

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

Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

AMENDMENT PROCESS FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1433, THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA HOUSE VOTING RIGHTS ACT OF 2007

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

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Madam Speaker, the Rules Committee intends to meet this week to grant a rule which may structure the amendment process for floor consideration of H.R. 1433, the District of Columbia House Voting Rights Act of 2007.

Members who wish to offer an amendment to this bill should submit 55 copies of the amendment and a brief description of the amendment to the Rules Committee in H-312 in the Capitol no later than 10 a.m. on Wednesday, March 21.

Amendments should be drafted to the bill as introduced. A copy of that bill is posted on the Web site of the Rules Committee. Amendments should be drafted by Legislative Counsel and also should be reviewed by the Office of the Parliamentarian to be sure that the amendments comply with the rules of the House. Members are also strongly encouraged to submit their amendments to the Congressional Budget Office for analysis regarding possible PAYGO violations.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1227, GULF COAST HURRICANE HOUSING RECOVERY ACT OF 2007

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 254 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 254

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. 1227) to assist in the provision of affordable housing to low-income families affected by Hurricane Katrina. 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. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Financial Services now printed in the bill, modified by the amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as the original bill for the purpose of further amendment under the five-minute rule and shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. Notwithstanding clause 11 of rule XVIII, no further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules. Each further 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 further 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, as amended, to the House with such further amendments as may have been adopted. 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. 1227 pursuant to this resolution, notwithstanding the operation of the previous question, the Chair may postpone further consideration of the bill to a time designated by the Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Madam Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART). All time yielded during consideration of the rule is for debate only.

I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. WELCH of Vermont asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Madam Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 254.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Madam Speaker, House Resolution 254 provides for the consideration of H.R. 1227, the Gulf Coast Hurricane Housing Recovery Act of 2007, under a structured rule.

The rule provides 60 minutes of general debate, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services, and the rule waives all points of order against consider-

ation of the bill except clauses 9 and 10 of rule XXI.

The rule provides that the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Financial Services now printed in the bill, modified by the amendment printed in part A of the Rules Committee report, shall be considered as adopted.

The bill, as amended, shall be considered as an original bill for the purpose of amendment and shall be considered as read. The rule waives all points of order to provisions of the bill, as amended.

The rule makes in order seven amendments printed in part B of the Rules Committee report. Each amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report and by the Member designated in the report. The amendments are considered as read, are debatable for the time specified, are not subject to amendment and are not divisible. All points of order against the amendments except, again, those in clauses 9 and 10 of rule XXI are waived.

Finally, the rule does provide one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the rule which makes in order nearly all of the amendments that were brought to the Rules Committee. Even though many on our side had concerns about the intent and effect of certain provisions in the amendments, the Rules Committee, with the recommendation of the Chair of the Financial Services Committee, voted to allow the House to debate the amendments and let the votes fall as they may.

Besides the manager's amendment, the rule makes in order more Republican amendments, actually, than Democratic ones, four Republican and three Democratic amendments. The few amendments that were not made in order by the rule were either withdrawn, determined to be nongermane, or had already been voted on earlier by the House.

The rule also provides extensive time for debate on each amendment so that the House can have a very vigorous discussion on each of them. Under this rule, each of the amendments is debatable for 20 minutes. Two of the amendments are debatable for an hour each.

Chairman FRANK came before our committee and testified that we should allow considerable time to debate each of these amendments on their merits and allow the views of all Members to be heard, even if that meant that we have to work late into the evening.

The Rules Committee agreed with the chairman, and I am pleased to bring forth this very even-handed rule.

Madam Speaker, as you know, Hurricane Katrina made landfall on August 25, 2005, followed by Hurricane Rita on September 24 and Hurricane Wilma on October 24, 2005, causing extraordinarily heavy loss of life and dislocation of thousands of families. Hurricane Katrina alone devastated 90,000

square miles, made 770,000 people homeless and had a death toll of 1,464 in Louisiana alone.

Just by comparison, in 1906 the earthquake and fire in San Francisco killed an estimated 500 to 3,000 people, resulted in about 250,000 people homeless. The Galveston Island flood of 1900 killed as many as 8,000 people, in the island and the city. The Chicago fire, the famous fire of 1871, burned an area of approximately 3 square miles and made 100,000 people homeless.

In the aftermath of the storms, Congress approved \$16.7 billion for Community Development Block Grants, and that's the portion of Katrina aid that we are talking about here, to aid the affected areas with rebuilding efforts. Of that, roughly \$1.2 billion has been spent. There has been a lot of bureaucratic mismanagement, frankly, in FEMA, resulting in the delay of aid approved to the people who need it.

Tragically, many residents continue to be displaced, and the pace of home repair and reconstruction is much slower than had been hoped for. And tens of thousands of federally assisted evacuees from these hurricanes face impending deadlines later this year for continued eligibility for rental assistance. A great number of residents are still scattered around the country, many hundreds of thousands of miles from their homes.

Madam Speaker, we are aware that FEMA didn't get its job done in the aftermath of the hurricane. We are here, in part, to try to put this back together and make certain that the aid people need is delivered. In part, this Congress now is responding to the needs of the folks in the gulf coast again.

I am very pleased to support this rule and support the underlying bill because it does provide some overdue housing relief to displaced gulf coast residents. H.R. 1227, the Gulf Coast Hurricane Housing Recovery Act of 2007, was passed out of the Financial Services Committee on a strong bipartisan vote of 50–16. The bill is practical in speeding up the repair and rebuilding of homes and affordable rental housing to the displaced low-income victims to Hurricanes Katrina, Rita and Wilma.

□ 1300

Very specifically, the measure frees up for use \$1.175 billion in funds that was previously made available to the State of Louisiana, but which has been held up by FEMA. Louisiana has proposed combining these funds with other Community Development Block Grant funds under its Road Home program for grants to homeowners, but FEMA won't approve use of the funds, thereby slowing down the program because of concerns about specific provisions of the Road Home program that provide incentives for homeowners to commit to return to the State of Louisiana and live.

This bill would transfer such funds to CDBG grants in order to expedite the

availability of those funds. The bill also has a number of provisions designed to address the shortfall in affordable housing for low-income families. And, as we all know, it was low-income families who bore the brunt of suffering as a result of these hurricanes. This measure would prevent public housing units in New Orleans from being demolished until the Federal Government has a plan to replace them and grant displaced public housing tenants an absolute right of return to either their former neighborhood or one as close as possible.

Faced with a looming September deadline for the cutoff of some 12,000 families currently receiving Disaster Voucher Program assistance, H.R. 1227 extends this deadline through at least the end of the year and authorizes replacement vouchers to affected families when the program terminates, and that would continue as long as the family is eligible for voucher assistance.

Additionally, responding to numerous accounts of government waste in the gulf coast rebuilding process, H.R. 1227 includes a number of provisions to ensure effective oversight. Federal funds must be used efficiently, effectively, and legally. The bill requires the State of Louisiana to submit monthly reports on the progress of the Road Home program in making funds available to homeowners. The bill requires the Government Accountability Office to complete quarterly reports identifying any waste, fraud, and abuse in connection with the program. We have got to stay on top of this money. And the bill requires the GAO study to examine methods of improving the distribution of Federal housing funds to assist States with hurricane recovery efforts.

Finally, the bill authorizes reimbursement of communities and landlords for monies lost through providing assistance to displaced individuals. A number of communities and private sector landlords throughout the country did play a critical role in providing housing assistance to evacuees in the aftermath of the hurricanes. This was crucial at a time when housing was in short supply and hundreds of thousands of families needed that assistance. We want to encourage such actions in future disasters to restore people's faith that the government can be a friend and an ally at a time of extraordinary need.

Much of the gulf coast remains devastated. Residents continue to suffer from inadequate housing, health care, and other basic services. And, more than 1½ years after Hurricane Katrina struck, the situation in the gulf coast remains an emergency. We must act now to right some of the wrongs that have been done and not wait on the sidelines anymore. We urge that you support the rule and the underlying bill.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. I would like to thank the distinguished gentleman from Vermont, my friend Mr. WELCH, for the time, and yield myself such time as I may consume.

On August 24, 1992, I remember Hurricane Andrew, category 5 storm, devastated my community, with wind gusts of over 200 miles per hour. That storm caused over \$26 billion of damage to south Florida. Entire communities were destroyed. Hurricane Andrew caused 43 deaths, destroyed over 125,000 homes, left approximately 180,000 people homeless, and wiped out approximately 80 percent of the area's farms. Until Hurricane Katrina hit the gulf coast in 2005, Hurricane Andrew was the costliest natural disaster in the United States' history.

We in south Florida were very fortunate to receive generous assistance from fellow Americans in the wake of Hurricane Andrew. I know that assistance was essential for recovery, as it is for recovery in the gulf coast.

As someone who experienced Hurricane Andrew firsthand, I have an idea of the trials that confront those who live through horrific storms. The road to recovery is long and difficult. It doesn't come easy. But communities must come together and put all of their efforts into rebuilding and meeting the needs of the residents. We cannot walk away from our obligations to our fellow Americans. And, just as we did after Andrew, together we must build, together we must recover, together we must be better and stronger than before.

Immediately after Hurricane Katrina hit the gulf coast, the Republican majority in this Congress committed over \$100 billion to help the area confront the immediate aftermath of the storm and to deal with the recovery effort. Included in that were \$16.7 billion, almost \$17 billion for the Community Development Block Grant programs. States applied for those funds through the Department of Housing and Urban Development. So far, HUD has approved under \$11 billion of those funds to affected States.

Madam Speaker, we all agree that those who wish to return to New Orleans or other devastated areas should be able to do so. This is the position of Mr. Alphonso Jackson, the Housing and Urban Development Secretary, which he reiterated in August when he said during a visit to New Orleans, "Every family who wants to come home should have the opportunity to come back." We should all do what we can to make certain that we rebuild, that we see communities rebuild and become even more robust and safer communities.

The underlying legislation seeks to assist in the provision of affordable housing to low-income families affected by Hurricane Katrina. There is some concern, Madam Speaker, that the legislation goes beyond the scope of the bill's stated intent. For example,

the legislation seeks to turn what is currently a temporary disaster voucher program into a permanent voucher, and to require HUD to provide tenant replacement vouchers for all public housing units not brought back on line, including those slated for demolition prior to the storms.

The American people have demonstrated their resiliency before and will do so again. Obviously our prayers continue to go out to the victims and their families of these horrific natural disasters. The spirit of community, generosity, and goodwill across the country continues to give me confidence that Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, just as Florida did before, will recover from these tragedies stronger and better than before.

I would like to thank the distinguished chairman of the Financial Services Committee. He listened to the needs of Miami-Dade County with regard to how the distribution formula for HUD section 8, when it was changed in the CR that this Congress passed some weeks back. There was damage, damage cost, and the chairman is ameliorating and alleviating that damage, and we are grateful for that.

Now, Mrs. BIGGERT, our colleague from Illinois, went before the Rules Committee with an amendment to hold harmless all of the public housing agents from the damage done by the change in the formula in the CR, to hold harmless all the agencies through this calendar year. I am sorry, I truly am, that the majority in the Rules Committee refused to make in order Mrs. BIGGERT's amendment, and that is one of the reasons why we are opposing the rule today.

I think it is appropriate to point out that the majority is failing to live up to its commitment to run the House in an open and fair manner. The majority sent a notice to Members that they had until Monday at 10 a.m. to file amendments with the Rules Committee in order to be considered; however, the official committee report accompanying this bill was not filed until Friday, giving Members less than 1 business day to review the report and file amendments for consideration, not to mention the fact that most Members were already in their districts or traveling back home on Friday.

So I think it is fair to ask the question, how can the majority expect Members to review the actions of the Committee on Financial Services in a timely manner when they barely give them a chance to review the committee report?

The majority also promised to provide more open rules. Yes, they have provided several open rules on non-controversial bills. I think it is important to ask, what about on bills where both sides do not necessarily agree on all aspects of the legislation? Will the majority continue to block amendments from the minority? What will they do on the supplemental appropriations bill? We shall soon find out.

I believe it is fair to say, if the majority is serious about their commitment to openness, they should allow for open rules on the underlying legislation and the supplemental appropriations bill which is coming forth soon. Members of the minority are concerned that this bill, as I stated before, turns a temporary disaster voucher program into a permanent one, and the concern that of the \$110 billion appropriated by the 109th Congress, only a small portion has been distributed to those in need. In response to these concerns, they offered several thoughtful and germane amendments to the Rules Committee to address their concerns; however, the majority once again closed them out. I think that is unfortunate, and, again, that is why, Madam Speaker, we oppose this rule.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Madam Speaker, as I mentioned earlier, just in response to the comments by my friend from Florida, this pretty much is an open rule. The ones that weren't allowed were nongermane. And then there was one amendment that was not allowed because it was an amendment that was earlier offered and rejected by this House, and that was at the recommendation of the Chair of the Financial Services Committee, who had a very open process in the Financial Services Committee considering numerous amendments and then has pretty much invited any Member who wanted to submit an amendment to have an opportunity on the floor to do so or for consideration before the Rules Committee.

At this time, Madam Speaker, I would yield 6½ minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts, the chair of the Committee on Financial Services, Mr. FRANK.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I thank the gentleman.

Madam Speaker, no, it is not a fully open rule. It is a far more open rule than any that the majority allowed in the previous Congress on major legislation from the Financial Services Committee. I tell you that as a fact.

First, the argument was made that people didn't have enough time to file amendments. This bill was voted out of committee on March 7. It is true that the actual report was delayed. It was delayed partly because staff on both sides held up the actual writing on the language, and we had a CBO scoring issue, and we were waiting for CBO. But the text of the bill was put forward publicly on March 7.

In fact, there are a number of amendments offered here; most of them are from members of the committee, some are from nonmembers of the committee.

So the notion that people didn't know until Friday what to put in the amendments on Monday is false. The fact is that this bill on March 7 was voted out of committee. In fact, the text of the bill was set on March 6.

What we did on March 7 was come back and complete roll call. But as of noon on March 7, people knew what would be in this bill. It was not a secret that we were marking it up; it was not a secret that it would be coming up today.

So anybody who waited until Friday, who made the mistake, they have themselves to blame. In fact, we made a couple of accommodations. The gentleman from Georgia had an amendment which he filed which was misfiled, and his amendment as filed went to a section different than he wanted to affect.

□ 1315

Whether you realize that, we urged the Rules committee to allow him, after the deadline, to make an appropriate substitution. That was done so that his appropriate amendment is in order. To the extent that there was that technical glitch, we said, that's not right; let's allow the gentleman from Georgia's amendment to go forward, the one substantive to the bill.

The gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BAKER) had an important amendment that was adopted in committee. CBO raised issues with it. We then asked the Rules Committee, after the deadline, to accommodate a change for Mr. BAKER's amendment because we were accommodating the CBO scoring. So we did make two agreements after the deadline to accommodate these particular changes.

But I want to stress again, Members knew on March 7 what was going to be in this bill. So I don't know why anybody would have waited until Friday to do the amendments. It was a fairly public controversial process that we had. We had a number of rollcalls in the committee.

And I will say this: my view, I would have had a rule that was even more accommodating. But what this does is allow every amendment that the Parliamentarian's Office found to be germane to the bill and the substance of this program to be in order. There is some debate over one amendment from the gentleman from Georgia involving a kind of generic language about offsets. And that was not allowed. I would have voted to allow it; but it was not allowed. We considered it in committee. It was voted on, debated, defeated.

But every amendment that was offered and, again, the deadline for amendments was Monday. The bill had been voted out of committee on Wednesday, March 7. There was plenty of time for that bill to be looked at and for people to offer amendments. When I saw the amendments on Monday, I urged the Rules Committee to put in order everything that was germane. They have put in order a number of germane amendments with a lot of debate time.

Now, I understand that there are Members who would like it to have included a few more things. But every single one of them voted for rules far

more restrictive. So this bill, you know, I have always thought the question is, Is this a good rule? I have always thought the fount of all wisdom that we should be guided by was expounded by a philosopher named Henny Youngman, whom you, Madam Speaker, along with I certainly remember. And the wisdom was, asked, How is your wife, the answer was, Compared to what? And is this a good rule? Compared to what? Compared to every rule that affected the Committee on Financial Services during Republican leadership, it is a rule of great openness. Compared to an ideal of complete openness, not quite.

So it is a far better rule than any Republicans ever brought forward with regard to openness. It is not as good as I would like, but it does allow into debate every amendment germane to the substance of this bill, particularly to this bill, in terms of these programs, a number of amendments that change it one way or the other: some that would expand it, some that would retract it. And I believe the House will have a chance to work its will on this issue.

The only other thing I would say is this when we are talking about time: For people who haven't been remembering exactly, I do want to remind people, despite what you might think, it is not November of 2005. We are now here in March of 2007. I say that because people who saw the devastation of Hurricanes Katrina and Rita in Mississippi and in Louisiana, to some extent in Texas, and who expected the Federal Government to respond, and looked at the things we are doing, which are called for by that dilemma that was created by the hurricanes, they would have assumed that their Federal Government would have done that within a couple of months after the hurricanes.

Unfortunately, about an 18-month freeze elapsed because the now-minority, then-majority, did not have the energy to deal with it. So we are doing a bill today that is 18 months overdue.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I appreciate the gentleman for yielding, and I thank you for allowing or supporting the inclusion of one of my amendments. But you would agree, I hope, that the reason that the section was misidentified in the initial submission to the Rules Committee is because the text of the bill that we are considering today wasn't available until Friday afternoon, and that section numbers indeed changed; is that not correct?

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Yes, I do agree, but it was changed as of Friday, and so people could have looked at that on Friday and gotten it right. And I appreciate that. So, yeah, the section changed and as somebody even picked it up as of Friday, in the case of the gentleman from Louisiana, it was a different thing. We didn't get the CBO's

scoring until too late, and then we had to work it out. The scoring came in. Part of the problem was CBO is very busy, and we passed the bill on March 7 and we didn't get their scoring until that Friday, and that was one of the reasons for the delay.

I thank the gentleman from the Rules Committee.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would note that there are 12½ minutes remaining for the gentleman from Vermont and 21 minutes remaining for the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume before yielding to my good friend from Georgia.

I think a fundamental part of the role of the opposition of the minority is to hold the majority accountable, not only to history, which our friend from Massachusetts is making reference to, but accountable with regard to the promises made by the majority.

And so it was the majority that reiterated that they would bring an open process. And, for example, we are already seeing not only, we have seen in bill after bill after bill, the minority closed out. But also, for example, rules passed by the majority, for example, requiring 3 days for people to view legislation before it comes to the floor, rules like that being waived.

So let's see, for example, what is done on the supplemental appropriations bill. Are they going to waive the rule passed by the majority requiring 3 days? Are they going to waive it with regard to that legislation as well?

And my friends on the other side of the aisle point out that, I think they said this is almost an open rule. It is not an open rule.

Mrs. BIGGERT, I mentioned before, had an amendment to hold harmless the public housing agencies from the effects of the change in the formula in the middle of the fiscal year with regard to section 8. And her amendment was not made in order.

So it is important to point that out. No, this is not an open rule nor an almost open rule nor a semi- or a pseudo-open rule. It is not an open rule.

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

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Well, first, the Parliamentarian ruled that the gentlewoman from Illinois' amendment which we debated in committee was not germane because it went far beyond the hurricane. So that was the reason for that.

The second thing is I want to concede one point to the gentleman. He has chided us because we have set ourselves too low a standard. We have set ourselves the standard of simply being better than they were last year. I acknowledge that is too low a bar. I think we have met it with ease, but I

am inclined to do better. So I promise him, as far as I am concerned, I will try to have a higher standard.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Reclaiming my time, I don't know exactly where the standard is in height. I will say that the promise was an open process, and that process does not exist, and that promise has not been kept. And in bill after bill after bill, the minority is closed out.

Now, it is true that some open rules have been permitted on legislation that we would bring forth under suspension. Madam Speaker, when bills are non-controversial, many times they are brought forth under a process called suspension of the rules when there is mostly unanimity or often unanimity or almost unanimity in this House. Yes. So in bills like that we have seen some open rules where the minority has been able to have the amendments that it wishes to be considered.

But I just want to remind colleagues that may be listening to this debate, Madam Speaker, that when I point to Mrs. BIGGERT, it is not a theoretical, you know, height issue, whether so much height of a promise has been met. No. No. Mrs. BIGGERT is here and Mrs. BIGGERT is a colleague, and she went before the Rules Committee with an amendment that I thought was an important amendment and that she has worked hard on, and she was closed out.

As a matter of fact, I would like to recognize, at this point, another colleague, and then I will recognize Mrs. BIGGERT. I yield 4 minutes to my good friend, Dr. PRICE, who also had an amendment, a germane amendment, that he has worked on, that he has given thought and effort to and he brought to the Rules Committee so that we here could consider it today. And he was closed out.

So, again, not theory, not height, not almost closed, almost open. The gentleman from Georgia exists.

I yield 4 minutes to Dr. PRICE.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I thank my good friend from Florida for his passion for openness and honesty in our process, and I thank him for yielding me some time.

I rise to oppose this rule for two specific reasons. One is because it is not an open rule. It is not an open rule. It is a violation of the assurances that we have been provided by the majority party. It is not an open rule. Having a little bit of an open rule is like being a little bit pregnant. It ain't possible. This is not an open rule. And I stand here with an amendment that was turned down by the Rules Committee. I stand here also opposing this because this rule takes fiscal sanity and it moves it into a room somewhere, a very dark room, and then locks the door and it throws away the key.

I have in my hand, Madam Speaker, the report from the Rules Committee on what we are considering today. And it has the amendment that I had offered, commonly known as PAYGO,

and it has the recorded vote. This is in the Rules Committee yesterday.

And my amendment would have been very simple. It said: "Would require any new spending authorized by this legislation to have a specific offset." Simple. And what happened on the vote? Mr. McGOVERN voted "no." Mr. HASTINGS from Florida voted "no." Mr. WELCH voted "no." Mr. ARCURI voted "no." Ms. SLAUGHTER voted "no." Ms. MATSUI voted "no." They voted against even considering, even considering financial responsibility. So I rise to oppose this rule.

This new majority has promised a fair and open process; but, Madam Speaker, I am here to tell you that what we are living in now is the land of Orwellian democracy. Because they just say something, they think it is so. Once again, this majority has blocked a vote on applying pay-as-you-go principles to new spending.

We have wonderful comments from leadership on the other side. Speaker PELOSI has said, on a previous rule, when the Republicans were in charge, "Because the debate has been limited and Americans' voices silenced by this restrictive rule, I urge my colleagues to vote against the rule." And I support that sentiment. "Because this is a restrictive rule, I urge my colleagues to vote 'no.'"

Majority Leader STENY HOYER said on a rule that came before the House, "Mr. Speaker, once again this House majority is resorting to heavy-handed tactics that are designed to do one thing only, to achieve a pre-ordained result by shutting down a full and fair debate in this House." And that is precisely what the majority party is doing now.

The new Chair of the Rules Committee said, "If we want to foster democracy in this body, we should take the time and thoughtfulness to debate all major legislation under an open rule, not just appropriations bills. An open process should be the norm, not the exception."

Democrat Caucus Chair RAHM EMANUEL said, "Let us have an up or down vote. Don't be scared. Don't hide behind some little rule. Come on out here. Put it on the table. Let us have a vote."

So I ask my friends on the majority side, what are you afraid of? The amendment said: "Which would require any new spending authorized by this legislation to have a specific offset."

What are you afraid of? What are you afraid of? That is real financial responsibility.

My good friend from Massachusetts said that they were waiting on a CBO scoring. Well, then the bill does require funding. In fact, what the CBO has said, that it has a price tag of nearly \$1.3 billion. Maybe money well spent, but I would suggest, Madam Speaker, that it is money that we ought to find in our current budget.

So this hypocrisy of the majority party is stifling, absolutely stifling.

They are not the most open and fair Congress in history; in fact, they are a far cry from it.

I would urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the rule based on fiscal responsibility and based on the hypocrisy of the majority party claiming to provide open rules, claiming to provide real and honest debate and running away from it once again.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Madam Speaker, in response to my friend from Georgia, I would say two things. First, there are seven amendments that have been allowed. One of them included an amendment by the gentleman from Georgia that was not timely, but was accommodated by the Rules Committee. The amendment that was rejected is an amendment that has been rejected before.

The second point that I think it is important to make is that we have a responsibility in this House to get work done.

□ 1330

And the rules are intended to help us do the work of the American people, not be a political wedge to make bogus arguments about process. And it is a disgrace, it is a disgrace, that going on 2 years after these hurricanes, there are people who are still homeless because we had a Federal Emergency Management Administration that was incompetent and reckless. It was headed by a person whose previous experience was as a judge of an Arabian horse contest, and that happened under the administration and the Congress that was led by Republicans.

That is not acceptable. It is not acceptable to this Congress. It is not acceptable to this party. It is not acceptable to this Congressman. It is not acceptable by a bipartisan vote of 52-16 of the Financial Services Committee.

We have business to do because there are people who are still in emergency situations well over a year after devastating hurricanes. This legislation is about doing something now that should have been done 1½ years ago.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman Mr. WELCH for his insightful leadership on this issue, and I thank the Financial Services Committee.

And I ask the question of my colleagues, how many of them have encountered Hurricane Katrina survivors, as I have every day in my congressional district, or been back to the scene of the crime, if you will, along the Mississippi gulf or the Louisiana gulf and asked the question, how long?

This legislation, which I believe the Rules Committee has been enormously fair in allowing amendments by both Republicans and Democrats, answers the immediacy of the concerns. One, being no housing. One of the amendments Mr. GREEN will be offering is raising the question of extending the

benefits so that individuals who are trying to recoup themselves to get back home will have housing. How many have walked into apartments in Houston, Texas, and talked to Katrina survivors who held in their hand an eviction notice because their FEMA benefits were being cut off, while at the same time they were trying to access the Road Home Program, and they could not access those dollars?

So this is answering real questions for real Americans, and it answers the failures of this administration, which never seemed to get it together and concern themselves enough with breaking, if you will, the entanglement of bureaucracy to ensure that these individuals will receive benefits.

So one of the issues, Madam Speaker, as we both serve on the Homeland Security Committee, is to pre-prepare so we are in front of the natural disaster or man-made disaster. I look forward to legislation that establishes post disaster housing, not trailers, so that individuals can be evacuated to real housing that is there in place to be able to be of help.

This legislation moves the ball further down the road. It is long overdue. It is a good rule. It is a rule that I have not seen in my time here in the Congress under the other majority; so I am grateful that we are moving forward as we are.

Let us vote for the rule. Let us vote for the underlying legislation. Let us help those who need our help, and let us help them now.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Madam Speaker, at this time I yield 4 minutes to my distinguished friend from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT), who also had an amendment that was closed out, closed out by the majority in the Rules Committee.

Mrs. BIGGERT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, while I am grateful that this rule made in order one of my amendments to H.R. 1227, I rise today in opposition to this modified closed rule because my other amendment, a very important amendment, was not made in order.

My second amendment would have struck section 302 of H.R. 1227 and inserted a new section at the end of the bill resetting the section 8 funding formula to its pre-continuing resolution state. The amendment would require HUD to distribute section 8 funds to public housing authorities for the remainder of the 2007 calendar year as they were distributed before the enactment of the continuing resolution just last month.

The section 8 funding formula change that was included in the CR was not well thought out. One doesn't need to look very far for evidence of this fact. Under the funding formula change that was included in the CR, all of the gulf coast PHAs lose funding, and the budget of the New Orleans PHA alone drops from \$73 million to \$3 million in 2007 and then permanently from there on.

The bill before us today fixes this problem for the gulf coast and New Orleans PHAs, but not for the rest of the country. I guess they realized that they had made a mistake in that area, but let's just leave the other PHAs in trouble. Half of the PHAs in the country, then, over 1,200 public housing authorities in 29 States, remain in trouble.

Because of the section 8 funding formula change in the CR, PHAs in half of our Nation's communities will not be able to serve many of our neediest citizens. Very soon HUD will issue a notice that informs PHAs that if they haven't spent their "unspent balances" by a date certain, they lose these funds. If a person is walking the streets with a voucher and hasn't found a place to rent, he or she loses the voucher because these "unspent funds" will be recaptured by HUD. It was wrong to change the funding formula midyear when PHAs had already set their budgets for this year.

My amendment would have corrected this problem by telling HUD to distribute section 8 funds to PHAs for the remainder of 2007 calendar year as they were distributed to PHAs before the enactment of the CR.

Unfortunately, my Democrat colleagues on the Rules Committee voted against making my amendment in order and against restoring much-needed funds to many of the Nation's PHAs. And they did so with full knowledge that PHAs in their own congressional districts would benefit from my amendment.

All three counties in my district lose funding under the formula change in this CR, but at least I attempted to do something about it and didn't consciously vote against fixing the problem.

We also will continue to try to fix the problem caused by the section 8 formula included in the CR. As ranking member on the Housing Subcommittee, I will continue to work with my Housing colleague Chairwoman Maxine Waters to craft a bipartisan section 8 reform bill in the Financial Services Committee, which is the appropriate place to address any changes to the funding formula, not in an appropriation bill such as the recently enacted CR.

I recognize that the minority party may not be able to stop this rule from going forward, Madam Speaker, but I urge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to seriously consider voting against this rule. While the bill prevents PHAs in the Gulf Stream from being harmed by the formula in the CR, this rule does nothing to help PHAs nationwide that are in the same predicament.

Again, I urge my colleagues to oppose this rule.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Madam Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK).

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Madam Speaker, I rise to correct myself.

The gentleman from Georgia asked me to acknowledge that his amendment was originally misfiled because of a change in the section that occurred last Friday. I acknowledged that, but incorrectly. In fact, the change happened during the markup. The section was renumbered during the markup. And the gentleman, of course, being a member of the committee, could have done that.

I want to stress again no change was made in the text of that bill from March 7 until today; so anybody who wanted to offer amendments knew that on March 7.

Secondly, as to the gentlewoman from Illinois, as I said, I guess I am coming here, Madam Speaker, confessing all day. I mean, I confess that I have not reached as high enough a standard as I should in parliamentary terms because I have taken simply being better than the Republicans as my standard, and I pledge to do better.

Similarly, I guess I should be scolded for being lax on the rules. The gentlewoman from Illinois offered her amendment in committee. We did not raise a point of order against it in committee. Now, I do want to point out the parliamentarian for our committee is the parliamentarian that was the parliamentarian under my predecessor. That is one of the first things I did after the election was to call the parliamentarian, Mr. Duncan, a former member of the Parliamentarian's Office, who had been hired by my predecessor, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Oxley), and asked him to stay on. I believe it should be totally nonpartisan, and I believe it has been. It was the Parliamentarian's Office that told the Rules Committee that the gentlewoman from Illinois' amendment was not germane.

Now, I acknowledge my excessive tolerance. I have learned I am more tolerant of a lot of things than a lot of people here, and I accept that. I perhaps should have been more strict with regard to the committee. We had that debated, and the rule is generally that you do not take something that is narrowly applied and make it broader. There is language in this bill that applies to how vouchers are allocated where there was a hurricane. The gentlewoman wanted to change something that had been in the CR. She said it shouldn't have been in the CR. And I will say this: We will in our committee be revisiting that. We will have a voucher bill. That will come before our committee going forward. But I do want to make it clear in defense of the Rules Committee that where I allowed the amendment without getting a ruling on it, the Rules Committee, when they restricted the gentlewoman's amendment from being offered, were following the ruling of the parliamentarian that it was not germane.

I will yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Mrs. BIGGERT. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

When it was in committee, there was no point of order. And the amendment

also contained New Orleans and the gulf coast.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I understand.

Mrs. BIGGERT. That was carved out by your side of the aisle, realizing that that was very important, leaving the other PHAs.

When I went to the Rules Committee, I spent over an hour there, and the germaneness never came up.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Madam Speaker, reclaiming my time, I acknowledge that I did not raise a point of order. I acknowledge that I was very tolerant and did not make a point of order that apparently would have been sustained by the parliamentarian. But it was the parliamentarian who said that.

I am sorry the woman spent over an hour in the Rules Committee. Sometimes that is fun; sometimes it is not, but that is part of the job. But the fact is that the decision to exclude her particular amendment was made on the ruling of the parliamentarian that it was not germane.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

We are grateful for the tolerance in the gentleman's committee with regard to the amendment presented by Mrs. BIGGERT. The Rules Committee could have been equally tolerant. Let us be clear.

In other words, the Rules Committee waives points of order, Madam Speaker, with regard to the whole bill; so, obviously, they could have waived a point of order with regard to the issue of germaneness for Mrs. BIGGERT. So the Rules Committee could have been amply tolerant. And that is one of the reasons, since the Rules Committee majority was not, with regard to our colleague who has put so much work into this issue to hold harmless the public housing agencies for the remainder of this year from the mistake made by the majority in the so-called continuing resolution, that we believe that she should have been able to make her point before all of the Members.

Madam Speaker, at this point I would like to yield 3 minutes to my distinguished friend from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS).

Mr. BACHUS. Madam Speaker, I have come down here this morning not to really speak about the process. It is to discuss with all my fellow Members something that I think we need to make a commitment to going forward.

Hurricane Katrina was a terrible tragedy for the gulf coast. It was a terrible tragedy for New Orleans. In fact, it was the greatest tragedy that we have had as far as a natural disaster in the history of our country. As far as loss of property and loss of life, it is somewhere between five and six times greater than anything we had ever experienced before. When you talk property loss, uninsured property loss, because a lot of the flooding was in New Orleans where there was not flood insurance, or along the coast where they

had wind insurance but not for the surge, the storm surge, the losses are even greater.

But out of a tragedy, there ought to always be opportunities. And the opportunity that we have let slip by today, and, as I said, I am more concerned about the future, and I hope that the chairman of the full committee will work with me, is for us to go back and make sure that we do right by the people of New Orleans in public housing.

□ 1345

The New Orleans public housing was a failure. It was dysfunctional, and it had been so for 40 or 50 years.

There is a philanthropist in Atlanta who has helped build a community in Atlanta called East Lake. It was the highest crime area in the State of Georgia. Today it is one of the safest precincts in the State of Georgia. He did it not by replacing one-on-one public housing units, as we are going to do in this bill. He did it by making a mixed community of renters, subsidized renters, owners and public housing units.

In the State of New York, almost half of the prisoners in the State penitentiary in New York State come from public housing projects in seven ZIP codes in New York.

We owe it to our citizens all over the United States, not just in New Orleans, to try to make a model, a vision in New Orleans, and correct what is a community of public housing where children actually hide in bathtubs and sleep in bathtubs at night because that is the only safe place to be. That ought not to be in America.

We can change this. We know how to do it. Some of these HOPE VI projects are amazing. We didn't do this in this bill. We owe it to the American people to do it going forward.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman and all who have participated in this debate for having done so. I think it has been a good debate.

I simply want to reiterate that on such an important issue, I am sorry that we do not have a truly open rule, one that obviously would satisfy any definition of the word. Under an open rule, for example, Mrs. BIGGERT could have had her hold-harmless amendment discussed and debated by the full House, as well as Dr. PRICE and others who wanted to have their amendments debated and discussed.

I would simply urge and request of my friends on the other side of the aisle that not only on noncontroversial bills should we have the ability for the minority to be heard, not only on noncontroversial bills or bills of consensus should there be open rules, but rather there should be open rules on other legislation, legislation where there will be

genuine debate and even disagreement and discussion.

Madam Speaker, having said that, having no other speakers, and reiterating our opposition to the rule, and looking forward to the debate on the underlying legislation, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. I thank my good friend from Florida.

Once again, Madam Speaker, this is, we believe, a fair and open rule that provides consideration for a much-needed, bipartisan piece of legislation. The rule makes in order nearly every amendment brought to the Rules Committee, more Republican than Democratic amendments, and with considerable time to debate the merits of each amendment that will be presented.

The underlying bill will provide increased flexibility for already allocated funds, provide new oversight for existing programs. It preserves public housing, assists evacuees with rental housing and provides support for landlords in local communities who assisted evacuees with housing.

Don't forget the displaced victims of Hurricanes Katrina, Rita and Wilma. That is really what this is all about. The Federal Government's response to the storms has been a national embarrassment, and it is just not acceptable. We have an obligation, all of us, to get our act together so that they can move on with their lives and put them back together.

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

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

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

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

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on adopting House Resolution 254 will be followed by 5-minute votes on suspending the rules and agreeing to House Concurrent Resolution 42; suspending the rules and passing H.R. 759; and agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 228, nays 190, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 160]

YEAS—228

Abercrombie	Berkley	Brown, Corrine
Ackerman	Berman	Butterfield
Allen	Berry	Capps
Altman	Bishop (GA)	Capuano
Andrews	Bishop (NY)	Cardoza
Arcuri	Blumenauer	Carnahan
Baca	Boren	Carney
Baldwin	Boswell	Carson
Barrow	Boucher	Chandler
Bean	Boyd (FL)	Clarke
Becerra	Boyd (KS)	Clay
	Braley (IA)	Cleaver

Clyburn	Johnson, E. B.	Price (NC)
Cohen	Jones (NC)	Rahall
Conyers	Jones (OH)	Rangel
Cooper	Kagen	Reyes
Costa	Kaptur	Rodriguez
Costello	Kennedy	Ross
Courtney	Kildee	Rothman
Cramer	Kilpatrick	Royal-Allard
Cuellar	Kind	Ruppersberger
Cummings	Klein (FL)	Rush
Davis (AL)	Lampson	Ryan (OH)
Davis (CA)	Langevin	Salazar
Davis (IL)	Lantos	Sánchez, Linda T.
Davis, Lincoln	Larson (CT)	Sanchez, Loretta
DeFazio	Lee	Barbanes
DeGette	Levin	Schakowsky
Delahunt	Lewis (GA)	Schiff
DeLauro	Lipinski	Schwartz
Dicks	Loebssack	Scott (GA)
Dingell	Lofgren, Zoe	Scott (VA)
Doggett	Lowey	Serrano
Donnelly	Lynch	Sestak
Doyle	Mahoney (FL)	Shea-Porter
Edwards	Maloney (NY)	Sherman
Ellison	Markey	Shuler
Farr	Marshall	Matheson
Fattah	Ellsworth	Sires
Filner	Emanuel	Skelton
Frank (MA)	Engel	Slaughter
Giffords	Eshoo	McCollum (MN)
Gillibrand	Etheridge	Smith (WA)
Gonzalez	Farr	Snyder
Gordon	Fattah	Solis
Green, Al	Filner	Space
Green, Gene	Frank (MA)	Spratt
Grijalva	Giffords	Stark
Gutierrez	Gillibrand	Stupak
Hall (NY)	Gonzalez	Sutton
Hare	Gordon	Tanner
Harman	Green, Al	Tauscher
Hastings (FL)	Green, Gene	Taylor
Herseth	Grijalva	Thompson (CA)
Higgins	Gutierrez	Thompson (MS)
Hill	Hall (NY)	Tierney
Hinchey	Hare	Towns
Hinojosa	Harman	Udall (CO)
Hirono	Hastings (FL)	Udall (NM)
Hodes	Herseth	Van Hollen
Holder	Higgins	Velázquez
Holt	Hill	Visclosky
Honda	Hinchey	Walz (MN)
Hooley	Hinojosa	Wasserman
Hoyer	Hirono	Schultz
Inslee	Hodes	Waterson
Jackson (IL)	Holder	Watson
Jackson-Lee (TX)	Holt	Watt
Jefferson	Honda	Waxman
Johnson (GA)	Hooley	Weiner
	Hoyer	Welch (VT)
	Inslee	Wexler
	Jackson (IL)	Wilson (OH)
	Jackson-Lee (TX)	Woolsey
	Jefferson	Wu
	Johnson (GA)	Wynn
		Yarmuth

NAYS—190

Aderholt	Capito	Fossella
Akin	Carter	Foxx
Alexander	Castle	Franks (AZ)
Bachmann	Chabot	Frelinghuysen
Baker	Coble	Galligan
Barrett (SC)	Cole (OK)	Garrett (NJ)
Bartlett (MD)	Conaway	Gerlach
Barton (TX)	Crenshaw	Gillmor
Biggert	Cubin	Gingrey
Bilbray	Culberson	Gohmert
Bilirakis	Davis (KY)	Goode
Bishop (UT)	Davis, David	Goodlatte
Blackburn	Davis, Tom	Granger
Blunt	Deal (GA)	Hall (TX)
Boehner	Dent	Hastert
Bonner	Diaz-Balart, L.	Hastings (WA)
Bono	Diaz-Balart, M.	Hayes
Boozman	Doolittle	Heller
Boustany	Drake	Hensarling
Brady (TX)	Herger	Hoekstra
Brown (SC)	Duncan	Hobson
Brown-Waite,	Ehlers	Hoekstra
Burgess	Emerson	Hulshof
Burton (IN)	English (PA)	Hunter
Calvert	Everett	Inglis (SC)
Carney	Fallin	Issa
Carson	Buyer	Jindal
Chandler	Calvert	Johnson (IL)
Clarke	Ferguson	Johnson, Sam
Cleaver	Camp (MI)	Jordan
	Campbell (CA)	Keller
	Flake	
	Forbes	
	Fortenberry	

King (IA) Moran (KS) Sensenbrenner
 King (NY) Musgrave Shadegg
 Kingston Myrick Shays
 Kirk Neugebauer Shimkus
 Kline (MN) Nunes Shuster
 Knollenberg Pearce Simpson
 Kuhl (NY) Peterson (PA) Smith (NE)
 LaHood Petri Smith (NJ)
 Lamborn Pickering Smith (TX)
 Latham Pitts Souder
 LaTourette Platts Stearns
 Lewis (CA) Poe Sullivan
 Lewis (KY) Porter Tancredo
 Linder Price (GA) Terry
 LoBiondo Pryce (OH) Thornberry
 Lucas Putnam Tiahrt
 Lungren, Daniel E. Radanovich Tiberti
 Mack Regula Turner
 Manzullo Rehberg Upton
 Merchant Reichert Walberg
 McCarthy (CA) Renzi Walden (OR)
 McCaul (TX) Reynolds Walsh (NY)
 McCotter Rogers (AL) Wamp
 McCrery Rogers (KY) Weldon (FL)
 McHenry Rogers (MI) Weller
 McHugh Rohrabacher Whitfield
 McKeon Ros-Lehtinen Wicker
 Morris Roskam Wilson (NM)
 Rodgers Royce Wilson (SC)
 Mica Ryan (WI) Wilson (SC)
 Miller (FL) Sali Wolf
 Miller (MI) Saxton Young (AK)
 Miller, Gary Schmidt Young (FL)

tion to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 42, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Kansas (Mrs. BOYDA) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 42, as amended.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 421, nays 0, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 161]

YEAS—421

Lewis (GA)	Oliver	Shuster
Lewis (KY)	Ortiz	Simpson
Linder	Pallone	Sires
Lipinski	Pascarella	Skelton
LoBiondo	Pastor	Slaughter
Loebsack	Paul	Smith (NE)
Lofgren, Zoe	Payne	Smith (NJ)
Lowey	Pearce	Smith (TX)
Lucas	Perlmutter	Smith (WA)
Lungren, Daniel E.	Peterson (MN)	Snyder
	Peterson (PA)	Solis
Lynch	Petri	Souder
Mack	Pickering	Space
Mahoney (FL)	Pitts	Spratt
Maloney (NY)	Platts	Stark
Manzullo	Poe	Stearns
Marchant	Pomeroy	Stupak
Markey	Porter	Sullivan
Marshall	Price (GA)	Sutton
Matheson	Price (NC)	Tancredo
Matsui	Pryce (OH)	Tanner
McCarthy (CA)	Putnam	Tauscher
McCarthy (NY)	Radanovich	Taylor
McCaul (TX)	Rahall	Terry
McCormick (MN)	Ramstad	Thompson (CA)
	Rangel	Thompson (MS)
	Regula	Thornberry
	Rehberg	Tiaht
	Tiberi	Tierney
	Renzi	Towns
	Reyes	Turner
	Reynolds	Rodriguez
	Rogers (AL)	Udall (CO)
	Rogers (KY)	Udall (NM)
	Rogers (MI)	Upton
	Rohrabacher	Van Hollen
	Rush	Velázquez
	Ryan (OH)	Visclosky
	Ryan (WI)	Walberg
	Ross	Walden (OR)
	Rothman	Walsh (NY)
	Royal-Allard	Walz (MN)
	Royce	Wamp
	Ruppersberger	Wasserman
	Rush	Schultz
	Ryan (OH)	Waters
	Ryan (WI)	Watson
	Salazar	Watt
	Sánchez, Linda	Waxman
	T.	Weiner
	Sanchez, Loretta	Welch (VT)
	Sarbanes	Weldon (FL)
	Saxton	Weller
	Schiff	Westmoreland
	Schmidt	Wexler
	Schwartz	Whitfield
	Scott (GA)	Wicker
	Scott (VA)	Wilson (NM)
	Sensenbrenner	Wilson (OH)
	Serrano	Wilson (SC)
	Sestak	Wolf
	Shadegg	Woolsey
	Shays	Wu
	Shea-Porter	Wynn
	Sherman	Yarmuth
	Shimkus	Young (AK)
	Shuler	Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—15

Bachus Gilchrest Meehan
 Brady (PA) Graves Paul
 Cannon Kanjorski Pence
 Castor Kucinich Sessions
 Davis, Jo Ann Larsen (WA) Westmoreland

□ 1415

Messrs. TERRY, SULLIVAN, JORDAN of Ohio and TOM DAVIS of Virginia changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MOMENT OF SILENCE IN MEMORY OF THE LATE HONORABLE JACK METCALF

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I rise to inform my colleagues that last Thursday, one of our former colleagues, Jack Metcalf, who represented the Second District in Washington State, passed away.

So, Madam Speaker, I would ask if we could have a moment of silence in his remembrance.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members will rise and the House will observe a moment of silence.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

There was no objection.

HONORING HEROIC SERVICE OF GLIDER PILOTS OF UNITED STATES ARMY AIR FORCES DURING WORLD WAR II

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the mo-

Bachmann	Cole (OK)	Granger	McCotter
Bachus	Ackerman	Green, Al	McCrary
Baird	Aderholt	Conyers	McDermott
Baker	Akin	Cooper	McGovern
Baldwin	Alexander	Costa	Grijalva
Barrett (SC)	Costello	Gutierrez	McHenry
Barrow	Allen	Hall (NY)	McHugh
Bartlett (MD)	Bachman	Hastings (FL)	McNerney
Barton (TX)	Cubin	Hastings (WA)	Rohrabacher
Bean	Cuellar	Hastings (WA)	Rangel
Becerra	Balderson	Hayes	Meek (FL)
Berkley	Cummings	Heller	McCrery
Berman	Baldwin	Hensarling	Rehberg
Berry	Barrett (SC)	Davis (AL)	Tiaht
Biggart	Barrett (SC)	Davis (CA)	Tiberi
Bilbray	Barrow	Davis (IL)	Renzi
Bilirakis	Bartlett (MD)	Davis (KY)	Tierney
Bishop (GA)	Bartlett (MD)	Davis (TX)	Towns
Bishop (NY)	Bishop (GA)	Diaz-Balart, L.	Turner
Bishop (UT)	Bishop (NY)	Diaz-Balart, M.	Udall (CO)
Blackburn	Bilbray	Dicks	Udall (NM)
Blumenauer	Bilirakis	Dingell	Walsh (NY)
Blunt	Bishop (UT)	Doolittle	Walz (MN)
Boehner	Blackburn	Donnelly	Wamp
Bonner	Blumenauer	Donnelly	Wasserman
Bono	Bilbray	Dingell	Velázquez
Boozman	Boehner	Doolittle	Visclosky
Boren	Bonner	Donnelly	Walberg
Boswell	Boozman	Dingell	Walden (OR)
Boucher	Boren	Doolittle	Walsh (NY)
Boustany	Boswell	Donnelly	Walz (MN)
Boyd (FL)	Boucher	Dingell	Wamp
Boyd (KS)	Boustany	Doolittle	Wasserman
Brady (TX)	Boyd (FL)	Donnelly	Schultz
Braley (IA)	Boyd (KS)	Dingell	Welch (VT)
Brown (SC)	Brady (TX)	Doolittle	Sarbanes
Brown, Corrine	Braley (IA)	Dingell	Weldon (FL)
Brown-Waite,	Brown (SC)	Doolittle	Weller
Ginny	Brown, Corrine	Dingell	Westmoreland
Buchanan	Brown-Waite,	Doolittle	Wexler
Burgess	Ginny	Dingell	Whitfield
Burton (IN)	Buchanan	Doolittle	Wicker
Butterfield	Burgess	Dingell	Wilson (NM)
Buyer	Burton (IN)	Doolittle	Wilson (OH)
Calvert	Butterfield	Dingell	Wilson (SC)
Camp (MI)	Buyer	Doolittle	Wolfe
Campbell (CA)	Calvert	Dingell	Woolsey
Cantor	Camp (MI)	Doolittle	Waters
Capito	Campbell (CA)	Dingell	Watson
Capps	Cantor	Doolittle	Watson
Capuano	Capito	Doolittle	Watson
Cardoza	Capps	Doolittle	Watson
Carnahan	Capuano	Doolittle	Watt
Carney	Cardoza	Doolittle	Watt
Carson	Carnahan	Doolittle	Watt
Carter	Carney	Doolittle	Watt
Castle	Carson	Doolittle	Watt
Chabot	Carter	Doolittle	Watt
Chandler	Castle	Doolittle	Watt
Clarke	Chabot	Doolittle	Watt
Clay	Chandler	Doolittle	Watt
Cleaver	Clarke	Doolittle	Watt
Clyburn	Clay	Doolittle	Watt
Coble	Cleaver	Doolittle	Watt
Cohen	Clyburn	Doolittle	Watt
	Coble	Doolittle	Watt
	Cohen	Doolittle	Watt

Brady (PA)	Gilchrest	Meehan
Cannon	Graves	Pence
Castor	Kanjorski	Schakowsky
Davis, Jo Ann	Kucinich	Sessions

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1426

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title was amended so as to read: “Concurrent resolution honoring the heroic service and sacrifice of the glider pilots of the United States Army Air Forces during World War II”.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.