any affirmative action necessary to correct or remedy the conditions resulting from such violation.

''(2) AVAILABILITY OF OTHER REMEDIES.—The remedy under paragraph (1) shall be in addition to all other rights and remedies provided by law.

''(o) PERFORMANCE BENCHMARKS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Each public housing agency that receives a grant under this section shall, in consultation with the Secretary and residents of the public housing subject to the revitalization plan for which the grant is made that are displaced as a result of the revitalization plan, establish performance benchmarks for each component of their revitalization plan.

''(2) FAILURE TO MEET BENCHMARKS.—If a public housing agency fails to meet the performance benchmarks established pursuant to paragraph (1), the Secretary shall impose appropriate sanctions, including—

''(A) appointment of an alternative administrator for the revitalization plan;

''(B) financial penalties;

''(C) withdrawal of funding under subsection (j); or

''(D) such other sanctions as the Secretary may deem necessary.

''(3) EXTENSION OF BENCHMARKS.—The Secretary shall extend the period for compliance with performance benchmarks under paragraph (1) for a public housing agency, for such period as the Secretary determines to be necessary, if the failure of the agency to meet such benchmarks is attributable to—

''(A) litigation;

''(B) obtaining approvals of the Federal Government or a State or local government;

''(C) complying with environmental assessment and abatement requirements;

''(D) relocating residents;

''(E) resident involvement that leads to significant changes to the revitalization plan; or

''(F) any other reason established by the Secretary by notice published in the Federal Register.

''(4) AUTHORITY OF SECRETARY.—In determining the amount of each grant under this section and the closeout date for the grant, the Secretary shall take into consideration the scope, scale, and size of the revitalization plan assisted under the grant.

''(p) APPLICABILITY OF OTHER LAWS.—

''(1) SECTION 18.—Any severely distressed public housing demolished or disposed of pursuant to a revitalization plan and any public housing developed in lieu of such severely distressed housing shall be subject to the provisions of section 18. To the extent the provisions of section 18 conflict with or are duplicative of the provisions of this section, the provisions of this section solely shall apply.

''(2) URA.—The Uniform Relocation and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1974 shall apply to all relocation activities pursuant to a revitalization plan under this section.''.

SEC. 9. PLANNING AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE GRANTS.

Subsection (v) of section 24 (42 U.S.C. 1437v(v)), as so redesignated by section 8(1), is amended by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following new paragraph:

''(2) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE GRANTS.—Subject only to approvable requests for grants pursuant to paragraph (1) for any fiscal year, the Secretary shall use not less than two percent for grants in such fiscal year to recipients of grants under this section to assist such recipients in obtaining technical assistance in carrying out revitalization programs.''.

SEC. 10. ANNUAL REPORT; AVAILABILITY OF DOCUMENTS.

Subsection (u) of section 24, as so redesignated by section 8(1) of this Act, is amended—

(1) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following new paragraph:

''(4) the extent to which public housing agencies carrying out revitalization plans with grants under this section have complied with the requirements under subsection (i) (relating to right to expanded housing opportunities for resident households); and''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''To the extent not inconsistent with any other provisions of law, the Secretary shall make publicly available through a World Wide Web site of the Department of Housing and Urban Development all documents of, or filed with, the Department relating to the program under this section, including applications, grant agreements, plans, budgets, reports, and amendments to such documents; except that in carrying out this sentence, the Secretary shall take such actions as may be necessary to protect the privacy of any residents and households displaced from public housing as a result of a revitalization plan assisted under this section.''.

SEC. 11. DEFINITIONS.

Subsection (s) of section 24, as so redesignated by section 8(l) of this Act, is amended—

(1) in clauses (i) and (iii) of paragraph (1)(C), by striking ''program'' each place such term appears and inserting ''plan'';

(2) in paragraph (3)—

(A) by striking ''SUPPORTIVE'' and inserting ''COMMUNITY AND SUPPORTIVE'';

(B) by inserting ''community and'' before ''supportive services'';

(C) by inserting before the period at the end the following: '', and such other services that, linked with affordable housing, will improve the health and residential stability of public housing residents''; and

(D) by inserting after ''transportation,'' the following: ''employment and vocational counseling, financial counseling, life skills training,'';

(3) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (6);

(4) by inserting after paragraph (2), the following new paragraph:

''(5) SIGNIFICANT AMENDMENT OR CHANGE.—The term 'significant' means, with respect to an amendment or change to a revitalization plan, that the amendment or change—

''(A) changes the use of 10 percent or more of the funds provided under the grant made under this section for the plan from use for one activity to use for another;

''(B) eliminates an activity that, notwithstanding the change, would otherwise be carried out under the plan; or

''(C) changes the scope, location, or beneficiaries of the project carried out under the plan.'';

(5) by redesignating paragraph (2) as paragraph (4); and

(6) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following new paragraphs:

''(2) COMPREHENSIVE RELOCATION ASSISTANCE.—The term 'comprehensive relocation assistance' means comprehensive assistance necessary to relocate the members of a household, and includes counseling, including counseling regarding housing options and locations and use of tenant-based assistance, case management services, assistance in locating a suitable residence, site tours, and other assistance.

''(3) DEVELOPMENT.—The term 'development' has the same meaning given such term in the first sentence of paragraph (1) of section 3(c) (42 U.S.C. 1437a).''.

SEC. 12. CONFORMING AMENDMENT.

Paragraph (1) of section 24(f) is amended by striking ''programs'' and inserting ''plans''.

SEC. 13. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Subsection (v)(1) of section 24, as so redesignated by section 8(1) of this Act, is amended by striking all that follows ''section'' and inserting ''$800,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2008 through 2015.''.

SEC. 14. EXTENSION OF PROGRAM.

Subsection (w) of section 24, (as so redesignated by section 8(2) of this Act) is amended by striking ''September 30, 2007'' and inserting ''September 30, 2015''.

SEC. 15. REVIEW.

The Comptroller General of the United States shall—

(1) conduct a review of activities, actions, and methods used in revitalization plans assisted under section 24 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 to determine which may be transferable to other federally-assisted housing programs; and

(2) make recommendations to the Congress regarding the activities, actions, and methods reviewed under paragraph (1) not later than the expiration of the 3-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 16. REGULATIONS.

Section 24, as amended by the preceding provisions of this Act, is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(x) REGULATIONS.—Not later than the expiration of the 120-day period beginning on the date of the enactment of the HOPE VI Improvement and Reauthorization Act of 2007, the Secretary shall issue regulations to carry out this section, including the amendments made by such Act.''.

The CHAIRMAN. No amendment to the committee amendment is in order except those printed in House Report 110–509. Each amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report; by a Member designated by 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 CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 110–509.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 1 offered by Ms. WATERS:

Page 9, strike lines 7 through 12, and insert the following:

''(I)(aa) provides for replacement in accordance with subsection (j) of 100 percent of all dwelling units in existence as of January 1, 2005, that are subject to the revitalization plan and that have been or will be demolished or disposed of, on the site of''.

Page 9, line 15, before the semicolon insert the following: '', or (bb) pursuant to subsection (j)(1)(B), requests a reduction of the percentage specified in subsection (j)(1)(A) and provides for replacement of dwelling units demolished or disposed of in accordance with the percentage requested''.

Page 9, line 18, strike ''tenants'' and insert ''residents''.

Page 9, strike ''and'' in line 24 and all that follows through ''(p)(1)'' on page 10, line 2, and insert ''(as modified by any percentage reduction requested under subsection (j)(1)(B))''.

Page 11, line 9, before the comma insert ''(including nonprofit housing developers)''.

Page 13, line 4, before the last comma insert ''(including nonprofit housing developers)''.

Page 14, line 9, after ''standard'' insert ''or standards''.

Strike line 16 on page 14 and all that follows through page 15, line 5, and insert the following: ''construction, complies with the components of the green building rating systems and levels identified by the Secretary pursuant to subsection (l)(3), but only to the extent such compliance exceeds the minimum level required under such systems and levels.''.

Page 15, line 13, before ''individuals'' insert '', but not limited to, elderly households, disabled households, households consisting of grandparents raising grandchildren, large families, households displaced by the revitalization plan in need of special services, and''.

Page 15, line 16, strike ''State or Federal correctional facility'' and insert ''prison, jail, or other correctional facility of the Federal Government, a State government, or a unit of local government''.

Page 17, after line 21, insert the following:

(c) EXCLUSION OF GREEN DEVELOPMENT COSTS FROM TOTAL DEVELOPMENT COSTS.—Subsection (f) of section 24 is amended by adding after and below paragraph (2) the following:

''In determining the total development costs for a revitalization plan, the Secretary shall not consider any costs of compliance with green building rating systems and levels identified by the Secretary pursuant to subsection (l)(3).''.

Page 21, line 6, before ''dates'' insert ''approximate''.

Page 23, after line 3, insert the following new paragraph:

''(5) SIGNIFICANT AMENDMENTS OR CHANGES TO PLAN.—A public housing agency may not carry out any significant amendment or change to a revitalization plan unless—

''(A) the public housing agency has convened and conducted a public hearing regarding the significant amendment or change at a time and location that is convenient for residents of the public housing subject to the plan and has provided each household occupying a dwelling unit in such public housing with written notice of such hearing not less than 10 days before such hearing; and

''(B) after such hearing, the public housing agency consults with the households occupying dwelling units in the public housing that are subject to, or to be subject to the plan, and the agency submits a report to the Secretary describing the results of such consultation; and

''(C) the Secretary approves the significant amendment or change.

Notwithstanding subparagraph (C), if the Secretary does not approve or disapprove a request for a significant amendment or change to a revitalization plan before the expiration of the 30-day period beginning upon the receipt by the Secretary of the report referred to in subparagraph (B), such request shall be considered to have been approved.''.

Page 24, line 20, strike ''either''.

Page 24, line 22, strike ''or provide the tenant'' and insert ''and continue to provide the household with comprehensive relocation assistance, or at the option of the household, provide the household''.

Page 26, strike line 13, and insert the following:

''(1) NUMBER.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—For one hundred percent, or such lower percentage as is provided pursuant to subparagraph (B), of all''.

Page 26, strike ''the date'' in line 14 and all that follows through line 16 and insert the following: ''January 1, 2005, that are subject to the revitalization plan and that have been or will be demolished or disposed of, the public hous-''.

Page 26, after line 18, insert the following:

''(B) WAIVER.—

''(i) AUTHORITY.—Upon the written request of a public housing agency submitted as part of an application for a grant under this section, the Secretary may reduce the percentage applicable under subparagraph (A) to a revitalization plan of the agency to not less than 90 percent, but only if—

''(I) the Secretary determines that such written request has sufficiently demonstrated a compelling need for such reduction due to extenuating circumstances, which shall include—

''(aa) a judgment, consent decree, or other order of a court that limits the ability of the public housing agency to comply with such requirements;

''(bb) a severe shortage of land available to comply with such requirements; and

''(cc) such other circumstances as the Secretary determines on a case-by-case basis; and

''(II) the reduction is narrowly tailored such that it—

''(aa) reduces the percentage only to the extent necessary to address the particular extenuating circumstances demonstrated pursuant to subclause (I); and

''(bb) is limited in a manner that ensures the maximum extent of compliance with the requirements of this subsection.

''(ii) REQUIRED AND IMPERMISSIBLE CONSIDERATIONS.—In determining whether a compelling need for a reduction pursuant to this subparagraph exists, and extenuating circumstances exist, for purposes of clause (i), the Secretary—

''(I) shall take into consideration the extent and circumstances of any vacant public housing dwelling units of the public housing agency;

''(II) shall take into consideration the extent to which revitalization plan provides additional amenities that will improve the quality of the life of residents by increasing open space or by providing health care or day care facilities or by providing larger units to accommodate families; and

''(III) shall not base any such determination solely or primarily upon any financial hardship of a public housing agency or any other financial condition or consideration.

''(iii) NO WAIVER OF TIME LIMITS.—The Secretary may not, under this subparagraph, waive any requirement of paragraph (3) (relating to timing). The preceding sentence may not be construed to limit or otherwise affect the authority under subsection (o)(3).

''(iv) PENALTY.—If, pursuant to this subparagraph, the Secretary reduces the percentage under subparagraph (A) applicable to the revitalization plan of a public housing agency, no grant under this section may be made to such agency or for any public housing of such agency at any time that such agency is not in full compliance with the requirements of this paragraph, as modified by the terms of such reduction.''.

Page 30, after line 2, insert the following:

''Notwithstanding the preceding sentence, if a public housing agency has limited areas within its jurisdiction having low concentrations of poverty, the replacement housing units provided in addition to the dwelling units provided pursuant to subparagraph (A) may be provided within a 25-mile radius of the mixed-income development referred to in subparagraph (A).''.

Page 30, strike line 3 and all that follows through ''credit.'' in line 13, and insert the following:

''(3) TIMING.—All replacement dwelling units required pursuant to this subsection with respect to the revitalization plan of a public housing agency shall be provided not later than the expiration of the 54-month period that begins upon the execution of the grant agreement under this section for the revitalization plan of the public housing agency.''.

Page 31, after line 2, insert the following:

''(5) PROJECT-BASED VOUCHERS.—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for each of fiscal years 2009 through 2015 for providing replacement vouchers for project-based rental assistance for the purpose of complying with the one-for-one replacement requirement under this subsection.''.

Page 33, line 1, strike ''(3)'' and insert ''(4)''.

Page 33, line 3, after ''standard'' insert ''or standards''.

Strike line 22 on page 33 and all that follows through page 34, line 9, and insert the following:

''(B) GREEN BUILDINGS CERTIFICATION SYSTEM.—All non-residential construction under the proposed plan complies with all minimum required levels of the green building rating systems and levels identified by the Secretary pursuant to paragraph (3), as such systems and levels are in effect for purposes of this subsection pursuant to paragraph (4) at the time of the application for the grant.''.

Page 35, after line 5, insert the following:

''(3) IDENTIFICATION OF GREEN BUILDINGS RATING SYSTEMS AND LEVELS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this section, the Secretary shall identify rating systems and levels for green buildings that the Secretary determines to be the most likely to encourage a comprehensive and environmentally-sound approach to ratings and standards for green buildings. The identification of the ratings systems and levels shall be based on the criteria specified in subparagraph (B), shall identify the highest levels the Secretary determines are appropriate above the minimum levels required under the systems selected. Within 90 days of the completion of each study required by subparagraph (C), the Secretary shall review and update the rating systems and levels, or identify alternative systems and levels for purposes of this section, taking into account the conclusions of such study.

''(B) CRITERIA.—In identifying the green rating systems and levels, the Secretary shall take into consideration—

''(i) the ability and availability of assessors and auditors to independently verify the criteria and measurement of metrics at the scale necessary to implement this subsection;

''(ii) the ability of the applicable ratings system organizations to collect and reflect public comment;

''(iii) the ability of the standards to be developed and revised through a consensus-based process;

''(iv) an evaluation of the robustness of the criteria for a high-performance green building, which shall give credit for promoting—

''(I) efficient and sustainable use of water, energy, and other natural resources;

''(II) use of renewable energy sources;

''(III) improved indoor environmental quality through enhanced indoor air quality, thermal comfort, acoustics, day lighting, pollutant source control, and use of low-emission materials and building system controls; and

''(IV) such other criteria as the Secretary determines to be appropriate; and

''(v) national recognition within the building industry.

''(C) 5-YEAR EVALUATION.—At least once every five years, the Secretary shall conduct a study to evaluate and compare available third-party green building rating systems and levels, taking into account the criteria listed in subparagraph (B).''.

Page 35, line 6, strike ''(3)'' and insert ''(4)''.

Page 35, lines 10 and 11, strike '' LEED rating systems'' and insert ''green building rating systems and levels''.

Page 35, line 12, after ''(B)'' insert ''of paragraph (1)''.

Page 35, line 13, strike ''and systems'' and insert '', systems, and levels''.

Page 35, strike lines 21 through 24 and insert the following: ''criteria checklist, any standard or standards that the Secretary has determined to be substantially equivalent to such checklist, and the green building ratings systems and levels identified by the Secretary pursuant to paragraph (3).''.

Page 35, line 25, strike ''LIMITATION ON EXCLUSION'' and insert ''CONSISTENT ELIGIBILITY AND OCCUPANCY STANDARDS''.

Page 36, line 5, strike ''LIMITATION ON EXCLUSION'' and insert ''CONSISTENT ELIGIBILITY AND OCCUPANCY STANDARDS''.

Strike ''. A household'' in line 15, on page 36 and all that follows through page 37, line 7, and insert the following: '', including requirements under Federal law relating to safety and security in public and assisted housing and ineligibility of drug criminals, illegal drug users, alcohol abusers, and dangerous sex offenders, preferences for elderly and disabled residents, and ineligibility of persons convicted of methamphetamine offenses.''.

Page 37, after line 7, insert the following:

''(3) CONSISTENT OCCUPANCY STANDARDS FOR DISPLACED FAMILIES.—Notwithstanding paragraph (2), any household who occupied a dwelling unit in public housing subject to a revitalization plan of a public housing agency and that was displaced as a result of the revitalization shall be subject, for purposes of occupancy in replacement housing provided pursuant to subsection (j) under the replacement plan that is owned or managed, or assisted, by the agency, only to policies, practices, standards, criteria, and requirements regarding continued occupancy in such original public housing (and not to initial occupancy).''.

Page 38, line 7, after the period insert the following: ''Such benchmarks shall include completion of the provision of all replacement dwelling units provided pursuant to the requirements of subsection (j)''.

Page 39, after line 5, insert the following:

''(D) project delays and cost increases due to shortages in labor and materials as a direct result of location in an area that is subject to a declaration by the President of a major disaster or emergency under the Robert T. Stafford Disaster and Emergency Assistance Act, except that an extension of the period for compliance with performance benchmarks pursuant to this subparagraph shall not be for a period longer than 12 months;''.

Page 39, line 6, strike ''(D)'' and insert ''(E)''.

Page 39, line 7, strike ''(E)'' and insert ''(F)''.

Page 39, line 9, strike ''(F)'' and insert ''(G)''.

Strike line 17 on page 39 and all that follows through ''(2) URA.—'' on page 40, line 1, and insert the following:

''(p) APPLICABILITY OF UNIFORM RELOCATION ACT.—''.

Page 42, lines 17 and 18, strike ''10 percent or more of the funds'' and insert ''20 percent or more of the total amount of HOPE VI grant amounts provided under this section''.

Page 44, after line 18, insert the following:

SEC. 16. EXTENSION OF AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS FOR REVITALIZATION PLANS DELAYED BY HURRICANES.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development may not, before October 1, 2009, recapture any portion of a grant made to a public housing agency to carry out a revitalization plan under section 24 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437v) if the public housing agency has suffered, as a direct result of Hurricane Katrina, Wilma, or Rita of 2005—

(1) project delays; and

(2) cost increases due to shortages in labor and materials.

Page 44, line 19, strike ''SEC. 16.'' and insert ''SEC. 17.''.

Page 45, after line 2, insert the following:

SEC. 18. NON-CITIZEN ELIGIBILITY RESTRICTIONS.

No person not lawfully permitted to be in or remain in the United States is eligible for housing assistance under this Act or the amendments made by this Act. Nothing in this Act or the amendments made by this Act alters the rules under section 214 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. §1436a).

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 922, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) and a Member opposed each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

I would like to thank the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Financial Services, BARNEY FRANK, and Oversight Subcommittee Chairman MEL WATT for their strong support of the manager's amendment to H.R. 3524.

In the manager's amendment filed before this committee, we worked very hard to address concerns that had been raised by the minority, housing advocates, resident organizations, housing authorities, and others to ensure that we have a bill that is achievable and responsive to the needs of low-income families and communities.

In the manager's amendment we maintain more of our public housing stock by requiring the replacement of any units in existence as of January 1, 2005; provide an extremely limited waiver of the one-for-one requirement in special circumstances, such as a court decree or a severe shortage of land, and impose a penalty on those housing authorities who receive a waiver but fail to meet their obligations under it; allow replacement units to be built outside the jurisdiction of the housing authority in the event the housing authority's jurisdiction is limited in the number of low-poverty areas; extend the timeline for rebuilding from 12 to 54 months; increase resident involvement in decisions surrounding significant changes to HOPE VI plans; exclude green building from total development costs; provide flexibility in nonresidential green development standards; protect grantees affected by cost increases and project delays as a result of the 2005 hurricanes from recapture of their funds; and provide that HOPE VI housing assistance is only for persons who are legally present in the United States.

These changes will greatly improve the bill and build upon the success of the HOPE VI program. Since this program's inception in 1992, we have all watched it at work in our districts and wondered how it could work better. We have all seen families displaced and heard stories about families disappearing into thin air because of these developments. We have seen the units come down and seen a reduced number come back up. We know that HOPE VI can and must do better.

This manager's amendment as well as the underlying bill will go far into making this a program that truly gives hope to low-income families. I urge you to support the manager's amendment and the underlying bill and to remember that this bill is about maintaining housing for our low-income families. They need our support.

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. CAPITO. Madam Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition, although I am not opposed to the manager's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentlewoman from West Virginia is recognized for 10 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mrs. CAPITO. Madam Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would like to thank the chairman and the chairwoman of the subcommittee, Ms. WATERS, for reaching across the aisle and working on some of the very serious concerns that we had about the original bill.

I would like to speak specifically about one area, the one-for-one replacement. We have heard a lot of discussion about that on the floor in the beginning arguments. But in this manager's amendment, there is much more flexibility in the one-for-one replacement. It also allows the Secretary to have some flexibility, and I think that means we will have more meaningful housing, housing with more vision on how to improve family and home life.

Another thing is the development timeline. In the original bill, the development timeline was 12 months. I can't imagine myself trying to build large projects such as these and have everything in 12 months. So that deadline was extended to 54 months, which I think was a very good move.

Also on the green building requirements, I have an amendment coming forward to ask for flexibility again in the green building requirements. But in the manager's amendment, some revisions were made, and I think it's moving us a step in the right direction.

I myself support the manager's amendment. I think that a lot of the changes that were made were made in response to what we were hearing in our various offices from not only individuals but various groups their concern for the best way to put forward affordable housing, HOPE VI, and make sure that what we build stands up to the challenges of the future.

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Chairman, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman

from Massachusetts (Mr. OLVER), who spent a lot of time working on this manager's amendment and this bill.

Mr. OLVER. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Madam Chairman, I want to congratulate first Chairman FRANK and Subcommittee Chairwoman WATERS, both from the Financial Services Committee, for their great work in bringing forward to the floor this reauthorization bill for the important HOPE VI program.

I am a supporter of the manager's amendment, and I want to say a few words from an appropriator's perspective here as the chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee that deals with HUD.

In America, we have at least 10 million American families who live below or near the poverty line who are struggling to make ends meet and working largely in minimum wage or near minimum wage jobs and part-time jobs. We appropriate voucher rental assistance for roughly 2½ million of those families through the tenant and project basis, and they're costly. We also appropriate monies to provide operations for the roughly 600,000 units which are under our public housing authorities all over the country.

The HOPE VI program is our only program that allows for total renovation of replacement of family housing units in that group that are under the public housing authorities in cities and towns all over the country. All 10 million of those families dream about better jobs and owning a home, but with incomes so limited, the family budget gets destabilized if there is a job loss or an unanticipated health problem in the family, and they end up being the most vulnerable people for predatory lending practices that have become so obvious in the mortgage disclosure crisis if they are trying to make ends meet and trying to have homeownership. Those are exactly the families that would benefit the most from reduced monthly energy bills, and they are the most in need of that help.

Under the bill before us, HOPE VI projects must meet energy saving requirements embodied in the green community criteria established by Enterprise Partners, the American Planning Association, the American Institute of Architects, and the Natural Resource Defense Council, among others, who have put forth a comprehensive set of criteria which include siting of buildings to maximize passive solar heating and cooling, siting near public transportation, using Energy Star highly efficient appliances, using water fixtures that save water and energy.

A study of 20 already completed projects using these standards showed an average of 2.4 percent only in construction cost increase, but that cost is recovered within 5 to 7 years by lower monthly energy bills.

□ 1200

For the rest of the 50- to 100-year lifetime of the public housing, the moneys, those savings go back to the individual families, and it requires us to appropriate less money to the public housing authority. So it's a very important program.

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Chairman, I would like to yield my remaining time to the ranking member of the full committee, Mr. BACHUS of Alabama.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the manager's amendment, and I would like to commend the majority on addressing several of our concerns. I think particularly the developmental timeline is very significant. I think it's a much more practical way of dealing with notifying tenants about changes, eligibility standards are much improved, and the provision on illegal aliens.

I do think that the one-on-one replacement provision, and I very much appreciate you, I think, making a good change, and I think it allows more of our Members to support the underlying bill. I do intend to continue to support doing away with the one-on-one replacement for the reasons I said in earlier debate, because I still believe that for most people the best option is for them to move out of this concentrated housing. I also think it has an unintended consequence of restricting the ability to create a mixed-income community that you attract a mix of individuals into.

So I will support the Neugebauer amendment. I think the green building requirement, it does do away with some specific references to the LEED rating standard. However, the Green Communities rating system for residential construction remains in the bill, and I believe that we have got to give more flexibility. Let's be environmentally sound, but let's don't adopt one standard, particularly as expressed by the Carpenters Union, the Laborers Union, also the National Home Builders. Let's not discriminate against American wood products.

As we continue to move forward, I am sure that the cooperation you all have shown today will manifest itself, and we will continue to work on that. I will support, and I believe very much we need Mrs. CAPITO's amendments on the green building requirement.

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, I again appreciate the gentlewoman's courtesy, as I appreciate her leadership on this, and that of my friend, Mr. OLVER.

There is a difference between flexibility in green building standards and gutting the provision altogether. Having green building standards should not be merely one factor that is considered, as will be proposed by the gentlewoman's amendment later in the game. The manager's amendment provides flexibility and allows the Secretary to deal with compliance. It does not have strict LEED certification, but still retains that environmental green building standard. Frankly, the notion that we just dismiss this as merely one factor to be considered is going to be regarded in the years to come as an embarrassingly shortsighted proposal.

As I mentioned earlier in the debate we in Portland used HOPE VI to create an environmentally-sensitive community that actually provided twice as many housing units as had been on the site before, using HOPE VI as an anchor for more investment and as a development model. The provisions that are in the underlying bill and the manager's amendment will provide more environmentally-sensitive construction and, frankly, the costs are going to be recovered in relatively short order, as my friend from Massachusetts pointed out, in savings, not just from energy, but also water and sewer as well.

These costs are going up exponentially over time. Having this wired into the HOPE VI provision means that it is a better investment for the community and a better investment for the Federal Government. It's going to save the Federal Government and the tenants money over the long haul. There is absolutely no reason to water it down.

I strongly urge approval of the manager's amendment and rejection of the subsequent amendment.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank all of the people that I have identified on this side of the aisle today, plus people I have not identified on the opposite side of the aisle. It has been very enjoyable working with Mrs. CAPITO, I have appreciated the work of Mr. SHAYS, and of course my old friend, Mr. BACHUS, even though we disagree on some things; and Mr. NEUGEBAUER. We have all come to the conclusion certainly that HOPE VI is a valuable program and that all of our communities can benefit from it.

We have a few different views about one-for-one, we have a few different views about Davis-Bacon maybe, the destruction of units, and the green requirements. But this is one bill that both sides of the aisle understand very thoroughly that America is going to benefit. Mr. BACHUS reminded us, even though I know that he understands, that the reason for HOPE VI is to deal with those public housing projects, those developments that were in great disrepair, that needed to be replaced, that needed to be restored, and not just the physical makeup, not just the buildings; but we also understood that what was wrong with our public housing developments was lack of services.

Many of these developments are like little towns, little cities without services. We all know and appreciate they need after-school, they need health care, they need all kinds of support for families, and job development. All of those things we all support, and I would not challenge my Members on the opposite side of the aisle on any of those issues.

I would like to thank them for the tremendous cooperation they have given, and the staffs have worked so well together to resolve a lot of questions to get us to the point that we are today; and while we will go through a few amendments, I feel very, very good that this very, very big and complicated bill has received such wonderful support.

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. HOLDEN). 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.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. 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 MR. NEUGEBAUER

The Acting CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 110–509.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Mr. 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 Mr. NEUGEBAUER:

Page 9, line 4, before the period insert ''FOR OCCUPIED UNITS''.

Page 9, line 11, after the comma insert ''occupied''.

Page 26, line 9, before the period insert ''FOR OCCUPIED UNITS''.

Page 26, line 14, strike ''in existence'' and insert ''occupied''.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 922, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. NEUGEBAUER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I believe there is a concept that I strongly support, and one that I think a lot of Members of this body support, that when government is too prescriptive, then good ideas and innovation get suppressed. This is the reason I brought forward this amendment, because in H.R. 3524, it requires that all housing units demolished under the HOPE VI grant program be replaced on a one-for-one basis. What we know is that this is a new provision in the HOPE VI program. One of the things that concerns me most about this is in many cases it is not necessarily feasible for us to go back on a one-for-one basis, nor may it be a need in that particular community.

Chairman WATERS and I had a chance to travel down to New Orleans and see some of the activities going on down there, and what we saw is some units that were brought back on a one-for-one basis that were vacant, were unoccupied, which indicated there may be some resistance to coming back to that particular neighborhood.

What we also know with the HOPE VI program is that this program was designed to replace some very terrible housing conditions, an old, failed system of putting all of these low-income systems in a very concentrated area, and we found out very quickly that that was not a successful program. So now with this particular legislation we are going to go back and say we didn't learn our lesson the first time; we are going to go back with these kinds of concentrations in these neighborhoods, which have already shown to fail.

The other thing that I think needs to be brought out is in some cases there may be land constraints that make this not feasible to go back for one-for-one. The second piece of it is that housing and demographics have changed since a lot of these units have been built.

What we are learning now is that we can do these mixed-use projects where we bring moderate and low-income families together and not putting all of these low-income families in one place. We have also learned a lot about the density, the environment, where we have open spaces for children to play, and we are not forcing them to play in the streets.

So there's a lot of things that we do better now, but we are trying to limit using some of those new techniques and new innovations in housing by going back to the old model.

One of the things that I think has been brought out in this debate is that this is not a debate about whether HOPE VI is a good program or not. I want to be clear about that, that when I stand before this body today and say we shouldn't be too prescriptive, I am not talking about not funding this HOPE VI program or reauthorizing it. I think we did some things that actually did make this better, but being too prescriptive begins to deny the ability of communities to sit down and decide what is the best footprint to provide good quality housing for our low-income residents, and they deserve that. For us to stand up and say this body of 435 here and 100 on the other side, that we know more about what the housing needs are in these communities around America, I think is a little ludicrous.

We need to empower the local governments and the housing authorities to be able to sit down and say, look, we have got these old and dilapidated units, people don't want to live in them, some are vacant, some are occupied, and some of them probably shouldn't be occupied, but for the United States Congress to say we know more about your housing needs in your community, I think is poor policy.

That is the reason I am going to be encouraging my colleagues today to vote for the Neugebauer amendment that takes out the provision of being too prescriptive, allowing American cities and communities and housing authorities to make the right decisions for our low-income folks.

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

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I appreciate the cooperative spirit, and we should note that the one-for-one replacement will remain in effect, but there's a question about what it accomplishes.

Let me describe the one-for-one replacement, because it is not nearly as prescriptive as my friend would have indicated. In the first place, communities will have 54 months after the demolition with which to replace the housing. Secondly, it does not have to be new public housing. We have explicitly added here the ability to do project-based vouchers. We have worked with some of those who in fact try to do HOPE VI, to make it more flexible.

Third, there's a waiver in here. One of the factors in the waiver, the gentleman from Texas correctly mentioned open spaces, one of the desirable things. My colleague from Massachusetts, Mr. CAPUANO, offered an amendment that has been incorporated into the manager's amendment that would say when you apply for a waiver, your willingness to put in more open space would be one of the justifications for a waiver for one-for-one. So we do have flexibility.

On the other hand, I reject the notion that we shouldn't be prescriptive here. This is not the Federal Government reaching out and telling people what to do. This is a restriction on the expenditure of Federal funds for a limited purpose. Here is the problem: we do have a shortage of affordable housing units. We do not want to see a Federal program contribute to a diminution of that. We allowed flexibility in the replacement.

Here's the problem with the gentleman's amendment: most of the people who run housing authorities are decent, hardworking people who have taken on a tough job, and we have tried to help them. But there are political situations in some community where the people running housing authorities are not supportive of this purpose.

What the gentleman's amendment says is if they leave the units vacant, they can then permanently get rid of the units. That is the problem. Going forward it gives people an incentive or reward not to fill the units. Most housing authorities won't be like that, but there is incompetence and there are people who for political reasons say, We don't want these people, they are too much of a problem.

So rewarding housing authorities for leaving units vacant by allowing them,

if the people left them vacant may want to have fewer housing units, allowing them that is a very bad idea. We should have flexibility, I agree with the gentleman. But that is flexibility with the waiver; that is flexibility in how you deliver placement. In other words, show why you're trying to do it. But to diminish the requirement at the outset arbitrarily to reward people for leaving units vacant, to reward the incompetence. People say, We have got too many other units here. We're going to leave them vacant. Remember, elderly housing is a major component. That would be a very grave error.

□ 1215

We have, I believe, in much of this country a shortage.

Now, if a community comes forward and says to HUD, You know what, there is no population here left anymore, there is nobody who wants to live here anymore, those are considerations that can be put into the waiver. So we agree there should be flexibility. That is why we have a waiver component.

By the way, in addition to open space, if you show you are going to do day care facilities, if you show you are going to do health care facilities, that can further justify fewer units. If you say you are going to build more large units for large families, yes, you can trade in a couple of small units for a large unit. All of those are encouraged.

The only thing we disagree with, because we believe we have built flexibility in here, is, as I said, to give people in some cases those who are, and it is not the majority by any means, people who are not supportive of this, give them an incentive to leave housing vacant.

Now, let me say this to the gentleman: His amendment didn't say housing that was physically unoccupiable. I agree the bill does not make that consideration. I would say to the gentleman, going forward, we might be able to work on a situation where units that were physically not habitable might not be counted. I agree with that. If that was the amendment, I think we might be working something out, and I hope we will as it goes forward. But what the gentleman's amendment says, units that are perfectly in good shape, that the authority either can't rent because they are incompetent or decides not to, that those can be disregarded.

So I hope the amendment is defeated. But I would promise to work with the gentleman as we go forward so that units that are in fact not habitable, not occupiable, would not be counted.

I would yield to the gentleman.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. I thank the gentleman. I do understand that there could be a small minority of housing authorities trying to accomplish some purpose by keeping those units vacant, but I would say we are being probably more prescriptive for the ones that are vacant.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Taking back my time, I would agree with that if we didn't have a waiver in there, if we didn't have a variety of ways of meeting the one-for-one replacement. It is not all public housing. In fact, one of the things I plan to do in future legislation in cooperation with my colleagues is to go to some of the other housing programs we may have, maybe the Low Income Housing Fund or others, and give a preference to housing authorities who have that HOPE VI obligation. So, in other words, there would be a wide variety of ways in which they could replace the housing, not simply by public housing, because, I agree, that would be self-defeating.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. If the gentleman would yield, I would appreciate working with the gentleman on that particular provision of making sure that those units that are not habitable now would not be counted.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I appreciate that. I thank the gentleman.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. NEUGEBAUER).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Mr. 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. 3 OFFERED BY MR. MAHONEY OF FLORIDA

The Acting CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 110–509.

Mr. MAHONEY of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

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 5, strike lines 8 through 23, and insert the following:

SEC. 5. MAIN STREET PROJECTS GRANTS.

Section 24 is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (n) as subsection (y);

(2) in subsection (l), by striking ''subsection (n)'' each place such term appears and inserting ''subsection (y)''; and

(3) in subsection (m)(3), by striking ''subsection (n)'' and inserting ''subsection (y)''.

Page 40, strike lines 19 and 20 and insert the following:

(1) in paragraph (4), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(2) by redesignating paragraph (5) as paragraph (6); and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (4) the following new paragraph:

Page 40, line 21, strike ''(4)'' and insert ''(5)''.

Page 44, line 21, strike ''by adding at the end'' and inserting ''by inserting before subsection (y) (as so redesignated by section 5(1) of this Act)''.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 922, 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. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment that will preserve the HOPE VI Main Street Grant program. This program, important to rural communities with very small populations, was created with the passage of the American Dream Act of 2003. Since its inception, the program has helped a small number of rural communities develop affordable housing units in conjunction with larger revitalization efforts.

The creation of the HOPE VI Main Street Grant program in 2003 is important to rural communities because it allows rural communities to compete with larger urban areas for HOPE VI dollars.

Mr. Chairman, for those not familiar with the program, the HOPE VI Main Street grants are funded through a 5 percent set-aside in the HOPE VI annual appropriations and each award is capped at $1 million.

As I noted, this program is extremely important to rural communities such as Moore Haven, Florida. Located on the banks of the Caloosahatchee River in Glades County and one of the most rural areas of Florida, Moore Haven is one of the oldest cities in South Florida. This beautiful, old, sleepy Florida town is home to one doctor, Dr. Geek, and one restaurant. It is one of the few places left in Florida where the families have lived there for generations and everyone knows their neighbor.

Unfortunately, it is also one of the poorest areas in the State. The population of the city is approximately 1,900 people and the annual tax revenue for all of Glades County is $6 million. The people of Moore Haven have a desire to revitalize their historic downtown area, but they lack the financial resources.

Guided by the vision of Tracy Whirls, the Executive Director of the Glades County Economic Development Council, Moore Haven applied for a HOPE VI Main Street grant last year. The city had hoped to use the money to purchase three historic but dilapidated and vacant buildings, with the intention of attracting businesses to the first floors and 12 affordable housing units on the upper levels. Plans for the first floors included opening Moore Haven's only pharmacy and furniture store.

I regret, Mr. Chairman, that Moore Haven was not successful in its attempt to secure the grant. The good news is that they are game and they are going to apply for it again this year. But I believe it is imperative that we continue to give Moore Haven and small rural cities like Moore Haven across this great Nation this opportunity.

Mr. Chairman, in closing, I would like to leave you with the words of Larry Luckey, the Glades County property appraiser. ''If we are unable to

save these historic commercial buildings, the downtown historic district will cease to exist. I am saddened at the thought that we may well become a city with no history.''

I would ask for the support of my colleagues to preserve the HOPE VI Main Street Grant program and the economy and history of small towns across America, including Moore Haven. In addition, with the passage of my amendment, we will ensure that rural communities continue to have access to the affordable housing benefits provided by the HOPE VI program.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD).

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman for yielding and thank the chairman and chairwoman for their passion and leadership on this very important issue.

I rise today in support of the amendment offered by my good friend and colleague from Florida, Mr. MAHONEY. Mr. Chairman, I represent the First District of North Carolina, which is the 15th poorest district in our country. One of the towns in my district is called Henderson, North Carolina. Last year, this town was one of three, one of three towns across the country, to receive the HOPE VI Main Street grant that this bill attempts to remove.

As we all know, HOPE VI Main Street grants seek to revitalize and rejuvenate older downtown business districts while retaining the area's traditional and historic character. The purpose of this program is to provide assistance to smaller communities in the development of affordable housing and the revitalization and reconfiguration of obsolete commercial offices or buildings into sustainable and affordable housing.

Mr. Chairman, towns like Henderson need these grants. We need these grants to reinvigorate the communities and to spur outside commercial investment. The point is, in closing, that HOPE VI Main Street grants are needed for rural America.

I want to thank Mr. MAHONEY for his leadership and passion and thank him for bringing forth this amendment.

Mr. MAHONEY of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. 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. SESSIONS

The Acting CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in House Report 110–509.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 4 offered by Mr. SESSIONS:

Strike line 18 on page 4 and all that follows through page 5, line 7.

Page 16, lines 20 through 22, strike '', as amended by the preceding provisions of this Act, is further'' and insert ''is''.

Page 16, line 24, strike ''(5)'' and insert ''(4)''.

Page 17, line 9, strike ''(6)'' and insert ''(5)''.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 992, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment, which strikes the prohibition of the demolition-only grants from the HOPE VI, allowing HUD to retain its current authority to issue these grants as conditions warrant. The original goal of HOPE VI was to eliminate severely distressed public housing, and demolition-only grants continue to play an important role in achieving this goal.

Currently, HUD is allowed to grant demolition-only grants only when necessary and in instances that benefit the community. That means it will be done in consultation with the community. As a result, HUD provides these grants with great discretion. In fact, a demolition-only grant has not been issued by HUD since 2003. Clearly, despite what the opponents of this legislation may claim, HUD has not covertly abused this power to tear down public housing units without reason and, I would suggest to you, without being asked to participate.

However, sometimes public housing authorities have already put together their own financing to redevelop housing, but they lack the funds to tear down the existing distressed facility. In instances like these, common sense dictates that a demolition-only grant under HOPE VI would be appropriate, once again, working with the existing local authority to make sure that what they want is accomplished.

As an added bonus, a cleared site also attracts more Federal and private resources for revitalization efforts, meaning that when local people ask for the support, then it can and would presumably be granted, making the site better.

Another instance in which demolition-only grants make sense is when a severely distressed public housing site is simply not a viable candidate for redevelopment, either because it is only partially occupied or completely vacant, once again, working directly with the local housing authority. In these cases, other forms of housing assistance, like section 8 vouchers, may be more beneficial to community members simply than reconstructing a new building, in particular on the same site, once again, at the discretion of local housing authorities.

The question that every Member should be asking themselves before they vote to eliminate this authority is, if there is no demand for public housing in a certain area, as evidenced by its partially or completely vacant status, and if the local housing authority is seeking this help, then why on Earth would Congress mandate that HUD create an unwanted supply? It makes no logical or fiscal sense to inefficiently direct these taxpayer dollars where there is no reason or demand to build. Prohibiting demolition-only grants almost guarantees this type of waste would occur.

Additionally and finally, Mr. Chairman, let's not forget that the ultimate goal of this program is to empower people to eventually get off public housing and become self-determined, not simply to create more public housing units. I would submit in the greater scheme of things, it is also to have the Federal Government, through HUD, have the flexibility to work carefully and closely with local housing authorities to make sure that the right thing happens.

By preventing HUD from having the authority to remove dilapidated housing without also rebuilding new units as Congress, we are certainly failing to live up to the spirit of this philosophy. I encourage all of my colleagues to support what I think is a commonsense amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WATT. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, listening to the gentleman, one would think that the demolition-only program is a harmless program in the Federal Government. It is absolutely true that the Bush administration has decided not to use the demolition-only authority that the statute gives them since 2003, but there are reasons that they have decided not to use the demolition-only authority.

Between 1996 and 2003, administrations made 285 demolition-only grants to 127 public housing authorities that resulted in demolishing, demolishing, 56,755 housing units, affordable housing units, in this country.

□ 1230

And the result was replacing less than half of those demolished housing units because we have had a net loss over that period of 30,000 affordable housing units. So the administration in its good wisdom decided that this was a program that was counterproductive, was contrary in fact to the original objective of the HOPE VI program, and discontinued the use of the authority that it had because it didn't think it was a good program.

Now, the case has been made well by a number of our committee members, Mr. GREEN from Texas in particular, that if there is anybody in America who thinks that there is an excess of affordable housing, they haven't read any statistics. If there is anybody in America who believes there is an excess of affordable public housing, or

public housing, period, in America, they haven't read the statistics.

So why the Federal Government would be giving money to local communities solely to tear down public housing, affordable housing in this country, given the dire shortage of housing in America and the massive existence of homelessness in America, I can't tell you.

Now, HOPE VI allows local communities to demolish distressed public housing; and one of the concerns that this bill addresses is that we have tried to have a program to replace those houses so that people won't be on the street. And that is exactly what HOPE VI does. That part of it we need to retain. The demolition grants need to be terminated. This bill terminates demolition-only grants, and we should support the bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman. What he said is let's take away the flexibility, notwithstanding that he has a disagreement with what the Clinton and the first term of this President has done.

I think what we are doing is taking a tool away from the toolbox rather than flexibility. I believe it is local people who would ask for this to be done, anyway, and then the Federal Government can participate. But simply to say we have a house and we ought to keep it no matter what, is, in my opinion, a bad argument. It is a bad argument because keeping up something that is bad and needs repair and can't take care of itself, we need to get rid of those. We need to rebuild. That is what HOPE VI is all about. I hope you vote for my amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WATT. I would just say the gentleman has made the exact point that I tried to make in my argument, probably even more cogently than I made it, that HOPE VI is about not only tearing down but rebuilding. And there is plenty of discretion in local communities inside the HOPE VI program to demolish public housing, as long as there is a plan to put housing back in place. And we have retained that authority to put housing back in place. The bill terminates the authority to just tear down rather than having the obligation to rebuild.

I oppose the gentleman's amendment and encourage my colleagues to vote against it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. 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 MS. LEE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in House Report 110–509.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 5 offered by Ms. LEE:

Page 40, line 4, strike the quotation marks and the second period.

Page 40, after line 4, insert the following:

''(3) PUBLIC HOUSING AND SECTION 8 EVICTION PROVISIONS.—In the case of any public housing or housing assisted under section 8, for which assistance is provided at any time pursuant to a grant for a revitalization plan under this section, the provisions of paragraph (6) of section 6(l) and clause (iii) of section 8(d)(1)(B), respectively, shall apply, except that any criminal or drug-related criminal activity referred to in the matter preceding subparagraph (A) of such paragraph or in the matter preceding subclause (I) of such clause, respectively, engaged in by a member of a tenant's household or any guest or other person under the tenant's control, shall not be cause for termination of tenancy of the tenant if—

''(A) the tenant is an elderly person (as such term is defined in section 202(k) of the Housing Act of 1959 (12 U.S.C. 1701q)) or a person with disabilities (as such term is defined in section 811(k) of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act (42 U.S.C. 8013(k)), and

''(B) the tenant did not know and should not have known of the activity or the tenant or member of household was the victim of the criminal activity;''.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 922, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, first let me thank Chairman BARNEY FRANK and our chairwoman, Congresswoman MAXINE WATERS, for their hard work in bringing to the floor this very critical legislation that reauthorizes HOPE VI for the first time in 6 years.

As a former member of Congresswoman WATERS' subcommittee, I saw firsthand her leadership on this and so many issues to create and expand affordable housing, to promote fair housing, to improve public housing, and to support the creation of a National Housing Trust Fund, among other initiatives. And so I know that, without her expertise and the chairman's expertise and their commitment, we wouldn't be considering today this truly important HOPE VI reauthorization bill. So I want to thank Congresswoman WATERS and Chairman FRANK for their leadership.

In revitalizing public housing, the HOPE VI program is able to offer precisely that, and that is hope: hope for a better community, hope for a better future. And I know that in my own district, for example, in Oakland, California, the Mandela Gateway HOPE VI initiative is doing just that.

Mr. Chairman, that is why I come to the floor today with a very simple amendment that builds on this hope. My amendment would allow Congress to stand up for the elderly and the disabled residents of public housing who are unwitting victims of the misdeeds of their relatives or guests. Specifically, this amendment would create a narrow exemption from the eviction rule for those who are elderly or disabled and who have committed no crime and have no knowledge of a crime being committed or are the actual victims of a crime. This amendment will give completely innocent tenants who are the most vulnerable a fighting chance to stay in their homes.

It is sad that we have to stipulate this, but there is a history of these unfair evictions. Let me just share one. In 2002, the Supreme Court reversed the Ninth Circuit Court and upheld the eviction order to remove a 63-year-old woman, Ms. Pearlie Rucker, from her home. The court did so despite the fact that she had committed no crime or had any knowledge that the crime was happening. The Court did so based on the criminal actions of her adult son and daughter, who committed their crime several blocks away from their home. The Court found that, because she had signed a lease that gave public housing authority the right to no-fault evictions, her inability to control the actions of other adults made her a threat to other tenants, and evicted her. This is just plain wrong.

Unfortunately, Pearlie Rucker and her Supreme Court case has become the basis for more forced evictions of people who have committed no crime.

So this amendment certainly does not want to stop our hardworking public housing authorities from providing low-income families with a safe place to live; but innocent, elderly, and disabled tenants must not have their housing rights stripped from them because of the actions of other individuals away from their homes. So as such, it is especially tragic that the elderly and the disabled are the most vulnerable but are the least able to effectively control the actions of their guests as fellow tenants should be held liable and punished for the actions of other adults.

So I urge my colleagues to support this very simple amendment, and again I want to thank Congresswoman WATERS and Chairman FRANK for their leadership and their assistance with this.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 3524, to reauthorize the HOPE VI Improvement and Reauthorization Act of 2007, introduced by my distinguished colleague from California, Representative MAXINE WATERS. This important legislation will reauthorize and make changes to the HOPE VI public housing revitalization program. I would like to thank Congresswoman WATERS for her consistent and dedicated work on this important issue, as well as to commend Chairman FRANK for his leadership in bringing this bill to the floor today.

Mr. Chairman, this legislation reauthorizes, with important changes incorporated into the

Manager's Amendment, the HOPE VI public housing revitalization program. Among other provisions, it provides for the retention of public housing units, protects residents from disruptions resulting from the grant, increases resident involvement, and improves the efficiency and expediency of construction. The HOPE VI program, created in 1992, has worked to improve the Nation's most dilapidated public housing units by providing much needed resources to public housing agencies. These funds have directly benefited countless Americans, particularly the elderly and those with disabilities, partnering with local agencies to improve conditions in public housing units and communities. I also support the technical changes made by the Manager's Amendment, and I believe that they will ensure that this legislation works to the maximum benefit of all Americans.

Mr. Chairman, because I believe that this is strong and positive legislation, and I would like to take this opportunity to address a number of amendments offered by my distinguished colleagues. I would like to express my support for the amendment introduced by my colleague, Mr. MAHONEY. This amendment will restore the set-aside funds for the Main Street grant program. Mr. Chairman, this important program provides resources for the revitalization of older, downtown business districts, while retaining an area's historical character. The Main Street grant program enables smaller communities to develop affordable housing while still retaining their traditional identity and roots in the past. I believe that this program is very important to countless communities across the Nation, seeking to provide for their citizens without losing sight of their shared history. I strongly urge my colleagues to join me in supporting Mr. MAHONEY's amendment to restore funding for this program to this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I also strongly support the amendment introduced by my colleague, Congresswoman LEE. This amendment will safeguard the rights of elderly and disabled tenants living in HOPE VI housing. Congresswoman LEE's amendment prohibits the eviction of elderly or disabled tenants based on the criminal activities of others, provided that the elderly or disabled tenant did not have knowledge of the criminal activity. This important amendment improves the underlying legislation by ensuring that disadvantaged members of our communities are not further victimized for events beyond their control. It allows Congress to stand up for the rights of those living in public housing, preventing the eviction of elderly and disabled residents as the result of the wrongdoing of family members.

However, I must oppose several amendments that I feel will harm the integrity of this bill. I stand opposed to the amendment offered by my colleague and fellow Texan Mr. NEUGEBAUER, limiting the number of dwelling units that housing agencies are required to replace. Under the provisions of this amendment, only those units that are occupied as of the date of the HOPE VI application must be replaced, rather than requiring that all units torn down through the use of HOPE VI grants be replaced on a one-to-one basis. I strongly oppose this change, because I believe it weakens the one-for-one requirement in this legislation by creating incentives for housing agencies to increase the number of vacant units prior to seeking a HOPE VI grant, to decrease the overall number of units that must be replaced. I encourage my colleagues to join me in opposing this amendment, and in support of the underlying language.

Mr. Chairman, I also must oppose the amendment offered by my colleague Mr. SESSIONS, reinstating the Department of Housing and Urban Development's authority to issue demolition-only grants. These grants, which have not been issued since 2003, provide resources for the demolition of properties and the relocation of families living there. While this legislation eliminates demolition-only grants, unless the demolition is done in connection with the replacement of dwelling units, ensuring that the total amount of units does not diminish. The adoption of this amendment would gut the strong replacement requirements of the underlying legislation, and would further reduce the already limited affordable housing stock in our nation.

I also oppose the amendment offered by Congressman KING of Iowa. This amendment would prohibit any amount authorized under this legislation from being used to pay wages in compliance with the Davis-Bacon Act. The adoption of this provision would in effect nullify the applicability of Davis-Bacon to the HOPE VI program. Mr. Chairman, the Davis-Bacon Wage Determinations are issued by the U.S. Department of Labor, and they indicate the prevailing wage rates in a region, to be paid on federally funded or assisted construction projects. These standards ensure that workers on Federal projects are paid a fair wage, and I believe it would be extremely detrimental to workers and to our economy as a whole to exempt HOPE VI projects from these standards.

Mr. Chairman, I also stand in opposition to the amendment offered by my colleague Congresswoman CAPITO, eliminating the requirements that all grants must comply with minimum Green Building requirements. I believe today's legislation, as introduced, makes important steps forward toward responsible stewardship of our natural resources, and Ms. CAPITO's proposal that compliance with Green Building requirements be only one factor in the evaluation of grant applications would weaken our effort to protect our global environment. The Capito amendment would weaken the minimum standards for energy efficiency set forth in this bill, and would permit the Department of Housing and Urban Development to propose much weaker green development standards than are currently required under this bill. I urge my colleagues to oppose the Capito amendment, and to keep the language set forth by this legislation.

I strongly urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this extremely important legislation by protecting the integrity of the underlying language, while making the technical corrections included in the Manager's Amendment to ensure that the intent of the legislation can be enacted.

Ms. LEE. I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. KING OF IOWA

The Acting CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 6 printed in House Report 110–509.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 6 offered by Mr. KING of Iowa:

Page 44, line 2, before the closing quotation marks insert the following: ''None of the funds authorized to be appropriated under this paragraph may used to pay wages in compliance with subchapter IV of chapter 31 of title 40, United States Code.''.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 922, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, the amendment that I offer to this bill that is before us today is an amendment that strikes the requirements for Davis-Bacon wage scale and prohibits any of the funds from going to Davis-Bacon wage scale. And for the information of the body, Davis-Bacon wage scale is a Federal wage scale that was imposed over 75 years ago in this country; and I could go back into the history of it, but the essence of Davis-Bacon wage scale is this: it imposes union scale on all projects and any projects that are $2,000 or more, which essentially are all projects.

I am a Member of this Congress that has worked and lived under Davis-Bacon wage scale, and I have done that for well over 30 years. I have done the homework, I have done the paperwork, I have put together the spreadsheets, and I dealt with all the employee dynamics that were involved there.

And I make the point, Mr. Chairman, that labor is a commodity like corn or beans or gold or oil or gasoline, and the value of it needs to be determined by the marketplace, not by the government. And for the Federal Government to intervene in a relationship between two people, and a contractual relationship in particular, at the cost of the taxpayer that always favors going to a union scale and is not a prevailing wage but it is in effect a union scale, this authorization as written, if my amendment is not adopted, will cost the taxpayers an additional $26 million.

And the inflation to construction projects runs between 8 percent and 35 percent. I use the number 20 percent. It is a low average. But I am pledged here to protect the taxpayers, and I believe we need to protect the relationship between the employer and the employee. And if unions want to negotiate, I am all for their ability to do that, but I don't think it should be imposed by statute, a statute that cannot keep up with a change in the wage scale, a statute that is not effective, and one that, according to a Department of Labor Inspector General study, nearly 100 percent of the data cannot be relied upon. It is time to end this practice. It is archaic, and it is time to strike this provision out of here and eliminate Davis-Bacon wage scale.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Iowa very cleverly uses the words ''union scale.'' This is not union scale; this is prevailing wage scale. This is set by scientific surveys within a community, based upon what is the prevailing wage in that community. It moves from community to community. There is a reason for that.

Davis-Bacon has been one of the foremost agents that we have been able to use in our entire economic structure to make sure that the American worker has a livable wage that maintains the standards in that community. The Davis-Bacon requirement has been on the books since 1931, and, if I might add, put on by a Republican, one of my opponents' party members, President Hoover, and it has served us well.

Now, this amendment is certainly an amendment that is very timely. Here we are in the throes of a recession, one of the most damaging economic crises that this Nation has faced in the last quarter of a century, and we have the gentleman from Iowa wanting to put on an amendment that would diametrically affect the living wages of the people who need the help the most.

Now, by preventing workers on HOPE VI projects from earning a living wage is certainly not the right way to go. It is a hole in the head bucket strategy, given that those very same workers in the absence of Davis-Bacon protections would be unable to find housing themselves. A part of the HOPE VI mission, Mr. Chairman, is to make construction of units more efficient and to ensure that the HOPE VI housing units are more environmentally friendly and cost effective. The Davis-Bacon prevailing wages helps attract the necessary skilled workforce to build housing in the most efficient and cost-effective manner. This is a bad amendment.

I yield 2 minutes to Mr. GEORGE MILLER to put his statement in the RECORD at this point.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I very much appreciate his remarks against this amendment to eliminate Davis-Bacon.

You cannot build good solid communities on the backs of poor people, and you can't build good solid communities on the back of poor wages, poor working conditions. This is about prevailing wages; it is not about a union wage. They constantly year after year come and mischaracterize this amendment; they mischaracterize the program. But the fact of the matter is the majority in this House understands how important this provision is to working people in this country and to the communities in which these projects are being built. In fact, all projects in this country where we invest taxpayer money, we should get good projects, good wages and good working conditions for the people on those projects.

I thank the gentleman for his statement.

I rise in strong opposition to the amendment offered by Mr. KING of Iowa.

Here we have a bill to reauthorize the HOPE VI program. That program provides grants to localities for the construction, rehabilitation, and, in some cases, demolition of public housing units. That work is going to be done in some of the poorest neighborhoods in this country. That work is going to be done in areas with some of the highest unemployment in this country.

And what does the King amendment do? It eliminates prevailing wage requirements for this work. It gives the money to contractors who would be free to pay poverty wages and pocket the rest as profit. This amendment worsens the cycle of poverty in the very areas that need the most help.

But that's not all. This is taxpayer money. What do you get when you give taxpayer money to contractors who pay poverty wages and treat their workers poorly? You get shoddy work. And you have to spend more taxpayer money to fix it later.

Let's summarize: The King amendment uses taxpayer money to worsen the cycle of poverty in the poorest neighborhoods in this country. It uses taxpayer money to buy shoddy work that just increases the costs later on. It's difficult to tell who the amendment is trying to hurt the most—the poor neighborhoods, the workers, or the taxpayers. This Amendment is outrageous and should be roundly defeated by this House.

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire of the amount of time remaining for each party.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa has 3 minutes remaining; the gentleman from Georgia has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, first of all I say to the gentleman from California, that is offensive to me to say that my 28 years of meeting payroll, my 1,400-some consecutive weeks of making payroll, of providing health insurance and retirement benefits and year-around work for employees and a career path for them is, to take his words, poor wages and poor working conditions. My employees didn't think so, and neither did the people that applied for a job that I didn't have room to hire. That is not the way it works out there in the world. And who in this Congress has some experience that can step forward and say otherwise?

□ 1245

I lived it. I lived it all of my working life. I know what happens when you pay the excavator operator $28 an hour and the shovel operator $12 an hour. You can't get the guy on the excavator to get down and pick up the shovel to move a clod. You can't get him to pick up a grease gun. It destroys the relationship on the workplace, and it rearranges everybody's assignments. And so the guy running the finish motor grader is rolling clods out there because he doesn't want to get off the machine and pick up the grease gun, and your machines wear out. And the boss has got to come to work at 3 o'clock in the morning to do the maintenance. That's what happens when government gets in the way. And it costs money. The inflation goes up; 8 percent, 35 percent. I pick 20 percent. There is $26.4 million in this bill that is unnecessary.

We have a shortage of labor. We are bringing in millions of people to unskilled jobs here in the United States because we say this economy cannot survive without that. And now we can't go without a union scale. That is union scale, Mr. SCOTT. And you can't show me any statistical evidence otherwise. It is the union operations that file the reports because those that are not union get organized and they get picketed.

These people are smart. They are not foolish about this. And this is a Jim Crow law. We went through this before. This was New York City. It was a Federal building back in 1930 or 1931, and a contractor in New York City decided that he wanted to keep out the low bid that came from Alabama. The low bid came from Alabama because the labor could come from Alabama. Those didn't happen to be white people. Those were African Americans that came up and undercut the union wages in New York and that brought about this ''Republican'' bill.

So I call it a Jim Crow bill. And I call it a racist bill, and it is one that has been now shoehorned into this economy, into this bill, into this legislation, in order to protect union wage scale.

I have pledged to come here to preserve and protect the free enterprise side of this, the competition that is necessary for the efficiency that is here. And I will also protect the right of individuals to organize and negotiate for a good wage and good benefits. That's also a right we should have in this country.

But this is not about prevailing wage. This is about union pay scale, and it was a bill that was rooted in Jim Crow laws that has now been transferred into union scale.

I urge the adoption of my amendment. Save $26.4 million and protect the relationship between employers and employees and let me provide a 12-month, year-round job with benefits and retirement funds so that people can plan their future, not hire them for 3 hours and let them go for the next rest of the week.

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, let it be noted that the gentleman from Iowa, my good friend, is the one who brought up the race card, not I. But I will be the one who quickly puts it back into the middle of the deck, where it should stay and belong forever.

The fact of the matter is this: For 77 years, Mr. Chairman, this country has had the prevailing wage. Not a union

wage. The prevailing wage standards are set by scientific surveys of actual wages paid in the local communities, and anyone awarded a government contract pays at least those prevailing wages. It is not a union scale. If you had union scale, that is it no matter where you go. Prevailing wages are what is established based upon that local economy, that local situation.

You talk about New York. When Hoover put this in in 1931, he didn't put it in for New York. It was for the entire Nation, because we were at the throes of the depression, at the beginning of the depression.

And now in a similar situation, while we are not in the beginning of a depression, but certainly in a recession, you misguidedly, my good friend, want to remove it. How ironic.

Mr. Chairman, this is a terrible amendment. It certainly is not the right time to even think about in any fashion any measure that would constrict the economic sector in this country rather than at a much greater need when we need to expand it, and we need to stand and protect the wage earner and working America on this amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. 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 Iowa will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MRS. CAPITO

The Acting CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 7 printed in House Report 110–509.

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 7 offered by Mrs. CAPITO:

Page 10, strike lines 13 through 16.

Page 14, strike ''non-mandatory'' in lines 5 and 6 and all that follows through line 14, and insert the following: ''components of the green building rating system, standard, or code determined by the Secretary pursuant to subsection (l)(3); and''.

Strike line 16 on page 14 and all that follows through page 15, line 5, and insert the following: ''construction, complies with the components of the green building rating system, standard, or code determined by the Secretary pursuant to subsection (l)(3).''.

Page 32, line 13, strike ''REQUIREMENT''.

Strike line 14 on page 32 and all that follows through page 34, line 9.

Page 34, line 10, strike ''(2)'' and insert ''(1)''.

Page 34, line 13, strike ''proposed''.

Page 34, strike lines 15 through 18, and insert ''this section is carried out in accordance with the terms included in the approved plan pursuant to section (e)(2)(C)(xii)''.

Page 35, after line 5, insert the following:

''(2) IDENTIFICATION OF GREEN BUILDINGS RATING SYSTEM, STANDARD, OR CODE.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this section, the Secretary shall identify a rating system, standard, or code for green buildings that the Secretary determines to be a comprehensive and environmentally-sound approach to development of green buildings.

''(B) CRITERIA.—In identifying the green building rating system, standard, or code under this paragraph, the Secretary shall take into consideration—

''(i) the impact of the cost of the enhanced building quality rating systems, standards, or codes on the number of affordable housing units;

''(ii) the ability and availability of assessors and auditors to independently verify the criteria and measurement of metrics at the scale necessary to implement this subsection;

''(iii) the ability of the applicable developer of the rating system, standard, or code to collect and reflect public comment;

''(iv) the ability of the rating system, standard, or code to be developed and revised through a consensus-based process;

''(v) an evaluation of the robustness of the criteria for a high-performance green building, which shall give credit for promoting—

''(I) efficient and sustainable use of land, water, energy, and other natural resources;

''(II) use of renewable energy sources;

''(III) improved indoor environmental quality through enhanced indoor air quality, day lighting, pollutant source control, and use of low-emission materials and building system controls; and

''(IV) such other criteria as the Secretary determines to be appropriate; and

''(vi) whether the rating system, standard, or code is accredited by a national standards developing organization.

''(C) 5-YEAR EVALUATION.—At least once every five years, the Secretary shall conduct a study to evaluate and compare available third-party green building rating systems, standards, and codes, taking into account the criteria specified in subparagraph (B).''.

Page 35, lines 9 through 11, strike ''national Green Communities criteria checklist and LEED rating systems'' and insert ''green building rating system, standard, or code''.

Page 35, line 13, strike ''checklist and systems'' and insert ''system, standard, or code''.

Page 35, strike ''the national'' in line 20 and all that follows through line 24, and insert the following: ''any rating system, standard, or code that the Secretary has determined to be appropriate pursuant to paragraph (3).''.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 922, 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. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment to the HOPE VI bill, and I would like to talk about first of all what this amendment does not do because my fear is the argument on the other side is going to distort what I really think the core of the discussion between my amendment and those opposed should be.

This amendment in no way is an advocate for destroying or throwing out the window environmental or green building standards. That is not my goal or my intention with this amendment. It retains requirements for green building standards, but it looks at how we build green in a different way.

In the bill presently, there is a mandatory building standard that has been a criteria that has been developed by a proprietary preference for one organization. My amendment would simply move this out of a mandated into the green communities specifically mandated criteria, and move it into a more flexible situation where the Secretary would then choose an appropriate green building standard, green building rating system and code that would address environmental considerations, and leaves flexibility for the Secretary, this Secretary and secretaries to follow, to be able to determine that criteria.

We are going to be building these HOPE VI projects all across this Nation, and I think it is important to note that there should be some geographic considerations for green building standards across the country.

We are also trying to find the best way to use our Federal dollars, to maximize the number of Federal housing units, while still adhering to good environmental standards.

I have listened a lot over the last 60 years to housing projects that have been made, destroyed and rebuilt and why some of them haven't lasted as long as they should. I think by putting this amendment forward, I think I am taking into consideration that what we know today to be a good green building standard and to be in the best interest of an environment or a community or a quality of life in 3 years may be outdated. The technology may not be in front of us now that says if you look at your water this way or your air this way or your environmental considerations for the landscaping, that there is going to be a better way in 3 years.

In this bill, I think we are locking down a certain proprietarily developed standard for green building. I think in selecting appropriate green building criteria, this gives HUD the ability to choose a green building system, a standard or code, in an open, consensus-based way. That is why I put forward this amendment to give HUD the flexibility not only for today but for the future.

Again, I want to reiterate what this amendment does not do. It does not have a goal in mind of undercutting green building in an environmentally stable way to create new HOPE VI projects. Also in this amendment, it also requires the Secretary to conduct a review once every 5 years to determine if the chosen system and standard or code is still relevant, and I think that is appropriate in terms of innovation.

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

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, first, there are two points,

and the gentlewoman tends to confuse the two. One is should there be flexibility in the standard. Both versions have that. Our version says the green communities or a standard promulgated by the Secretary, but we say it has to be substantially equivalent in what it accomplishes.

Secondly and more important, the bill with the manager's amendment says that a green component must be in any HOPE VI application. The gentlewoman dilutes that. She says it will be one factor that can be considered. But under her proposal, if you are very strong elsewhere, they would not have to be very much in the green. So there is a real difference there. We both say it is a good idea, but the bill says you must include the green component. Her bill says you may include the green component. You will get points if you do, but you might not. Both have flexibility as to how you reach that.

Now I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. OLVER), the chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on HUD and Transportation.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I have high respect for the gentlewoman from West Virginia, the ranking member of the subcommittee. In fact, I occupy now the apartment that she used before upgrading.

But arguments in the builders' letter to Members promoting the amendment are specious and deliberately misleading. First of all, all references to LEED have been removed. Secondly, the letter greatly exaggerates the cost of green community criteria which are so strongly supported by the U.S. Council of Mayors and 40 other major organizations.

A well-documented study of some 20 completed projects using these criteria, completed projects using these criteria, showed an average of only 2.4 percent increase in cost. We all need to remember that we build housing for 50 to 100 years. The small increased construction costs produce huge savings in lower monthly bills for energy for tenants. The low-income tenants have all of the remaining 50 years to accrue those savings after the payback comes within the first 5 to 7 years of the program.

I urge defeat of the amendment.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman if I left the apartment environmentally stable? I think I did.

I yield 1 minute to my colleague from the Committee on Financial Services, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY).

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague and appreciate her leadership.

Leave it to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to make an inefficient program even more inefficient. By imposing these arbitrary and uncredited green standards, it will drive up construction costs. And in the end, that means we will have fewer units put out in this housing program. And it also delays the spending of the $1.3 billion HOPE VI surplus that we currently have.

I think it is a better use of the money to allow the Secretary to establish standards that are appropriate for the region, appropriate for the product being put out, and this gives the flexibility to do that.

What I would say is that the Capito amendment still allows for green standards, high, strong, green standards, but it does not impose arbitrary standards. It allows for a collaborative effort for this to go forward, and it strikes the right balance, not a one-size-fits-all approach.

I urge adoption of her amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from West Virginia has 30 seconds remaining.

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Chairman, I would encourage a ''yes'' vote for my amendment to give the flexibility, to give the innovation and technology that we see every day in green and environmental building standards to move forward so we don't lock down in this bill.

And when the gentleman just briefly says that the LEED standards were removed from the commercial building, yes, they were removed. Why? Because the union of carpenters that we heard about earlier were raising Cain because they were going to have to get their wood from imported wood to be able to meet these standards. That goes right to my point. We need to be reasonable, but we also need to make sure that we protect our environment and move forward with the best communities we can.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. First, Mr. Chairman, yes, the carpenters objected to the LEED standard. They did not object to the green community standard. We thought the objection was reasonable and met it.

Secondly, again, the bill, without the gentlewoman's amendment, does provide flexibility. We say, however, that when HUD does an alternative proposal, it has to meet the minimum standard. That is the difference.

□ 1300

We put in the minimum. The other difference is that her amendment would allow some of the projects to go forward without green components, depending on how they were otherwise rated and others would not.

I yield for the remainder of our time to the head of our Subcommittee on Energy Efficiency for the Financial Services Committee, my colleague, Mr. PERLMUTTER of Colorado.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. I thank the chairman. I thank the chairwoman for bringing this bill. And Congresswoman CAPITO and I are part of this energy efficiency task force. And I know that she has strong feelings toward building in an energy-efficient, sustainable way. We have a big difference of opinion as to property rights on this one. And it's unusual, here in this instance, the Federal Government is the owner and the financer of these projects. It has the right, as any property owner does, as any owner does, to say how it wants its building built. And that's what's done within this proposal, within this bill, and that is to build these units in a green fashion. And so that, I think, is appropriate. It is an appropriate exercise of ownership to say we want these to be green. And the people of the United States of America in this last election said we have to be more energy conscious. We have to figure out a change to how we power this Nation and how we consume energy, and this is where we get started as a Federal Government.

Now, one of the things we've talked about is the flexibility within the bill as to the standards to be used. We use the words ''substantially equivalent.'' And if, in fact, HUD or EPA or the Department of Energy is being recalcitrant, isn't following through on developing substantially equivalent standards, you can bet that our side of the aisle will work with you and the various Departments to make sure they get off their fannies and they do develop some substantially equivalent standards so that there is flexibility.

This is a good bill. This is a bad amendment. I urge a ''no'' vote.

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 noes appeared to have it.

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. 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.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in House Report 110–509 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 1 by Ms. WATERS of California.

Amendment No. 2 by Mr. NEUGEBAUER of Texas.

Amendment No. 4 by Mr. SESSIONS of Texas.

Amendment No. 6 by Mr. KING of Iowa.

Amendment No. 7 by Mrs. CAPITO of West Virginia.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MS. WATERS

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment 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 vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 388, noes 20, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 12]

AYES—388

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Alexander
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Barton (TX)
Bean
Becerra
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)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carter
Castle
Castor
Chabot
Chandler
Christensen
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 (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Dent
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Fortenberry
Fortuño
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gerlach
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gingrey
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Hulshof
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Jordan
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
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 (MI)
Miller (NC)
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
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
Reynolds
Richardson
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sali
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Shays
Shea-Porter
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Wexler
Whitfield (KY)
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Wittman (VA)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wynn
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—20

Akin
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Broun (GA)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Feeney
Flake
Franks (AZ)
Garrett (NJ)
Hensarling
Johnson, Sam
Lamborn
Linder
Mack
Miller (FL)
Pence
Royce
Stearns
Wilson (SC)

NOT VOTING—27

Baca
Baker
Berkley
Berry
Brown (SC)
Davis (IL)
Deal (GA)
Delahunt
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Faleomavaega
Forbes
Fossella
Gordon
Hobson
Hunter
Jefferson
Kingston
Lantos
Lewis (KY)
Miller, Gary
Paul
Schmidt
Sherman
Shimkus
Visclosky
Wu

□ 1321

Messrs. LAMBORN, BARRETT of South Carolina, BARTLETT of Maryland and MACK changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. BURGESS, CHABOT, Mrs. BONO, Mr. MACK and Mr. CONAWAY changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. NEUGEBAUER

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. NEUGEBAUER) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes 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 will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 181, noes 227, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 13]

AYES—181

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachmann
Bachus
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carney
Carter
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Tom
Dent
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
English (PA)
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Fortenberry
Fortuño
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gilchrest
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Hall (TX)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
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)
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
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Saxton
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
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)

NOES—227

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
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
Castle
Castor
Chandler
Christensen
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver

Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Lincoln
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
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)
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)
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
Rangel
Renzi
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shays
Shea-Porter
Shuler
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
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
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wynn
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—27

Baca
Baker
Berkley
Berry
Boehner
Brown (SC)
Davis (IL)
Deal (GA)
Delahunt
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Faleomavaega
Forbes
Fossella
Hobson
Hunter
Jefferson
Kingston
Lantos
Lewis (KY)
Miller, Gary
Paul
Schmidt
Sherman
Shimkus
Visclosky
Wu

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1336

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Chairman, on Thursday, January 17, 2008. I was unavoidably detained and thus I missed rollcall votes No. 12 through 13. Had I been present, I would have voted in the following manner:

On rollcall vote No. 12, the Waters Amendment to H.R. 3524, the HOPE VI Improvement and Reauthorization Act of 2007, I would have voted "aye."

On rollcall vote No. 13, the Neugebauer Amendment to H.R. 3524, the HOPE VI Improvement and Reauthorization Act of 2007, I would have voted "aye."

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. SESSIONS

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes 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 will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 186, noes 221, not voting 28, as follows:

[Roll No. 14]

AYES—186

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachmann
Bachus
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carney
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Tom
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
English (PA)
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Fortenberry
Fortuño
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gilchrest
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Hall (TX)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
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)
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Tim
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Saxton
Sensenbrenner
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)

NOES—221

Abercrombie
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
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
Castor
Chandler
Christensen
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Lincoln
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
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)
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)
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
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
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
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—28

Ackerman
Baca
Baker
Berkley
Berry
Boehner
Brown (SC)
Davis (IL)
Deal (GA)
Delahunt
Faleomavaega
Forbes
Fossella
Hobson
Hunter
Jefferson
Kingston
Lantos
Lewis (KY)
Miller, Gary
Paul
Radanovich
Schmidt
Sherman
Shimkus
Visclosky
Wu
Wynn

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1343

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. KING OF IOWA

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes 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 will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 136, noes 268, not voting 31, as follows:

[Roll No. 15]

AYES—136

Aderholt
Akin
Bachmann
Bachus
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Burgess
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Carter
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Tom
Dent
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Flake
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Hall (TX)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hensarling
Herger
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Lamborn
Latham
Latta
Linder
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCrery
McHenry
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Moran (KS)
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Royce
Sali
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Tancredo
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Walberg
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Westmoreland
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman (VA)
Wolf
Young (FL)

NOES—268

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Alexander
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berman
Biggert
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Blunt
Bordallo
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Butterfield
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Carney
Castle
Castor
Chandler
Christensen
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Lincoln
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Ferguson
Filner
Fortuño
Frank (MA)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
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
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (NY)
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
LaTourette
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Norton
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Richardson
Rodriguez
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shays
Shea-Porter
Shuler
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield (KY)
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wynn
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—31

Baca
Baker
Berkley
Berry
Boehner
Brown (SC)
Burton (IN)
Cardoza
Davis (IL)
Deal (GA)
Delahunt
Faleomavaega
Fattah
Forbes
Fossella
Heller
Hobson
Hoyer
Hunter
Jefferson
Kingston
Lantos
Lewis (KY)
Miller, Gary
Paul
Payne
Schmidt
Sherman
Shimkus
Visclosky
Wu

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1350

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MRS. CAPITO

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes 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 will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 169, noes 240, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 16]

AYES—169

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

NOES—240

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baird
Baldwin
Bartlett (MD)
Bean
Becerra
Berman
Bilbray
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
Castor
Chandler
Christensen
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doyle
Edwards
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fortuño
Frank (MA)
Giffords
Gilchrest
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
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
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 (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Norton
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Platts
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Ramstad
Rangel
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Shuler
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Tsongas
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Weldon (FL)
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wynn
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—26

Baca
Baker
Berkley
Berry
Boehner
Brown (SC)
Davis (IL)
Deal (GA)
Delahunt
Faleomavaega
Feeney
Forbes
Fossella
Hobson
Hunter
Jefferson
Kingston
Lantos
Lewis (KY)
Miller, Gary
Paul
Schmidt
Sherman
Shimkus
Visclosky
Wu

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised that there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1356

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

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 16 for the Capito amendment to H.R. 3524 I voted "no" but my intent was to vote "aye". I ask that the official RECORD reflect that my intent was to vote "aye" on the Capito amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. PASTOR) having assumed the chair, Mr. HOLDEN, 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. 3524) to reauthorize the HOPE VI program for revitalization of severely distressed public housing, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 922, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole? If not, the question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. GRAVES

Mr. GRAVES. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. GRAVES. Yes, sir, in its current form, I am.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Graves moves to recommit the bill H.R. 3524 to the Committee on Financial Services with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following instructions:

In clause (xiii) of paragraph (2)(C) of the matter proposed to be inserted by the amendment made by section 7(a) of the bill, strike ''individuals who are not ineligible'' and all that follows through the end of the clause and insert the following: ''households consisting of or including an individual who served on active duty in the Armed Forces of the United States for a period of not less than 90 days and who was discharged or released from such duty under conditions other than dishonorable. For purposes of this clause, the term 'families whose housing needs are difficult to fulfill' shall not include any individuals, or any categories of individuals, who have been released from a prison, jail, or other correctional facility of the Federal Government, a State government, or a unit of general local government, notwithstanding whether such individuals are not ineligible for occupancy in public housing pursuant to subsection (m)(2), have not been arrested for or charged with any crime during any specific period, or are individuals for whom housing is a critical need.''.

Mr. GRAVES (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1400

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GRAVES. Mr. Speaker, the Republican motion to recommit on this legislation is as straightforward as it is reasonable. All you have to do is read it and see exactly what it does. As written, it would simply amend the legislation forthwith to give greater priority for housing decisions under the HOPE VI program to give men and women who have served our country on the battlefield rather than men and women who have acted in violation of our laws.

Mr. Speaker, under current law, public housing authorities may use discretion when determining whether or not it is in the interest of the community to provide public housing to certain felons, including those convicted of drug-related criminal offenses. This bill under consideration on the floor, however, incentivizes public housing authorities when applying for HOPE VI grant funding to give convicted felons preferential treatment.

There is absolutely, absolutely no reason why we should be encouraging local public housing authorities to place convicted felons at the head of the line, especially when so many, so many of the American veterans live today without adequate housing. We should be encouraging public housing authorities to assist these men and women first and foremost and in a manner that recognizes their tremendous service to this country.

Veterans have acute housing needs, Mr. Speaker. According to the most recent Veterans Affairs reports, there are over 310,000 homeless veterans. The frustrating part about this is we are talking about our veterans. These are people that served our country, were willing to give their lives for our country, and I think they deserve to be heard on this bill.

The National Association to End Homelessness estimates that veterans represent roughly a quarter of all homeless people in America. My home State of Missouri has an estimated 4,800 homeless veterans and ranks fourth in the Nation of the highest percentage of veterans that are homeless, according to a recent report.

Mr. Speaker, I can talk about figures all day long; I can go on and on about this and that. The bottom line is we are talking about veterans. These are

men and women who have served their country, and they served their country with great distinction. They are willing to put their lives on the line, and now they aren't at the front of the list? We would put somebody who has knowingly, knowingly violated our laws ahead of somebody who has stood up for this Nation?

To me, Mr. Speaker, it's very frustrating. The motion to recommit includes veterans in the category of those considered hard to house. It helps address the pressing housing needs of America's past and present heroes, Mr. Speaker.

There are some out there, Mr. Speaker, that hold our veterans in contempt. That is a fact. There are some that do it, but I don't, and we don't. We don't hold our veterans in contempt, Mr. Speaker, and they should be at the front of the line.

I encourage my colleagues to support this legislation, because that is what it does. Towards that end, I encourage every one of us, every one of us in this Chamber to support this motion so that men and women who step forward in the service of our country and in defense of our freedom and in defense of that flag, Mr. Speaker, are the ones given preferential treatment. They should be the ones getting preferential treatment, not folks who have violated our laws. If there is any preferential treatment to be given, it ought to be given to those folks.

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

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I am suffering a little disorientation because I didn't get the anti-immigration amendment. So I hope the gentleman from Georgia isn't ill and was not, therefore, able to present it.

On this amendment, I congratulate the minority. They make a reasonable point. Yes, I think that we should have included the veterans. To that extent, I think this is worth supporting. I do not understand why this has to come at the expense of people who had committed an offense and have come out. I had thought there was these days some sense that rehabilitation was a goal. As the gentlewoman from California will explain, we are talking about a very narrow category of ex-offenders. We certainly don't believe that when you come out of prison, you ought to then become homeless if you have otherwise satisfied society's reasonable demands. But I do not oppose this because, I agree, we should be including the veterans.

I will say this. What this does is two things: it says include the veterans, but then excludes people who have been sentenced, served a term, et cetera, and have shown that they met all these conditions. We will be going forward with this bill with the Senate, and there is no need to put these two issues against each other. So I believe that we can accept this with full support then for the veterans, but then not have the other issue foreclosed. I would ask the gentleman, I will yield to him, if he would clarify this.

Sadly, one of the problems we have had with some veterans, because of problems that were created, some veterans have committed offenses. I would ask the gentleman, what about a veteran, and this has two parts, yes to veterans, no to people who are ex-offenders. I would ask the gentleman: How should the housing authority on this treat a veteran ex-offender, assuming again it was an honorable discharge. Someone who was honorably discharged, later got into some trouble, completed all the term, et cetera, how should the housing authority under this deal with a veteran who's an ex-offender?

And I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GRAVES. Mr. Speaker, I was having a hard time hearing what the gentleman was saying.

Mr. Speaker, we are after the veteran here. They will take precedence.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I take back my time to repose the question. I am sorry the gentleman had trouble hearing me. He may not be sorry he had trouble hearing me, but now I will try to be more clear. We say in this ''preference for veterans.'' We agree with that. But it also denies that, not preference, but listing in this category for ex-offenders. What does the housing authority do if a veteran who was an ex-offender who has served his or her term, satisfied all the conditions, how do you treat under this amendment a veteran who's an ex-offender?

I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GRAVES. Mr. Speaker, it's going to give preference to that veteran. If they are a veteran, then they are going to get it. Vote for the motion and show the support for the veterans.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry the gentleman doesn't want to answer the question. I still don't understand. It seems to me the housing authority is entitled to guidance. What do you do if it's a veteran who's an ex-offender?

I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GRAVES. Mr. Speaker, they can still receive assistance; they won't get preferential treatment. Support the veterans.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman has got that mantra that he keeps repeating. He can send out a taped phone call with that and not take up our time.

We are, I assume, going to back this, but I think there is this ambiguity. So I will have to say we will have to deal with this further. I would not want to give to the veterans with one hand what you might take away with another one. We do know some veterans, not entirely through their fault, given the conditions in which they serve, problems that occur, some of them become offenders. So we will deal with that going forward, and I would assume people would want to vote for this because we should have included veterans. But I will say, especially after my inability to get an answer, the question of ex-offenders will remain an open question and we'll have to deal with that going forward.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of passage.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 372, noes 28, not voting 30, as follows:

[Roll No. 17]

AYES—372

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bean
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Broun (GA)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Chandler
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cohen
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Doggett
Donnelly
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards
Ehlers
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson
Filner
Flake
Fortenberry
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
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger

Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Hoyer
Hulshof
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Jordan
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Lampson
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Marchant
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
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
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
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sali
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Shays
Shea-Porter
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Spratt
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Wexler
Whitfield (KY)
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Wittman (VA)
Wolf
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—28

Becerra
Castor
Clarke
Clay
Conyers
Davis (IL)
DeGette
Dingell
Ellison
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Honda
Johnson, E. B.
Kucinich
Lee
Lewis (GA)
McDermott
Miller, George
Moran (VA)
Richardson
Schakowsky
Slaughter
Stark
Thompson (MS)
Waters
Watson
Woolsey
Wynn

NOT VOTING—30

Baca
Baker
Berkley
Berry
Boehner
Brown (SC)
Camp (MI)
Deal (GA)
Delahunt
Forbes
Fossella
Hobson
Hunter
Jefferson
Kingston
Lantos
Lewis (KY)
Markey
McGovern
Miller, Gary
Paul
Radanovich
Schmidt
Sherman
Shimkus
Space
Visclosky
Welch (VT)
Wilson (SC)
Wu

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised 1 minute remains.

□ 1426

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California and Messrs. THOMPSON of California, RUSH, BUTTERFIELD and MEEKS of New York changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the motion to recommit was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the instructions of the House in the motion to recommit, I report the bill, H.R. 3524, back to the House with an amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts:

In clause (xiii) of paragraph (2)(C) of the matter proposed to be inserted by the amendment made by section 7(a) of the bill, strike ''individuals who are not ineligible'' and all that follows through the end of the clause and insert the following: ''households consisting of or including an individual who served on active duty in the Armed Forces of the United States for a period of not less than 90 days and who was discharged or released from such duty under conditions other than dishonorable. For purposes of this clause, the term 'families whose housing needs are difficult to fulfill' shall not include any individuals, or any categories of individuals, who have been released from a prison, jail, or other correctional facility of the Federal Government, a State government, or a unit of general local government, notwithstanding whether such individuals are not ineligible for occupancy in public housing pursuant to subsection (m)(2), have not been arrested for or charged with any crime during any specific period, or are individuals for whom housing is a critical need.''.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. 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 271, noes 130, not voting 29, as follows:

[Roll No. 18]

AYES—271

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonner
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Butterfield
Calvert
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Castle
Castor
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doyle
Edwards
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Fortenberry
Frank (MA)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gilchrest
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
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (NY)
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kucinich
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
LaTourette
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
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
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Platts
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shays
Shea-Porter
Shuler
Sires
Skelton
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt

Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Weldon (FL)
Wexler
Whitfield (KY)
Wilson (OH)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wynn
Yarmuth

NOES—130

Akin
Alexander
Bachmann
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Bono Mack
Boozman
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Carter
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Emerson
English (PA)
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Flake
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Hall (TX)
Hastings (WA)
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Issa
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
Lamborn
Latham
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Linder
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCrery
McHenry
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moran (KS)
Neugebauer
Nunes
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Poe
Price (GA)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rehberg
Reynolds
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Tancredo
Terry
Thornberry
Walberg
Wamp
Weller
Westmoreland
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman (VA)
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—29

Baca
Baker
Berkley
Berry
Boehner
Brown (SC)
Camp (MI)
Cohen
Deal (GA)
Delahunt
Forbes
Fossella
Hobson
Hunter
Jefferson
Kingston
Lantos
Lewis (KY)
Miller, Gary
Paul
Rush
Schmidt
Sherman
Shimkus
Slaughter
Solis
Sullivan
Visclosky
Wu

□ 1433

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to be present for today's floor votes due to personal business. If I were present I would have voted "aye" on Final Passage of H.R. 3524, the HOPE VI Improvement and Reauthorization Act of 2007.

Stated against:

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 18 for final passage to H.R. 3524 I voted "aye" but my intent was to vote "no." I ask that the official RECORD reflect that my intent was to vote "no" on final passage.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, January 17, I was unable to vote on rollcall votes Nos. 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, and 18 due to unavoidable circumstances. Had I been present, I would have voted "no" on rollcall votes Nos. 13, 14, 15, and 16; and "aye" on rollcall votes Nos. 12, 17, and 18.

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN ENGROSSMENT OF H.R. 3524, HOPE VI IMPROVEMENT AND REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2007

Ms. WATERS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk be authorized to make technical corrections in the engrossment of H.R. 3524, to include corrections in spelling, punctuation, section numbering and cross-referencing, and the insertion of appropriate headings.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. LEE). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 760

Mrs. CAPITO. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove my name as a cosponsor of H.R. 760.

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

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I was unavoidably detained on yesterday, January 16, in the rollcall vote No. 11, H.R. 4986, the defense authorization bill.

If I had been present, because of the continued support of the Iraq war, I would have voted "no."

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. BLUNT. I yield to my friend from Maryland, the majority leader, to inquire about next week's schedule.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the distinguished Republican whip for yielding.

On Monday, the House will not be in session, in observance of Martin Luther King, Jr.'s birthday, which was on January 15, but will be celebrated and honored on Monday.

On Tuesday, the House will meet at 12:30 p.m. for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

On Wednesday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for legislative business. We will consider several bills under suspension of the rules. A list of those bills, as is the normal course, will be announced by the close of business tomorrow. On Wednesday, we will also take up the President's veto of the children's health insurance legislation.

The House will not be in session on Thursday or Friday. The minority party is having its conference at that point in time, as we will have the following week.

Mr. BLUNT. I thank the gentleman for that information. And we are having a short week next week because of the Republican planning retreat and a short week the next week because of the majority's planning retreat.

With those two short weeks, I know that the FISA legislation that had a bipartisan extension in the very first days of August expires February 1. That is just 2 weeks from now; it is about 4 or 5 working days. Given that deadline, I wonder if we could expect the House to consider some extension during that 2-week period of time, and if the gentleman has any sense yet as to what extension the majority might propose.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his question. As he and I have discussed and as he knows, I am disappointed that we are not in conference on the FISA bill. The Senate has not yet passed its version of the FISA bill. As you know, we passed the FISA bill in December. I think it was early December, as a matter of fact. And we understand that the legislation we passed last August has an expiration date of February 1 and that, therefore, we will either be acting under the old law, an extended law, or a revision that we might pass.

The leader of the Senate, Harry Reid, has talked about perhaps a 30-day extension. I have not talked to him about that personally, but I know that they are considering that. I also know that it is the Senate's intention to address this issue upon their return next week. As you know, they will be in most of the week next week, I think, so we will have to see probably the end of next week where the other body is so that we might better judge where we need to be.

Mr. BLUNT. I look forward to talking to my friend during the week next week and at the end of next week at this same opportunity about that if we don't yet quite know where we are. But I appreciate that, and I know we are both going to keep a close eye on that. This is an important law, and my belief is that everyone involved would rather have a long-term solution as another short-term solution, but it does appear at least possible if not likely that a short-term solution might have to be part of what happens here before we get to a conference.

On the DOD authorization bill that we passed by working together this week to solve a problem, does the majority leader have any sense as to whether that bill that we sent over originally will be back on the floor at any time, or if there will be any provisions? I have heard some discussion that there might be those among our Members who would like to vote on just the passage that created a problem, and I am wondering if you have any thoughts on how to deal with that bill. The authorization bill we replaced is still out there, but it would be my impression that it is not coming back in any form, and I am wanting some verification on that.

Mr. HOYER. First of all, I share the gentleman's view, and my expectation is that the authorization bill we passed yesterday will be passed by the Senate as was passed here. Because, as you

know, the only thing we did was modify, consistent with an agreement with the administration and the Senate, the provision that the administration vetoed the bill on. So my expectation is it will pass whole.

Now, as the gentleman observes, there is an interest I think perhaps on both sides of the aisle in considering the provision that was modified and essentially a part of it taken out of the bill. There is interest in considering that bill. That has been discussed with Mr. SKELTON, and Mr. SKELTON and the committee are looking at that.

I believe, and I don't have confirmation of that, that there were Members who have talked to me who are in fact introducing a bill to speak to that particular point. I say ''I believe'' because, again, I don't have confirmation that that bill has been introduced, but I know that there were Members very focused on that, very concerned. As you know, this provision dealt with the ability of some of our former soldiers, in particular marines, injured by, tortured by the Saddam Hussein regime and being compensated for that to which they had been subjected. I know there is a lot of concern about making sure that litigants who have gotten judgments have an opportunity to execute on those judgments. The President was concerned about that.

So I think the short answer to your question is it either has been introduced, or going to be introduced maybe next week. Mr. SKELTON has indicated that he will look at that.

Mr. BLUNT. I appreciate that information. I also appreciate the way we are able to work through that problem, get the DOD authorization bill on the way back to the President's desk, get that remaining half a percent of pay increase for military personnel taken care of. I don't know on this side of the aisle of any interest in addressing that. Certainly it is a debate that we could have, but it does seem to me that we have already reached a bipartisan consensus on that, and we may or may not want to pursue that. But I had heard those same things and wanted to ask in that regard.

Mr. HOYER. If my friend will yield.

Mr. BLUNT. I would.

Mr. HOYER. When you indicate we reached bipartisan agreement, what we reached bipartisan agreement on was, obviously, that the bill, as you point out, had many important provisions, not only the pay that you refer to, the wounded warriors, treatment of veterans medically, as well as meeting our defense needs, all of which we did have an agreement on and we passed that bill. There was bipartisan agreement that if we were going to pass that bill with all those important provisions in it, that it was necessary to consider the matter that the President was opposed to separately and apart, and take it out, which was done.

□ 1445

But certainly all of the Members on my side did not believe that the President's veto was appropriate. So I don't want to mislead anybody that there was a bipartisan agreement that his veto was appropriate in that sense and that there was a consensus on that. There was disagreement on that.

Mr. BLUNT. I thank my friend for that. I believe I understand the point that you just made that the procedure there certainly was a procedure that, frankly, we could have spent a lot of time debating. By doing that, we could have slowed down this pay increase, and I think we wisely did not do that.

I suppose that if the greater issue of individuals that were harmed by the Saddam Hussein regime comes to the floor, we can debate that at the time. And I just would suggest right now, if there was some way to reach the personal or family assets of Saddam Hussein, that is one thing. I think we hamper the efforts of this new government if we continue to hold the new government responsible for whatever bad things a government did that was virtually universally held in the lowest possible regard by the Congress. And I think we are universally glad that government is gone, no matter how we feel about the other issues in Iraq. I think that is really the point at the end of this one part of that debate. The government is gone. I suppose we can debate that. I think the arrangement we made in the bill handles other countries appropriately and also gives the President the proper waiver authority for dealing with this new situation in Iraq. But I suppose today is also not the day to debate that, unless my friend wants to comment on that.

Mr. HOYER. I understand the gentleman's point, but as the gentleman well knows, there are opposing views to that point. But certainly now, as the gentleman observed, is not the time to debate it. I think the answer to your question is that it may well be before us again.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 10:30 a.m. tomorrow, and further, when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Tuesday, January 22, for morning-hour debate.

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

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

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

There was no objection.

HOPE VI AND DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION

(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. Madam Speaker, yesterday we revisited the question of the Defense Authorization bill. I think it is important to remind my colleagues that in our appropriations bill that was passed and signed by the President, we took care of a number of issues dealing with our soldiers, including an increase in their compensation, including a recognition of traumatic brain injury, and a number of other concerns.

This bill yesterday was a disappointment because it continued to include money for Iraq, and it is time to bring our soldiers home.

I also want to commend the debate today on HOPE VI, another issue that addresses the issue of homelessness and those who are without homes. This legislation was provocative and important because it is an economic stimulus when you provide housing for those in public housing who cannot be housed.

It is innovative because it suggests we should have green buildings, meaning more efficient, and it is innovative because it protects the elderly who may have those young people in their homes who have had some run-in with the law, that those individuals go but not the elderly who would be evicted.

This is a good piece of legislation. I supported HOPE VI. I am disappointed I could not support the Defense Authorization bill.

EARMARK REFORM

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

Mr. FLAKE. Madam Speaker, we have always been fortunate to have in this body of legislators Members who, for lack of a better term, are called ''institutionalists.'' These are Members on both sides of the aisle who understand and appreciate the fact that this institution will outlive all of us and that we should try to ensure that when we leave the Congress, we leave the institution better than we found it.

Madam Speaker, we desperately need these institutionalists to stand up today and play a role in reforming the practice of earmarking that is beneath the dignity of this great institution.

It is almost a daily occurrence that we wake up to newspaper articles detailing questionable earmarks that coincide with large campaign contributions, earmarks that face little or no scrutiny in this body, earmarks that were more intended to garner votes or contributions than to address legitimate needs.

We have also seen little inclination on the part of those currently in the

position of leadership on either side of the aisle to address this issue in a meaningful way. We have changed the parties in charge, but we haven't changed the practice.

So the mantle falls on the institutionalists among us to foster this change, those who deep down know that we owe more to this institution than we are giving it.

It is time to stand up and be counted.

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.

POLITICAL PRISONERS FOR ONE YEAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. POE. Madam Speaker, today it is cold in Washington. It is snowing. They say it may snow some more. But there are two places in the United States that are colder than in this city, and they are in separate places. They are two prison cells, Federal penitentiaries, where two border agents, now, today have spent one calendar year in confinement for doing their job on the Texas-Mexico border.

Madam Speaker, it seems as though border agents Ramos and Compean have been punished for doing what we hired them to do. Because, you see, when they were patrolling the Texas-Mexico border, a drug smuggler came into the United States bringing almost a million dollars worth of drugs into this country. They had a confrontation with this drug dealer. They both believed him to have a weapon. Shots were fired, and he disappeared in Mexico, leaving his load of drugs in this country.

Unbeknownst to them, they shot the drug smuggler. A few months later, our Federal Government relentlessly went and found this drug dealer, brought him back to the United States and gave him immunity from his crimes to testify against the border agents for, get this, a civil rights violation against him, the drug smuggler. They were tried and they were convicted and sent to the Federal penitentiary for 11 and 12 years.

But what the jury in that trial did not know was that the U.S. Justice Department, the Attorney General's Office, hid evidence in that case from the jury, because Madam Speaker, they not only made a deal with this drug smuggler not to prosecute him for bringing in a million dollars worth of drugs; while he is waiting to testify at the trial, he brings in another load of drugs. And then our U.S. Attorney's Office had the audacity for months to deny that ever occurred.

But now the truth has come out. Now we know. Now the whole world knows that that evidence was hidden from the jury. The Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals has heard this case on appeal. We are waiting to see if they reverse the case because the U.S. Attorney's Office hid evidence that the jury should have heard because, you see, the star witness, the witness that the U.S. Attorney's Office made a backroom deal with, brought in other drugs. The jury should have known that to judge the credibility of the witness. And this is not the first time the U.S. Attorney's Office has done this.

In the year 2000, another border agent by the name of David Sipes came in contact with a human smuggler. He had a fight with him in the Rio Grande River as the human smuggler was bringing in people. And then David Sipes was prosecuted for, yes, a civil rights violation for assaulting the human smuggler.

In that particular case, the U.S. Attorney's Office did the same thing. They hid evidence from the jury. They hid from the jury that this human smuggler was given $80,000 as a settlement, that he was allowed to cross back and forth between the United States and Mexico, that he was given a Texas driver's license, a U.S. Social Security card. And also in that case, yes, that human smuggler, while waiting to testify, brought in another load of illegals into this country.

But in that case, the U.S. Attorney's Office was caught. A new trial was ordered because they hid evidence, and that jury in that case found David Sipes, border agent, not guilty because the U.S. Attorney's Office was not seeking justice but convictions.

It makes us wonder what our U.S. Attorney's Office is doing and what side of they border war they are on. They are supposed to be protecting Americans. They are supposed to be protecting the border agents. But yet they seem to prefer protecting human smugglers and drug dealers. That makes us wonder whether the Justice Department needs to be investigated as to their priorities, because this ought not to be.

Yet two border agents are still in prison 1 year today. They have served time, and they should be released. The President should pardon them, and hopefully the Fifth Circuit will do the right thing and order a new trial in this case.

Our government needs to be on the right side of the border war and support our border agents and make people understand that you can't bring drugs and illegals into the country without being prosecuted.

And that's just the way it is.

HONORING THE LIFE OF HRANT DINK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CROWLEY. Madam Speaker, I rise today to solemnly remember the life of journalist and activist Hrant Dink.

On January 19, 2007, Mr. Dink was gunned down by a Turkish ultranationalist outside his newspaper office in Istanbul, Turkey.

Hrant Dink was a man who called for tolerance, peaceful dialogue, and greater civil rights for all Turkish citizens. He was a fierce defender of freedom and believed all people have equal rights under the law. He believed that everyone should have the right to know the truth about their Nation's past, however dark that past may be.

Hrant Dink had been prosecuted by the Turkish Government under penal code 301, a law that bans free speech and was used to suppress a wide range of dissenting opinion, from criticism of Turkish Government institutions to opposing official Turkish denial of the Ottoman campaign of genocide against its Armenian population. Under the all-encompassing phrase ''insulting Turkishness,'' a citizen in Turkey can receive a prison sentence of up to 3 years with the offense being increased by 50 percent if the so-called offense is committed abroad.

Nearly 100 journalists and intellectuals have been prosecuted under article 301, including Nobel Prize author Orhan Pamuk. Many informed observers believe Hrant Dink's prosecution under article 301 opened him up to a campaign of harassment and death threats from ultranationalists, which eventually led to his murder. To this day, citizens of Turkey live under threat of this gag law, with Hrant Dink's own son prosecuted under this law because he reprinted his father's newspaper articles.

This is not the action of a true democracy. It is reflective of how a totalitarian state would behave, and this is not the Turkey we, the United States of America, have aligned our country with.

Amnesty International has called for a complete repeal of this punitive legislation. The European Commission has repeatedly asked for its repeal.

Unfortunately, indications now suggest that the Government of Turkey is only tinkering with changes, making this gag rule even more ambiguous. Today, I ask the House to support calls for the Turkish Government to immediately repeal article 301.

One year ago, Members of Congress, their staffers and several members, and members of several communities, came together to watch ''Screamers,'' a film about genocide in the last century, featuring, among others, Hrant Dink. Here, in the Halls of Congress, we watched as Hrant Dink discussed the problems of article 301.

Just 2 days after the film's premiere, Hrant Dink was shot dead, a man who only wanted to speak the truth about historical facts as he saw them, a man who wanted every citizen to be treated equally, a man we should applaud here

in America for his courage and dedication to democracy.

I believe that if Turkey wants to further explore the opportunities that she wishes to do within the present European Union, she must address the issue of article 301. I hope my colleagues will join me in honoring the memory of Hrant Dink and continue to urge the repeal of article 301.

□ 1500

ECONOMIC STIMULUS PACKAGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maine (Mr. MICHAUD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MICHAUD. Madam Speaker, I rise today on behalf of the workers at NewPage Corporation in Rumford, Maine, and Fraser Timber Limited in Ashland, Maine. These workers received some devastating news this week about job losses and layoffs. Fraser Timber Limited will lay off 70 workers on February 8, 2008 to June 1, 2008. NewPage Corporation announced a shutdown of a paper machine in Rumford as of February 25, 2008. This decision could impact approximately 60 to 70 jobs in Maine.

In Maine, we are all too familiar with an economic and trade policy that has devastated our manufacturing sector. As a mill worker for nearly 30 years at Great Northern Paper Company, I know how devastating this news is for these workers and their families. When this happens in small rural communities in Maine, it ripples through the economy and throughout the region.

When the House considers a potential economic stimulus package in the next few weeks, I'll keep the workers of NewPage and Fraser at the forefront of my mind. Any economic stimulus package the House considers must consider what's good for our workers and their industry. We must get back to fiscal discipline, yet provide the relief so many people in Maine need.

But if we are truly trying to reform our economy, we must also address the serious trade imbalance that's creating this job loss. It's no secret that trade has gotten the better of Maine's manufacturing industry. Since passage of NAFTA, Maine has lost 23 percent of our manufacturing base.

Today the USTR Trade Representative Susan Schwab said that moving forward on these trade agreements will actually help our economy. Well, I can tell you this, she obviously hasn't talked to the men and women of NewPage and Fraser. She hasn't talked to other workers in Maine and across this country that have been devastated by these NAFTA-style trade deals. These workers don't want more TAA. They want their jobs back.

I've been in touch with the Maine Department of Labor Rapid Response Team, the workers at the mills, to discuss the implication of this, the paper machine shutting down on these workers. In the days and weeks ahead, my office will be working to provide whatever assistance is necessary to help these workers get back to work. But they want their jobs.

Mainers have rallied for each other during difficult times in the past and will do so again. I'll continue to be involved in meeting the needs of our workers affected by this announcement, and I'll stay in close contact with plant officials and workers in the days ahead.

But this Congress has to look at the fundamental problem with our flawed trade models and trade deals that we've been passing in this Congress. And this Congress is no different than the previous Congress. We continue to use the same flawed trade model, and that's going to continue to hurt workers and manufacturing businesses here in this country.

This Congress has to wake up to what's actually happening out there. We will not need any economic stimulus package if we make sure that we pass fair trade deals that are good for our workers here, that are good for our businesses here in this country.

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 ELON PEACE PLAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Madam Speaker, today I rise to bring to the attention of the House an important new plan that seeks to bridge the longstanding divide between the Israelis and the Palestinians. The plan is titled ''The Right Road to Peace,'' and it is a comprehensive proposal for finding an avenue to peace, as well as addressing the humanitarian needs of the Palestinian people.

As we know, the Palestinian people have, for nearly three generations, languished in U.N.-run refugee camps in Lebanon, Jordan, Gaza and the West Bank. The author of the proposal, Mr. Binyamin Elon, a highly respected member of Israel's Knesset, he, at the heart of this plan, has offered an innovative approach for providing opportunity, housing and education to a population which, for a long time, has lived as a ward of the international community. Mr. Elon's proposal would end the cycle of dependence that long has shackled Palestinian development.

Madam Speaker, I will include a summary of the document entitled ''The Right Road to Peace'' into the RECORD after my remarks.

Today, there are approximately 1.3 million registered Palestinians being cared for in 59 camps run by the United Nations Relief and Works Agency, or the U-N-R-W-A, sometimes referred to as UNRWA.

Nearly 60 years after the first of these camps were established, virtually nothing has been done to return this population to a settled existence. The 1.3 million Palestinians living in these camps live in a world of poverty, their day-to-day existence solely reliant on international handouts.

The history of Palestinian refugee problems clarifies why the Elon peace plan is so needed at this time:

Following the Israeli War of Independence in 1948, hundreds of thousands of Palestinians were displaced. At the time, hundreds of thousands of Jews fled also or were ousted from their homes in Arab lands. The U.N. established the U.N. Relief and Works Agency in 1949 to care for the Arab/Palestinian refugees. The U.N. has never created an agency solely to serve the interests of one displaced group of people.

Many of the refugees do not even have historical roots in the territory now known as Palestine. Many of those residing in the West Bank are descendants of those who came from Syria and the Trans-Jordan area.

While the displaced Jews of the region settled in Israel and were integrated into the Israeli society, the Palestinians remain sequestered in these refugee camps. Why the Arab community that perpetually talks about the welfare of the Palestinians does nothing to relocate these people out of these camps is strange and, for many, it's considered no mystery. Many of these regimes fought against Israel in 1948, seeking to destroy Israel, and their desire is to perpetuate the camps and to perpetuate the terrorism the camps breed.

This, in my opinion, is unfortunate, and UNWRA is a U.N. agency established purportedly for the benefit of the refugees. However, in my opinion, it serves to perpetuate the terrorism problem.

While UNWRA lets camp residents run their own activities, under its own oversight, the camps have become centers of terrorism, lawlessness, and crime. This further victimizes the Palestinians in the refugee camps who have no involvement in these criminal activities. Palestinian terrorists operate freely in many of these camps, coordinating attacks against innocent Israeli civilians and Palestinians who oppose their terror agenda.

In 2004, the UNWRA commissioner, Peter Hansen, admitted in an interview with the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation that the agency employs individuals who are members of groups like Hamas, a group the U.S. Government considers to be a terrorist organization.

Madam Speaker, it is high time that the truth be told and that the UNWRA mandate come to an end. In its place, a proposal should be adopted that would

truly resolve the Palestinian refugee question, regardless of whether there is ever a formal resolution of the Arab-Israeli conflict.

There is no reason why generations of Palestinians must continue to subsist in squalor and deprivation just so regimes in the Arab world have a diplomatic foil with which to attack Israel.

The Elon plan is simple. Working cooperatively with nations around the world, Israel and the international community will assist the Palestinian refugees to find new homes outside the camps.

Why should Palestinians continue to languish? Support the Elon plan.

THE ISRAELI INITIATIVE: THE RIGHT ROAD TO PEACE

PRINCIPLES OF THE ISRAELI INITIATIVE

(1) Rehabilitation of the refugees and dismantling of the camps. Israel, the US, and the international community will formulate it multi-year program for full and rapid rehabilitation of the Palestinian refugees. while absorbing them as citizens in various countries. During the rehabilitation process, UNRWA, an organization that perpetuates the status of the refugees, will be dismantled, and all residents of refugee camps will be offered permanent places of residence, citizenship, and a generous rehabilitation grant. The refugee camps will also he dismantled following this process.

(2) Strategic cooperation with the Kingdom of Jordan, Israel, the U.S., and the international community will recognize the Kingdom of Jordan as the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinians, and Jordan will again grant citizenship status to the residents of Judea and Samaria. The Palestinian Authority in Judea, Samaria and Gaza will no longer be recognized as a representative body, and all weapons will be collected from armed organizations.

Israel, the US, and the international community will invest in the long-term development of the Kingdom of Jordan to restore and strengthen its economy.

Israel and Jordan, together with Egypt, Turkey, and the US, will create a strategic organization to halt the Islamic axis based in Teheran, and to promote overall peace between Israel and the Arab countries.

(3) Israeli sovereignty in Judea and Samaria. In coordination with Jordan, Israel will extend its sovereignty over Judea and Samaria. Arab residents of these areas will become citizens of Jordan (Palestine). Their status, their relationship to the two countries, and the nature of the administration in the populated areas will be formulated and set forth in an agreement between the governments of Israel and Jordan.

THE CONFLICT IN IRAQ IS STILL GOING ON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Speaker, I rise to make an important and urgent announcement to the House: the conflict in Iraq is still going on, and we are still occupying that country.

I have to make this announcement because apparently some people have forgotten all about Iraq or don't think it's an important issue anymore. That's because it doesn't dominate the TV news like it used to. As an example of that, a recent story on CNN began with the words, ''Whatever Happened to the War?''

Well, I hate to spoil everyone's day, but I have to report, with great regret, that the occupation is still going. As proof of that, nearly 300 American and Iraqi soldiers and Iraqi civilians have been killed or wounded so far this month alone. Yes, the bloodshed continues.

And after nearly 5 years of occupation, our leaders still have no exit strategy. They have even stopped pretending that they have one. Last year they told us we couldn't get out of Iraq because things on the ground were going badly. This year they're telling us we can't get out because things are going well; and if we get out, they'll go badly again.

So if you follow the administration's argument to its logical conclusion, this is what you get: we can't leave when things are good; we can't leave when things are bad. Which means we can never leave. The result is permanent occupation, which is precisely what the administration appears to want.

Forgetting about the bloodshed in Iraq is bad enough. But it's dangerous for many, many other reasons. It gives the administration a free hand to ratchet up the threats against Iran. It takes the pressure off the Iraqi Government to make progress toward national political reconciliation. It means our military will continue to be overstretched and less capable of meeting real challenges to our national security that may and will arise elsewhere. It continues to make America appear to be a lawless and arrogant Western occupier of the Middle East. And it allows our budget to be plundered at a time when our economy is more than shaky. People are in danger of losing their jobs here at home; but thanks to the administration's policies, the boys at Blackwater will always have their high-paying military contractor jobs in Iraq where they can continue to terrify the Iraqi people.

We are spending over $300 million every day in Iraq, Madam Speaker. We couldn't afford that when the economy was good, and we certainly can't afford it as the economy goes into recession.

But thankfully, thankfully, the American people are too smart to fall into the trap of believing that everything is just swell. According to a recent CBS News poll, nearly 60 percent of Americans continue to believe the occupation is going badly, and 58 percent believe the U.S. should never have gotten into Iraq in the first place.

Madam Speaker, we cannot stick our heads in the sand and pretend that Iraq isn't a problem anymore. The only way to change course is to hold the administration accountable, and the only way to do that is to keep the pressure on the administration every single day. That's why I'll continue to raise my voice against the madness of this occupation, and why I will continue to urge the House to use its power of the purse to end it.

Iraq is not a television show that got canceled because of the writers' strike. Iraq is a real place where real people continue to die. We must redeploy our troops. We must give the Iraqi people back their sovereignty, and we must give them their hope for a brighter future.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ENGLISH) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. ENGLISH 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 Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. CUMMINGS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

□ 1515

FREE TRADE AGREEMENT WITH INDIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, today my very good friend Mr. CROWLEY of New York, in a bipartisan way, and I joined together, and we now have, I'm happy to say, our good friend from north Dallas, a great Member of the Rules Committee, PETE SESSIONS as a cosponsor of legislation, a resolution actually calling for free trade negotiations to begin between the United States and India. We introduced this resolution to highlight the tremendous benefits of deeper economic engagement between the world's two largest democracies.

While bilateral trade has spurred growth in both of our countries, we have not yet come close to realizing the full benefits of complete access to each other's markets and full liberalization of the Indian economy.

Madam Speaker, the American people are very focused on the economy right now, understandably. While growth remains strong and unemployment remains low, and we just this morning got the report of the drop in unemployment claims, the prevailing economic stories, however, in the news stir up a great deal of fear and concern among working families. The subprime mortgage crisis has dominated the headlines for months. The housing slump in many communities makes homeowners feel like their financial security is threatened. And as always, Madam Speaker, there is the natural anxiety that comes from the highly dynamic and fast-paced environment of the global economy.

At a time of economic anxiety, the most important thing is to ensure that growth remains strong, so that opportunities can be creative. If we look at what has been our biggest source of strength in recent months, it has been export-led growth. Over the last year, there have been dire predictions for GDP growth, and every single quarter the numbers have come out much stronger than has been anticipated because exports have made up for softer areas within our own economy.

At the same time, Madam Speaker, imports have ensured that working families have access to the goods they need at prices that they can afford. We are weathering these economic challenges because we are engaging in the worldwide marketplace.

India has been a very important component of that engagement. Our exports to India have doubled in the last 5 years. We are India's largest trading partner and largest investment partner. Trading with India has opened up new doors for American producers, service providers, workers and consumers as well.

But India still has miles to go in its reform process. Tariffs in many sectors are prohibitively high. The regulatory environment is absolutely Byzantine. American investors looking for opportunity in an otherwise ripe environment still confront significant roadblocks to successful investment.

If we are to maximize the benefits of trade with the world's second-largest consumer market, there must be broad, comprehensive reform. Free trade negotiations would provide maximum leverage for encouraging this kind of reform. Whether it's slashing exorbitant tariffs, which average 20 percent and range as high as 210 percent, Madam Speaker, that's a 210 percent tariff, protecting intellectual property, and another thing they have done is ensuring transparency in governance, a free trade agreement would provide the necessary impetus for comprehensive liberalization of their economy.

Many of our FTAs are negotiated with foreign policy concerns chiefly in mind. Our pending FTA with Colombia, for example, will solidify strong democratic institutions for a key ally in a key region, in addition to the economic benefits to both countries.

There are certainly foreign policy concerns associated with a U.S.-India free trade agreement as well. It would provide an opportunity to deepen and broaden our ties with a strong, stable Asian democracy that shares our fundamental values in a challenging region.

But Madam Speaker, the commercial benefits to such an FTA would be considerable. It would open up a tremendous opportunity to build upon our export-led growth and ensure that Americans can take full advantage of the more than 1 billion consumers in the world's second-largest emerging market. With all eyes on the economy, now is the time for the U.S. and India to begin to pursue comprehensive economic engagement with a free trade agreement.

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 Texas (Mr. BURGESS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURGESS 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.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. CONAWAY addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

THE TRAGIC MISADVENTURE IN IRAQ

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SESTAK) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SESTAK. Madam Speaker, in the wake of the 9/11 attacks against the United States, I was sent on the ground for a short period of time to Afghanistan. As a Navy admiral, I saw what needed to be accomplished. Eighteen months later, I returned on the ground and saw what had not been done because we tragically changed the focus of our attention and our resources to Iraq.

Now, Afghanistan has become once again prey to terrorists and the Taliban have moved back into the southern ungoverned regions and the provinces.

Because of this failure to have our legal or political or security structures there that we were trying to support be established, we were unable to have economic activity, the education take root so that we would be able to harness the efforts to have livelihoods established and an infrastructure in place, to overcome what General Eikenberry, our U.S. commander who was the NATO commander earlier last year said, ''Where the road ends, the Taliban begin.''

Secretary of Defense Gates has recently said that we will place 3,000 troops into Afghanistan because of the possible spring offensive of the Taliban. That is too little and way too late.

We have to be able to bring the infrastructure into those ungoverned regions so the Taliban once again cannot provide a safe haven for al Qaeda, that is presently in a safe haven because of this tragic misadventure in Iraq, within Pakistan.

But more to my point today, I do not understand the criticism of a very good Secretary of Defense, Secretary Gates, that the United States wants to point at NATO and say you have not met your commitment in Afghanistan when, in fact, potentially a little known fact is that the United States itself has not met its own requirement for trainers and mentors of the Afghanistan National Army and the Afghanistan National Police. In fact, we are 63 percent short of our goal. That's 2,400 troops.

It all began in Afghanistan. And if we are to look back there 2 years from now and another tragedy would have been planned by the al Qaeda in another safe haven, whether Pakistan or Afghanistan, how can we say, as a senior commander said, ''In Iraq we do what we must; in Afghanistan we do what we can?''

The right strategic template is as Winston Churchill said, ''Sometimes it's not enough to do your best; sometimes you have to do what is required.''

It is required to ensure that the education, the economic activity, the wells, the reconstruction can be accomplished, but you can only do that in a secure enough environment. That, again, is one of the tragedies of this misadventure of Iraq.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. NORTON 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 gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE SURVEILLANCE ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from California (Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Madam Speaker, this afternoon we find ourselves in what only can be described as ominous circumstances.

In 2 weeks, our Nation will no longer be able to conduct critical surveillance

of foreign terrorists located outside the United States. We face this situation because, in order to close what the Director of National Intelligence described as critical intelligence gaps, he had to agree with the Congress the necessary reforms embodied in the Protect America Act would expire in 180 days.

Although this body did adopt follow-on legislation, the majority party's so-called RESTORE Act in November of last year, this legislation imposed additional burdens on the intelligence community which, in my judgment, undermined the essential nature of the compromise reached with Admiral McConnell.

Furthermore, it punted on the critical question of whether retroactive protection would be extended to those communication providers who responded to the call for help from their government in the wake of 9/11. If press reports are accurate, similar ideological currents in the other body threaten to dominate the outcome of this critical issue and potentially the eventual resolution of the larger FISA issue itself, that is, the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act issue itself.

There is no issue of greater importance to those of us who serve in this body than the protection of the American people from another catastrophic attack like that we received on 9/11. In fact, this responsibility goes to the very heart of the purpose for which government exists. The very preamble to our Nation's Constitution spells out this obligation to provide for the common defense.

It was for this very reason that on August 5 last year we passed the Protect America Act, which responded to the minimum requirements presented to this body by the Director of National Intelligence, Admiral McConnell.

At the same time, Admiral McConnell described this legislation as necessary in order to ''close critical intelligence gaps.'' He defined the concept of a gap to mean ''foreign intelligence information that we should have been collecting.''

Admiral McConnell testified before the House Judiciary Committee that prior to the enactment of the Protect America Act this past August we were not collecting somewhere between one-half and two-thirds of the foreign intelligence information which would have been collected were it not for the recent legal interpretations of FISA which required the government to obtain FISA warrants for overseas surveillance.

This is very serious business, because if you look at our challenge from those who would kill us in the name of some sort of distorted view of Islam, we basically have to assess that risk by way of threat, by way of vulnerability and by way of consequence.

With respect to consequence and vulnerability, we have within our property of information, within our store of information, the ability to make those judgments. In other words, when we look at vulnerability for a particular site, a potential target, we have the information about that target because it is either American owned, privately or governmentally, and we can analyze that and determine what vulnerabilities exist.

Similarly, with respect to the question of consequence, we have that information available as well, because we can make calculations as to a type of attack which might take place, the damage it would do and, therefore, the consequences that would flow from that.

But there is one area of the analysis of risk that is not totally within our information base, and that is the area of the threat. What is the threat? The threat is that which is in the mind of those who would do us harm. It is within the planning of those who would do us harm, and it is within the orders of those who would carry out those attacks on us to do us harm.

That is where intelligence comes into play. Intelligence means gathering information that otherwise is within the authority of those who would do us harm. That means essentially listening in wherever we can on the conversations or communications they may have.

□ 1530

That is the essence of intelligence. That's why it is so important. It is that part of the three-part analysis of risk which is not totally within our information base and therefore that which we have to go out and extract. That's why it's so important.

I am sure that most Americans would agree with Admiral McConnell, a distinguished public servant who headed the National Security Agency in the Clinton administration for 4 years and now serves as our Director of National Intelligence, that the changes contained in the Protect America Act were necessary. Regardless of how one interprets the most recent National Intelligence Estimate concerning Iran, any attempt to attack Admiral McConnell as a tool of the Bush administration would appear to be lacking in any credibility whatsoever.

I would say it is somewhat interesting that when he appeared before our committee, one of the questions asked of him was whether he had it in himself to speak truth to power. There should be no doubt in anyone's mind that Admiral McConnell is a man of honor who, in fact, calls them as he sees them. And, in fact, that's precisely what he has done. According to Admiral McConnell, the Protect America Act has provided us with the tools to close gaps in our foreign intelligence collection. In other words, the law that we passed in August, which necessarily accompanied with it a 180-day sunset as the price of passing it, so, therefore, it is in the law now, that law, as it works, has, in the judgment of Admiral McConnell, provided us with the tools ''to close those gaps in our foreign intelligence collection.'' This act clarified that the definition of ''electronic surveillance'' under FISA would not be interpreted to include intelligence directed at persons reasonably believed to be located outside of the United States. Thus, under the Protect America Act, it is not required for our intelligence community to obtain a FISA warrant when the subject of the surveillance is a foreign intelligence target located outside the United States.

Now, critics of the Protect America Act have suggested that the FISA warrant process should be excused only under circumstances where the communication is a foreign-to-foreign communication. The corollary of this argument is that if a foreign terrorist were to contact someone in the U.S., the intelligence community should be required to first obtain a warrant before listening to the conversation.

Now, let's put aside the fact that were Aiman al Zawahiri to place a telephone call to a sleeper cell, let's say in San Francisco, perhaps that might be the most worrisome of circumstances, and we want to be assured that we would collect that information.

But focusing purely on the practical legal considerations raised by the opponents of the Protect America Act, this formulation is simply unworkable. Why? The problem is that we do not target both ends of the conversation or communication, because we can't. Rather, we target only one end of the communication or conversation, the foreign person located outside the U.S. When a foreign terrorist in Islamabad places a call, the known factor beforehand that we have is that he or she is the one making the call. In the normal course of things, to whom the call is being made is unknown prior to the time that the call is made. Before the call is placed, it is simply not technically possible to note whether the call will go to another foreign destination, say Frankfurt, OR to someone somewhere in the U.S.

The attempt to legislate warrant requirements on foreign individuals outside the U.S. based on whether they place a call to another foreign destination or to a U.S. destination would create an impossible nightmare for our foreign intelligence operations. Admiral McConnell made this very point in questioning during the Judiciary Committee hearing. The admiral responded that ''when you're conducting surveillance in the context of electronic surveillance, you can only target one end of the conversation. So you have no control over who that number might call or who they might receive a call from. The Protect America Act addressed the problem, while at the same time maintaining the longstanding prohibition against targeting U.S. persons in the U.S.''

The Protect America Act was a targeted response to a specific challenge. However, if we're presented with a problem, which has once again brought

us to the House floor this afternoon, by its terms, as I mentioned before, the Protect America Act is scheduled to expire on February 1, about 2 weeks from today, but with a lot fewer legislative days available.

It's interesting, the 5-day work week has gone by the boards; we canceled any consideration of votes tomorrow; we are able to get out of here in the afternoon in good time. That's good for Members who had to leave because of the weather. But what is the reason we're here? The reason we're here is to do the people's business. And is there anything more important than protecting the American people from attack? What can be more important than working out an answer to the FISA problem?

Why is it a problem? Because on February 1 the currently law expires, we go back to the old law, which Admiral McConnell testified under oath did not allow him to gather between 50 percent and two-thirds of the information we otherwise would gather from those who are suspected terrorists or terrorist affiliates around the world.

Unless you think the Islamic radicals who are plotting to kill us are for some reason going to have a dramatic change of heart before the first week of February and, therefore, we don't need the law, this doesn't make a whole lot of sense. If that is the intention here, then maybe this body should, in the spirit of wishful idealism, pass legislation renouncing wars as an instrumental policy and hope the whole world will follow it. Unfortunately, Osama bin Laden and al Qaeda are not likely to be assuaged any more than Hitler was in the decade following the signing of the Kellog-Briand Pact outlawing war. No, these people made it very explicit they want to come here, or go anywhere, and kill us; and there is no indication that's going to change within the next 2 weeks.

I don't want to be or appear unfair to the leadership of this body, for they do recognize in their RESTORE Act, which would repeal the core provisions requested by Admiral McConnell, that the need to defend our Nation will require a commitment beyond 180 days. Their new proposal has a sunset date which is approximately 2 years from now. Now, when I first saw this, my immediate reaction was, again, one of bewilderment. Such a truncated timeframe would require a great deal of optimism concerning the conduct of the war against Islamic radicalism by the Bush administration. On reflection, this did not seem to be a likely explanation. For even President Bush has repeatedly stressed that we are engaged in a prolonged battle with those who would seek to kill us.

So an alternative explanation of the short sunset might be that the nature of the threat is such that the next occupant of the White House, whoever that might be, will have it in their power to bring an end to terrorism's war on us within 10 months of their inauguration. This, to put it mildly, is quite a leap of faith. However, it appears that FISA has become a faith-based initiative in the 110th Congress. For if there is any truth to recent press accounts, it appears that one of the proposed solutions to the current stalemate over FISA in the other body would be to extend the terms of the Protect America Act for an additional 12 to 18 months. The superficial logic of such an extension would enable the next administration to change the direction of foreign intelligence gathering. Despite the fact that the vernacular of ''change'' has come to dominate the race for the White House, I would suggest it has little or no relevance to the challenge posed by terrorists and their network.

One thing is abundantly clear, Madam Speaker, that terrorists are not going to change their objective. Our policy as a Nation must begin with the recognition of reality. However inconvenient or discomforting it may be, we must recognize that meeting the challenge posed by those who seek to kill us is going to be a long-term challenge. It will, therefore, require a long-term investment in our security. We can't just be thinking about 6 months or 12 months or 18 months or 2 years. The gravity of the challenge that we face requires a commitment which is commensurate with the serious nature of the threat.

There is absolutely no excuse for this failure to pursue a permanent reauthorization for intelligence measures which are critical to the safety of the American people. We must send a clear message to the terrorists that we understand the nature of their struggle. There must be no doubt in their minds that we will never forget what they've done, or that we are committed to the long haul.

There is no excuse for this body not providing Admiral McConnell with the tools he has asked for and doing so on a permanent basis. We know this policy of fits and starts isn't going to satisfy the leftist blogosphere anyway. And more importantly, it undermines the necessary confidence of those in the intelligence community that there will be a long-term continuity in the law.

Unfortunately, the majority party's RESTORE Act, which passed this Chamber last November, did not reflect what Admiral McConnell and the Intelligence Committee told us it needs as a minimum. The idea that a court order should be required before surveillance can take place against a foreigner overseas is precisely the thing that Admiral McConnell warned against and which he said had made it impossible for him to collect that necessary intelligence.

While my friends on the other side of the aisle are fond of the rejoinder that they only require a basket warrant under their version of the law, that does little or nothing to respond to the admiral's concern. For even if it is a basket, the intelligence community is going to have to identify every piece of fruit in that basket. In the real world of intelligence, this is simply unworkable.

And what is worse, the language found in section 282 of the majority party's RESTORE Act creates even additional problems. The language that was passed in this body includes a section entitled ''Treatment of Inadvertent Interceptions.'' Now, this deals with a situation where the intelligence community believes in good faith that they are dealing with a foreign-to-foreign communication, but inadvertently they capture a communication that deals with a foreign-to-domestic call. And the language in the majority party's act says that you cannot use that information for any purpose; cannot be disclosed, cannot be disseminated; cannot be used for any purpose or retained for longer than 7 days unless a court order is obtained or unless the Attorney General determines that the information contained within indicates a threat of death or serious bodily harm to any person.

Now, this means simply that if we have a conversation or communication involving Osama bin Laden on one hand and someone in the United States, we didn't know he was going to call the United States beforehand, but we now have captured that communication and there is no indication that what is said or contained in that communication concerning a threat of death or serious bodily harm to any person, but in that conversation something indicates where Osama bin Laden happens to be at that time or where he is going to be in a very short period of time, we couldn't use that information for any purpose unless we went through a process of finding the Attorney General, having the Attorney General determine that the information contained within indicates a threat of death or serious bodily harm to any person.

And, actually, the Attorney General would have to break the law to make that finding because all the information indicates is where Osama bin Laden is. He is not at that time making any threat against anybody. Now, simply put, that's nonsense. That's not the way we handle legal wiretaps in the United States involving someone who is, let's say, a Mafia member. If you have a wiretap on someone who's a Mafia member and he calls someone who is not also a target and that communication indicates where the Mafia member is or he's about to be and you want to capture him, you can use that information; you can use that information for any purpose.

But we don't allow that here in this bill, which means that Osama bin Laden or another terrorist has greater protection under this law as passed by this House, the majority party's bill, than an American citizen who is accused of a crime in the United States. That makes no sense.

Now, to be fair, the majority responds to this criticism by saying that

language is found in section 22 of the bill which provides this: it would not ''prohibit the intelligence community from conducting lawful surveillance necessary to protect Osama bin Laden or any other terrorist or terrorist organization from attacking the United States.'' That's their catch-all; it takes care of the problem. But it does not. Why? The problem with this logic is that the qualification that the surveillance must be ''lawful'' is obviously affected by what is found elsewhere in the law, including the language found in section 282 that I just discussed. Thus, by its own terms, any assertion we will be able to listen to the conversation of Osama bin Laden, as I just suggested, must be read in light of the bill and, therefore, would not allow us to act in a timely fashion.

Not only did the majority party's legislation, which passed this body in November, fail to address the needs of the intelligence community, it also added insult to injury by throwing under the bus those telecommunications providers who responded to the call of their government after 9/11. And if the press reports are true, the issue of liability protection for these companies is one of the major sticking points of FISA in the other body.

Now, let me suggest that the failure of Congress to address this liability issue will have telling consequences, not only for those companies who came to the aid of their country at a time of great peril, but for our Nation as well.

Failure to act on this critical issue would send this message to the American people: if you are stupid enough to respond to our government when our fellow citizens are threatened by a cataclysmic attack, the very government which sought your help will not be there for you when the ideologues come after you with lawsuits. You might say that this is the majority's position on the matter, the reverse Good Samaritan act.

□ 1545

Do you know what the Good Samaritan law is? It's a law where we grant immunity upon a doctor who comes upon an automobile accident, immunity from prosecution. Why? Because we think it is better to have him or her attempt to help someone that they come upon at the time of an accident and not have to be worried about a lawsuit later on. Now, does this sometimes allow a doctor to screw up, a malpractice, and not be sued? Yes, it does. But we made the judgment that on balance it is better to have people coming to the aid of their countrymen, coming to the aid of someone who is in need, and here we have said don't dare come to the aid of your country because afterward you might be sued.

When I was a young person learning how to type, we used to type something that said, ''Now is the time for all good men to come to the aid of their countrymen.'' That was the way you learned to type. We'd have to change that now: ''Now is the time for all good people not to come to the aid of their countrymen unless they have got a lawyer and enough money to defend themselves against subsequent lawsuits.'' This would be a terrible precedent for future generations with respect to future conflicts, which, if history is any guide, are certain to occur. The failure to step up to the plate on this issue can only serve to erode our national ethos and a willingness to respond to future crises.

It is time, Madam Speaker, to transcend ideology and to do the right thing. And this has nothing to do with what you think of President Bush. It has nothing to do with what you think about the war in Iraq or the larger war on terrorism. It's not a Republican or a Democratic issue. We're going to have a change of administrations in about a year from now, and whoever that President might be, we must not do anything which would detract from his or her ability to marshal all the resources and support necessary to defeat the enemies of our Nation. The new administration is going to need to call on the help of all Americans, including companies like those whose only offense was to respond to the appeal of the Nation in the aftermath of the tragedy of 9/11 by seeking to help prevent its occurrence.

This ideologically driven abandonment of those who relied on the word of their government following the worst attack on our Nation since Pearl Harbor hardly qualifies as a profile in courage. If there is any culpability to be found from the safe vantage point of 20/20 hindsight, it's not with the communication provider. Rather, if any fault is to be found, it is with the government itself, and the proper recourse lies within the political process. That's why we have elections. On this issue, it is my belief that the American public will overwhelmingly understand the unfairness of walking away from those who responded when the memory of over 3,000 dead Americans was the only known fact at the time. Perhaps it is this reality which makes the lawsuit option more appealing than the normal remedy of the democratic process.

It is indeed ironic that at a time when such respect has been accorded to the Greatest Generation, and appropriately so, in my estimation, we would through our inaction eschew the ethos of service to our country after it has been attacked. It is particularly odd in the light of the fact that there was grave concern that we would be hit again. In fact, you will all recall that this fear was so prominent that a Member of the other body temporarily closed his office. This was the environment produced by 9/11, and we should not reward those who rose to the defense of their country with ingratitude and the prospect of lawsuits. For in the end, if we are to prevail against the terrorists, a tireless, relentless commitment much like that of the generation before will be required. I would hope we would send a message to all who were asked to take a stand to protect our citizens that we will likewise be with you.

There is a serious misconception about what is a allowed under the Protect America Act, which is about to expire. In her statement in support of the majority party's RESTORE Act, which made those changes in the compromise reached by Admiral McConnell I spoke of before, the Speaker observed this: that ''all of us want our President to have the best possible intelligence, our President and our policymakers, so they can do the best possible job to protect the American people. But no President, Democrat or Republican, should have the authority, to have inherent authority, to collect on Americans without doing so under the law.''

Let me point out there is absolutely nothing in the Protect America Act which would allow the President to target Americans or U.S. persons outside of the law. The Protect America Act did nothing to change this aspect of law which has existed since 1978. The problem addressed by the soon-to-expire Protect America Act related to changes in technology which led to gaps in our ability to listen in on conversations by foreign terrorists outside the U.S. This stifling of the capability of our Nation's intelligence community was unrelated to any other considerations envisioned by the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act in 1978.

In short, the definition of ''electronic surveillance'' constructed almost 28 years ago has not kept pace with changes in technology. When FISA was enacted, almost all international communications were wireless and almost all local calls were on a wire. Over time the evolution of our telecommunications technology has reversed this state of affairs, has turned it upside down. Today most intelligence communications are transmitted by wire. Even though most international communications were not considered to be subject to the FISA Act in 1978, now they are subject to the FISA warrant requirement simply because they are transmitted by wire. That clearly was not the intention of the law. Thus, changes in technology have brought communications within the scope of FISA which Congress did not cover in 1978. Now, this is simply no way to operate in the age of weapons of mass destruction where terrorists are seeking to obtain them. Our intelligence policy must be made by policymakers, not by technological default.

Madam Speaker, the adoption of the Protect America Act last August was designed to address this very issue and to assure that, if Osama bin Laden were to place a call into the United States, there would be no obstacle placed in the way of our ability to uncover any murderous scheme aimed at innocent Americans. Admiral McConnell told us what he needs to prevent Osama bin Laden from succeeding.

However, the majority party in this body has made a dramatic U-turn with the so-called RESTORE Act. Their bill responds to Admiral McConnell with the rebuff that ''we know better and that we will substitute our own judgment for that of the Director of National Intelligence.''

Now, please don't misunderstand me. As a Member of this body, I am the first to defend our right to exercise our oversight responsibilities as a coequal branch of government. Those in this body certainly have the prerogative to pursue a different course concerning our national security policy. However, based upon Admiral McConnell's expertise and service in the last two administrations, one Democrat and one Republican, I would suggest that those who seek substantive changes in what he has told us to be necessary should face a heavy burden of proof.

This burden of overcoming the expressed needs of our intelligence community should be considered all the more difficult in light of the fact that the impact of the Protect America Act on the privacy rights of Americans is itself de minimis. There are two things I would hope we would keep in mind:

First, if the intelligence community targets someone inside the United States, they must first obtain a court order from the FISA Court under the law that we passed in August, continuing what has been the case before. Secondly, if the intelligence community surveils a communication where both ends of the communication are in the United States, the intelligence community must obtain a FISA Court order. Furthermore, if Osama bin Laden calls a U.S. person within the United States, the end of the conversation conducted by the U.S. person would have to be minimized, and that's a term of art, minimized under the existing procedures of the 1978 act. Let me once again emphasize the minimization process which is applied in cases where information has been inadvertently obtained from a U.S. person is not only in the original FISA statute but is something that we have been familiar with on the criminal side for decades as well. It is not something we dreamed up for the FISA Act. It is not something we put into the Protect America Act. It is something that has been within the fabric of the U.S. criminal justice system for at least five decades.

The Protect America Act does nothing to alter the definition of ''electronic surveillance'' under the 1978 act which determines when a FISA warrant is required. So under the scenario where a U.S. person located in the U.S. is involved, nothing would change. The minimization requirements under the law remain intact and are intact today.

Finally, the Speaker's comment about the ''inherent authority of the President'' would not and could not be affected by either the Protect America Act or the leadership's attempt to alter the compromise with Admiral McConnell under the RESTORE Act. Such rhetoric has no relevance to this debate. The majority's law, the majority's bill, the RESTORE Act, which passed this body on November 15, represents not so much a rejection of the claims of executive authority as it does the rejection of the actions taken by this House as recently as August 2007. The language of the majority party's bill places burdens on the intelligence community which have nothing to do with the protection of civil liberties of Americans.

As a matter of law, the FISA appeals court set the record straight in its decision of In Re Seals by stating that all courts, to have addressed the issue of the President's inherent authority, have ''held that the President did have inherent authority to conduct warrantless searches to obtain foreign intelligence information.'' Not some courts, not a court, not just the FISA appeal courts, but all Federal courts have so found. Nothing does or could alter the President's inherent authority under the Constitution. So it's not pertinent to this debate.

And finally, the Speaker made the assertion that the majority party's bill protects Americans by providing the Director of National Intelligence with the flexibility he has requested to conduct electronic surveillance of persons outside the United States.

Now, this is the most puzzling of all. Why would Admiral McConnell be happy with legislation which has the effect of replacing what he sought as recently as August of this last year? If the claim were true, it would in essence place Admiral McConnell in the position of opposing himself. However, it's not necessary to engage in speculation because the admiral has been the most vocal defender of the agreement reached by Congress in August. In fact, this is what he said to the Judiciary Committee of the other body:

''The Protect America Act, passed by the Congress and signed into law by the President on August 5, 2007, has already made the Nation safer by allowing the intelligence community to close existing gaps in our foreign intelligence collection.'' He goes on: ''After the Protect America Act was signed, we took immediate action to close critical foreign intelligence gaps related to the terrorist threat, particularly the preeminent threats to our national security.''

It sure sounds like an endorsement to me. As a matter of fact, it suggests that if we get rid of the provisions of the Protect America Act, as suggested by the majority, that we would be opening up the foreign intelligence gaps that we had previously closed. Why anyone would think the admiral would support legislation which would do this is a puzzle, to say the least.

Now, why is all this so important? The manner in which we approach FISA is of such critical importance because of its direct connection with the larger question of homeland security. I think we ought to do whatever is necessary and is constitutional and lawful to prevent another attack against our homeland, but we should not put ourselves in the position of having to get it right every time. Perfection is not possible in this world. Overseas intelligence collection is absolutely a critical component to developing a successful homeland security strategy.

The relationship between foreign intelligence and the protection of our homeland is very real. Here's how Admiral McConnell explained it to our committee:

''In the debate over the summer and since, I have heard individuals from both inside and outside the government assert that threats to our Nation do not justify this authority,'' that is, the authority he asked for. ''Indeed, I have been accused of exaggerating the threats that face our Nation. Allow me to attempt to dispel this notion. The threats that we face are real and they are indeed serious. In July of this year, we released a National Intelligence Estimate, commonly referred to as an NIE, on the terrorist threat to the homeland . . . ''

In short, these assessments conclude the following: The United States will face a persistent and evolving terrorist threat over the next 3 years. And let me just parenthetically mention the reason why it's limited to 3 years is that is the limit of the NIE's reach.

The main threat comes from Islamic terrorist groups and cells, especially al Qaeda. Al Qaeda continues to coordinate with regional terrorist groups such as al Qaeda in Iraq, across North Africa, and other regions. Al Qaeda is likely to continue to focus on prominent political, economic, and infrastructure targets with a goal of producing mass casualties, visually dramatic destruction, significant economic aftershock, and fear among the United States population.

□ 1600

These terrorists are weapons-proficient, they are innovative, and they are persistent. Al Qaeda will continue to seek to acquire chemical, biological, radiological, and nuclear material for attack, and they will use them, given the opportunity.

Now this is the threat we face today, and one that our intelligence community is challenged to counter. This is the real issue. This is the 800-pound gorilla in the room, if you will, and it remains the central question for us. How do we best protect the American people from another cataclysmic attack? As the National Intelligence Estimate makes clear, those who seek to kill us continue in their resolve to once again inflict mass casualties upon our Nation. The threat is still here. Although we have been successful in thwarting another attack since 9/11, there are no guarantees in this business.

Independent sources such as Brian Jenkins of the Rand Corporation have stressed that our intelligence capability is a key element in our effort to

protect our homeland. He says this: in the terror attacks since 9/11, we have seen combinations of local conspiracies inspired by, assisted by, guided by al Qaeda's central leadership. It is essential that while protecting the basic rights of American citizens, we find ways to facilitate the collection and exchange of intelligence across national and bureaucratic borders.

Again, the development of a comprehensive homeland security strategy cannot be conceived in isolation from the need for surveillance of terrorists overseas. The Director of National Intelligence has told us what he needs and, unfortunately, that is not encompassed by the RESTORE Act, which passed this body in November. The expiration of the Protect America Act on February 1 will leave us without the minimum acceptable threshold of protection negotiated with Admiral McConnell last August.

The gravity of the potentially cataclysmic consequences of a failure to get it right presents a threat not only to our national security but the protection of our rights as Americans. Anyone concerned, and I hope that is everybody, about the protection of civil liberties should be most alarmed about the potential consequences of a successful terrorist attack on the United States with weapons of mass destruction. This is the real threat to civil liberties acknowledged by the U.S. Supreme Court in the Keith case when they noted that were the government, that is the U.S. Government, to fail ''to preserve the security of its people, society itself would become so disordered that all rights and liberties would be endangered.''

In like manner, Brian Jenkins notes that several national commissions convened both before and after 9/11 reached the same conclusion. All agreed ''that the United States has to prepare for catastrophe.'' They also warn that ''national panic in the face of such threats could imperil civil liberties.''

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the 9/11 Commission itself issued the following observation concerning the relationship between national security and civil liberties: ''The choice between security and liberty is a false choice, as nothing is more likely to endanger America's liberty than the success of a terrorist attack at home.''

Mr. Speaker, there's nothing more important for us to confront than the expiration of the existing FISA law on February 1 of this year. I would beg us, as a collective body, both the House and the Senate, to come together to work out an answer to this problem, and respond to the request by Admiral McConnell for us to continue to give him those tools necessary to gather that information so that we cannot only know what the terrorists want to do, but to allow us to take timely action to prevent them from succeeding.

A COLD WAR ERA STATUTE IN A WORLD OF WMDS

The changes made by the Protect America Act responded to the needs of our intelligence community. That act meets our national security needs without in any way departing from the framework of the original FISA statute. At the time of the adoption of the 1978 act, our Nation was in the midst of a cold war with the Soviet Union. FISA was designed to accommodate the need to intercept overseas communications without prior court approval. The failure to capture such communications—including those coming into the United States—was recognized as potentially damaging to our national security.

Now, 29 years later, our adversary operates undeterred by balance of power calculation, and its surreptitious means of operation are conceived with the express purpose of avoiding detection in order to succeed in killing innocent civilians. Can anyone seriously suggest that there is not an equally compelling need to uncover the plans of these murderers, regardless of the intended destination of the call? I don't think so, and believe that it would be a serious error to move away from a rationale that remains as valid today, if not more so than it did in 1978.

PAKISTAN AS AN EXAMPLE FOR THE NEED FOR INTEL

In this regard, is there anyone who has been following events in Pakistan who does not have an appreciation for the need for the greatest flexibility in our foreign intelligence collection. Although I am sure that we all hope for an outcome in Pakistan which entails stability and democratic elections, our national security policy cannot be based upon hope. This is a nation with nuclear weapons and a segment of the population which subscribes to radical Islamic ideologies. We need the best foreign intelligence possible to ensure that if the unthinkable was ever to happen that we are in the best possible position to detect any potential transfer of nuclear materials or a WMD that could end up in the hands of terrorists positioned in the United States. Good foreign intelligence is essential to the protection of the American people.

OPTIONS FOR STIMULATING THE U.S. ECONOMY THROUGH EFFICIENCY AND CLEAN ENERGY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. YARMUTH). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, I come to the House floor today to address the two issues that we have a chance to really move forward on, and that is the difficulties in our economy and the difficulties in our energy policy; and we think we have an opportunity, and I met this afternoon with a good number of my colleagues about how to do something about both, the slow-down in our economy and our need to rejuvenate our economy by adopting some new clean energy strategies for the country. We think this is an ideal opportunity for the House of Representatives to lead a short-term plan economically to help stimulate our economy, while at the same time directing our economy towards a clean energy future which can really grow jobs, millions of jobs in our country.

What the group of my colleagues and I discussed is the hope that in our upcoming stimulus package, which is now under development, that our stimulus package can hew to the values set forth by Speaker PELOSI of being timely, targeted, and temporary. We think if we follow those three guidelines, we can do things to help our short-term clean energy revolution really take off in the United States.

I have come to the floor to talk about that night, about some options that are available to us. We know that we want to make sure that our stimulus package is timely, that it in fact gets into the economy very quickly, because that is what we need. This is not something that can wait 5 years. We need to have a stimulus now. But we also need that stimulus to be targeted. This is not a moment where it would be wise for us to simply sort of spread butter across America very thinly in the hopes that somehow it will help the economy blossom.

We need to target our strategies so that it will be really driving economic growth in the United States and, importantly, make sure that that economic growth takes place in the United States. It won't do us much good to just short of spread a thin layer of relief, because a lot of that would end up buying products from China, frankly.

We want to look for targeted stimulus that will really help the growth in the American economy and create jobs in America. If we have a choice between two activities, one of which would be simply to allow buying retail products from China, and one which would really grow jobs in America, we should pick the latter.

A group of my colleagues and myself want to make a proposal that will ensure that we target some of the stimulus into a clean energy future for America that really grows jobs in this country and doesn't simply buy retail products from China. So we are going to make a proposal that will suggest that we adopt some measures that in a very timely fashion can inject growth into the American economy this year and will ensure that we target that strategy to the development of clean energy jobs, and I want to talk about some of the things that can accomplish that in our stimulus package.

The first thing that we will propose is a very down-to-Earth, extremely commonsense expansion of an existing program that helps low-income Americans weatherize their homes. We currently have a program that is working very well, very efficient, and extremely popular to help Americans put in insulation, fill in cracks, get energy-efficient windows, essentially just quit wasting heat that filters out through the cracks of our homes. That right now is a $250 million program to help Americans do that.

We suggest we boost that by $100 million this year in a program that can immediately put people to work. We know we have people that are losing their jobs today because the home construction industry is slowing down,

something I am familiar with. My oldest son is in the home construction industry, and he is doing okay in Washington State, but we know in other areas, particularly, they have had a real slow-down in the home construction industry.

We can put those people that are being laid off back to work in the home weatherization industry, and we can do that today if we boost the funding in the home weatherization industry. If we do that, and we have checked with the Department and it can easily accommodate another $100 million right away so that we can get that work being done in the next several months.

So we are proposing that we add $100 million. It sounds like a lot of money, but in the course of a 50 or $100 billion stimulus package, it is actually a very small amount of money. It can make a big difference for people to make their homes more weather efficient. They reduce their energy costs. At the same time, we are putting people back to work who are being laid of in the construction industry. This is really a golden opportunity for us. It's the first thing we'd propose.

The second thing we'd like to propose is that we stop the hemorrhaging that is going on right now in the renewable energy industry. Now, we allowed, in a huge failure by our Congress, frankly, the lapse of some tax incentives which have created thousands of jobs in this country in the renewable energy industry. Those lapsed this past December, essentially. Any project that is not done this year would not be able to take advantage of them. We have projects right now that are just crying out for this tax relief as an incentive in the wind industry, in the solar energy industry, and several of the other renewable energy industries.

Because those tax credits lapsed, and I just got off the phone this afternoon with a leader in the solar energy industry who told us we are already seeing a decline already in the number of orders for some of these renewable energy industry projects, and that is a terrible mistake at the very moment where we need to stimulate growth, and we know we need to do it in these advanced energy growth segments of our economy.

So we would propose that we have a short-term, a 1-year extension of the production tax credit and the investment tax credit, which would allow these industries to again get on the growth track that they have been on with such great success. These industries are tremendously beneficial in creating jobs. They actually create twice as many jobs. For every $1 of economic growth, they create twice as many jobs. They are very, very labor intensive in growing these technologies.

Now, it would be a terrible moment to allow us to go backwards in solar and wind and other associated technologies. The reason is we are just starting to lead the world in these technologies.

Last Friday was the first commercial shipment of what we call thin cell photovoltaics by the Nano Solar Company in Palo Alto, California. Thin cell photovoltaics are extremely cost effective. It's a new type of photovoltaic cells. People are now familiar with the silicone-based cell. The thin cell photovoltaic cells, as its name suggests, it's thin, and it can be made with great cost advantages. The very first commercial sale in world history took place a week ago last Friday.

So we hate to see these breakthroughs taking place and not see the possible expansion of their application. The very first permit for a wave power buoy, and we have buoys now that can generate electricity as they bob up and down in the waves, the very first permit off the Washington State coast was issued in the last two weeks to the Finavera Company, a company with offices in the Northwest.

So at the moment we see these technologies, we'd hate to see a decline in the orders for these technologies taking place, which is now taking place because we allowed these production and investment tax credits to lapse. We should simply restore them and renew them for at least another year, short-term relief, and this is very timely if we do this, because if we do this, there's an immediate, an immediate demand by people when we know these tax credits will be available to go out and order these projects that get these jobs going, putting the pedal to the metal. You don't have to wait.

The third thing we would propose is a renewal and partial extension of the solar tax credit for residential homes. That also expired, and it has been historically limited to $2,000. Frankly, it hasn't cut the mustard. It simply hasn't been enough to really get residential customers engaged to get going on ordering these products. If we simply renew that for 1 year, we recommend expanding it to $4,000 per consumer. If we do that, we are going to have an immediate burst of orders and at least continuation of the growth in orders in solar, as we have had historically.

Fourth, we propose to essentially extend the otherwise lapsed consumer credit for solar for the same reasons that we just talked about. It just makes a lot of sense. Fifth, we'd suggest extending the expired energy efficient credit both for homes and commercial buildings. It makes no sense to have allowed these tax credits to expire. When they exist, they create this demand for the type of work we talked about in the weatherization program, only it's larger in its application, because this is not just low-income people. It's now the entire United States, folks who can take advantage of it. It creates a demand. It happens immediately, because once people know they are going to be able to have access to these tax credits, they can go out and make the orders right away to get this done.

We also hope to propose a Green Fund proposal. Frankly, we are working on this right now to discuss how we can create ''green collar jobs'' in this country, and a ''green collar job'' proposal is something we think we ought to pursue.

□ 1615

We want to find a way to do that to make it timely.

But as a package, these proposals as a package have the capacity to make sure that our stimulus package is targeted to something that is really going to get spent in America. Frankly, a lot of the other proposals out there are going to get spent buying retail products from China. You know, that is fair and Americans do that. But if we want to stimulate the economy, these proposals we have now proposed have the added advantage of spending money right here.

This will happen immediately, and we know it works, because all of the things we have proposed have been tested. These are not avant-garde proposals. These are things we know that work because they have been in the field, we know the economic growth they have produced, we know they create jobs. The weatherization program is doing it today. The production investment tax credits for several years we know created great growth. The most rapidly growing part of the economy right now has been the wind turbine industry, and we hate to see that slow down, and the same can be said about the solar industry.

So we simply want to continue apace the success we have had, and we are going to urge our colleagues to include at least a portion of our proposal in this package.

We also want to note that we don't want to bust the bank on this. The proposals we have talked about, cumulatively, if this is a $100 billion stimulus package, this would be about 1 percent. We are proposing just maybe 1 percent of the package would include the provisions we have included. If it is $50 billion, it would be 2 percent. So the items we have suggested today are relatively modest portions of this package, but they are very important, because we are going to lose the momentum the United States is starting to develop as a world leader in clean technology.

We have just started to gain that momentum. We don't want to give it up. It would be a shame to see these industries start to plateau just when they are on the growth curve of new technological development. That is not the American way. The American way is to innovate, to grow and have a confidence in our economy and our inventive talents. This is part and parcel of that, and in the spirit of the New Apollo Project, something I have been advocating for a long time, that we should have the same confidence that Kennedy had in the original Apollo project that took us to the moon, we ought to have

the same confidence in a clean energy economy.

I am not the only one talking about this. I was listening to Senator CLINTON talk about this the other day in the Senate, about the need for an Apollo project. She has made some proposals about a stimulus package that are very similar to some of the ones we are proposing in the House. I think that is the right attitude we should have, because it is based on confidence.

Her larger program for clean energy also tracks the New Apollo Project that I have proposed in the House that would really on a major league basis propose major investments in clean technology. She has proposed a major league weatherization program to weatherize 20 million homes, and that is the scale that we ought to be thinking about. She has proposed 55 mile per gallon standards for our cars, and a $50 billion pool of funds to be financed by transferring some of the tax benefits that have been given to the oil and gas industry and put it back into the clean energy industry and create a multi-billion dollar fund for the research to expand this technology. That is the type of thing we need. We appreciate that going on in the Senate, and we are going to continue to push these ideas in the House.

But let's start on the stimulus package. It is one small step for man, maybe not quite a giant leap for mankind, but it is commonsense for Americans that we do this. I appreciate my colleagues working with me, LLOYD DOGGETT, who has been a long time leader on this, TOM UDALL and others. We are going to push this ball. We hope we are successful.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BACA (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today and January 16 on account of personal business.

Mr. SHERMAN (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today.

Mr. VISCLOSKY (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today on account of legislative business in the State.

Mr. WU (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today on account of attending a funeral.

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 Mr. CROWLEY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. CROWLEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MICHAUD, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CUMMINGS, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SESTAK, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. POE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. BURGESS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CONAWAY, for 5 minutes, today.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 20 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, January 18, 2008, at 10:30 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

5002. A letter from the Principal Deputy Under Secretary for Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's Fiscal Year 2007 annual report on the Regional Defense Counterterrorism Fellowship Program, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2249c; to the Committee on Armed Services.

5003. A letter from the Under Secretary for Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting An interim report on the activities of a working group tasked with identifying the needs of National Guard and Reserve Members Returning From Deployment In Operation Iraqi Freedom or Operation Enduring Freedom, pursuant to Public Law 109-364, section 676; to the Committee on Armed Services.

5004. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Installations and Environment, Department of Defense, transmitting notification of the results of a public-private competition for the administrative support services being performed by civilian employees at the Fleet Readiness Center-East (Cherry Point), located in Havelock, NC; to the Committee on Armed Services.

5005. A letter from the Under Secretary for Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General James L. Campbell, United States Army, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

5006. A letter from the Chief Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Suspension of Community Eligibility [Docket No. FEMA-8001] received January 4, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

5007. A letter from the Chief Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Suspension of Community Eligibility [Docket No. FEMA-8003] received January 4, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

5008. A letter from the Chief Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Changes in Flood Elevation Determinations [Docket No. FEMA-B-7750] received January 4, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

5009. A letter from the Secretary of the Commission, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Charges for Certain Disclosures — received January 4, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

5010. A letter from the Deputy Director, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Benefits Payable in Terminated Single-Employer Plans; Allocation of Assets in Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Valuing and Paying Benefits — received January 4, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

5011. A letter from the Acting Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final rule — Definition of ''Positional Isomer'' as It Pertains to the Control of Schedule I Controlled Substances [Docket No. DEA-260F] (RIN: 1117-AA94) received January 4, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5012. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Pennsylvania; Revisions to Stage II Requirements in Allegheny County [EPA-R03-OAR-2006-1011; FRL-8517-2] received January 10, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5013. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Maryland; Revisions to Stage II Requirements [EPA-R03-OAR-2007-0644; FRL-8516-9] received January 10, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5014. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Indiana; Amendments to Lead Rules, Quemetco [EPA-R05-OAR-2006-0276; FRL-8508-8] received January 10, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5015. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Transportation Conformity Rule Amendments to Implement Provisions Contained in the 2005 Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users [EPA-HQ-OAR-2006-0612; FRL-8516-6] received January 10, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5016. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — In the Matter of Exclusive Service Contracts for Provision of Video Services in Multiple Dwelling Units and Other Real Estate Developments [MB Docket No. 07-51] received January 4, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5017. A letter from the Director, International Cooperation, Department of Defense, transmitting Pursuant to Section 27(f) of the Arms Export Control Act and Section 1(f) of Executive Order 11958, Transmittal No. 15-07 informing of an intent to sign a Project Arrangement for the F/A-18 International Structure Integrity Program among Australia, Canada, Finland, Switzerland, and the United States, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2767(f); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5018. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Copies of international

agreements, other than treaties, entered into by the United States, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5019. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Copies of international agreements, other than treaties, entered into by the United States, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5020. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, Transmittal No. 08–22, concerning the Department of the Army's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance to Kuwait for defense articles and services; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5021. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, Transmittal No. 08-18 concerning the Department of the Air Force's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance to Saudi Arabia for defense articles and services; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5022. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary For Export Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Revisions to License Exceptions TMP and BAG: Expansion of Eligible Items [Docket No. 071114704-7749-01] (RIN: 0694-AD72) received January 4, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5023. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting pursuant to Section 620C(c) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and in accordance with section 1(a)(6) of Executive Order 13313, a report prepared by the Department of State and the National Security Council on the progress toward a negotiated solution of the Cyprus question covering the period October 1, 2007 through November 30, 2007; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5024. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a Report on the U.S. — Vietnam Human Rights Dialogue Meeting, pursuant to Public Law 107-228, section 702; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5025. A letter from the Under Secretary for Political Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's report covering current military, diplomatic, political, and economic measures that are being or have been undertaken to complete our mission in Iraq successfully, pursuant to Public Law 109-163, section 1227; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5026. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting pursuant to section 36(c) and 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act, certification regarding the proposed manufacturing license agreement for the manufacture of significant military equipment abroad and the export of major defense equipment with the Government of Greece and Israel (Transmittal No. DDTC 009-07); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5027. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting pursuant to section 36(c) and 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act, certification regarding the proposed agreement for the export of major defense equipment with the Government of Germany (Transmittal No. DDTC 099-07); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5028. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, certification regarding the proposed manufacturing license agreement for the manufacture of significant military equipment abroad and the export of major defense equipment with the Government of Sweden and Italy (Transmittal No. DDTC 079-07); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5029. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, certification of a proposed technical assistance agreement for the export of technical data, defense services and defense articles to the Government of South Korea (Transmittal No. DDTC 066-07); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5030. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles or defense services to the Government of Iraq (Transmittal No. DDTC 118-07); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5031. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the annual inventory of U.S. Government-sponsored international exchanges and training programs, as well as the FY 2006 report on the activities of the Interagency Working Group on U.S. Government-Sponsored International Exchanges and Training (IAWG), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2460(f) and (g); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5032. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting as required by section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), and pursuant to Executive Order 13313 of July 31, 2003, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to the risk of nuclear proliferation created by the accumulation of weapons-usable fissile material in the territory of the Russian Federation that was declared in Executive Order 13159 of June 21, 2000; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5033. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting as required by section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), and pursuant to Executive Order 13313 of July 31, 2003, a six-month periodic report of the national emergency with respect to the Western Balkans that was declared in Executive Order 13219 of June 26, 2001; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5034. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting as required by section 401(c) of the National Emergency Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), and pursuant to Executive Order 13313 of July 31, 2003, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to terrorists who threaten to disrupt the Middle East peace process that was declared in Executive Order 12947 of January 23, 1995; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5035. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Acquisition Regulation: Guidance on Use of Award Term Incentives; Administrative Amendments [Docket ID No. EPA-HQ-OARM-2003-0001; FRL-8575-8] (RIN: 2030-AA89) received January 10, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5036. A letter from the Acting Chair, Federal Subsistence Board, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Subsistence Management Regulations for Public Lands in Alaska, Subpart C and Subpart D-2007-08 Subsistence Taking of Wildlife Regulations; 2007-08 Subsistence Taking of Fish on the Kenai Peninsula Regulations (RIN: 1018-AU15) received December 20, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

5037. A letter from the Acting Assistant Director — International Affairs, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Final Rule to List Six Foreign Birds as Endangered [FWS-R1-JA-2008-007] [96100-1671-000] (RIN: 1018-AT62) received January 11, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

5038. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Fish, Wildlife and Parks, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Designation of Critical Habitat for Arenaria ursina (Bear Valley Sandwort), Castilleja cinerea (Ash-gray Indian Paintbrush), and Eriogonum kennedyi var. austromontanum (Southern Mountain Wild-Buckwheat) (RIN: 1018-AU80) received December 20, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

5039. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Fish, Wildlife and Parks, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Designation of Critial Habitat for the San Diego Fairy Shrimp (Branchinecta sandiegoensis) (RIN: 1018-AV37) received December 20, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

5040. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Fish, Wildlife and Parks, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Revised Designation of Critical Habitat for the Coastal California Gnatcatcher (Polioptila californica californica) (RIN: 1018-AV38) received December 20, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

5041. A letter from the Acting Director Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Magnuson-Stevens Act Provisions; Fisheries Off West Coast States; Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery; Biennial Specifications and Management Measures; Inseason Adjustments [Docket No. 060824226-6322-02] (RIN: 0648-AW27) received January 4, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

5042. A letter from the Acting Director Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Bluefish Fishery; Commercial Quota Harvested for New York [Docket No. 061109296-7009-02] (RIN: 0648-XD64) received January 4, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

5043. A letter from the Acting Director Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Summer Flounder Fishery; Commercial Quota Harvested for Connecticut [Docket No. 061020273-7001-03] (RIN: 0648-XE14) received January 4, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

5044. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator For Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric

Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Pacific Halibut Fisheries; Subsistence Fishing; Correction [Docket No. 070913514-7517-01] (RIN: 0648-AW04) received January 4, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

5045. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator For Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands; 2008 Final Harvest Specifications for Groundfish [Docket No. 070213033-7033-01] (RIN: 0648-XD68) received January 4, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

5046. A letter from the Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting the report on the Administration of the Foreign Agents Registration Act for the six months ending December 31, 2006, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 621; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5047. A letter from the Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting the 2007 Annual Report of the Office of Privacy and Civil Liberties, pursuant to Public Law 109-162, section 1174; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5048. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Reduction of foreign tax credit limitation categories under section 904(d) [TD 9368] (RIN: 1545-BG55) received December 21, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5049. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Allocation of Prepaid Qualified Mortgage Insurance Premiums for 2007 [Notice 2008-15] received January 14, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5050. A letter from the Program Manager, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Medicaid Program; Elimination of Reimbursement under Medicaid for School Administration Expenditures and Costs Related to Transportation of School-Age Children between Home and School [CMS-2287-F] (RIN: 0938-AF13) received December 3, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of the rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. RAHALL: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 664. A bill to amend the Water Desalination Act of 1996 to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to assist in research and development, environmental and feasibility studies, and preliminary engineering for the Municipal Water District of Orange County, California, Dana Point Desalination Project located at Dana Point, California (Rept. 110–511, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XII the Committee on Science and Technology discharged from further consideration. H.R. 664 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. REYNOLDS (for himself, Mr. HERGER, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. WELLER, Mr. CANTOR, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. WALSH of New York, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. KUHL of New York, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. GERLACH, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. CAMPBELL of California, Mrs. BONO MACK, Mr. TERRY, Mrs. DRAKE, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. WALDEN of Oregon, Mr. MCCARTHY of California, Mr. KLINE of Minnesota, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. MCHUGH, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. BRADY of Texas, and Mr. HUNTER):

H.R. 5031. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend relief from the alternative minimum tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JORDAN (for himself, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. SALI, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. MCCARTHY of California, Mr. HENSARLING, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, and Mrs. BACHMANN):

H.R. 5032. A bill to ensure that women seeking an abortion receive an ultrasound and the opportunity to review the ultrasound before giving informed consent to receive an abortion; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LIPINSKI:

H.R. 5033. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the public disclosure of charges for certain hospital and ambulatory surgical center services and drugs; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MCNERNEY:

H.R. 5034. A bill to amend titles 10 and 38, United States Code, to extend the time periods of for the use of educational assistance benefits to which certain veterans and members of the reserve components are entitled under such titles; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SCOTT of Virginia (for himself, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. NADLER, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. WATERS, Mr. COHEN, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. FILNER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. STARK):

H.R. 5035. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act and the Controlled Substances Import and Export Act to eliminate increased penalties for cocaine offenses where the cocaine involved is cocaine base, to eliminate minimum mandatory penalties for offenses involving cocaine, to use the resulting savings to provide drug treatment and diversion programs for cocaine users, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HOLT (for himself, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. EMANUEL, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. INSLEE, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. FARR, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. HONDA, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. HARE, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. SIRES, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. WEINER, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. OLVER, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. DOYLE, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. WATSON, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. KLEIN of Florida, and Mr. CROWLEY):

H.R. 5036. A bill to direct the Administrator of General Services to reimburse certain jurisdictions for the costs of obtaining paper ballot voting systems for the general elections for Federal office to be held in November 2008, to reimburse jurisdictions for the costs incurred in conducting audits or hand counting of the results of the general elections for Federal office to be held in November 2008, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on Science and Technology, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BOOZMAN (for himself and Mr. HAYES):

H.R. 5037. A bill to require offices of the legislative branch to meet a threshold for participation by small business concerns owned and controlled by veterans with service-connected disabilities in procurement contracts entered into by such offices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. CONYERS (for himself, Mr. EMANUEL, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. NADLER, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. COHEN, Mr. HOLT, Mr. HONDA, Ms. KILPATRICK, and Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin):

H.R. 5038. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prevent the election practice known as caging, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COSTA:

H.R. 5039. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on 1,2,4 Triazole; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COSTA:

H.R. 5040. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Fluopicolide; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COSTA:

H.R. 5041. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Fenhexamid; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COSTA:

H.R. 5042. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Belt & Synapse; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COSTA:

H.R. 5043. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on Phenmedipham; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COSTA:

H.R. 5044. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on Propiconazole; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COSTA:

H.R. 5045. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on Previcur; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FORTUÑO:

H.R. 5046. A bill to amend the Military Construction Authorization Act, 1974 to repeal the limitation on the authorized uses of

the former bombardment area on the island of Culebra and the prohibition on Federal Government responsibility for decontamination of the area; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey:

H.R. 5047. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Bismuth Subsalicylate; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey:

H.R. 5048. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Acetoacetamide; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey:

H.R. 5049. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on 5-Ethyl-2-methylpyridine; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey:

H.R. 5050. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on squaric acid; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey:

H.R. 5051. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on N,N-Dimethylacetoacetamide; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey:

H.R. 5052. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on certain mixtures of N,N-Dimethylacetoacetamide; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey:

H.R. 5053. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Chlorodimethylacetoacetamide; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey:

H.R. 5054. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Polyphenolcyanate; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey:

H.R. 5055. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on certain mixtures of N,N-Dimethylacetoacetamide; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. LEE (for herself, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. WATERS, Mr. OLVER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. KUCINICH, and Mr. HINCHEY):

H.R. 5056. A bill to provide for the appointment of a high-level United States representative or special envoy for Iran for the purpose of easing tensions and normalizing relations between the United States and Iran; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. MALONEY of New York (for herself, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. SMITH of Texas):

H.R. 5057. A bill to reauthorize the Debbie Smith DNA Backlog Grant Program; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. HINCHEY, and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut):

H.R. 5058. A bill to prohibit the Secretary of the Interior from selling any oil and gas lease for any tract in the Lease Sale 193 Area of the Alaska Outer Continental Shelf Region until the Secretary determines whether to list the polar bear as a threatened species or an endangered species under the Endangered Species Act of 1973, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. MCDERMOTT:

H.R. 5059. A bill to amend the African Growth and Opportunity Act with respect to lesser developed countries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California (for herself, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. COBLE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. COHEN, Mr. PASCRELL, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. BISHOP of New York, and Mr. SERRANO):

H.R. 5060. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to allow athletes admitted as nonimmigrants described in section 101(a)(15)(P) of such Act to renew their period of authorized admission in 5-year increments; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SESTAK:

H.R. 5061. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Oryzalin; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SESTAK:

H.R. 5062. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on lambda-cyhalothrin; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SESTAK:

H.R. 5063. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on Acephate; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SESTAK:

H.R. 5064. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on Ziram; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SESTAK:

H.R. 5065. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on Cypermenthrin; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SESTAK:

H.R. 5066. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on mixtures of thiophanate methyl and application adjuvants; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SESTAK:

H.R. 5067. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on thiophanate methyl; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SESTAK:

H.R. 5068. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on asulam sodium salt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VISCLOSKY (for himself, Mr. WILSON of Ohio, Mr. COHEN, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. PASTOR, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. MURTHA, and Mr. ALLEN):

H.R. 5069. A bill to require manufacturers to demonstrate sufficient means to cover, for certain products distributed in commerce, costs of potential recalls, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DREIER (for himself and Mr. CROWLEY):

H. Res. 928. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to the trade relationship between the United States and India; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. FOXX (for herself and Mr. COBLE):

H. Res. 929. A resolution commending the Appalachian State University Mountaineers for winning the 2007 National Collegiate Athletic Association Division I Football Championship Subdivision (formerly Division I-AA) title; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BAIRD (for himself and Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania):

H. Res. 930. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of ''Career and Technical Education Month''; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FEENEY (for himself, Mr. MICA, Mr. KELLER, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. BOYD of Florida, Mr. MAHONEY of Florida, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. WELDON of Florida, and Mr. STEARNS):

H. Res. 931. A resolution expressing support for designation of February 17, 2008, as ''Race Day in America'' and highlighting the 50th running of the Daytona 500; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California (for herself, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. MCKEON, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. FARR, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. HOLT, Mr. HONDA, Mr. KAGEN, Mr. KELLER, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KUHL of New York, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. MARCHANT, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. WATSON, and Ms. SOLIS):

H. Res. 932. A resolution expressing support for designation of the week of February 4 through February 8, 2008 as ''National School Counseling Week''; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 82: Mr. WITTMAN of Virginia.
H.R. 248: Mr. KUHL of New York.
H.R. 460: Mr. MCDERMOTT.
H.R. 471: Mr. LATOURETTE.
H.R. 543: Mr. ABERCROMBIE.
H.R. 621: Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 624: Mr. SESTAK.
H.R. 657: MS. ZOE LOFGREN of California.
H.R. 891: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. HODES, and Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 1000: Mr. RAHALL, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. CANNON, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and Mrs. LOWEY.
H.R. 1032: Ms. WOOLSEY and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
H.R. 1069: Mr. HONDA.
H.R. 1070: Mr. MCINTYRE and Mr. HONDA.
H.R. 1073: Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida.
H.R. 1174: Mr. SHAYS.
H.R. 1261: Mr. PRICE of Georgia.
H.R. 1283: Mr. ROTHMAN and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 1407: Mr. AKIN.
H.R. 1419: Mr. GOODLATTE.
H.R. 1428: Mr. MCINTYRE.
H.R. 1435: Mrs. LOWEY.
H.R. 1497: Mr. GUTIERREZ.
H.R. 1553: Mr. SERRANO, Mr. RAMSTAD, and MS. WOOLSEY.
H.R. 1609: Mr. GOODLATTE and Mr. GUTIERREZ.
H.R. 1610: Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. ROSKAM, and Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 1621: Mr. FERGUSON.
H.R. 1673: Mr. JORDAN and Ms. RICHARDSON.
H.R. 1778: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 1843: Mr. SALI and Mr. DOYLE.
H.R. 1845: Mrs. CUBIN.
H.R. 1881: Mr. WOLF and Mr. KIND.
H.R. 1947: Mr. SESTAK, Mr. COHEN, and Ms. WOOLSEY.
H.R. 2040: Mr. WEXLER, Mr. HOLT, and Mr. HONDA.
H.R. 2049: Ms. SUTTON.
H.R. 2131: Mr. OBERSTAR.
H.R. 2212: Mr. SERRANO.
H.R. 2220: Mr. MANZULLO.
H.R. 2267: Mr. ALTMIRE.
H.R. 2290: Mr. MELANCON.
H.R. 2353: Mr. ALTMIRE.
H.R. 2379: Mr. SIRES.
H.R. 2464: Mr. SESTAK and Ms. WOOLSEY.
H.R. 2473: Mr. MICHAUD.
H.R. 2478: Mr. KUCINICH and Mr. MARKEY.
H.R. 2564: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 2634: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.
H.R. 2734: Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. TERRY, and Mr. BROUN of Georgia.
H.R. 2744: Mr. KAGEN, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Ms. BEAN, Ms. WATSON, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. HERSETH Sandlin, and Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 2802: Mr. SESTAK.
H.R. 2862: Mr. EHLERS.
H.R. 2915: Ms. SOLIS and Mr. CLAY.
H.R. 2923: Mr. BURTON of Indiana.
H.R. 2927: Mr. PEARCE and Mr. FORBES.
H.R. 2942: Mr. HARE.
H.R. 2964: Mr. SESTAK.
H.R. 3001: Ms. SOLIS.
H.R. 3008: Mr. HINOJOSA.
H.R. 3132: Mr. SPACE.
H.R. 3176: Mr. MCCAUL of Texas.
H.R. 3229: Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. BEAN, and Ms. HOOLEY.
H.R. 3232: Ms. BEAN, Mr. BOUSTANY, and Mr. HERGER.
H.R. 3289: Mr. HARE.
H.R. 3291: Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida.
H.R. 3304: Mr. GOODE.
H.R. 3363: Mr. MARSHALL and Mr. ROGERS of Michigan.
H.R. 3438: Mr. SESTAK.
H.R. 3439: Mr. SPACE and Mr. TOWNS.
H.R. 3464: Mr. ALLEN and Mr. CAPUANO.
H.R. 3532: Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. LINDER, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. GINGREY, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. BARROW, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, and Mr. BROUN of Georgia.
H.R. 3618: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
H.R. 3645: Mr. HINOJOSA.
H.R. 3660: Mr. COURTNEY and Mr. EVERETT.
H.R. 3691: Mr. WATT.
H.R. 3697: Mrs. CUBIN and Mr. HINOJOSA.
H.R. 3698: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts and Mr. VAN HOLLEN.
H.R. 3700: Mr. UDALL of Colorado.
H.R. 3726: Mr. KUHL of New York.
H.R. 3819: Mr. ALTMIRE.
H.R. 3903: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
H.R. 3934: Mr. SMITH of Washington and Mr. CANTOR.
H.R. 3936: Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. LINDER, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. GINGREY,
Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. BARROW, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, and Mr. BROUN of Georgia.
H.R. 3957: Ms. GIFFORDS.
H.R. 3987: Ms. MATSUI.
H.R. 4008: Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, and Mr. NADLER.
H.R. 4025: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska and Mr. BOREN.
H.R. 4036: Mr. MCCOTTER.
H.R. 4054: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
H.R. 4087: Mrs. DRAKE.
H.R. 4088: Mr. BRADY of Texas.
H.R. 4173: Mr. ABERCROMBIE.
H.R. 4288: Mr. SMITH of Washington.
H.R. 4460: Mr. MCCAUL of Texas.
H.R. 4462: Mrs. CUBIN.
H.R. 4464: Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. WITTMAN of Virginia, Mr. PITTS, and Mr. SENSENBRENNER.
H.R. 4498: Mr. TERRY, Mr. KING of New York, Mrs. EMERSON, and Mr. SALI.
H.R. 4504: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 4627: Mr. KUHL of New York and Mr. BILIRAKIS.
H.R. 4838: Ms. SOLIS, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. FARR, Mrs. CAPPS, and Mr. FILNER.
H.R. 4852: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. PAUL, Mr. RENZI, Mr. HAYES, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. SALI, Mr. BILIRAKIS, and Mrs. SCHMIDT.
H.R. 4934: Mr. ELLISON, Mr. FARR, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. DEFAZIO.
H.R. 4936: Ms. DELAURO, and Mrs. MALONEY of New York.
H.J. Res. 9: Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey.
H.J. Res. 12: Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey.
H.J. Res. 54: Mr. DENT, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. BOUSTANY, and Ms. FALLIN.
H.J. Res. 63: Mr. TERRY.
H. Con. Res. 154: Mr. WITTMAN of Virginia.
H. Con. Res. 161: Mr. FILNER.
H. Con. Res. 163: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.
H. Con. Res. 198: Mr. ROSS, and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
H. Con. Res. 244: Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. LINDER, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. PORTER, Mr. WALDEN of Oregon, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. WAMP, Mrs. DRAKE, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. PASCRELL, and Mrs. MUSGRAVE.
H. Con. Res. 257: Mr. WITTMAN of Virginia.
H. Con. Res. 267: Mr. HINOJOSA and Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania.
H. Con. Res. 280: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. KUCINICH, and Mr. NADLER.
H. Res. 49: Mr. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee.
H. Res. 185: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
H. Res. 248: Mr. MARKEY and Mr. TOWNS.
H. Res. 339: Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. FILNER, and Mr. TOWNS.
H. Res. 620: Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, and Mr. TOWNS.
H. Res. 821: Mr. TANCREDO.
H. Res. 848: Mr. WOLF and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
H. Res. 875: Mr. TOWNS and Mr. WOLF.
H. Res. 887: Mr. RENZI, Mr. WHITFIELD of Kentucky, and Mr. KING of New York.
H. Res. 897: Mr. ROHRABACHER.
H. Res. 908: Ms. ESHOO, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. RENZI, Mr. DONNELLY, and Mr. LANGEVIN.
H. Res. 916: Mr. KAGEN, Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, Mr. JONES of North Carolina,
Mr. GINGREY, Mr. BAKER, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. HARE, Mr. COURTNEY,
Mr. RENZI, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. MCCOTTER, and Mr. DONNELLY.
H. Res. 917: Mr. WILSON of Ohio, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. HONDA, Mr. KIND, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. CLEAVER, and Mr. HINCHEY.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 760: Mrs. CAPITO.