

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, Washington Republicans are throwing the facts out the window and are trying to scare the American public into believing that our Nation is less safe today than it was under the administration's supposed Protect America Act.

The Bush administration was wrong when it said the intelligence community would go dark, outrageous, when the act expired earlier this month.

Kenneth Wainstein, the Assistant Attorney General for National Security, said that even after the President's law expired, "intelligence officials would still be able to continue eavesdropping on already-approved targets for another year." And Kate Martin, the Director of the Center for National Security Studies, said our government could immediately listen in on any new individual plotting a terrorist attack without a court order under existing FISA emergency authority.

Clearly, our intelligence community is not going dark. And I would hope that congressional Republicans would stop this scare tactic.

EXTEND PRODUCTION AND INVESTMENT TAX CREDIT

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

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow the House will vote on commonsense legislation to extend the production tax credit and investment tax credit and pay for it by reducing wasteful subsidies to big oil companies.

As an expert in renewable energy, I am confident that this legislation will ease the pain at the pump and allow our economy to create family wage jobs and make America less dependent on foreign oil.

The bill we will vote on comes just after the big five oil companies report record profits. Our bill will channel unnecessary funding that goes to oil companies back to the renewable industry where it's greatly needed. I cannot overstate the urgency of extending the production tax credit and the investment tax credit as soon as possible.

As with any other form of electrical generation, renewable energy products must adhere to development timelines. And if the schedule of a project is delayed due to uncertainty about the tax credits, a year-long construction cycle will be lost, setting our country further behind foreign competition.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to see the importance of this legislation and join us tomorrow in passing it.

FISA: PRESIDENT AND REPUBLICANS PLAY POLITICS WITH NATIONAL SECURITY

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

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, the politics of fear are alive and well in the

Republican Party. Despite the fact that the House and Senate are actively working to craft a strong new FISA bill, Republicans and the White House refuse to attend the negotiations. Instead, they're insisting that this House simply rubber-stamp a bill that was recently passed by the Senate.

The decision to boycott these negotiations shows that Republicans prefer a political issue rather than a strong new FISA bill.

Democrats are hopeful that Republicans will consider their decision to sit on the sidelines and will instead join us in crafting a bill that protects our country while respecting the fundamental rights of American citizens.

Mr. Speaker, House Democrats passed a bill in November that meets both of these criteria. Then, earlier this month, the Senate passed its own version. As is common procedure here on Capitol Hill, we are now in the process of negotiating the differences between the two bills in order to come up with the strongest bill possible. I would hope Republicans would want to remain relevant and would join us in passing the strongest FISA bill we can.

FISA: PRESIDENT AND REPUBLICANS PLAY POLITICS WITH NATIONAL SECURITY

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, President Bush and congressional Republicans are playing politics with our national security. They're falsely claiming that the expiration of a temporary provision of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act is endangering America and compromising our national security. If that is indeed the case, why did the President threaten to veto any extension of his own law? And why did every House Republican vote against a 21-day extension of the law earlier this month?

If the expiration of this law would, indeed, endanger the American public as Republicans suggest, wouldn't House Republicans do everything in their power to actually keep the law in place? And despite all this fearmongering, House Republicans know that all of our electronic surveillance capabilities are still in place.

Mr. Speaker, while the White House and congressional Republicans play games with our national security, congressional Democrats will continue to work to pass a final FISA bill that will give our intelligence community the tool it needs to protect our Nation while we also protect our citizens' civil liberties.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3521, PUBLIC HOUSING ASSET MANAGEMENT IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2007

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Com-

mittee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 974 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 974

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3521) to improve the Operating Fund for public housing of the Department of Housing and Urban Development. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Financial Services now printed in the bill. The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived except those arising under clause 10 of rule XXI. Notwithstanding clause 11 of rule XVIII, no amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. During consideration in the House of H.R. 3521 pursuant to this resolution, notwithstanding the operation of the previous question, the Chair may postpone further consideration of the bill to such time as may be designated by the Speaker.

SEC. 3. House Resolution 955 is laid upon the table.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my friend, the gentleman from Texas, Representative SESSIONS. All time yielded during consideration of the rule is for debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous materials into the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1230

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 974 provides a structured rule for consideration of H.R. 3521, the Public Housing Asset Management Improvement Act of 2007. The rule provides 1 hour of general debate controlled by the Committee on Financial Services. The rule makes in order two amendments printed in the Rules Committee report accompanying this resolution. The rule also provides one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, I am especially pleased that the rule makes in order an amendment offered by my colleague from Florida, Representative KENDRICK MEEK. His amendment ensures that in extreme cases where HUD is forced to take over control of a housing authority, it must honor any and all existing agreements between the local housing authority and tenant associations. This amendment is needed in south Florida and throughout the country, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. Speaker, the skyrocketing number of foreclosures and the lack of affordable housing are some of the greatest financial problems our Nation faces today. In Broward County, the county in which I live in Florida, foreclosure rates tripled in 2007 alone. It is obvious this situation has grown beyond a crisis and extends into our entire economy.

One group of service providers that is suffering significantly from this economic crisis is our public housing authorities. For this reason I support this rule and underlying legislation that will provide flexibility to public housing authorities during our Nation's housing crisis so that they are able to sufficiently meet the needs of our constituents.

There are approximately 3,300 individual public housing authorities in the United States serving 1.2 million households. Low- and middle-income individuals and families making between 50 percent and 80 percent of the median income level in their community are eligible for Federal assistance. Without this assistance, literally millions of people would be homeless or in some cases even worse. Despite this known reality, HUD recently issued a ruling which will result in funding cuts for over 800 housing authorities throughout the country. If the House does not act, then 26 percent of the housing authorities in the United

States will lose significant funding because of HUD's decision. To make up for the anticipated funding shortfalls, the underlying legislation gives housing authorities the flexibility to transfer funds from their capital to operational accounts. This move will ensure that housing authorities will not be forced to close down existing public housing units because of HUD's shortsightedness.

Finally and importantly, the legislation also reaffirms the role that tenants play in determining where they live and how those communities are governed.

Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, the problems addressed in this legislation are not the only obstacles public housing authorities have been forced to deal with over the last 7 years. As my colleagues know, the current administration has a long record of failing to meet America's low- and middle-income housing needs. For example, funding shortfalls have become regular staples in the President's public housing budgets, while the administration continues to neglect the more than \$18 billion backlog in deferred maintenance for public housing units, allowing the deterioration of public housing units to the point that many of them are completely uninhabitable. This is simply unacceptable.

In my district some housing units are literally falling apart. Roofs are leaking and in some instances even caving in. Appliances are broken and decades, not years, old. Units are deteriorating, unattractive, and lacking in some of the most basic amenities. Even more is that security in many of the public housing communities has been consistently disappearing. Residents in some public housing units in my congressional district alone are literally afraid to leave their homes.

Yes, we are working to address these and other public housing issues. But we will not be able to fully address these issues if the underlying legislation does not pass.

Mr. Speaker, this housing bill was reported out favorably by the Financial Services Committee, the whole committee, by voice vote. The minority members of the committee did not offer any amendments during markup, and not one Republican amendment was submitted to the Rules Committee.

It is my sincere hope that the House will pass this rule and underlying bill with that same overwhelming bipartisan support. I urge my colleagues to support this rule and the Public Housing Asset Management Improvement Act of 2007 as we work to improve public housing throughout America.

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Florida for yielding me this time, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This bill is real simple. It's real simple. For several years there was a negotiation with HUD to look at the best

practices across this country from people who are in the housing industry to determine best how to go about and manage assets of housing units. This bill is all about taking away the best practices that exist for nongovernment housing, the rest of the industry, because it will take money away from people who don't engage in best practices. Of course it will take money away from them. But what this is all about is to try to take a negotiation that has happened for about 7 years from what the previous Congresses have passed to say we think that public housing needs to raise its standards to where we do have proper public housing, public housing that works, public housing that can pass the smell test of asset management.

Now my good friends, led by our Speaker, NANCY PELOSI, want to say forget the standards. Forget the standards of the industry. If they have to live up to those standards of proper management, of best practices, do you realize what that would mean to us? We couldn't pass those audits; so we will lose our money. So this rule and this new change that we are having here that's called the Public Housing Asset Management Improvement Act of 2007 is all about trying to say forget trying to do something that's better. Forget following standards that have been established in the public sector. We don't want those to apply. So now we're going to pass a rule and a law that says you don't have to do that because if you did, you would lose money.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition. I rise in opposition not only to the rule, which I believe is unnecessarily restrictive, but also to the provisions in this bill and the underlying legislation that unilaterally and at the last minute seeks to abuse the Congress's power and to undo specific parts of a process that have previously been carefully negotiated over years with the private sector best practices and brokered over the last decade to make public housing more accountable for its spending and more accountable to the public housing units that we don't want to go into disrepair in the United States of America.

In 1998 Congress passed the Quality Housing and Work Responsibility Act, which among other things required a deliberate and negotiated rule-making process to bring asset management at our Nation's public housing administrations up to a reasonable standard. What we are here to do today is to say we don't want that standard.

And you're right. The gentleman from Florida is right. Public housing units that cannot meet the standards would lose money. That's why we talk about waste, fraud, and abuse. People that do not use the money that has been given them by this Congress, by the taxpayer to work in the best interests, we thought, I think, as we vote to spend money, of people who are in public housing, who, through some sometimes no fault of their own, have to end

up in public housing and find out they are in a rat-infested, bad housing project because asset management standards aren't followed. Amazing.

By adopting widespread private sector common practices such as project-based budgeting and accounting to ensure that costs are known, managed, and maintained at a reasonable level, which is what the current bill is about, which is what we're going to undo, Congress wisely gave public housing administrations the tools they needed, and just like private sector tools, to manage their own finances better, bringing them into line with every other operator of subsidized housing in this country and ensuring that spending moneys to support their tenant and tenants remain the highest priority. We are going to do away with that today. That's what we are going to do away with, and we call that new and approved. I call that a sham and disrespectful of the residents whom we are trying to help.

Today's legislation would overturn these longstanding negotiations and turn back the clock for public housing administrations nationwide by eliminating any restrictions on the amount of management fees they could charge, promoting inefficiency, reducing the level of funding available to tenants, and decreasing oversight and accountability. In other words, making sure that these public housing agencies stay on the watch list for waste, fraud, and abuse rather than using private sector standards of best practices to make them better.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot understand why this self-proclaimed most honest, ethical, and open Congress in history would use this time today to bring this legislation to the floor to make financial management of mid-sized public housing administrations less transparent, less responsive, and not even following the standards established by the private sector and by unilaterally overturning a lengthy and fairly negotiated rule-making process. But here we are.

In fact, if Speaker PELOSI really wanted to demonstrate her commitment to honest, open, and ethical government, she could be using this time instead to take up a resolution that I and over 150 of my Republican colleagues have cosponsored, authored by my good friend, Representative JACK KINGSTON from Georgia, which is a continuation of House Republicans' long-term commitment to reform the earmark process. Congressman KINGSTON's bill would create a Joint Committee on Earmark Reform to conduct a full study of the earmark practices of the House, the Senate, and executive branch. Upon completion of this study, the joint committee would file a report of its findings and its recommendations. Most importantly, until this report is filed, the House would put in place an immediate moratorium on the consideration of all earmarks.

By the way, that's the people's money. That's the people's money that

people really back home are worried about.

Instead, Mr. Speaker, this House, which recently tied the record as the most closed Congress in history, with 49 closed rules so far in the 110th Congress, will consider this legislation that will impede the successful transition to, and implementation of, asset management by overturning a long negotiated process that is consistent with proper standards of the private sector.

□ 1245

I know that other bills like the bipartisan Senate legislation to give our Nation's intelligence services tools that they need to protect Americans against terrorists is also trying to be taken up by the House. But, instead, this Democrat leadership has chosen to miss yet another opportunity to provide Americans with greater security by instead allowing the Protect America Act to expire. If there is any question as to why the public holds Congress in such low regard, with only about one in five Americans approving the job that this House is doing, one need not look any further than the congressional calendar this week, again, this week, and examine what both the Democrat leadership and the House are doing and what we are neglecting to do.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to insert in the RECORD a Statement of Administrative Policy explaining their strong opposition to H.R. 3521's passage.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT
AND BUDGET,

Washington, DC, February 12, 2008.

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE POLICY

H.R. 3521—PUBLIC HOUSING ASSET MANAGEMENT
IMPROVEMENT ACT

The Administration is strongly committed to the successful transition to and implementation of asset management for Public Housing Agencies (PHAs). Asset management will adopt widespread private sector practices, including project-based budgeting and accounting, to assure costs are known, managed, and maintained at reasonable levels—ensuring public housing tenants are the first priority. However, the Administration is deeply concerned that H.R. 3521, as reported by the House Financial Services Committee, would severely undermine PHAs' long-awaited conversion to asset management and the adoption of conventional business practices. For the reasons that follow, the Administration strongly opposes House passage of H.R. 3521.

H.R. 3521 would exempt 88 percent of PHAs, those which own or operate fewer than 500 public housing units, from the requirement to convert to asset management. The increase of the threshold for exemption from asset management, from 250 to 500 public housing units, would directly contradict a fundamental element of the Operating Fund negotiated rulemaking process.

The bill also would eliminate any restriction or limitation on the amount of management and related fees that a PHA could charge through January 2011. This change would promote program inefficiency, likely reduce funds available to directly assist tenants, and erode effective program oversight and accountability. Moreover, the Department of Housing and Urban Development

(HUD) has already provided the PHAs with the flexibility to phase-in management fees through 2011, provided they include reasonable documentation in their Annual Plan.

PHAs would be allowed to spend as much as 20 percent of their Capital Fund grant on central office costs related to the operation of public housing. The extra 20 percent is above and beyond the 10 percent of the Capital Fund grant that the PHA earns as a management fee, and on top of the normal management fees that a PHA earns for operating each project. The Administration strongly opposes this provision because it could lead to excessive Capital Fund diversions and expenditures on administrative costs, and because HUD has already allowed PHAs until 2011 to abide by the new management fee guidelines, with supporting documentation. Beyond that date, PHAs should abide by the new management fee guidelines so that Capital Fund amounts are spent, to the maximum extent possible, on capital works projects, not on central overhead costs.

Under the bill, HUD is directed to ensure that PHAs encourage the reasonable efforts of resident tenant organizations to represent their members, and to issue guidance encouraging resident participation in the implementation of asset management. Although these provisions are well-intended, HUD's regulations already encourage resident and tenant participation, especially in the adoption of Annual Plans. Moreover, the provisions in H.R. 3521 giving wide latitude to a PHA's determination and use of management fees are directly contrary to the interests of public housing residents. Such provisions encourage PHAs to direct valuable resources away from the direct operation of public housing projects in favor of central overhead.

The Administration looks forward to working with the Congress to ensure that the long-awaited conversion of PHAs to asset management occurs smoothly and under the guidance of conventional business practices. However, H.R. 3521 moves in the wrong direction and would undermine these efforts.

I urge all my colleagues to vote against the previous question and this rule so that today the House can actually take up legislation that will move America in a positive direction.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is bad policy when you stand up and try and pass a law that takes away more accountability, more opportunity for sunlight, but most of all a standard that exists everywhere else. The people we are really robbing, hurting, harming, and continuing to harm are the people that live in public housing. We believe transparency is important. But we believe in responsibility. We believe that people who are in public housing are entitled to know that where they live that someone is responsible, looking at the dollars wisely, and prepared with the investments that had been made on their behalf. To be worried about leaving where they are, I do understand. As the gentleman from Florida has said, people are concerned that they even leave where they are, concerned that something will happen. Well, that's right. That's right.

And today, what this House wants to do is to lower the standards even lower. I am disappointed. But I remain optimistic, because we have got a vote in just a few minutes and we can change that pathway.

Mr. Speaker, the tragic events of September 11 taught us many lessons, and one of the most basic lessons was that our Nation must remain aggressive, nimble, proactive, and adaptable in our fight against international terrorism. To accomplish this common-sense goal, and a goal that I think we, as Members of Congress, when we raise our hand to say we will support and defend our country, Congress must give our intelligence agencies the tools that they need to stay one step ahead of terrorists who wish to harm Americans.

Telecommunications technology has changed greatly since 1978 when FISA was first written, and the modernization of foreign intelligence surveillance to adapt to the realities of the 21st century should be a critical national security priority. I am pleased that several of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle also agree.

On January 28, 21 members of the Blue Dog coalition sent a letter to Speaker PELOSI in support of the Rockefeller-Bond FISA legislation in the United States Senate. The letter states, "The Rockefeller-Bond FISA legislation creates satisfactory language addressing all of these issues which we fully support that would measure and should reach the House floor without substantial change. We believe these components will ensure a strong security apparatus that can thwart terrorism across the globe and save American lives here in our country."

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I will insert into the RECORD the letter by the Blue Dogs to Speaker PELOSI.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Legislation reforming the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act (FISA) is currently being considered by the Senate. Following the Senate's passage of a FISA bill, it will be necessary for the House to quickly consider FISA legislation to get a bill to the President before the Protect America Act expires in February.

It is our belief that such legislation should include the following provisions: Require individualized warrants for surveillance of U.S. citizens living or traveling abroad; Clarify that no court order is required to conduct surveillance of foreign-to-foreign communications that are routed through the United States; Provide enhanced oversight by Congress of surveillance laws and procedures; Compel compliance by private sector partners; Review by FISA Court of minimization procedures; Targeted immunity for carriers that participated in anti-terrorism surveillance programs.

The Rockefeller-Bond FISA legislation contains satisfactory language addressing all these issues and we would fully support that measure should it reach the House floor without substantial change. We believe these components will ensure a strong national security apparatus that can thwart terrorism across the globe and save American lives here in our country.

It is also critical that we update the FISA laws in a timely manner. To pass a long-term extension of the Protect America Act, as some may suggest, would leave in place a limited, stopgap measure that does not fully address critical surveillance issues. We have it within our ability to replace the expiring Protect America Act by passing strong, bipartisan FISA modernization legislation

that can be signed into law and we should do so—the consequences of not passing such a measure could place our national security at undue risk.

Sincerely,

Leonard L. Boswell, Marion Berry, Mike Ross, Bud Cramer, Heath Shuler, Allen Boyd, Dan Boren, Jim Matheson, Lincoln Davis, Tim Holden, Dennis Moore, Christopher Carney, Earl Pomeroy, Melissa L. Bean, John Barrow, Joe Baca, John Tanner, Jim Cooper, Brad Ellsworth, Charlie Melancon, Zack Space.

It is unfortunate that House Democrat leaders chose to allow the Protect America Act to expire instead of bringing to the House floor the bipartisan measure that passed the United States Senate by a vote of 68–29. To make our country safer, Congress needs to act immediately. Today, I will once again give all the Members of the House an opportunity to vote on a bipartisan long-term modernization of FISA. I will call on all my colleagues, including members of the Blue Dog coalition that signed the letter to Speaker PELOSI, to join me in defeating the previous question so that we can immediately move to concur in the Senate amendment and send the bill to the President to be signed into law quickly.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SESSIONS. I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the previous question and in favor of a bipartisan permanent solution that closes the terrorist loophole.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am hard put to move hurriedly, so I will yield myself such time as I may consume. I am also hard put, Mr. Speaker, to restrain myself and not get involved with the ongoing discussion and the numerous ads that I saw during the previous recess that were very much in error concerning the House of Representatives' actions on the FISA legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I served for 7 years on the House Select Committee on Intelligence. I find it hard to believe that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, or that anyone, would believe that the distinguished Chair of the Intelligence Committee, SILVESTRE REYES, the distinguished Chair of the Judiciary Committee, JOHN CONYERS, the distinguished Chair of the Homeland Security Committee, BENNIE THOMPSON, their counterparts in the United States Senate, all combined would want to put this Nation in jeopardy in any way.

Enough of the fearmongering. Enough of making people think that something is going to happen that is not going to happen. The simple truth

is that there will be legislation that will be legislation fashioned by the House and by the United States Senate and not by the United States Senate and not by this administration without those of us who have actual concerns about the United States Constitution having our say in that regard.

Civil liberties and civil rights are critical to America, and the foundational aspects of our country allow full airing before conclusions are made by people that have oriented the most secretive administration that I know of in the history of this country.

I won't go much further on that score on the previous question, Mr. Speaker. I return now to what we have heard about why we must pass this rule and the Public Housing Asset Management Improvement Act, which we are here about today. It is nice to have the nuances. It is nice to have the process. It is nice to have the procedural opportunities that the minority takes, and correctly they can bring up those matters which are not on the agenda today. I can assure my friends on the other side that the Speaker of the House of Representatives and those in this body, including the Blue Dogs, will address FISA legislation, and it will be appropriately undertaken to protect every American, every American's civil liberties and civil rights, and more important, to protect the Constitution of the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, the American people deserve an opportunity to improve their lives. Transitional public housing opportunities have served this purpose for decades, nurturing families and yielding such leaders as some of us who serve in this Congress. Public housing authorities must be empowered to effectively and flexibly manage their assets with appropriate tenant oversight. My colleague on the other side mentioned private sector tools. I am fascinated by the notion that the private sector, which all of us respect, has been so careful with all of their management. If their management has been so successful, why is it, then, that there is a housing crisis in this Nation with reference to foreclosure?

This morning, Mr. Speaker, and I take the liberty of doing this because occasionally we come to the floor and talk about different matters, but a distant cousin of mine in Fort Worth, Texas, called me. Her name is Sharon Samuels. And Sharon shared her story with me about her involvement with her mortgage company, Countrywide. She has been in her home since 1993, she said, and in addition, thereto, had never taken out any of her equity out of her home. She has three children, all of them that she has managed to educate. And she was pursued by Countrywide to enter into a mortgage set of circumstances that has now led from her mortgage rising from \$1,100 to \$2,200 and foreclosure proceedings going forward without any forbearance or opportunity for her to do anything

other than lose all of her assets that she had developed during the years since 1993. I mention that because that is the private sector that has put an individual in a home, in a position of being in need of this kind of stuff that we are talking about here today. Hard-working Americans families should not suffer as a result of HUD's failed policies.

I applaud my colleagues for joining together in this effort that will benefit the low-income families, the elderly and the disabled Americans who live in public housing. This bill has been endorsed by all the groups that represent not only public housing administrators and agencies but also tenant advocacy groups. The bill is supported by the Council of Large Public Housing Authorities, the Public Housing Authorities Directors Association, the National Association of Housing and Development Officials, National Housing Law Project, and the National Training and Information Center.

But guess who doesn't support it? Some people on the other side of the aisle who had an opportunity in the Financial Services Committee to offer amendments if they so choose, and they chose not to do so, and yet they will come here today and say that we are lacking on our side of the aisle in providing the necessary standards and providing the necessary tools for people to live in public housing.

Mr. Speaker, 15 years ago, I ran for the United States Congress, and among the things that I said was I would try to improve public housing in my congressional district and throughout this Nation. I don't feel that I have succeeded. Twelve of those years have been spent under Republican administrations that were controlled by Republicans, 12 years in the House, 8 years just now, ending soon, happily, in November so that these \$18 billion backlogs and so that housing won't collapse and fall down around people.

This is the same administration that didn't answer in New Orleans. But what have we done? In the limited time that we are here, and I continue to hear criticism about what we have not done. What we have done in the House, we passed the section 8 voucher reform program that increases the number of families, veterans, and seniors that are able to afford safe homes by adding 20,000 new vouchers. We did expand the Homeownership Act of 2007 that allows the population of borrowers to have access to the Federal Housing Administration. In this House we have passed the National Affordable Housing Trust Fund Act of 2007, which creates a fund to use and build more affordable housing for low-income families and families who have lost their homes to foreclosure.

□ 1300

They keep saying that the agenda isn't good. We passed the Housing Finance Reform Act and expanded the size of loans that can be issued by

Freddie Mac and Fannie Mae. We passed the Mortgage Reform and Anti-Predatory Lending Act that increases transparency and heightens standards to keep brokers from practicing predatory lending. Save us from these people who argue that asset management is a landmark program change now several years in the making? You bet it is.

What I don't understand is why is it poor people are always the ones that have to take it right on the chin every time this Nation gets itself in a crisis. The National Training and Information Center sponsored by La Raza; the Center for Community Change; the Chicago Rehab Network; Cleveland Housing Tenant Association; Fall River Housing Joint Tenants Council; Legal Aid Justice Center; Miami Workers Center, all sorts of organizations. I will include all of the letters of all of the organizations I have for the RECORD.

NATIONAL TRAINING
AND INFORMATION CENTER,
Chicago, IL, February 7, 2008.

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

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER, The undersigned 150 democratic grassroots resident organizing groups and allies would like to convey our strong support for protecting the rights of public housing residents to organize, as delineated in H.R. 3521, the Public Housing Asset Management Improvement Act of 2007. As the transition to a system of asset management is one of the most significant shifts facing the administration of public housing in many years, it is more important than ever that public housing residents are involved in the decisionmaking processes at the local and national levels.

In April of 2007, the National Training & Information Center (NTIC) submitted a letter to Congress endorsed by local, statewide, and national organizations in protest of recent attempts to undermine the efforts of resident and community organizations to participate in the decisions around public housing that impact their communities and their lives. One of those attempts was a notice by HUD on March 1, 2007 to streamline the process to waive 24 CFR 964, which outlines the rights of residents to organize, for PHAs transitioning to asset management. Section 4 of H.R. 3521 is critical in order to ensure that the congressionally sanctioned rights to organize for public housing residents are protected.

The NTIC network is of the perspective that residents must be central to the discourse around policies that impact them—both at the local and national level. Section 4 of this bill will ensure that the voices of public housing residents are not lost in the implementation of asset management. Over the past year, NTIC has brought together public housing residents and allies from 38 cities to identify the most pressing areas for reform of public housing policy. The right to organize and meaningful resident participation are among the highest priorities for residents across the country. In order to make asset management work for everyone, it is critical that residents are involved in decisions around its implementation.

The undersigned 150 local, statewide, and national organizations would like to convey our support for the principles outlined in Section 4 of H.R. 3521. Namely, we feel strongly that residents should have a right to organize in public housing and should be meaningfully and substantively involved in the decisions that impact their lives—both

at the local and national level. Specifically, it is critical that the rights bestowed by 24 CFR 964 not be undermined by the transition to asset management. We hope that we can rely on your support for these principles.

Access Living—Chicago, IL.
Annapolis Tenant Task Force—Boston, MA.
Beacon Glen Resident Association—Cincinnati, OH.
Bethel New Life—Chicago, IL.
Bethune Village Resident Council—Daytona Beach, FL.
Border Fair Housing & Economic Justice Center—El Paso, Texas
Bowen Homes Resident Association—Atlanta, GA.
Cabrin Green Rowhouse Council—Chicago, IL.
California Coalition for Rural Housing—California State
Center for Community Change—National
Central Advisory Council—Chicago, IL.
Central Illinois Organizing Project—Central Illinois
Chicago Coalition for the Homeless—Chicago, IL.
Chicago Rehab Network—Chicago, IL.
Cleveland Housing Resident Association—Cleveland, TN.
Clinton Springs Resident Association—Cincinnati, OH.
Coalition to Protect Public Housing—Chicago, IL.
Communities United for Action—Cincinnati, OH.
Community Voices Heard—New York, NY.
Connecticut Legal Services—Connecticut State
Consumer Action—National
Crossroads Urban Center—Salt Lake City, UT.
Detroit United Organizing for Power—Detroit, MI.
District of Columbia Grassroots Empowerment Project—Washington, DC.
Empower DC—Washington, DC.
Empowering & Strengthening Ohio's People—Cleveland, OH.
Erie Tenant Council—Erie, PA.
Everywhere & Now Public Housing Residents Organizing Nationally Together—National
Fall River Housing Joint Tenants Council Inc.—Fall River, MA.
Families United for Racial and Economic Equality—New York, NY
Faneuil Tenant Task Force—Boston, MA.
Findlater Gardens Resident Association—Cincinnati, OH.
Fuerza Laboral/Power of Workers—Providence, RI.
Good Old Lower East Side—New York, NY.
Grass Roots Organizing—Mexico, MO.
Guste Homes Resident Management Corporation—New Orleans, LA
Hartford Organizing for Power & Equality—Hartford, CT.
Homeline—Minnesota State
Horizon Hills Resident Association—Cincinnati, OH.
Housing Action Illinois—Illinois State
Housing Choices Coalition—Santa Cruz, CA.
Housing Rights Committee of San Francisco—San Francisco, CA.
Housing Trust Fund Project—National
Illinois Network of Centers for Independent Living—Illinois State
Imagine Supported Living—Santa Cruz, CA.
Iowa Citizens for Community Improvement—Iowa State
Jane Addams Senior Caucus—Chicago, IL.
Janie Poe Residents Council—Sarasota, FL.
Jurisdiction-Wide Resident Advisory Board—Cincinnati, OH.

Just Cause Oakland—Oakland, CA.
 Kalamazoo Homeless Action Network—Kalamazoo, MI.
 Lafayette Resident Advisory Board—Lafayette, WI.
 Lake City House Council—Seattle, WA.
 Lake County Center for Independent Living—Lake County, IL.
 Lake Park East Tenant Association—Chicago, IL.
 Lakeview Action Coalition—Chicago, IL.
 La Playa Resident Council—San Diego, CA.
 La Raza Centro Legal—San Francisco, CA.
 Lawyers' Committee for Better Housing—Chicago, IL.
 Lebanon Tenants Association—Lebanon, PA.
 Le Claire Court Community Development Corporation—Chicago, IL.
 Legacy of Equality, Leadership and Organizing—Seattle, WA.
 Legal Aid Justice Center—Charlottesville, VA.
 Legal Aid Justice Center—Richmond, VA.
 Legal Assistance Resource Center of Connecticut—Connecticut State.
 Liberty Apartments Resident Association—Cincinnati, OH.
 Livermore Tenants and Neighbors—Livermore, CA.
 Logan Square Neighborhood Association—Chicago, IL.
 Los Angeles Coalition to End Hunger and Homelessness—Los Angeles, CA.
 Lowden Homes Local Advisory Council—Chicago, IL.
 Low Income Families Fighting Together—Miami, FL.
 Madera Action Coalition—Madera, CA.
 Maine Association of Interdependent Neighborhoods—Maine State.
 Maine Equal Justice Partners—Maine State.
 Mar Vista Gardens Resident Advisory Committee—Los Angeles, CA.
 Massachusetts Alliance of HUD Tenants—Massachusetts State.
 Massachusetts Union of Public Housing Tenants—Massachusetts State.
 Mennonite Central Committee—National.
 Metro Atlanta Task Force on Housing & Homelessness—Atlanta, GA.
 Metropolitan Tenants Organization—Chicago, IL.
 Miami Workers Center—Miami, FL.
 Millvale Resident Association—Cincinnati, OH.
 Mineral Manor Resident Council—Reno, NV.
 Minneapolis High Rise Council—Minneapolis, MN.
 Mission Terrace Residents Association—San Jose, CA.
 Mississippi Coalition for Citizens with Disabilities—Mississippi State.
 Mobilizing and Organizing for Victory and Empowerment—Minneapolis, MN.
 Mothers on the Move—New York, NY.
 Myra Birch Manor Resident Council—Reno, NV.
 National Alliance of HUD Tenants—National.
 National Association for the Advancement of Colored People—Richmond, VA.
 National Association of Consumer Advocates—National.
 National Association of Resident Management Corporations—National.
 National Economic and Social Rights Initiative—National.
 National People's Action—National.
 National Training & Information Center—National.
 New Direction for Change—Chicago, IL.
 New Orleans Women's Health Clinic—New Orleans, LA.
 New Orleans Women's Health & Justice Initiative—New Orleans, LA.

Neill Resident Association—St. Paul, MN.
 North Valley Community Cooperative—North Valley, NM.
 North West Bronx Community & Clergy Coalition—New York, NY.
 North West Side Housing Center—Chicago, IL.
 New York City AIDS Housing Network—New York, NY.
 New York City Public Housing Residents Alliance—New York, NY.
 Oahu Housing Task Force—Oahu, HI.
 Old Colony Tenant Task Force—Boston, MA.
 Organization of the North East—Chicago, IL.
 Organizing Neighborhood Equity DC—Washington, D.C.
 Peabody-Englewood Tenant Task Force—Boston, MA.
 People for Community Recovery—Chicago, IL.
 People Organized for Westside Renewal—Los Angeles, CA.
 People Organized to Win Employment Rights—San Francisco, CA.
 People Organizing to Demand Environmental & Economic Rights—San Francisco, CA.
 People United to Secure Housing—Kalamazoo, MI.
 Pittsburg Community Reinvestment Corporation—Pittsburg, PA.
 Portland Tenants Union—Portland, ME.
 Praxis Project—National.
 Public Housing Association of Residents—Charlottesville, VA.
 Public Housing Residents of the Lower East Side—New York, NY.
 Public Housing Residents of Trumbull Park Homes—Chicago, IL.
 Resident Owned Business, Inc.—Gary, IN.
 Residents of Salem United—Salem, OH.
 Rhode Island HUD Tenant Project—Rhode Island State.
 Richland Resident Council—Richland County, MT.
 Rogers Park Section 8 Tenants Council—Chicago, IL.
 Rose Garden Apartment Association of Residents—Las Vegas, NV.
 Safe Streets/Strong Communities—New Orleans, LA.
 Senior Action Council—Phoenix, AZ.
 Seventy St. Botolph Street Tenant Taskforce—Boston, MA.
 Single Mothers on the Move—Hartford, CT.
 South Austin Coalition Community Council—Chicago, IL.
 Southside Together Organizing for Power—Chicago, IL.
 Sunflower Community Action—Kansas State.
 Survivors Village—New Orleans, LA.
 Sutter View Resident Council—Cincinnati, OH.
 Syracuse United Neighbors—Syracuse, NY.
 Tenants Union of Washington State—Washington State.
 Tenants Rallying In Unity to Maintain Public Housing—New York, NY.
 Transadvocacy Coalition—Hartford, CT.
 Tri-City Resident Council—Southeastern Kentucky.
 Union de Vecinos—Los Angeles, CA.
 United Community Housing Coalition—Hartland, VT.
 United Residents for Housing Rights—Jackson, OH.
 Upland Residents Association—Upland, CA.
 West Broadway Tenant Task Force—Boston, MA.
 Whittier Street Tenant Task Force—Boston, MA.
 Winton Terrace Resident Association—Cincinnati, OH.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF HOUSING
 AND REDEVELOPMENT OFFICIALS,
 Washington DC, February 1, 2008.

Hon. ALBIO SIREs,
House of Representatives,
 Washington DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE SIREs: On behalf of the more than 22,000 members of the National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials (NAHRO), I am pleased to join with our industry colleagues the Public Housing Authority Directors Association (PHADA) and the Council of Large Public Housing Agencies (CLPHA) in formally expressing our strong support for House passage of H.R. 3521, "The Public Housing Asset Management and Improvement Act."

We believe H.R. 3521 contains provisions that will help ensure a responsible and practicable transition to asset management. The bill would establish a reasoned process for defining and determining management and related fees and a suitable transition period for implementing them. The bill also addresses concerns expressed by NAHRO and our industry colleagues with regard to the practicality and cost-effectiveness of asset management for local housing agencies with fewer than 500 public housing units. We believe H.R. 3521 correctly makes the transition to asset management optional for agencies with portfolios of this size. The legislation also confirms current law enabling the use of capital fund dollars used for operating purposes as permitted for central office costs.

Finally the legislation reaffirms current statute with respect to the right of residents to provide input and participate in the development of local agency policies.

NAHRO maintains that the provisions contained in H.R. 3521 are necessary and would, upon final enactment, resolve some of the more difficult and problematic concerns expressed by our members with regard to the transition to asset management as defined by recent HUD policies and directives. NAHRO has and will continue to work with the Department to ensure a smooth transition to public housing asset management, but strongly feels that congressional action providing clarity and certainty with respect to the items noted above is necessary and warranted.

We thank you for your leadership on this issue and stand ready to be of further assistance as appropriate.

Respectfully,

SAUL N. RAMIREZ, JR.

COUNCIL OF LARGE
 PUBLIC HOUSING AUTHORITIES,
 Washington, DC, January 30, 2008.

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

DEAR CHAIRMAN FRANK: On behalf of the Council of Large Public Housing Authorities (CLPHA), I am writing in support of H.R. 3521, the Public Housing Asset Management Improvement Act of 2007, and to urge passage of this sensible legislation by the U.S. House of Representatives.

Asset management is landmark program change now several years in the making. CLPHA members have made the commitment to transition to a flexible asset management system, a shift involving sweeping management and accounting changes.

Provisions in the legislation of most concern to our members are those relating to management and related fees and the prohibition on restriction of fungibility of capital fund amounts. The legislation allows:

Housing agencies and HUD to have an expanded formal process by April 1, 2009, the basis of which is already established in the Public Housing Operating Fund Final Rule,

enabling the negotiation of appropriate property management, bookkeeping and asset management fees. Once arrived upon, execution of those fees would commence in 2011; and

Housing agencies to use a portion of their Capital Fund grant towards eligible operating expenses. This provision was first established by Congress in 1996 and reinforced in the 2008 HUD appropriations bill in recognition of housing agencies' need for funding flexibility—a need which has only increased over time.

We thank you for your leadership and support of public housing and look forward to working with you on passage of this legislation.

Sincerely,

SUNIA ZATERMAN,
Executive Director.

NATIONAL HOUSING LAW PROJECT,
Oakland, CA, February 25, 2008.

Hon. ALBIO SIREs,
Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs, Longworth Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SIREs: We are writing to convey our support for H.R. 3521, the Public Housing Asset Management Improvement Act. The focus of our support is based upon the resident participation provision.

The National Housing Law Project (NHLP) is a 40 year old national housing law and advocacy center whose mission is to advance housing justice for poor people. NHLP's goals are to increase and preserve the supply of decent affordable housing, improve housing conditions for very low-income persons and households, expand and enforce low-income tenants' and homeowners' rights and increase housing opportunities for racial and ethnic minorities. In pursuit of these goals, NHLP provides support through written materials, training, legislative and administrative advocacy, litigation, and technical assistance on housing issues affecting very low income families. NHLP works with numerous legal services organizations around the country.

HUD and public housing agencies (PHAs) are currently engaged in the very substantial effort of transitioning to and implementing asset management. This effort is having a substantial impact at the local level. PHAs that never applied for operating subsidies are now doing so. Other PHAs are experiencing cuts in operating subsidies due to asset management and the new funding formula. All PHAs are making new staffing and program determinations because of the requirements of project-based management and project-based budgets, all of which affect current residents. Simultaneously most PHAs are experiencing a cut in operating subsidies because of the low level of funding for such subsidies. In this environment of change, it is vital that the Secretary of HUD issue guidance supporting resident participation in the implementation of asset management and the development of local policies that arise from that effort.

It is also critical that Congress recognize the rights of public housing residents to organized and represent their members. Previously, Congress recognize these rights for residents of other federally assisted but privately owned housing. See 12 U.S.C. §1715z-1b(4). It is important that Congress also recognize the same rights for the approximately 1.2 million public housing families.

Sincerely,

CATHERINE M. BISHOP,
Staff attorney.

PUBLIC HOUSING AUTHORITIES
DIRECTORS ASSOCIATION,
Washington, DC, January 31, 2008.

Hon. ALBIO SIREs,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE SIREs: On behalf of its members. PHADA thanks you for your support of the public housing program and for your efforts to ensure the workability of public housing asset management. Asset management is a landmark program change now several years in the making. During this time, PHADA has advocated for a cost-effective and practicable transition to asset management; a transition that would also enable smaller housing agencies (for whom the transition to individual project based management is neither cost effective nor practical) to be exempt from the process altogether.

The Public Housing Asset Management Improvement Act of 2008 (H.R. 3521) would authorize in statute recommendations long advocated for and broadly supported by PHADA's membership; recommendations that would accomplish this overall objective. PHADA is pleased to express its strong support for the passage of this important and necessary legislation.

H.R. 3521 will make possible the following:

1. In 2009, housing agencies and HUD will have an expanded formal process, the basis of which is already established in the Public Housing Operating Fund Final Rule, enabling the negotiation of appropriate property management, bookkeeping and asset management fees. Further, once arrived upon, execution of those fees would commence in 2011.

2. Small housing authorities that own and manage between 250 to 500 public housing units, 12 percent of all agencies, will gain regulatory relief in that the transition to asset management will be optional for them.

3. The legislation upholds current statute by which public housing residents may organize and participate in the development of policies at public housing agencies.

PHADA believes these simple provisions will mitigate implementation impediments broadly identified by its members and would provide flexibility critical to housing agencies' survival in a time of dwindling resources.

PHADA views these items as being essential to the fair, efficient and effective implementation of asset management as currently defined by HUD. It welcomes the opportunity to continue to work with the Department and Members of Congress to ensure that the administration of asset management is handled in a responsible manner going forward. Thank you for the opportunity to express these views.

Respectfully,

TIMOTHY G. KAISER,
Executive Director.

Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to yield back the balance of my time, but not before saying that I urge a "yes" vote on the previous question and the rule and remind people that this passed the Financial Services Committee by voice vote.

Oh, no, we are not here about FISA. We are not here about earmarks. We are here about public housing for poor people in a country that has dumped on them over and over and over again. We will get to earmarks. We will get to FISA.

The material previously referred to by Mr. SIREs is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 974

OFFERED BY MR. SESSIONS OF TEXAS

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 4. "That upon adoption of this resolution, before consideration of any order of business other than one motion that the House adjourn, the bill (H.R. 3773) to amend the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 to establish a procedure for authorizing certain acquisitions of foreign intelligence, and for other purposes, with Senate amendment thereto, shall be considered to have been taken from the Speaker's table. A motion that the House concur in the Senate amendment shall be considered as pending in the House without intervention of any point of order. The Senate amendment and the motion shall be considered as read. The motion shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the Majority Leader and the Minority Leader or their designees. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to final adoption without intervening motion."

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

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

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

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

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

Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

On approving the Journal, by the yeas and nays;

On ordering the previous question on H. Res. 974, by the yeas and nays;

On adopting the resolution, if ordered.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 226, nays 183, answered "present" 1, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 72]
YEAS—226

Abercrombie	Bean	Bishop (NY)
Ackerman	Becerra	Bishop (UT)
Andrews	Berkley	Blumenauer
Arcuri	Berman	Boren
Baca	Berry	Boswell
Baird	Bilirakis	Boucher
Baldwin	Bishop (GA)	Boyd (FL)

Boyd (KS)	Hunter	Peterson (PA)
Brady (PA)	Inslee	Petri
Braley (IA)	Israel	Pickering
Brown, Corrine	Jackson (IL)	Pomeroy
Buchanan	Jackson-Lee	Price (NC)
Butterfield	(TX)	Rahall
Capps	Jefferson	Rangel
Capuano	Johnson (GA)	Reyes
Cardoza	Johnson (IL)	Richardson
Carnahan	Johnson, E. B.	Rodriguez
Castor	Jones (NC)	Ross
Chandler	Kagen	Rothman
Clarke	Kanjorski	Roybal-Allard
Clay	Kaptur	Ruppersberger
Cleaver	Kennedy	Salazar
Clyburn	Kildee	Sánchez, Linda
Cohen	Kilpatrick	T.
Conyers	Kind	Sarbanes
Cooper	Klein (FL)	Saxton
Costa	Kucinich	Schakowsky
Costello	Kuhl (NY)	Schiff
Courtney	Lampson	Schwartz
Cramer	Langevin	Scott (GA)
Crowley	Larsen (WA)	Scott (VA)
Cummings	Larson (CT)	Serrano
Davis (AL)	Lee	Sestak
Davis (CA)	Levin	Shea-Porter
Davis (IL)	Lewis (GA)	Sherman
Davis, Lincoln	Linder	Shuster
DeFazio	Lipinski	Sires
DeGette	Loeback	Skelton
Delahunt	Lofgren, Zoe	Slaughter
DeLauro	Lowey	Smith (NJ)
Dent	Maloney (NY)	Smith (WA)
Dicks	Markay	Snyder
Dingell	Marshall	Solis
Doggett	Matsui	Space
Doyle	McCarthy (NY)	Spratt
Edwards	McCollum (MN)	Stark
Ellison	McDermott	Sullivan
Emanuel	McGovern	Tanner
Engel	McIntyre	Tauscher
Eshoo	McNerney	Taylor
Etheridge	McNulty	Thompson (CA)
Farr	Meek (FL)	Thompson (MS)
Fattah	Meeks (NY)	Tierney
Filner	Melancon	Towns
Frank (MA)	Michaud	Tsongas
Gerlach	Miller (NC)	Turner
Gillibrand	Miller, George	Udall (CO)
Green, Al	Moore (KS)	Udall (NM)
Green, Gene	Grijalva	Van Hollen
Hall (NY)	Moran (VA)	Velázquez
Hare	Murphy (CT)	Visclosky
Harman	Murphy, Patrick	Walz (MN)
Hastings (FL)	Murtha	Wasserman
Herseht Sandlin	Nadler	Schultz
Higgins	Napolitano	Neal (MA)
Hill	Neal (MA)	Watson
Hinchey	Oberstar	Watt
Hinojosa	Obey	Waxman
Hirono	Olver	Weiner
Hodes	Ortiz	Welch (VT)
Hoekstra	Pallone	Whitfield (KY)
Holden	Pascrell	Wilson (OH)
Holt	Pastor	Wu
Honda	Paul	Wynn
Hooley	Payne	Yarmuth
Hoyer	Perlmutter	

NAYS—183

Aderholt	Calvert	Duncan
Akin	Camp (MI)	Ehlers
Alexander	Campbell (CA)	Ellsworth
Altmire	Cannon	Emerson
Bachmann	Cantor	English (PA)
Bachus	Capito	Everett
Barrett (SC)	Carney	Fallin
Barrow	Carter	Feeney
Bartlett (MD)	Castle	Ferguson
Barton (TX)	Chabot	Flake
Biggert	Coble	Forbes
Bilbray	Cole (OK)	Fortenberry
Blackburn	Conaway	Fossella
Blunt	Crenshaw	Fox
Boehner	Cubin	Franks (AZ)
Bonner	Cuellar	Frelinghuysen
Bono Mack	Culberson	Gallegly
Boozman	Davis (KY)	Garrett (NJ)
Boustany	Davis, David	Giffords
Brady (TX)	Davis, Tom	Gilchrest
Broun (GA)	Deal (GA)	Gingrey
Brown (SC)	Diaz-Balart, L.	Goode
Brown-Waite,	Diaz-Balart, M.	Goodlatte
Ginny	Donnelly	Gordon
Burgess	Doolittle	Granger
Burton (IN)	Drake	Hall (TX)
Buyer	Dreier	Hastings (WA)

Hayes	McMorris	Ryan (WI)
Heller	Rodgers	Sali
Hensarling	Mica	Sanchez, Loretta
Herger	Miller (FL)	Schmidt
Hobson	Miller (MI)	Sensenbrenner
Inglis (SC)	Miller, Gary	Sessions
Issa	Mitchell	Shadegg
Johnson, Sam	Moran (KS)	Shays
Jordan	Murphy, Tim	Shimkus
King (IA)	Musgrave	Shuler
King (NY)	Myrick	Simpson
Kingston	Neugebauer	Smith (NE)
Kirk	Nunes	Smith (TX)
Kline (MN)	Pearce	Souder
Knollenberg	Pence	Stearns
LaHood	Peterson (MN)	Stupak
Lamborn	Pitts	Terry
Latham	Platts	Thornberry
LaTourette	Poe	Tiahrt
Latta	Porter	Tiberi
Lewis (CA)	Price (GA)	Upton
Lewis (KY)	Putnam	Walberg
LoBiondo	Radanovich	Walden (OR)
Lucas	Ramstad	Walsh (NY)
Mack	Regula	Wamp
Mahoney (FL)	Rehberg	Weldon (FL)
Manzullo	Reichert	Weller
Matheson	Renzi	Westmoreland
McCarthy (CA)	Rogers (AL)	Wilson (NM)
McCaul (TX)	Rogers (KY)	Wilson (SC)
McCotter	Rogers (MI)	Wittman (VA)
McCrery	Rohrabacher	Wolf
McHenry	Ros-Lehtinen	Young (AK)
McHugh	Roskam	Young (FL)
McKeon	Royce	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Tancredo

NOT VOTING—18

Allen	Keller	Rush
Gohmert	Lungren, Daniel	Ryan (OH)
Gonzalez	E.	Sutton
Graves	Marchant	Wexler
Gutierrez	Mollohan	Woolsey
Hulshof	Pryce (OH)	
Jones (OH)	Reynolds	

□ 1328

Mr. SHADEGG and Mrs. MYRICK changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia and Ms. SLAUGHTER changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3521, PUBLIC HOUSING ASSET MANAGEMENT IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2007

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on House Resolution 974, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The question is on ordering the previous question.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 212, nays 198, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 73]

YEAS—212

Abercrombie	Berman	Braley (IA)
Ackerman	Berry	Brown, Corrine
Altmire	Bishop (GA)	Butterfield
Andrews	Bishop (NY)	Capps
Arcuri	Blumenauer	Capuano
Baca	Boswell	Cardoza
Baird	Boucher	Carnahan
Baldwin	Boyd (FL)	Castor
Becerra	Boyd (KS)	Chandler
Berkley	Brady (PA)	Clarke