

It is my understanding that a recent decision by Indiana state regulators will allow the British Petroleum company to dump more ammonia and suspended solids daily into Lake Michigan. Although I do agree that our country needs to work on finding additional materials and sources for energy, and we do need to create jobs to help our economy, I do not believe British Petroleum's plan takes our nation in the right direction. As a society, we need to protect our already endangered waters, for they provide means to run our businesses, fulfill daily chores, and relax.

Improving the state of the Great Lakes is not an antiquated policy goal from the last century; rather, we still fight today to improve these waters. The House Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment, which I chair, continues to pursue the problems of invasive species, low water levels, and pollutants entering the Lakes on a regular basis. We do not need to add additional waste to our struggling, yet essential, waters.

I urge my colleagues to join with me and vote in favor of this resolution.

Mr. DINGELL. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of the resolution before us. Recently, the Indiana Department of Environmental Management granted BP's Whiting refinery in Indiana broad exceptions under the Clean Water Act. These exemptions will allow BP to increase the amount of discharge of ammonia by 54 percent and its discharge of total suspended solids by 35 percent. This means that an additional 1,584 pounds of ammonia and 4,925 pounds of total suspended solids could be dumped into Lake Michigan.

This is simply unacceptable and I thank my colleagues from Illinois and Michigan for bringing the resolution to the floor with the utmost speed. I am dismayed, Madam Speaker. Dismayed that the State of Indiana issued the permits and further dismayed EPA allowed the State to do so.

Algae blooms, Madam Speaker, are serious business. Algae blooms, which can be caused by ammonia and total suspended solids, overtake native ecosystems by taking nutrients away from the surrounding plant life and also feed harmful bacteria which remove oxygen, killing aquatic life. This leads to poor water quality and beach closings. Instead of taking action to increase algae blooms, we should be taking action to decrease them.

According to BP, the company intends to install a diffuser to create a "mixing zone"—mixing zones are areas where clean water gets mixed with polluted water to further dilute the concentration of pollutants. In 2000, EPA instituted a rule requiring the elimination of existing mixing zones for persistent and bioaccumulative pollution in all the Great Lakes States. The rule required the phase-out of current mixing zones by 2010 and does not allow any new zones to be created. The expansion of the BP facility is not scheduled to be finished until 2011. The exemptions essentially roll back the clock for sound environmental policy.

Madam Speaker, those of us from the region have a unique appreciation for the Great Lakes, as we are quite literally surrounded by them. The lakes are a blessing to us. We owe our tourism industry to the Great Lakes—where people come from around the country to recreate, hunt, fish and relax. The lakes as a transportation system provided Michigan and the surrounding States with the means to turn our region into a manufacturing powerhouse.

At a time when Congress is finally taking a long-overdue look into a broad restoration and conservation plan for the Great Lakes, the State of Indiana is allowing more pollution into the lakes. And EPA—the lead Agency in Great Lakes Regional Collaboration—is allowing it. This, Madam Speaker, is exactly the opposite of what we should be doing. Instead, restoring and protecting the Great Lakes must be a priority.

I urge all of my colleagues to support the resolution and again thank my friends, the gentleman from Illinois and the gentleman from Michigan, for bringing it up.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 187.

The question was taken.

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

Mr. UPTON. 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 motion will be postponed.

#### TRANSPORTATION, HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2008

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 558 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 3074.

□ 1120

#### 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 further consideration of the bill (H.R. 3074) making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes, with Mr. WEINER (Acting Chairman) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Monday, July 23, 2007, a request for a recorded vote on the amendment by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) had been postponed and the bill had been read through page 67, line 2.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### HOUSING CERTIFICATE FUND (RESCISSION)

Of the unobligated balances, including recaptures and carryover, remaining from funds appropriated to the Department of Housing and Urban Development under this heading, the heading "Annual Contributions for Assisted Housing", the heading "Tenant-Based Rental Assistance", and the heading "Project-Based Rental Assistance", for fiscal

year 2007 and prior years, \$1,300,000,000 is rescinded, to be effected by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development no later than September 30, 2008: *Provided*, That if insufficient funds exist under these headings, the remaining balance may be derived from any other heading under this title: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall notify the Committees on Appropriations 30 days in advance of the rescission of any funds derived from the headings specified above: *Provided further*, That any such balances governed by reallocation provisions under the statute authorizing the program for which the funds were originally appropriated shall be available for the rescission: *Provided further*, That any obligated balances of contract authority from fiscal year 1974 and prior that have been terminated shall be cancelled.

#### PROJECT-BASED RENTAL ASSISTANCE

##### (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For activities and assistance for the provision of project-based subsidy contracts under the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437 et seq.) ("the Act"), not otherwise provided for, \$6,479,810,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the amounts made available under this heading are provided as follows:

(1) Up to \$6,239,122,000 for expiring or terminating section 8 project-based subsidy contracts (including section 8 moderate rehabilitation contracts), for amendments to section 8 project-based subsidy contracts (including section 8 moderate rehabilitation contracts), for contracts entered into pursuant to section 441 of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11401), for renewal of section 8 contracts for units in projects that are subject to approved plans of action under the Emergency Low Income Housing Preservation Act of 1987 or the Low-Income Housing Preservation and Resident Homeownership Act of 1990, and for administrative and other expenses associated with project-based activities and assistance funded under this paragraph.

(2) Not less than \$238,728,000 but not to exceed \$286,230,000 for performance-based contract administrators for section 8 project-based assistance: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development may also use such amounts for performance-based contract administrators for: interest reduction payments pursuant to section 236(a) of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1715z-1(a)); rent supplement payments pursuant to section 101 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 (12 U.S.C. 1701s); section 236(f)(2) rental assistance payments (12 U.S.C. 1715z-1(f)(2)); project rental assistance contracts for the elderly under section 202(c)(2) of the Housing Act of 1959 (12 U.S.C. 1701q); project rental assistance contracts for supportive housing for persons with disabilities under section 811(d)(2) of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act (42 U.S.C. 8013(d)(2)); project assistance contracts pursuant to section 202(h) of the Housing Act of 1959 (Public Law 86-372; 73 Stat. 667); and loans under section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959 (Public Law 86-372; 73 Stat. 667).

(3) \$1,960,000 shall be transferred to the Working Capital Fund.

(4) Amounts recaptured under this heading, the heading "Annual Contributions for Assisted Housing", or the heading "Housing Certificate Fund" may be used for renewals of or amendments to section 8 project-based contracts or for performance-based contract administrators, notwithstanding the purposes for which such amounts were appropriated.

PUBLIC HOUSING CAPITAL FUND  
(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the Public Housing Capital Fund Program to carry out capital and management activities for public housing agencies, as authorized under section 9 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437g) (the "Act") \$2,438,964,000, to remain available until September 30, 2011: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law or regulation, during fiscal year 2008 the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development may not delegate to any Department official other than the Deputy Secretary and the Assistant Secretary for Public and Indian Housing any authority under paragraph (2) of section 9(j) regarding the extension of the time periods under such section: *Provided further*, That for purposes of such section 9(j), the term "obligate" means, with respect to amounts, that the amounts are subject to a binding agreement that will result in outlays, immediately or in the future: *Provided further*, That of the total amount provided under this heading, up to \$10,890,000 shall be for carrying out activities under section 9(h) of such Act; up to \$10,000,000 shall be transferred to the Working Capital Fund; and up to \$15,345,000 shall be to support the ongoing Public Housing Financial and Physical Assessment activities of the Real Estate Assessment Center (REAC): *Provided further*, That no funds may be used under this heading for the purposes specified in section 9(k) of the Act: *Provided further*, That of the total amount provided under this heading, up to \$17,000,000 shall be available for the Secretary to make grants, notwithstanding section 204 of this Act, to public housing agencies for emergency capital needs resulting from unforeseen or unpreventable emergencies and natural disasters occurring in fiscal year 2008: *Provided further*, That of the total amount provided under this heading, \$38,000,000 shall be for supportive services, service coordinators and congregate services as authorized by section 34 of the Act (42 U.S.C. 1437z-6) and the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act of 1996 (25 U.S.C. 4101 et seq.): *Provided further*, That of the total amount provided under this heading up to \$8,820,000 is to support the costs of administrative and judicial receiverships.

PUBLIC HOUSING OPERATING FUND

For 2008 payments to public housing agencies for the operation and management of public housing, as authorized by section 9(e) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437g(e)), \$4,200,000,000: *Provided*, That in fiscal year 2008 and all fiscal years hereafter, no amounts under this heading in any appropriations Act may be used for payments to public housing agencies for the costs of operation and management of public housing for any year prior to the current year of such Act: *Provided further*, That no funds may be used under this heading for the purposes specified in section 9(k) of the United States Housing Act of 1937.

AMENDMENT NO. 26 OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS  
OF FLORIDA

Mr. HASTINGS 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. 26 offered by Mr. HASTINGS of Florida:

Page 72, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$20,000,000) (increased by \$20,000,000)".

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amend-

ment with my friends, Ms. BARBARA LEE of California and Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, which emphasizes the need for HUD to place a greater priority on the security in our Nation's public housing communities.

Indeed, I applaud the work of Chairman OLVER and Ranking Member KNOLLENBERG, and I am very supportive of their bill.

However, a recent criminal act that occurred in the district that I am privileged to represent demands a response. I won't go into the details because it was a brutal act that was done allegedly by 10 young men in a project referred to, known as Dunbar Village.

Until 2002, there was a program at HUD that funded security and safety in public housing communities. A footnote right here: I recently spoke with the inspector of HUD, who informed me that you cannot have good public housing without good security.

However, in 2001, the Bush administration felt that the Public Housing Drug Elimination Program had a limited impact and did not reflect HUD's core mission. When the drug elimination program was consolidated with the public housing operating fund, a grant of \$168,000 for securities services was cut just from the West Palm Beach Housing Authority, which oversees Dunbar village.

Mr. Chairman, this incident has demonstrated that the Public Housing Drug Elimination Program had a far-reaching impact in reducing all forms of crime in public housing facilities.

Our amendment sends a message to HUD to the tune of \$20 million that the Department has a responsibility and the authority to fund security programs in public housing facilities around this Nation's communities. At this funding level, 10 percent of the \$200 million increase in the account could fund security programs in over 100 public housing communities. These functions include employing security personnel, reimbursing local police for additional security services, making physical changes to improve security, funding community policing accreditation activities, as well as training and equipping voluntary tenant patrols.

HUD should recognize this amendment and the despicable incident, like the one that occurred in my district, and others around this Nation as clear indication that they need to do more to improve the safety in their facilities. Unfortunately, it takes violent acts such as the one that I have discussed for us to open our eyes and for Congress to begin reversing funding trends and program adjustments that have left our communities vulnerable.

This amendment does not place an undue burden on the desperately needed increase in the public housing operating fund. While all of the \$200 million increase could be used for activities prioritized in this amendment, we rise today to call attention to the need for secure public housing.

Once again, I commend Chairman OLVER and Ranking Member KNOLLEN-

BERG for their work on this legislation and including the \$200 million increase in the public housing operating fund. It is our hope that this amendment is a welcome contribution to their work.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment to begin demanding that incidents like those experienced by the residents of Dunbar Village never occur again.

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

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. OLVER. I want to thank my colleague from Florida for bringing this issue to light.

Mr. Chairman, all of our public housing and section 8 residents deserve to live in a safe environment. We have done our best to ensure that PHAs have adequate resources to address the security issues.

The gentleman from Florida is correct, that there were public housing Drug Elimination Grants, a separate item in the budgets up until the fiscal year 2001 budget. The last time we had that separate program for Drug Elimination Grants, the appropriation for that was around \$300 million on a nationwide basis for securing, for employing security personnel and employing local police and other additional security services that were necessary.

At that time, in the fiscal year 2001 budget, the Drug Elimination Grants were combined with the operating fund. Since that time, the housing authorities, the public housing authorities have had the authority to use monies that were in the operating fund for the purposes that had been previously done with the direct Drug Elimination Grants.

So we, as my colleague from Florida has pointed out, we no longer have the direct Drug Elimination Grants, but all of the functions of those grants may be funded at the discretion of the individual public housing authorities under the operating funds or under the capital funds. I support the use of either of those funds for the important functions of safety and security for our public housing residents.

I am happy to work with the gentleman in the future on this issue. I thank the gentleman for bringing the issue to the discussion today and thereby highlighting the problem, which is severe in some cases, but the resources, as we have indicated, as he has indicated, and we have already done, have been added.

We have added \$200 million this year above the President's request for the operating fund of the public housing authorities, and that should give them the necessary money to do, where it is needed, as they deem appropriate, as the public housing authorities deem appropriate, the drug elimination activities. I am very pleased that the gentleman has brought the issue to the discussion today.

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

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I just want to say a few words about why the Drug Elimination Grant Program was eliminated back in 2005.

It was terminated in 2005 after numerous reports and investigations revealed that the program had been greatly abused and that funds were being spent for completely inappropriate activities ranging from picnics to conferences. Further, as a competitive grant program, HUD had difficulty receiving qualified applicants, and much of the funds went unspent. In fact, at the time it was terminated, almost 2 years of funds remained unspent.

Instead, the Congress wisely, rather, increased the formula, the operating subsidy program, that has continued to significantly increase that program each and every year. As my colleague's amendment suggests, every activity funded by the former Drug Elimination Grant program is eligible for funding under the operating subsidy program. I think the chairman mentioned that.

This is a better way to achieve the Members' objectives, since these funds are sent to the PHAs by formula, so no competition or plan is required, and because there is certainty of funding.

Most importantly, it leaves it up to the PHA to determine the priorities of use of those funds.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

□ 1130

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

REVITALIZATION OF SEVERELY DISTRESSED  
PUBLIC HOUSING (HOPE VI)

For grants to public housing agencies for demolition, site revitalization, replacement housing, and tenant-based assistance grants to projects as authorized by section 24 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437v) \$120,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2008, of which the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development may use up to \$2,400,000 for technical assistance and contract expertise, to be provided directly or indirectly by grants, contracts or cooperative agreements, including training and cost of necessary travel for participants in such training, by or to officials and employees of the department and of public housing agencies and to residents: *Provided*, That none of such funds shall be used directly or indirectly by granting competitive advantage in awards to settle litigation or pay judgments, unless expressly permitted herein.

NATIVE AMERICAN HOUSING BLOCK GRANTS  
(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the Native American Housing Block Grants program, as authorized under title I

of the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act of 1996 ("NAHASDA") (25 U.S.C. 4111 et seq.), \$626,965,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act of 1996, to determine the amount of the allocation under title I of such Act for each Indian tribe, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall apply the formula under section 302 of such Act (25 U.S.C. 4152) with the need component based on single-race Census data and with the need component based on multi-race Census data, and the amount of the allocation for each Indian tribe shall be the greater of the two resulting allocation amounts: *Provided further*, That of the amounts made available under this heading, \$4,250,000 shall be to support the inspection of Indian housing units, contract expertise, training, and technical assistance in the training, oversight, and management of such Indian housing and tenant-based assistance, including up to \$300,000 for related travel: *Provided further*, That of the amount provided under this heading, \$1,980,000 shall be made available for the cost of guaranteed notes and other obligations, as authorized by title VI of NAHASDA (25 U.S.C. 4191 et seq.): *Provided further*, That such costs, including the costs of modifying such notes and other obligations, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 661a): *Provided further*, That these funds are available to subsidize the total principal amount of any notes and other obligations, any part of which is to be guaranteed, not to exceed \$17,000,000: *Provided further*, That for administrative expenses to carry out the guaranteed loan program, up to \$148,500 from amounts in the third proviso, which shall be transferred to and merged with the appropriation for "Salaries and Expenses".

NATIVE HAWAIIAN HOUSING BLOCK GRANT

For the Native Hawaiian Housing Block Grant program, as authorized under title VIII of the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act of 1996 (25 U.S.C. 4221 et seq.), \$8,727,000, to remain available until expended, of which \$299,211 shall be for training and technical assistance activities.

AMENDMENT NO. 14 OFFERED BY MR.  
WESTMORELAND

Mr. WESTMORELAND. 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. 14 offered by Mr. WESTMORELAND:

Page 74, strike lines 15 through 21.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would simply eliminate the \$8.7 million for the Native Hawaiian Housing Block Grant program. The 2007 level was \$8.7 million, and the President requested \$5.9 million for fiscal year 2008. This would simply eliminate it.

These funds, this Native Hawaiian Housing fund, has been funded since 2002. So far there has been over \$37 million going to the housing fund.

In the 2000 census, the Native Hawaiians, and there was approximately 750,000 Native Hawaiians, lived in homes on the island of Hawaii, the average medial value was \$209,000. The Native Hawaiians that live in Georgia, and there is 2,200 of them by the 2000

census, their median value home was \$111,000.

These grants can only go to Native Hawaiians on the islands of Hawaii. I believe that this is probably unconstitutional in the fact that we are doing a set-aside for a racial group, and so I just wanted to point that out.

It is a great opportunity to save some money. It is a great opportunity to look and make sure that we are all treated equally and that the 14th amendment of our Constitution is kept intact.

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

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. The Native Hawaiian Housing Block Grant program is a small program, a small account that makes a big difference in the lives of Native Hawaiians who happen to reside on Hawaiian homeland.

From 2002 through 2005, when the gentleman's party was in the majority, Congress funded in each of those years an average of \$9.4 million for this program. We held it to \$8.7 million in the 2007 budget, and have frozen it at the same level as the 2007 budget in the recommendation in this budget for the 2008 fiscal year.

So this is not an increase. We are, in fact, holding it steady for a program that has been funded at higher levels earlier when the gentleman's party was in the majority and in substantial majority control of this process.

With the funding in the bill, more than 100 Native Hawaiian families will be provided with the opportunity for home ownership, including counseling, construction, and rental assistance during that process. This is one of the HUD programs. We have programs for Native Alaskans, we have programs for American Indians and so forth that are helpful in providing the hope for home ownership on the part of some of our small minorities in our population. I think it is a goal that we should support, and I strongly support the program and urge a "no" vote on the gentleman's amendment.

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from Hawaii is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong opposition to the amendment offered by Mr. WESTMORELAND to eliminate funding for the Native Hawaiian Housing Block Grant program.

The Native Hawaiian Housing Block Grant is authorized under title VIII of the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act (NAHASDA). The block grant is used to carry out affordable housing activities for Native Hawaiian families who are eligible to reside on Hawaiian

homelands which were established in trust by the United States in 1921 under the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act (HHCA).

Due to a variety of factors, including long-term leases for purposes outside of the HHCA and the lack of funding for infrastructure, only 8,000 individuals currently hold leases, and approximately 19,000 remain on a waiting list, and many of our elderly, our kapuna, have died waiting for the dream of home ownership.

I submit for printing in the RECORD an article from the Honolulu Star-Bulletin that introduces these families to us.

[From the Honolulu Star-Bulletin, July 9, 2006.]

**HOMESTEAD AWARDS END LONG WAIT FOR LUCKY FEW—ONE HAWAIIAN HOMESTEAD IS AWARDED TO A WOMAN 57 YEARS AFTER HER FATHER APPLIED.**

(By Alexandre Da Silva with Leila Fujimori)

The line for a homestead was so long for Aloysius Lincoln that he never saw the end of it.

But yesterday, 57 years after the former Honolulu Gas Co. employee applied for a lease, his daughter claimed the lease awarded for the second phase of a Department of Hawaiian Home Lands project in Kapolei.

"Unfortunately, he died two years ago. He was 87," said Frances Segundo, 60, who was a baby when her father signed up for the program. "However, his legacy goes on, because this award is for our ohana, our family."

About 2,000 people showed up yesterday morning at the Neal S. Blaisdell Center Exhibition Hall, where the Department of Hawaiian Home Lands awarded 250 lots in Phase 2 and Phase 3 of in their Kaupē'a project in Kapolei.

The 52-acre subdivision has 326 lots, 76 of which were awarded in November 2005.

Segundo, a clerk at Maui Community College, said her cousin, Naira Martin, would live in the four-bedroom, three-bathroom house with her daughter, but there would always be room for another relative.

"I'm free from the rent, which is going to be over with," said Martin, 56. The \$2,000 she pays each month for rent will now go toward her mortgage. "When the whole family comes from the mainland, Louisiana, they will stay with me. It's a very good feeling."

Gov. Linda Lingle, who was present for yesterday's selection meeting, said the latest awards would help the state's shortage of affordable rentals as new homeowners are able to free up rental homes and apartments.

"Those units now become available for the general public," Lingle said. "It is better for the entire community."

Yesterday's crowd was a fraction of the nearly 20,000 native Hawaiians currently on the homestead waiting list, about half of which are on Oahu, said Lloyd Yonenaka, a spokesman for the Hawaiian Home Lands Department.

Even though more than 1,200 leases have been given out since 2003, the department's waiting list keeps growing, at a pace of about 100 people a month, Yonenaka said.

To qualify, applicants must have at least 50 percent Hawaiian blood and be pre-approved to afford one of the five Kaupē'a models, which range between \$238,600 and \$296,100 in lots averaging 5,000 square feet. The lease rent for the land under their homes is \$1 per year.

The first phase of the Kaupē'a project is expected to be completed by the end of the year, while Phase 2 and Phase 3 should be done in the first and second quarters of 2007, according to the department.

As she signed documents for her new lease yesterday, Vivian Perreira, 71, said she would vacate her Maili home in Waianae—where she lives with husband, Alfred, her son and his two children—sometime next year. Perreira said her youngest son, 47-year-old Prince, a refuse truck driver for Rolloffs Hawaii Inc., had to co-sign her application because her Social Security earnings weren't enough for a loan.

After waiting 48 years for her name to be called, Perreira, now in a wheelchair, will lease a four-bedroom home on a corner lot in Kapolei.

"I signed up when I was 23," she said. "I almost gave up, but I left my name on for so long."

The federal government set up the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act in 1921, eventually reserving 200,000 acres statewide to benefit native Hawaiians. But development of land to provide homes has been slow, and many families have been on the waiting list for decades.

Last month the state Supreme Court ruled that 2,700 native Hawaiians can seek monetary damages in a lawsuit against the state for its alleged mismanagement of the Hawaiian Home Lands program.

Not everyone who came yesterday had a happy story to share. Homes went to 250 families, but 750 people qualified for lots, which are awarded on the basis of seniority. People who have qualified and waited the longest are the next in line for a home.

Lee Kogler, 54, who has been researching her genealogy for more than 20 years, had to leave without a lease after arriving at 7 a.m. with her husband, daughter, grandson and two sons.

Kogler turned in her paperwork in 1991. But after marrying and moving to New York, Kogler's application was returned, with the department saying she needed to show the Hawaiian lineage on her father's side. Finally, in 1994, Kogler combed through the bound volumes of records at the state Archives, where she found a Census Bureau report listing her grandmother, Hannah Kaulia, at age 19, living in the house of her father, Samuel, a master carpenter.

Kogler, who is number 7,954 on the wait list for Oahu, said she would never quit trying for a lease.

"It's not a sad day," Kogler said, citing plans by the department to award another 300 lots in Kapolei in October. "I'm still with hope. I've waited a long time for this, and I'm not going to give up."

Aloysius Lincoln first applied for Hawaiian Home Lands in 1949. In 2006, a wait of 57 years, his daughter, Frances Segundo, claimed the lease awarded for the second phase of a Department of Hawaiian Home Lands project on the Island of Oahu. Frances claimed the lease because her father had, unfortunately, passed away 2 years before. Frances herself, now 60 years old, was a baby when her father first signed up for the program. Frances stated that "[her father's] legacy goes on because this award is for our ohana, our family."

That is something I would like this body to remember: That this is not just money we are talking about today. We are talking about the opportunity for families to live the American dream of home ownership, and Native Hawaiian families are among those with the greatest need. A study conducted in 1996 by the Urban Institute, the National Commission on the American Indian, Alaska Native, and Native Hawai-

ian Housing, and the State Department of Hawaiian Home Lands, found that nearly half of Hawaiian households and 67 percent of those on waiting lists for Hawaiian Home Lands experienced housing problems related to affordability, overcrowding, or structural inadequacy. That compares with 44 percent of American Indians and Alaska Natives living on tribal lands, and 27 percent of all U.S. households.

In 1992, 49 percent of Hawaiian Home Lands applicants lived in overcrowded conditions compared with 37 percent of all Hawaiian households, and 21 percent of non-Hawaiian households. Twenty-eight percent of Hawaiian households put more than 30 percent of income toward housing compared with 22 percent for non-Hawaiians. The rate of homelessness among Hawaiians at 12.2 households per 1,000 is double that of non-Hawaiians.

In 1982, the U.S. Secretary of the Interior and the Governor of the State of Hawaii established a Federal-State task force to renew HHCA and the programs carried under that act. The Federal-State task force issued a report in 1983 with specific recommendations, including one that the State and Federal Government should each make contributions of \$29 million per year to accelerate the program.

For the first time in 2000, Federal funding was made available when housing assistance for Native Hawaiians was added to NAHASDA through the Native Hawaiian Block Grant. This amendment follows what I sense is a developing pattern of challenges to programs benefiting Native American, Alaska Native, and Native Hawaiian people.

The earlier failed challenge to the previously uncontroversial Native Hawaiian Housing Act earlier this year was the first apparent salvo against Native American programs. The attempt to strike funds in the Labor and Education appropriations bill for the Alaska Native, Native Hawaiian-Serving Institutions, and the Higher Education Act raises the concerns that all programs benefiting Native Americans will be subjected to attack by certain groups.

The same arguments of constitutionality of these programs benefiting Native Americans have been raised and rejected by this body time and again. This is not race-based discrimination. The relationship between the United States and Native Americans is based on a political relationship, as Supreme Court decisions have consistently held.

Like other indigenous peoples, such as Native Americans and Alaska Natives, Native Hawaiians have a special trust relationship with the United States. It has been well settled that Congress has clear plenary power to fulfill its obligations to indigenous people who once had sovereign governing entities before the establishment of the United States, and whose lands are currently within the borders of the United States. Like Native

Americans and Alaska Natives, Native Hawaiians suffered the loss of their sovereignty and lands to the United States.

I could go on, Mr. Chairman, but for these and many other reasons, I strongly urge my colleagues to vote against this amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Chairman, apparently we are going to have to come to the floor over and over on this. I would appreciate it if the gentleman from the Eighth District of Georgia representing the people in Grantville, who I presume have more courtesy than the gentleman from that district has, could let us know besides the smirk on his face when he intends to come and attack someone else in another district. I don't know how you were raised; I know how I was raised.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Chair would remind the gentleman to address his remarks to the Chair.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. I am confining my remarks to the Chair, because if I was saying it directly to the gentleman, he would know it a lot more physically.

Now, the way I was raised, when you have something to say to somebody, you come and say it to their face. Now, if the gentleman would like to accompany me sometime out to Hawaii, I will introduce him to some of these folks that he is attacking today.

This act was established by the Congress, and every single dollar and every single item associated with that has been set forth by the Congress over time. The President of the United States, Republican or Democrat, including this President, has put these funds in the budget in order to meet the obligations of the contract.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I am not familiar with how the gentleman from the Eighth District of Georgia handles contracts, but we honor them where I come from.

There is 200,000 acres set aside, and the original legislation states as follows, section 1065-569, I commend to the gentleman's attention: "Congress does not extend services to Native Hawaiians because of their race, but because of their unique status as the indigenous people of a once sovereign nation as to whom the United States has established a trust relationship."

The Admissions Act that brought us into the Union as the 50th State says specifically that, with regard to these lands, the Hawaiian Homes Lands, that they are to be administered by the State of Hawaii and the United States "for the betterment of the conditions of Native Hawaiians as defined under the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act of 1920." And it goes on from there to cite what is involved.

Now, the block grant program provides funds for infrastructure to help Native Hawaiians obtain mortgages on lands set aside for them from Congress. Because of the conditions set out by the Congress, ordinary financing is not available to them. This is why we have to do it. If the gentleman had had the courtesy to sit down for 2 minutes with us, we could have explained what this was about.

A decision has to be made here. Of course we have to come and defend our programs. Everybody does. I am quite content to do that.

□ 1145

But this is the first time ever in my experience, my legislative experience of more than 33 years, that this kind of thing has taken place.

Now, I know you folks over there. I'm looking at friends of mine right here. You would never have, me or Ms. HIRONO would never do this kind of thing to you. If you have a disagreement about it, come and see us. Let's sit down and talk about it. And if you still disagree with what we're doing and why we're doing it, by all means bring it to our attention on the floor. But these kinds of attacks are unworthy of this House. It's unworthy of us to have relationships with one another like this. I don't understand it. I've never experienced it before.

Now, we can do this in 5-minute segments if we want to, but that's not the way to handle this. I appeal to you, if this is going to be a continuing onslaught, let's sit down and talk it over.

This legislation, the Department of Hawaiian Homelands is one of the most effective housing efforts that we have in order to try and meet the conditions that were set forth by the Congress and administered faithfully by the State of Hawaii since our entrance to the Union in 1959.

The House supported reauthorization of this program; 272 Members, including 45 Republicans, voted for it. It is not a partisan issue.

And I'll finish with this, Mr. Chairman. The Republican Governor and the Republican Members of the House of Representatives and the Senate in Hawaii, as well as the Democrats, support this program. It is not a partisan issue.

And so I ask, out of courtesy for Members, that if we're going to have a discussion about this, at least let's have it on the merits of what the issue is before us. And if we're going to do this kind of thing, at least have the courtesy, the common courtesy that should be extended to any Member of House, to let us know that it's happening so perhaps, Mr. Chairman, we could resolve the issue beforehand.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. WELDON of Florida. I'm happy to yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Chairman, I missed in the rule book where you needed to call any Member or anything to discuss an amendment that you might have, and I apologize for not reading that chapter in the rule book.

And, Mr. Chairman, I think I was raised very appropriately from a family that had to watch their money. My father worked two jobs. He was an Atlanta firefighter, and he worked shifts. In one week he'd be gone, work at the fire department during the day and then he'd be home at night. And then the next week he worked surveying during the day and the fire station at night, so we didn't see him for a week at a time. And he would watch every dollar that he had, and I think he did a great job in raising me and my sister and providing for our family.

He never really asked for anything from the government, and so I guess that I'm very careful about some of the ways that we spend our money, and especially when it is on a program that I look at as a set-aside program. And whether the gentleman from Hawaii or the lady from Hawaii look at it as a set-aside or not, I don't know. That's their right. And I understand that they may know some things that I don't know. And I can just look at this as a Member of Congress and look at see what the Congresses have done in the past.

And for some reason, Mr. Chairman, the tendency for the majority party now is to tell me and other Members that stand up here and try to look after the taxpayers' dollars what the Republicans did. I don't care what the Republicans did. What they did, what other people did in the past doesn't make what we're doing today right or wrong.

And so all I'm doing is bringing up the point that this is a set-aside for somebody, for a group of people that are not Native Americans. They're not an Indian tribe. This is a race group, and that's as simple as it is.

Now, we can argue all the points that we want to argue, and the learned gentleman from Hawaii is a very smart guy. I know he's probably a doctor in sociology. And he can come down here and talk negatively about me if he wants to. That's his prerogative.

But I was asking a learned defense attorney one day, I said, you know, what does it feel like to have a client that you're trying to defend, and all the information and the facts are against you?

He said, you know what, you just have to really get up and talk as loud as you can and really be as mad as you can and really talk about anything other than the facts. And I know I've seen that on a couple of occasions here from different people.

And so all I'm asking is that we have a chance, in this House, to vote on this amendment. And I think it's fair that we vote on this amendment; that we vote on this amendment to try to decide if we want to give another \$8.7 million, and regardless of what they've

gotten from the Republican Congress since 2002, that we could start anew. And so I think it's worthwhile that we can offer an amendment that we can have a vote on trying to take a special set-aside for a racial group to have something different than the rest of the people in this country have.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. I yield back, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. SHAYS. First off, I've been listening to this debate, and I felt, candidly, that it was getting a little personal and I'm uncomfortable with that. But I'm also now uncomfortable with what was described.

I believe, and I want to be on record, since I was on this floor, that Eskimos and Native Hawaiians are a group of people no different from American Indians. They were there before we got there. And that's the way I view it.

And I think that we need to look at how we provide funding for all Native Americans, Native Eskimos, and Native Hawaiians. But I don't see their difference. I see them all collectively the same.

I oppose this amendment. I will be voting against it. But I certainly understand the right of my colleague from Georgia to introduce an amendment. And I certainly agree, though, that it should be opposed.

I yield back.

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

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

Mr. WESTMORELAND. 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 Georgia will be postponed.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

INDIAN HOUSING LOAN GUARANTEE FUND  
PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the cost of guaranteed loans, as authorized by section 184 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1992 (12 U.S.C. 1715z-13a), \$7,450,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That such costs, including the costs of modifying such loans, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974: *Provided further*, That these funds are available to subsidize total loan principal, any part of which is to be guaranteed, up to \$367,000,000.

In addition, for administrative expenses to carry out the guaranteed loan program, up to \$247,500 from amounts in the first paragraph, which shall be transferred to and merged with the appropriation for "Salaries and Expenses".

NATIVE HAWAIIAN HOUSING LOAN GUARANTEE  
FUND PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the cost of guaranteed loans, as authorized by section 184A of the Housing and

Community Development Act of 1992 (12 U.S.C. 1715z-13b), \$1,044,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That such costs, including the costs of modifying such loans, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974: *Provided further*, That these funds are available to subsidize total loan principal, any part of which is to be guaranteed, not to exceed \$41,504,255.

In addition, for administrative expenses to carry out the guaranteed loan program, up to \$34,650 from amounts in the first paragraph, which shall be transferred to and merged with the appropriation for "Salaries and Expenses".

COMMUNITY PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT  
HOUSING OPPORTUNITIES FOR PERSONS WITH  
AIDS

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For carrying out the Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS program, as authorized by the AIDS Housing Opportunity Act (42 U.S.C. 12901 et seq.), \$300,100,000, to remain available until September 30, 2009, except that amounts allocated pursuant to section 854(c)(3) of such Act shall remain available until September 30, 2010: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall renew all expiring contracts for permanent supportive housing that were funded under section 854(c)(3) of such Act that meet all program requirements before awarding funds for new contracts and activities authorized under this section: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may use up to \$1,485,000 of the funds under this heading for training, oversight, and technical assistance activities; and \$1,485,000 shall be transferred to the Working Capital Fund.

RURAL HOUSING AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

For the Office of Rural Housing and Economic Development in the Department of Housing and Urban Development, \$16,830,000, to remain available until expended, which amount shall be competitively awarded by September 1, 2008, to Indian tribes, State housing finance agencies, State community and/or economic development agencies, local rural nonprofits, and community development corporations to support innovative housing and economic development activities in rural areas.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT FUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For assistance to units of State and local government, and to other entities, for economic and community development activities, and for other purposes, \$4,180,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2010, unless otherwise specified: *Provided*, That of the amount provided, \$3,929,300,000 is for carrying out the community development block grant program under title I of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 (the "Act") (42 U.S.C. 5301 et seq.): *Provided further*, That unless explicitly provided for under this heading (except for planning grants provided in the second paragraph and amounts made available under the third paragraph), not to exceed 20 percent of any grant made with funds appropriated under this heading shall be expended for planning and management development and administration: *Provided further*, That \$1,584,000 shall be transferred to the Working Capital Fund: *Provided further*, That \$62,000,000 shall be for grants to Indian tribes notwithstanding section 106(a)(1) of such Act, of which, notwithstanding any other provision of law (including section 205 of this Act), up to \$3,960,000 may be used for emergencies that constitute imminent threats to health and safety.

Of the amount made available under this heading, \$160,000,000 shall be available for

grants for the Economic Development Initiative to finance a variety of targeted economic investments: *Provided*, That none of the funds provided under this paragraph may be used for program operations: *Provided further*, That, for fiscal years 2006, 2007, and 2008, no unobligated funds for EDI grants may be used for any purpose except acquisition, planning, design, purchase of equipment, revitalization, redevelopment or construction.

Of the amount made available under this heading, \$20,000,000 shall be available for neighborhood initiatives that are utilized to improve the conditions of distressed and blighted areas and neighborhoods, to stimulate investment, economic diversification, and community revitalization in areas with population outmigration or a stagnating or declining economic base, or to determine whether housing benefits can be integrated more effectively with welfare reform initiatives.

The referenced statement of managers under this heading in title II of division I of Public Law 108-447 is deemed to be amended with respect to item number 194 by striking "for costs associated with replacing the roof on the historic Luckey, Platt Building" and inserting "for building stabilization measures at the historic Hoffman House".

The statement of managers correction referenced in the second paragraph under this heading in title III of division A of Public Law 109-115 is deemed to be amended with respect to item number 846 by striking "Mahanoy City, Pennsylvania for improvements to West Market Street" and inserting "Mahanoy City, Pennsylvania for improvements to Centre Street".

The statement of managers correction referenced in the second paragraph under this heading in title III of division A of Public Law 109-115 is deemed to be amended with respect to item number 250 by striking "for renovation and construction of a resource center" and inserting "for construction of a homeless shelter".

The statement of managers correction referenced in the second paragraph under this heading in title III of division A of Public Law 109-115 is deemed to be amended with respect to item number 713 by striking "for construction of a senior center" and inserting "renovation and expansion of facilities".

The statement of managers correction referenced in the second paragraph under this heading in title III of division A of Public Law 109-115 is deemed to be amended with respect to item number 844 by striking "Liverpool Township" and inserting "Liverpool Borough".

The referenced statement of managers under this heading in title II of division I of Public Law 108-447 is deemed to be amended with respect to item number 36 by striking "respite care facility" and inserting "rehabilitative care facility for the developmentally disabled".

The referenced statement of managers under this heading in title II of division I of Public Law 108-447 is deemed to be amended with respect to item number 608 by striking "construct" and inserting "purchase and make improvements to facilities for".

The referenced statement of managers under this heading in title II of division I of Public Law 108-447 is deemed to be amended with respect to item number 521 by striking "Missouri" and inserting "Metropolitan Statistical Area".

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MS. CORRINE  
BROWN OF FLORIDA

Ms. CORRINE BROWN 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. 5 offered by Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida:

Page 80, after line 22, insert the following: The referenced statement of managers under this heading in title II of Public Law 107-73 is deemed to be amended with respect to the item relating to the City of Maitland, Florida, by striking "for a senior citizens center" and inserting "for the Minihaha Park development".

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A point of order is reserved.

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, this amendment simply reprograms funds for a project that was included in the 2002 VA-HUD appropriation bill to another project in the same city.

The city of Maitland, Florida, which is located in the southern portion of my district, had money allocated to them for the construction of a community center. Unfortunately, the project was completed before funds were distributed by the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and they are now unable to use this money.

The city of Maitland, the recipient of the funds, has requested that the funds be redirected to another EDI project that involves the redevelopment of a public park that includes the creation of age-specific exercise courses and walking and bike paths.

The money promised to Maitland is still available at the Department of Housing and Urban Development and will have no financial impact on this year's bill. The community center is fully completed, making funds earmarked for this project useless to the city.

Every Member knows this type of Federal funding is crucial to a small city like Maitland, and I would hate to see funds meant for my district go unspent because we could not, HUD, get their act together and make this change.

I would ask the chairman to work with me as this bill moves forward to try to help the city of Maitland solve this problem.

Mr. Chairman, I'm going to withdraw this amendment, but I'm hoping that as we move forward, you will work to help rectify this problem that was created by the Department of HUD and this administration.

I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. OLVER. I would be very pleased if you would withdraw this, and then I will work with you as best we can to try to resolve this problem in an expeditious and favorable way, if it is at all possible to do as we go forward in this process.

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT LOAN GUARANTEES  
PROGRAM ACCOUNT  
(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the cost of guaranteed loans, \$2,970,000, to remain available until September 30, 2009, as authorized by section 108 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5308): *Provided*, That such costs, including the cost of modifying such loans, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974: *Provided further*, That these funds are available to subsidize total loan principal, any part of which is to be guaranteed, not to exceed \$137,500,000, notwithstanding any aggregate limitation on outstanding obligations guaranteed in section 108(k) of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, as amended.

In addition, for administrative expenses to carry out the guaranteed loan program, \$743,000 shall be transferred to and merged with the appropriation for "Salaries and Expenses".

BROWNFIELDS REDEVELOPMENT

For competitive economic development grants, as authorized by section 108(q) of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5308(q)), for Brownfields redevelopment projects, \$9,900,000, to remain available until September 30, 2009.

□ 1200

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SHAYS

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SHAYS:

Page 81, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$1,000,000)".

Page 97, line 11, after the first dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$1,000,000)".

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I am offering an amendment today to increase the brownfields program funded at HUD by \$1 million. This funding will be taken from the Department's general salaries and expenses.

I believe the brownfields program is one of the most successful programs the Federal Government has to help revitalize urban areas. These sites, typically in the heart of urban areas, lie idle because no one wants to incur the large costs associated with Superfund cleanups and the uncertainty of whether, in fact, it is a Superfund. As a result, cities are marked by abandoned buildings and vacant lots while developers construct new buildings on what was previously open space in the suburbs.

Though small, these grants serve as seed money, enabling dozens of communities to leverage millions of State and private dollars to move into the actual cleanup phase. This funding should encourage more environmental cleanup and bring about economic development of brownfield sites. By reusing brownfield sites, we are not only rebuilding blighted communities, but also targeting development in city centers and avoiding unnecessary urbanization on fringes of metropolitan areas.

Mr. Chairman, a brownfield is an abandoned, idle, or unused property where expansion of redevelopment is

complicated by the presence or potential presence of contaminations. Brownfields redevelopment can benefit both private investors and the communities in which they are located. For the private sector, brownfields redevelopment can mean new business opportunities, the potential for profit on unused or underutilized properties, improve community environmental stewardship, and access to untapped urban markets.

The retail purchasing power of a central-city resident is conservatively estimated at \$665 billion. Even households in those economically distressed urban neighborhoods possess \$85 billion in annual retail purchasing power. Brownfields redevelopment is critical to tapping into these consumer markets.

Cities encounter many impediments to developing brownfields: the lack of necessary funding for cleanup, concerns over liability, the need for environmental assessments of properties, uncertainty over cleanup standards, unfavorable neighborhood and market conditions, land assembly issues, reluctance to invest in distressed communities due to concerns with urban social and economic conditions.

The bottom line for me is the most successful program that we have encountered in this Congress to deal with urban areas is the brownfields program. Whether it comes from EPA or whether it comes from HUD, we need to do everything we can, in my judgment, to clean up these sites and make them productive, and thereby in the end saving our greenfield sites that should stay undeveloped.

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

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I am hopeful that the gentleman will withdraw his amendment here, and I would be happy to work with him because in substantial measure I support the intent of the amendment, but I have concerns about the offset, even though it is a relatively small offset. But I do want to use this time to point out what has happened here on the brownfields program.

The President, in the 2007 budget process, ended up recommending that we zero out this program in the 2007 budget, and he actually recommended rescinding the 2006 moneys, which were exactly the same amount of money that has been put in the 2007 finally and had been put in the 2006 budget. And under those circumstances, when they are making recommendations to rescind, their approach is not to give out any grants under the program until after the budget process for the following year is complete, and, therefore, those moneys just don't get put out until very late. There is a real big gap in it. That is what has happened previously.

This year the President did not propose to rescind the 2007 budget moneys for the simple reason that the 2007 budget moneys were not settled in this until the CR was adopted after the budget was submitted. If that had been done prior to when the budget was submitted, my guess is that the President would have proposed rescinding the 2007 moneys as well as zeroing out the 2008 moneys, which is what has happened in his recommendations for this year's bill.

So we are in this game, in a situation where the people over at OMB believe, I believe wrongly, but they seem to insist that there is someplace else in the budget, namely under EPA, where brownfields redevelopment is going to get done. That doesn't happen. The moneys that are in for brownfields under EPA are for assessments, and we have been doing assessments, and I believe that this should be funded. So in the face of what I have described, we have for the last couple of years continued to appropriate, but at the constant value of \$9.9 million for this program, to keep it there until such time as we have someone who understands that that kind of program isn't being done anywhere else and is willing to move the moneys along, which the administration, as I have described, simply is not willing to do. So that is the situation that we are in.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLVER. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I won't ask for a rollcall vote on this amendment, which may amount to the same thing as withdrawing this amendment, but could I have a dialogue with this gentleman?

Mr. OLVER. I have yielded.

Mr. SHAYS. What I am hearing is that you are not saying that these dollars are now going to be in EPA. You are saying basically what is in EPA are for assessments, but not to help developers come in and start to clean up. And what I am hearing you say is that these dollars, therefore, are just being maintained at a constant amount, and that this administration is choosing not to allocate them and spend them.

Is that what I am hearing from you?

Mr. OLVER. I am saying that they finally put the grant proposals out for award, but a year late essentially, and each time only after it is clear, for instance, the 2007 moneys will finally be sent out for grant announcements at the very end of this fiscal year when it is clear that we have not rescinded the 2007 moneys.

Mr. SHAYS. Could I ask the gentleman another question?

Mr. OLVER. Yes.

Mr. SHAYS. The \$10 million that is in here, which is a smaller amount than the 25 million that used to be there a few years ago, it will be available if we can convince the Secretary of HUD to allocate these dollars to communities; is that correct?

Mr. OLVER. Repeat it, please.

Mr. SHAYS. There is money for brownfields in this legislation. I am just adding 10 percent more. But let's take my amendment out of the equation and at least have this dialogue about brownfields for my edification and for the RECORD. Is it your point that you are appropriating this \$10 million in this budget that you have, but that you do not anticipate it will be spent?

Mr. OLVER. It will not be spent probably until the very end of the 2008 fiscal year, is when finally the RFPs will go out for possible granting.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

(On request of Mr. SHAYS, and by unanimous consent, Mr. OLVER was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, could I just ask is there any legal impediment if we in Congress are able to convince HUD to spend the money? This is not a trick question. This is an edification question. Is there any legal impediment to the administration's spending the \$10 million that you have allocated?

Mr. OLVER. No, there is none. There is none. But the offset that the gentleman has used is salaries and expenses, salaries and expenses is an account which, in the tightness of this budget, in trying to do for section 8 and CDBG and the other places, we have already cut a bit, not a great deal, but a bit, and I oppose, as I said before, in good conscience, the movement of salaries and expense moneys into this where we know that it is not going to be spent with any alacrity and any expedition.

Mr. SHAYS. I thank the gentleman.

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

The amendment was rejected.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

HOME INVESTMENT PARTNERSHIPS PROGRAM  
(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the HOME investment partnerships program, as authorized under title II of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act (42 U.S.C. 12721 et seq.), \$1,757,250,000, to remain available until September 30, 2010, of which \$990,000 shall be transferred to the Working Capital Fund: *Provided*, That up to \$9,900,000 shall be available for technical assistance: *Provided further*, That of the total amount provided in this paragraph, up to \$41,580,000 shall be available for housing counseling under section 106 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968 (12 U.S.C. 1701x).

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. TURNER

Mr. TURNER. 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. TURNER:

Page 82, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$6,760,000)".

Page 82, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$6,760,000)".

Page 100, line 5, after the first dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$6,760,000)".

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Chairman, my amendment, coauthored by Representative BIGGETT of Illinois and Mr. GILLMOR of Ohio, seeks to help families who are potential victims of lending practices that could lead to foreclosure. The amendment increases the amount of funds available for housing counseling under section 106 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968.

The amendment would increase the program's funding by \$6.7 million. The increase is offset by reducing the Office of Inspector General account by \$6.7 million. The CBO has scored this amendment as budget-neutral.

Funding for housing counseling has increased by only \$2 million since fiscal year 2003.

Mr. Chairman, as a former mayor of the city of Dayton, Ohio, I have seen directly the detrimental impact that predatory lending and the practice of unwarranted subprime loans have had on urban families and communities. In 2001, the University of Dayton released a study of how mortgage foreclosures were affecting urban areas in Ohio. My community of Dayton had 1 foreclosure for every 43 households. Similar findings were seen in Cleveland, Akron, Columbus, and Cincinnati.

The problem of home foreclosures isn't limited to Ohio and the Midwest. According to a June 12, 2007, Bloomberg article, national home foreclosure rates in May soared 90 percent from last year. Many of these are tied to the subprime loan industry.

Many foreclosed homes sit vacant and boarded up for long periods of time. These properties go beyond just being an eyesore and become a threat to public health and safety. These properties are a blight to our neighborhoods and result in falling property values and increased crime, lead to an eroded tax base, and impair a city's ability to provide important services to families.

Beyond the individual impact these practices have on our neighborhoods, the subprime foreclosure crisis is resulting in the loss of capital in the financial market, a market that, if not righted, could threaten our growing robust economy.

Today we are seeing headlines from all across the country showing the growing concerns of financial markets regarding predatory and subprime lending practices that have resulted in a record number of foreclosures.

Recently, members of the Ohio delegation, led by Representatives GILLMOR, PRYCE, LATOURETTE, and Senator BROWN, held a forum on the predatory lending crisis in Ohio. At this forum we heard from a variety of groups, from banks to fair housing groups. All of these groups shared a mutual concern over the issue of



predatory and subprime lending, and many agreed that an increased focus on housing counseling was a key component to fighting this problem.

It is my hope that increased funding possible through this amendment will allow housing counseling agencies the ability to provide vital counseling services to families in need. These services will give families the assistance they need to protect themselves from practices and circumstances that could lead to foreclosure.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that homeownership is a privilege that everyone should enjoy. We must give all American families the tools they need to be successful homeowners.

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

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I would ask the gentleman if he would withdraw his amendment, and I would be happy to work with him, as I am sure the ranking member would as well, though I would lead him to comment, to work with him in conference to address this issue.

□ 1215

Otherwise, I rise in reluctant opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

I believe the need, as he has indicated, for housing counseling is strong. But what his offset does in this instance is to take the funding for the Inspector General for HUD back to the level of the budget request for the year 2007, where we had increased in the supplemental budget the appropriation for the IG to \$88.2 million, in the supplemental budget had been added to the IG to do its work, and have recommended in this bill a less than 2 percent increase. So that, compared with the 2007 appropriation for the IG, the amendment would represent a 5 or 6 percent decrease in the amount of funding available for the IG.

We simply are not in a position to be able to increase this account because of the deep holes that the President handed to us in the HUD budget. We froze the account at the FY07 level, with the supplemental amount there, which is the best that we could do without harming other HUD programs.

Now, taking the funding from the Inspector General to increase this account is counterproductive to the gentleman's amendment. Should we reduce the oversight in order to increase the housing counseling? They're both vital programs. We feel that we have struck the correct balance here for this pair of needs.

I commend the gentleman's passion on the issue, and I would be happy to work with him in the future on the issue related to housing counseling. And I do recognize that we are likely to have some, in the secondary lending market, problems later this year, con-

tinuing problems, as we have been having, but I would urge the gentleman to withdraw the amendment at this time and we would try to work it out in conference.

Mr. TURNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLVER. I would be happy to yield.

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate your commitment to look to work on this issue; however, the housing crisis is enormous. It is impacting a number of families and neighborhoods throughout the country. We're seeing the impacts are grave.

I would like to work with you on where, perhaps, an offset would be acceptable. But at this time we would like the House to be on record in support of this increased funding, so I would desire not to withdraw the amendment. But I appreciate your support of the increased funding and will look forward to working with you.

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

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Turner-Biggert-Gillmor amendment to increase funding for HUD-approved housing counseling services by \$6.76 million, bringing the HUD total housing counseling budget to \$48.34 million for fiscal year 2008.

As the ranking member of the Financial Services Housing and Community Opportunity Subcommittee, I want to thank my colleagues from Ohio for their work on this amendment, which is a modest increase in funding that could prevent millions of Americans from losing their homes.

I've spent many an hour this year listening to witness after witness testify before our subcommittee and the Financial Services Committee about the current home foreclosure spike. According to data released by the Mortgage Bankers Association, while our country will continue to enjoy record homeownership rates, foreclosures are on the rise and we should expect another 1 million Americans to lose their homes this year. These mortgage foreclosure rates raise eyebrows and call into question what actions can be taken to help homeowners keep their homes. I would like to emphasize the word "action."

Almost 2 weeks ago this body passed, by a vote of 411-7, House Resolution 526 sponsored by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS). This resolution called on this body to take action to support home ownership and responsible lending. The resolution directed us to increase opportunities for loan counseling. So what can Congress do to meet this directive today? What is it we should be doing right now to ensure that 650,000 homeowners and those who may follow can keep their homes? One

step in the right direction is to support the Turner amendment to increase funding and, therefore, opportunities for housing counseling.

It is crucial to promote financial literacy and educate our youth and adults. This is the most direct way of ensuring that consumers understand the terms of their loans so that they may avoid predatory loans and foreclosure altogether.

I'm pleased that on June 25, NeighborWorks America and the Ad Council launched a national ad campaign aimed at preventing home foreclosures. Homeowners in trouble can try to save their homes by calling a hotline, 888-995-HOPE, a number provided by the Homeownership Preservation Foundation.

In addition, we have about 2,300 HUD-certified housing counseling agencies across the country. Americans should know that they can visit HUD's Web site or call 800-569-4287 to find a HUD-certified counselor in their neighborhood. HUD-certified counselors can give straightforward and free or low-cost advice to potential or existing homeowners about buying a home, refinancing a mortgage or preventing foreclosure.

The Turner amendment is one way that we can enhance the ability of our local HUD-certified housing counselors to help our constituents avoid foreclosure and keep their piece of the American Dream. But I think this amendment is good for the economy, good for American homeowners, and I think it's crucial that we act upon it now, where so many people are in these dire straights.

I know that there are groups that are in support of this, and one that comes to mind that we just received a letter from is Acorn. So I would urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

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

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this funding for housing counseling.

I know, Mr. Chairman, you have a view about hoping to see him withdraw, but there is an urgency involved here. This amendment recognizes the harsh realities that in many places across the country families face delinquencies in mortgage payments. And they're on a rapid rise. Michigan is one of those States as well. This modest amendment would add funds to professional counselors to help families keep their homes and perhaps help them avoid high-risk loans to begin with.

The program has been a proven success. Michigan, like Ohio, has been experiencing a rise in delinquent loans. This increase could make a huge difference for so many families who are facing a mortgage crisis.

The Inspector General has received significant increases since Katrina to ensure that it can monitor the use of funds in the reconstruction. Therefore, I do not believe the reduction will in any way impact the IG's ability to do its job, and could greatly improve the lives of many families facing a financial crisis.

I do support the amendment, and I urge its adoption.

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

Mr. GILLMOR. I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. GILLMOR. Mr. Chairman, I will enter my statement in the RECORD, and I am going to be very brief.

I rise in support of the amendment. I want to commend the gentleman, Mr. TURNER, for taking leadership on this amendment. He has a record of being very active, when he was mayor of Dayton, trying to deal with the problems of predatory lending. And I want to commend Mrs. BIGGERT for her work on this, as well as her work on financial literacy.

Ohio, unfortunately, has been one of the leaders in foreclosures. And I want to point out one of the things that we found about foreclosures nationally and also in the Midwest, most of those foreclosures have not come as a result of loans by federally regulated banks and savings and loans. They have come from those lenders and mortgage brokers who are not regulated by the Federal Government but by the States, who have not done their job.

I called together a conference, I guess about six weeks ago, of Ohio financial institutions, of regulators, of community groups, to talk about the foreclosure crisis and what effectively could be done. And I was surprised that the consensus that came out of that meeting of all those groups was that the single most important thing you could do would be to provide for housing counseling. And the people who did have counseling had a very low foreclosure rate. And all this bill would do would be to provide a modest increase in counseling. We will get a tremendous benefit and a decrease in foreclosures as a result of it.

I think this amendment presents a choice. You have two agencies, and you have a choice between them. You've got the Inspector General and the Housing Counseling Program. Which one are you going to fund level to last year and which one are you going to increase? And I would say to you, if you look at what's going on in the housing market, it is pretty clear that if there is to be a priority between those two, it ought to be to put more money into counseling so that you can save people and their homes.

I also point out that the Senate has already passed language that goes much further than ours. So I would ask for support of the Turner-Biggert-Gillmor amendment.

Today I rise in strong support of the Turner-Biggert-Gillmor amendment. Not a day goes by that we do not see reports of another facet of the growing turmoil in our housing markets. For far too long, Ohioans and others have been subject to predatory lenders, loose underwriting standards and too few housing counseling opportunities. My colleagues Mr. TURNER, Ms. BIGGERT and many others have explored these issues for years and have worked tirelessly to find solutions to the problem of foreclosure. Mr. TURNER was active in efforts to prevent predatory lending as the mayor of Dayton. My colleague Ranking Member BIGGERT has been a leader in efforts to promote financial literacy. Housing counseling is a critical element to helping Americans stay in their home. During a recent summit I put together on Ohio's foreclosure crisis, regulators, lenders and housing advocates from Ohio alike presented an opinion that a significant number of homeowners were not able to tell you whether they had a fixed-rate or an adjustable-rate mortgage. Today, too many find out the hard way when their loan resets. It is expected that some \$600 billion in subprime loans will reset in the next 18 months and the fallout could be devastating to many of our constituents.

The consensus of all those attending was that the most important single thing we could do to prevent foreclosure was to provide counseling before people actually entered into a mortgage. Housing counseling will not be a silver bullet, nor will it prevent someone currently in the foreclosure process from losing their home. That being said, there is a clear need for additional federal resources in this area and would hope my colleagues will support this small increase.

Legislation I recently introduced with Representatives BACHUS, PRYCE and others would authorize some \$100 million per year in housing counseling, a more than doubling of FY2007 enacted levels. The Senator has proposed a comparable increase. While I hope this stand-alone legislation is quickly adopted by the House, this amendment assures that moving forward, Congress is in favor of additional resources for housing counseling.

I urge my colleagues to accept this modest increase in funding so that our constituents can keep their homes once they realize the American dream of homeownership.

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I asked for time simply to have a discussion with Mr. TURNER, if I might, regarding his amendment.

Mr. TURNER, in ancient history I had the privilege of chairing this subcommittee, and during those early years I was very, very concerned with what was happening within the total housing programming, what happens to the money as it flows to communities, et cetera. The focus then was upon section 8 housing. I will never forget my trip to New Orleans to try to see what was happening with money we sent there over a lot of years to the Housing Authority. I met with the Inspector General in the offices of the FBI to dis-

cuss what I had seen and some of my concerns. The FBI guy who was there listening to our conversation was heard to say, Congressman, if you really want to get a handle on this, I would suggest that one of the things that you might do is put enough money into the Inspector General's office so you can have a full-time inspector general here in New Orleans, for this fellow flew in from Houston to talk with you today.

I heard a while ago that there had been added monies to the Inspector General's office since Katrina. I have no idea what that means in terms of the real volume, et cetera, but I do perceive that there is an ongoing problem across the country.

So this discussion, or my reason to talk with you, is I admire very much what you're about. I would hope also, as you go about it, that you work very closely with the chairman and ranking member about finding another source of money. The issue is a very important one, but I'm not certain just how well off the Inspector General is.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. TURNER. I certainly appreciate your description of the needs for the Inspector General. And I support, of course, the chairman's description of searching for additional offsets for this in order to find additional monies for housing counseling. And in that, I'm certain that after the amendment passes the House, that there would be a great deal of effort by the chairman in conference to seek, perhaps, an additional offset where the Inspector General amount could be restored.

But as you have heard from so many of the Members that are here, this is an issue that strikes at the very heart of the fabric of our neighborhoods and our families. I have so many families who have come to me to tell me the stories of what they have experienced. There are nonprofit organizations in my community who are every day working with families who have faced this issue of foreclosure, and they want to know that we support the services that are being provided to them and that might be available to them.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Reclaiming my time, let me say that it is my intention to support the gentleman's amendment. I would urge the chairman to consider doing the same as we search for an offset somewhere else. But in the meantime, the issue is a critical issue. It is spreading across the country like wildfire. We are going to see an awful lot more of this challenge, not less of this. So I appreciate the gentleman's effort.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

□ 1230

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HOLDEN) having assumed the chair, Mr. WEINER, 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. 3074) making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

**PROVIDING FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3074, TRANSPORTATION, HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2008**

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, during further consideration of H.R. 3074 in the Committee of the Whole pursuant to House Resolution 558, notwithstanding clause 11 of rule XVIII, no further amendment to the bill may be offered except:

Pro forma amendments offered at any point in the reading by the chairman or ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their designees for the purpose of debate;

An amendment by Mr. CROWLEY regarding a study to determine staffing needs for air traffic controllers;

An amendment by Mr. AL GREEN of Texas regarding funding for the Fair Housing Initiatives Program;

An amendment by Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, or Mr. TERRY regarding funding for lead hazard reduction grants;

An amendment by Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida regarding an annual study of FHA single-family housing mortgage insurance programs;

An amendment by Mr. GARY MILLER of California regarding the authorization for additional Moving to Work Demonstration agreements;

An amendment by Mr. BLUNT regarding Corporate Average Fuel Economy standards;

An amendment by Mr. CONAWAY regarding use of reductions made through amendment for deficit reduction;

An amendment by Mr. DEFAZIO, or Mr. HUNTER, or Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas prohibiting use of funds for certain cross-border motor carrier demonstration projects;

An amendment by Mr. FLAKE limiting funds for the National Mule and Packers Museum in Woodlake, California;

An amendment by Mr. FLAKE limiting funds for the Los Angeles Fashion District in Los Angeles, California;

An amendment by Mr. FLAKE limiting funds for the Bel Alton High School Alumni Association Community Development Corporation in Maryland;

An amendment by Mr. FLAKE limiting funds for the Hunting and Fishing Museum of Pennsylvania;

An amendment by Mr. FLAKE limiting funds for the Houston Zoo in Texas;

An amendment by Mr. FLAKE limiting funds for the Walter Clore Wine and Culinary Center in Washington;

An amendment by Mr. FLAKE limiting funds for the Belmont Complex in Armstrong County, Pennsylvania;

An amendment by Mr. FLAKE limiting funds for the North Central Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission in Wausau, Wisconsin;

An amendment by Mr. FLAKE limiting funds for the Arlington Chamber of Commerce in Texas;

An amendment by Mr. FLAKE limiting funds for the Strand Theatre Performing Arts Center in Plattsburgh, New York;

An amendment by Mr. FLAKE limiting funds for the Huntsville Museum of Art in Alabama;

An amendment by Mr. FLAKE limiting funds for the Friends of Cheat Rails to Trails program;

An amendment by Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts or Mr. RANGEL regarding community service requirements;

An amendment by Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN limiting funds to implement a preferred alternative for the New York-New Jersey-Philadelphia airspace redesign;

An amendment by Mr. GINGREY limiting funds for certain economic development activities which obtain property through eminent domain;

An amendment by Mr. HASTINGS of Florida regarding TRACON consolidation;

An amendment by Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas regarding noise mitigation studies;

An amendment by Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas regarding technology for temporary disaster housing;

An amendment by Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas prohibiting use of funds to undermine unions and other labor organizations representing workers on federally funded transportation projects;

An amendment by Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas prohibiting use of funds to prohibit transportation workers from having necessary communication equipment;

An amendment by Mr. JORDAN of Ohio reducing funds in the bill by 6.3 percent, which shall be debatable for 40 minutes;

An amendment by Mr. KING of Iowa limiting funds to implement Davis-Bacon requirements;

An amendment by Mr. KING of Iowa limiting funds to employ workers described in section 274A of the Immigration and Nationality Act;

An amendment by Mr. KING of Iowa limiting funds for the Alpine Heritage Preservation in West Virginia;

An amendment by Mr. GARY MILLER of California, Ms. WATERS, or Mr. AL GREEN of Texas prohibiting use of funds to take certain actions on standards for mortgagor's investment in mortgaged properties;

An amendment by Mrs. MUSGRAVE reducing funds in the bill by 0.5 percent,

which shall be debatable for 40 minutes;

An amendment by Mr. PALLONE or Mr. PATRICK MURPHY of Pennsylvania regarding waste processing and transferring facilities;

An amendment by Mr. PRICE of Georgia reducing funds in the bill by 1 percent, which shall be debatable for 40 minutes;

An amendment by Mr. SESSIONS limiting the use of funds for a certain AMTRAK route;

An amendment by Mr. SHULER regarding use of funds designated for North Shore Road in Swain County, North Carolina;

An amendment by Mr. UPTON, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina or Mr. LIPINSKI regarding energy efficient light bulbs;

An amendment by Mr. PRICE of Georgia limiting FHA funds for the creation of an affordable housing fund;

An amendment by Mr. HENSARLING limiting funds for parking facilities;

An amendment by Mr. HENSARLING limiting funds for the Edmunds Center for the Arts in Washington;

An amendment by Mr. KING of Iowa limiting funds for homeownership assistance for certain individuals;

An amendment by Mr. KING of Iowa limiting funds for the Association of Community Organizations for Reform Now;

An amendment by Mr. CROWLEY limiting funds for the Blairstown Historic Preservation Commission in Blairstown, New Jersey;

An amendment by Mr. CROWLEY limiting funds for the City of Marshall, Texas;

An amendment by Mr. CROWLEY limiting funds for the City of Muncie, Indiana;

An amendment by Mr. CROWLEY limiting funds for the I-25 North of HS 66 project in Colorado;

An amendment by Mr. CROWLEY limiting funds for the State Route 374, from State Route 149 to 77, project in Montgomery County, Tennessee;

An amendment by Mr. WALBERG limiting funds to promulgate regulations based on race, ethnicity or sex;

An amendment by Mr. HENSARLING limiting funds for museums;

An amendment by Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania limiting funds for tolling on I-80 in Pennsylvania;

An amendment by Mr. HUNTER limiting funds for a U.S.-Mexico freeway;

An amendment by Mr. OBEY regarding earmarks; and

An amendment or amendments by Mr. OLVER regarding funding.

Each such amendment may be offered only by the Member named in this request or a designee, shall be considered as read, shall not be subject to amendment except that the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations and the Subcommittee on Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies each may offer one pro forma amendment for the purpose of debate;