

ethanol subsidies—don't want to touch that. Twelve billion dollars in agricultural subsidies for corporate farms—can't touch that. Tax loopholes for Big Oil while they're gouging us at the pump and not paying taxes in the United States of America—can't put that on the table.

But the Republicans have shown us their priorities, and even their friends in the Senate yesterday refused to take up their bill.

And that's the way it is.

□ 1220

#### SURFACE TRANSPORTATION EARMARK REVISION, SAVINGS AND ACCOUNTABILITY ACT

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, the majority has now been in power for 10 weeks and has yet to offer a plan for job creation. Instead, they have chosen to ignore the warnings of economists from across the political spectrum and are promoting a continuing resolution that threatens to derail and reverse our Nation's recovery.

Instead of slashing programs that are vital to job creation and economic growth, we need to carefully examine the budget and eliminate all wasteful spending. That is why I am introducing the Surface Transportation Earmark Revision, Savings and Accountability Act of 2011, and I'd ask for bipartisan support on this. This legislation will reduce the deficit by \$584 million by rescinding unspent funds authorized by Federal transportation projects requested by Members of Congress that date back to 1978.

Instead of eliminating research at the National Institutes of Health or eliminating funding to protect our air and water, let's focus on elimination of wasteful, unnecessary spending. I encourage you to work with me to include this language in the continuing resolution.

#### ADDRESSING THE CRIES OF THE NATION

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

Ms. HANABUSA. Mr. Speaker, we know that the economy is getting better. We know the job numbers are getting better, but we're still not there. We still have not addressed the cries of the people of this great Nation.

We do know that essential to addressing the cries is a sense of public confidence, and tied to that public confidence is something that is essential to everyone, and that is feeling safe in your home and being able to provide for your family. That is what two bills are about to address in this legislative body, two bills that should not pass—the attempts by the Republicans to defund two major programs that ad-

dress what the people want and what the people need.

One, of course, is the Federal Housing Administration's Refinance Program and the other is the Emergency Homeowner Loan Program. That's for people who are without jobs through no fault of their own, either through unemployment or just simply medical conditions. Thirty thousand to 50,000 people were to be helped with that particular program. The other one is, of course, the underwater loan. Sixty-seven percent of homes in Nevada fall in that category; 25 percent in the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, let's concentrate on giving people public confidence and hope in the future.

#### GOP MESSAGE TO CONSTITUENTS: SUCK IT UP

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, today's message from the House Republicans is as follows—and these are my quotes, by the way—“This House will subsidize Big Oil and Wall Street, but our constituents who are losing their homes can just suck it up and find a bridge to sleep under.”

Just about every economist under the sun agrees that we won't have robust job growth and recovery until foreclosures are under control; but rather than putting forth a proposal to improve the deeply flawed homeowner assistance programs, the GOP panders to its Wall Street base by proposing we do away with homeowner assistance altogether.

I urge my colleagues to join me in rejecting this anti-homeowner, anti-middle class proposal so we can turn to the serious work of improving homeowners' assistance programs that are currently failing.

#### RADICALIZATION OF THE REPUBLICAN AGENDA

(Ms. SPEIER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, the House Homeland Security Committee will hold a hearing that will actually have the potential to make our Nation less safe. The title of the hearing is “The Extent of Radicalization in the American Muslim Community,” but what's truly radical is using committee time and resources to profile and demonize whole communities of people based on their faith. American Muslims are peaceful, law-abiding citizens, and many have cooperated with the U.S. authorities to help prevent terrorist attacks. We should target terrorists based on actions, not religion.

When law enforcement agencies were asked to identify terrorist groups within their States, Muslim extremist

groups ranked 11th out of 18. Neo-Nazis, environmental extremists, and anti-tax groups were all more prevalent. Radicalization and homegrown terrorism are serious and legitimate concerns and deserve thoughtful examination, not an ideologically motivated charade.

We must continue efforts to defeat al Qaeda wherever they exist, but one key to combating extremism is winning the hearts and minds of the next generation of Muslims.

#### PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 836, EMERGENCY MORTGAGE RELIEF PROGRAM TERMINATION ACT

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 151 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 151

*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. 836) to rescind the unobligated funding for the Emergency Mortgage Relief Program and to terminate the program. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair 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. Each section of 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. No amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those received for printing in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII in a daily issue dated March 9, 2011, or earlier and except pro forma amendments for the purpose of debate. Each amendment so received may be offered only by the Member who caused it to be printed or a designee and shall be considered as read if printed. 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.

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman, my friend from New York (Ms.

SLAUGHTER), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 151 provides for a modified open rule that allows any Member to offer an amendment to the underlying bill as long as it is preprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and complies with House rules. This rule continues to build on the commitment of the Republican majority to consider legislation in a more open, honest, and thoughtful way.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this rule and the underlying bill. This legislation was introduced by my dear friend, the gentleman, the chairman of the Republican Conference, JEB HENSARLING, on February 28, 2011, and marked up in the Financial Services Committee last week on March 3.

This legislation went through regular order, which included committee hearings prior to a markup and making the text of the legislation publicly available for Members and the public to review prior to consideration in the committee and on the House floor.

The chairman of the Rules Committee, the gentleman from California, DAVID DREIER, has once again provided Members of this body a transparent and accountable structure under the rule we are debating and discussing today, allowing Members of both sides of this aisle and of this body to offer amendments and to join in the debate of the underlying legislation.

H.R. 836 repeals the Emergency Mortgage Relief Program and rescinds and permanently cancels all unobligated funds. It directs the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to conduct a study to determine the extent of usage of the Emergency Mortgage Relief Program by covered homeowners, which includes members of the armed services, veterans, and Gold Star recipients.

□ 1230

Lastly, it requires the Secretary to submit the report to Congress, including the results of that study and identifying any best practices that could be applied to the Emergency Mortgage Relief Program for "covered homeowners."

The Dodd-Frank Act established a \$1 billion Housing and Urban Development Emergency Homeowner Loan Program, which provides loans or credit advances to unemployed borrowers who cannot pay their mortgages to make mortgage payments for a period of 12 months, with a possible extension.

These loans increase the amount of the homeowner's indebtedness, or the borrower's indebtedness, so that a borrower who is unable to pay back either the original amount of principal or the additional loans made under the program would quite probably be worse off in the long run. These borrowers derive no benefit from the program and the government will suffer the losses from their eventual defaults. That's the way the program was set up by the Democrat majority.

Continued government intervention and questionable use of taxpayer dollars only prolongs our current economic crisis and ensures that the housing market will continue to struggle. The market needs to find its own footing free of government intervention and manipulation so that we can get on with a full recovery.

The deficit is expected to reach a record \$1.65 trillion this year, while our national debt is well over \$14 trillion and growing rapidly. As a matter of fact, growing so rapidly that last month a \$230-plus billion as a deficit for 1 month, the largest in the history of this Nation, was recorded. Yet what do we hear out of the White House? Spend, spend, spend, including against this bill that they have offered to veto because it would save some money. The U.S. simply cannot afford to loan billions of taxpayers' dollars that will not be repaid.

The Obama administration in its FY 2012 budget proposal estimates that this program will have an almost 98 percent subsidy rate. That means for every dollar spent, the government is expected up-front to lose 98 cents. On every dollar of this program, the government right up-front is expected to lose 98 cents.

Mr. Speaker, no wonder Republicans are trying to go back and look at the programs, the massive spending programs, not only by President Obama and former Speaker NANCY PELOSI but also the committee chairmen and those who brought these measures to the floor that have had a stunning impact on the economy of this country.

Also, HUD regulations set up a process where the bridge loan can be forgiven over a 5-year period. This is irresponsible. It is irresponsible not only now; it was irresponsible at the time it was passed by this House, passed by the Senate, and signed by the President. This is not a loan program, but another government welfare program.

Job creation is the most effective foreclosure prevention tool. Job losses—rather than unsustainable mortgage terms—are now the driving force behind foreclosures and mortgage defaults. The government does not need to be adding additional debt obligations onto borrowers who are already struggling with their current commitments, particularly when doing so adds to the debt burden of every single American, including those who took out these loans who have to suffer through the process as they are seeing

their use of a government program that provides not only more debt for the country but tremendous strain on themselves.

Government was not there to help. They were there to indent the American people. Congress should focus on job creation, not welfare and giveaway programs. This is the best way to prevent more foreclosures and to get our economy back on track.

The Congressional Budget Office estimates that enacting H.R. 836 would decrease Federal budget deficits by \$840 million over the 2011–2021 period. My colleagues on both sides of the aisle understand the current dire emergency that we are facing with the state of the U.S. economy and that American families are struggling. Why should the government go and make matters worse? It is our job as Members of Congress and as legislators to ensure that the policy which is passed by this House has integrity and can be backed up by the full measure of a free enterprise system instead of a government backstop. It is that government backstop that Republicans objected to then and object to now.

We need to make sure that our greatest days lie in our future, not the government handing out checks because the government didn't mind the blank check that it originally satisfied itself for in this legislation. We should be creating opportunities. We should not be holding back Americans from earning not only the opportunity for potential in their future but also for making their life better. Eliminating this program will save taxpayer dollars and encourage more responsible government spending by the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, this was an unwise program, and today Republicans are on the floor of the House of Representatives to say we can do the right thing today. I encourage a "yes" vote on the rule and a "yes" vote on the underlying legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend and colleague for yielding this time to me, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I certainly want to agree with my colleague, the gentleman from Texas, that what the world is waiting for this Congress to do is to create jobs. We are approaching 100 days here without a single bill to do that, and we certainly look forward to that great day.

Mr. Speaker, it was not that long ago that this country was facing the real possibility of another Great Depression. The financial crisis of 2008 was caused by reckless decisionmaking on Wall Street that had deep and painful impacts on hardworking Americans everywhere. As a result, millions of people lost everything. They lost jobs, retirement savings, and homes. All across America, families anguished over how to avoid homelessness, how to feed their families, how to keep them intact, how to keep their lives together for just one more day.

Three years later, we are starting to see the signs of a fragile recovery. However slowly, we have started to see modest private sector job growth over the past few months. However, we are far from where we need to be, and the troubled housing market remains in complete disarray. Millions of Americans are unemployed and still struggling to keep up with their mortgage payments. Millions more are saddled with mortgages worth more than their homes.

Foreclosures swallowed up a whopping 1.2 million homes across the country in 2010, up from 900,000 in 2009. Despite the Republicans' apparent lack of concern for the ongoing foreclosure mess, many estimate that the United States will eclipse previous yearly totals and foreclose on even more Americans in 2011.

There is overwhelming evidence that everybody knows about that many of these foreclosures were faulty or downright illegal, and yet no accounting of this failure is demanded. But the people who lost their homes have lost it in major ways and have no recourse except some of these bills. These bills obviously need a lot of help. I couldn't agree more. They are not the best we could do. And yet the sad thing to me is that once these four bills are done away with, there is no replacement, and we simply leave Americans to function as best they can.

□ 1240

If we are a Nation that cares whether or not our neighbors are kicked out onto the street, it's clear that we can't end these programs designed to lend a helping hand without something to replace them. The Emergency Homeowners Loan Program was created to help prevent foreclosures that are the result of massive financial hardships caused by unemployment and underemployment across the Nation.

Admittedly, some foreclosure prevention efforts of the past few years have not had as much success as we hoped. And we certainly have had very little cooperation from banks. They were simply asked to help, not required to. Democrats agree that the programs need improvement and would support a process to allow for bipartisan collaboration. So it's a shame that we stand here today ready to kill this program before it even gets off the ground or has a chance to help stem the tide of foreclosure.

My colleagues on the other side are ready to end the program without offering any solution to what is clearly a continuing problem. But if we don't provide help to our constituents in need, then who? It surely won't be the big banks foreclosing on our neighbors at record numbers. Just today, the New York Times reports that the CEO of Bank of America rejected the idea of reducing home loans for Americans in need. He thinks if he has to do it for one, he'll have to do it for all.

What's fair about big banks reporting record profits by kicking homeowners

out on the street? What's fair about banking executives walking away from their failed mortgage schemes without punishment while thousands live in their cars or subsist in squalor not fit for a global superpower? The audacity to call for a fair modification process after swindling millions of Americans with predatory mortgages and walking away with record profits as the house of cards collapsed is simply maddening. Yet we stand here today preparing to debate a bill that will tell the American people that we just don't care.

With so many homeowners still facing foreclosure, we should be focused on ways to improve programs designed to keep people in their homes. Many of these families are facing insurmountable odds on their own, but with just a little help they may be able to make it through this tough time. But instead of reforming the program, today we are eliminating it.

I would like to talk a little about the process. Today's rule is called a modified open rule, but this is not an open process. For starters, if the debate on the bill inspires an amendment, a Member cannot offer it because it would not have been printed in time. Secondly, if the bill is changed by an amendment, Members will not have the ability to respond to the changes. This limits the give-and-take of ideas that is the hallmark of dynamic and rigorous debate. But the biggest problem with this process is that Members who want to reform the program rather than completely get rid of it must find a germane offset, which is nearly impossible because the bill completely eliminates the program. In other words, any amendment to save any part of it would have to be offset by new money.

We agree that reform is needed. Members have ideas for reform, alternatives to simply eliminating the existing program. Unfortunately, under this process, these alternatives cannot be offered.

I urge my colleagues on the other side to work with us to improve these foreclosure programs, stem the foreclosure tide, and strengthen our middle class. This bill does not do that.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on today's rule.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, by the way, we are working with all the Members of Congress. And that's why we went through regular order, which was a new process for this House from the last 4 years. We also came to the Rules Committee and allowed an open process. And any Member that chose to have an amendment to be offered today simply had to go and tell us ahead of time that they would like a preprinting notice and they could get that done. That is working together with every single Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield such time as she may consume to the chairwoman of the Housing Subcommittee of the Financial Services Committee,

the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT).

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule, House Resolution 151, and House Resolution 150, the rule for H.R. 830.

Last week, the Committee on Financial Services considered and approved two bills: H.R. 836, the Emergency Mortgage Relief Program Termination Act, and H.R. 830, the FHA Refinance Program Termination Act. H.R. 836 would terminate the Emergency Mortgage Relief Program and rescind any unobligated balances remaining under the program.

The Emergency Mortgage Relief Program, created by the Dodd-Frank Act, establishes a \$1 billion fund to provide loans or credit advances to borrowers who cannot pay their mortgages because of unemployment or reduction in income. To date, no funds have been provided to homeowners under this program, and serious questions remain about its cost, effectiveness, and benefits. The CBO estimates the program will have a 98 percent subsidy rate, meaning that for every dollar loaned under this program, 98 cents is not expected to be repaid. Given the country's current fiscal situation, no program warrants funding when benefits are speculative at best and substantial taxpayer losses are certain.

The other bill approved by the Financial Services Committee, H.R. 830, which will be addressed by rule in a little bit, H.R. 830, the FHA Refinance Program Termination Act, would rescind all unobligated balances made available for use under this program. More than \$8 billion in TARP funds have been set aside for the FHA Refinance Program, and \$50 million has been disbursed since September 2010.

For this extraordinary investment of their money, taxpayers have thus far gotten very little return. The administration originally estimated this program would help between 500,000 and 1.5 million homeowners. However, only 44 loans have been refinanced and only 245 applications have been submitted.

This program has been plagued by problems from the start. Borrowers are frustrated that few lenders participate in the program, and it is difficult for borrowers to even find out if their mortgage servicer has agreed to participate. Rather than continue to spend money we do not have on programs that do not work, Congress should focus on creating the certainty job creators need for economic activity and hiring. This means we must root out wasteful government spending on ineffective programs such as the FHA Refinance Program. What the American people want are jobs, not a handout or a program that doesn't work or is ineffective.

I urge my colleagues to support the rules for H.R. 836 and H.R. 830.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

(Mr. ANDREWS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ANDREWS. I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I want to agree with the gentlelady from Illinois who just spoke, who said what the American people want is jobs. I agree with her. And when we assess the record of the new majority on this issue, I think we have to assess that it's found very wanting.

This is the 10th week of the new majority. In 10 weeks, they found a way to shut down women's health clinics by defunding Planned Parenthood. They've found a way to essentially repeal 30 years' worth of protections for our drinking water and our air and our land. They've found a way to pass a budget that cuts education, that saps strength and energy from our job creators in this country, but they haven't found one bill, 1 minute, one debate over a plan to work together to create jobs for the American people.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the American people want Republicans and Democrats to come together and figure out an environment that will encourage entrepreneurs and small businesses to create jobs for our country. The majority has, frankly, done everything but that. And today is yet another bill that I think is a wasted opportunity in that regard.

I view today's debate through the eyes of three constituents I interacted with at home this weekend. One was a gentleman who runs a music distribution company. They produce CDs for people who have written and recorded music and don't have a label yet so they can get their music out to the rest of the world. He employs 500 people, and he wants to grow. And in order to grow, he needs people who are facile with various software and other technologies that will help his company grow. He depends upon graduates from our community colleges and our 4-year colleges and universities. And he didn't understand why the majority wants to cut the maximum college scholarship under Pell Grants by \$845, thereby taking employees away, conceivably, from him by taking them out of school.

□ 1250

It's the homebuilder that I met who really can't call himself a homebuilder anymore because he's not building any homes, and he wonders what we're doing to try to restore faith and confidence to the real estate market so that Americans will feel secure and confident enough to buy a home and put him and his workers back to work. He wonders what we're doing.

It was the gentleman I met yesterday who runs a biotech company that has two employees, and he depends on contracts from the National Institutes of Health to do research on various pharmaceutical products. He wants to double the size of his company, put just two more people to work, but he won't

hire them as long as the threat of a government shutdown is imminent.

This is the wrong bill at the wrong time on the floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield the gentleman an additional 2 minutes.

Mr. ANDREWS. I thank the gentlelady.

What we should be doing is coming together, Republicans and Democrats, to cut spending, to find ways to sensibly cut spending. Many of us on the floor, for instance, 2 weeks ago voted to not send \$1.5 billion to Iraq to fund their police department. Many of us voted not to spend a substantial amount of money for the Brazilian Cotton Institute. Many of us voted to say that if you make over a quarter of a million dollars a year as a farmer you shouldn't get a crop subsidy. These are areas that we agreed upon to reduce spending.

Let's work to sensibly reduce spending but let's not cut education and let's not undermine jobs. By all means, let's bring to the floor a bill that says to my friend that runs the music production company, we will help train the workers that you need; that says to my friend that wishes he were a homebuilder, we will talk to these banks that have record amounts of money in their balance sheets and get them lending money again so people can buy a home; and says to our friend that's running the small biotech company, you don't have to worry that there's going to be gaping cuts in the research budget of the National Institutes of Health, we're going to fund them, and they're going to continue to pay people to be the best and the brightest and find cures to diseases, and you can hire those two more people.

Ten weeks, no jobs bill, no jobs plan, no cooperation to produce an environment where small business and entrepreneurs can put America back to work. Let's put aside our differences. Let's get to work on solving the real problems of our country.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, you know, I'm shocked at our friend after friend on the Democratic side who say "no jobs bill," "no jobs bill." But my friends also recognize what the American public does, that we voted, literally the first vote in this House, to overturn what is known as ObamaCare, the massive government takeover of health care in this country that would result in a loss of 800,000 jobs. Mr. Speaker, the Republican majority does have a jobs bill, and that is to go and rescind what the Democrats have outrageously done and that is to put this country in a diminished position not only with us being competitive overseas but also for us diminishing American jobs.

No, we're not going to go and do a, quote, jobs bill to add jobs. We're trying to simply go back and save the jobs that are being lost today and would be lost by wasteful government spending,

and so my friends on the other side simply want to come and attack us. Well, the Republicans have it, and so do the American people. We are going to stop the outrageous spending. We are going to attack the rules and regulations which are killing not only business but losing jobs all across this country. We, as Republicans, are going to stand up and say \$4 gasoline is outrageous, Mr. President; work on the things from your administration that you are doing that ruin jobs, that make sure we have higher gas prices at the pump, and do those things that would help the American people.

The Republican House majority is one-half of one-third of the body, and we are one-third of government. We are trying to do the things that the American people sent us here for. We are all about trying to reduce wasteful government spending. We are going to take on the laws that have been passed by this President and the former two sessions of Congress that were outrageous spending, tax increases, an assault on employers, making it more difficult for the American people to have freedom and diminishing our future.

So every time one of our Democrat friends goes and says there's no jobs bill by the Republicans, the American people will get it. The Republicans first have to save the jobs that are at risk today; 800,000 net free enterprise system jobs that—if we do not overturn ObamaCare that was passed by this body on March 22, a year ago, we're going to lose even more jobs.

So the most immediate thing we're doing is trying to reduce wasteful government spending, to try and do away with and attack rules and regulations that will kill the jobs that we have, and to make sure that we're telling the American people that this spending spree that we're on causes a massive deficit, a hemorrhaging by this government, including last month \$230 billion we overspent. Then we're doing our job. If we are doing those things, we're trying to save the jobs that we've got.

Mr. Speaker, that is what the Republican majority is about. We're not going to let the Democrats get us off our game. We understand what they want. They want to talk about, well, we can look at doing back to some of the spending, but when it comes down to it, they can't pick anything they really will support. Everything is a sacred cow. Everything that we do is a problem if you go and touch it.

Mr. Speaker, the Republican Party, the Republican majority, led by Speaker BOEHNER and our majority leader ERIC CANTOR, is all about trying to get back to an America where we have a balance, to where we don't lose more jobs, where we don't add more debt, and we stand up for the American people. That's why we're the new majority party.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS) to respond.

(Mr. ANDREWS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ANDREWS. I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I have great respect and affection for my friend from Texas. He's a valued Member of this House and someone who cherishes this institution and represents his constituents well. I would like to respond to two of the points that he's made.

First, he makes reference to this 800,000 job loss as a result of the health care act. There was a prediction made before the final version of the act was put together, very early in the process, by a group that frankly is rather ideologically to his side of the aisle, that predicted that 800,000 jobs would be lost. In fact, most economists have argued that hundreds of thousands of jobs would be gained, but more importantly, Mr. Speaker, than predictions is reality.

The health care law was signed into law almost a year ago, and I wonder if anyone on the majority side could tell us how many jobs the economy has lost in that year. How many jobs has the economy lost since the health care bill was signed into law?

Mr. SESSIONS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. SESSIONS. You asked if somebody who knew the answer would stand up. I don't know the answer, but what I will tell you is that we will have the taxation start, and yet, the plan kicks in 2014. So massive taxation will start, and then we will find out what happens.

Mr. ANDREWS. Reclaiming my time, the answer is that the economy has added over 1 million private sector jobs since the health care law was signed into effect, so predictions of great job loss have turned out not to be the case.

Secondly, the gentleman made reference to the sort of great opposition to this law around the country.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

□ 1300

Mr. ANDREWS. I thank my friend for yielding.

So the fact here is that despite this prediction of 800,000 jobs lost, in fact, the economy has gained more than 1 million private sector jobs since this happened.

But I want to address one other thing that he said. He said that our goal is to "knock the Republicans off their game." We do not think this is a game. We think 15 million unemployed people is a very serious national crisis, and we do not want to play a game. We want to come to an agreement that would create an environment for small busi-

nesses and entrepreneurs to create jobs for the American people.

He mentioned sacred cows. We don't think college scholarships are wasteful spending. We don't think that student loans are reckless spending. We don't think that reading teachers and math coaches for our neediest children is wasteful spending. We don't think that job-training grants for people who have lost their job is wasteful. We think that cutting those programs wastes jobs in the private sector. That's why we oppose their reckless budget plan. That's why we beseech the majority, let's get to work putting Americans to work.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I stood up and openly said I have no clue how many jobs have been added. But the million-job figure that the gentleman quotes is not a net figure. It's not a net figure. We have lost many, many, many times what we have gained. And the net figure means that when you add in what has been added versus what was lost, this country is in trouble. And I think the American people understand this. They understood it last November. They understand it now.

People are scared. They're scared about their future. They're scared about their job. They're scared about how much gasoline is going to go up. They're scared about whether the EPA is going to come put some more rules and regulations on them. They're scared about what will happen in the long run with their job and health care. They see the diminishment of freedom.

They see where we are in trouble not only in our own homes; we are in trouble with our country. They see that we ran a \$230 billion deficit last month alone. They see where this administration is incapable of looking at facts and factors and making a realistic choice about, now that we understand what's happening, what are we going to do when we're in trouble.

The Republican Party is here, and we are not going to be knocked off our game. We're going to go and try and save as many jobs as we can from the onerous rules and regulation, the excessive taxation, and perhaps worst of all, the inattention to try and create a better circumstance for this country.

So that's what we're going to do. We're going to go after and we're going to repeal this ObamaCare. We're going to stay after the rules and regulations, and we're going to make sure that the middle class of this country has a chance to save the job that they have rather than diminishing it.

You have seen, Mr. Speaker, all across this country the States who are in the most trouble have top-to-bottom Democratic-controlled legislatures as well as Democrat Governors. Those States are unwilling to make tough choices. They're unwilling to do the things which would say "no" to constituencies who are special interests. Today, the Republicans are on the floor of the House of Representatives, and

we're saying not only "no" to special interests, but what we're trying to say is that we need to use common sense and balance.

And I recognized 14 years ago when I came up here that common sense is not common in Washington. But today, part of that common sense takes place with, we're going to read the bills before we vote on them; we're going to go through regular order; we're going to relook at the things which have been passed which diminish jobs and which harm our economy. And those are the things which are on the floor today.

Mr. Speaker, I'm proud of our Republican majority. I'm proud of our Speaker, who's from the great State of Ohio, who understands himself, personally, because of the State where he is from, that the State of Ohio is in need of leadership, real leadership, in Washington, DC, just as the rest of the country. And so the Republican Party stands on the floor of the House today. We are about jobs. We're about reducing wasteful Washington spending, and we're going to stand for common sense.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I would like to yield myself 1 minute, if I may, simply to say that one of the things that we're hearing today is that these bills are unneeded.

Let me just quote a little bit from the Dallas Morning News: home prices down 3.6 percent in December, 40 percent of home sales in north Texas are foreclosed and short-sale homes. A Dallas housing analyst said, "There's no doubt the foreclosures continue to have an impact on the market," and they're going to receive 135 million assistance unless all these bills die.

I will insert the full text of the Dallas Morning News into the RECORD. I obviously mention Dallas because that is the district of my colleague, and I wanted to point out that there's pain at home.

[From the Dallas Morning News, Feb. 22, 2011]

DALLAS-AREA HOME PRICES SAG AGAIN  
(By Steve Brown)

Dallas-area home prices show no sign of a rebound in the latest measure. And economists worry that further declines are ahead.

Prices in the area were down 3.6 percent in Standard & Poor's Case-Shiller Home Price Index released Tuesday.

The December report was the sixth consecutive year-over-year Dallas decline in the closely watched monthly survey.

Nationwide home prices were 2.4 percent lower than a year earlier, according to Case-Shiller.

Only two of the 20 cities that Case-Shiller tracks had increases from previous-year levels.

"Despite improvements in the overall economy, housing continues to drift lower and weaker," Standard & Poor's David Blitzer said in the report.

Dallas' decline in December was a bit improved from the 4.2 percent annual price drop that the area saw in November.

Home prices in the area remain about 9 percent below where they were at the peak of the market in 2007.

So far, that's the smallest such drop among all the U.S. markets that the Case-Shiller index tracks.

Nationwide prices have slid about 30 percent since residential values began falling in summer 2006.

Dallas prices at the end of 2010 were about 5 percent lower than they were in June, when the local housing market appeared to have turned the corner.

Since then, sales have plunged and the number of foreclosures coming onto the market has grown—both creating downward pressure on prices.

“There’s no doubt the foreclosures continue to have an impact on the market,” said David Brown, who heads the Dallas office of housing analyst Metrostudy Inc. “We are [also] continuing to see the effect of the slowdown in sales after the tax credit expired.

POSITIVE, BUT . . .

“I think the reports will start to turn more positive in the second half of the year,” Brown said.

In the meantime, economic growth in the area and expected gains in home sales later in 2011 will reduce the unsold inventory, he said.

But there are also worries that thousands of public-sector layoffs will add to the housing sector’s woes. “Most of the people who work in the public sector are homeowners,” said Dr. James Gaines, an economist with the Real Estate Center at Texas A&M University. “It will be like another wave of private-sector layoffs.”

Gaines said it’s too early to tell how many teachers and other state and local government workers will lose their income because of Texas’ huge budget shortfall.

But he knows the impact of these layoffs could cause further home foreclosures and certainly reduce potential housing purchases. “Hopefully, the private sector will absorb some of these folks losing their jobs,” Gaines said. “It depends on how severe it is.”

Case-Shiller said that at the end of 2010, the biggest home price declines were in Detroit, down 9.1 percent from a year earlier, and Phoenix, down 8.3 percent.

Washington, D.C., (up 4.1 percent) and San Diego (up 1.7 percent) were the only markets that Case-Shiller studied where December prices were higher.

Dallas-area home prices began falling in July after eight months of year-over-year gains.

TROUBLED PROPERTIES

By recent estimates, almost 40 percent of monthly home sales in North Texas are distressed properties—previously foreclosed and short-sale homes. On average, these homes sell for about 30 percent below nondistressed prices.

Case-Shiller looks at the actual value of specific single-family homes over time. The index does not include condominiums and townhouses. It only covers pre-owned properties—no new construction.

Declining home prices.

Percentage change in home prices in December 2010 compared to year earlier in each market.

Atlanta	-8.0%
Boston	-0.8%
Charlotte	-4.4%
Chicago	-7.4%
Cleveland	-4.0%
Dallas	-3.6%
Denver	-2.4%
Detroit	-9.1%
Las Vegas	-4.7%
Los Angeles	-0.2%
Miami	-3.7%
Minneapolis	-5.3%
New York	-2.3%
Phoenix	-8.3%
Portland	-7.8%
San Diego	1.7%
San Francisco	-0.4%

Seattle	-6.0%
Tampa	-6.2%
Washington	4.1%
Composite—20 city	-2.4%

Source: Standard & Poor’s and Fiserv

Mr. Speaker, I now yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS).

Mr. CUMMINGS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

As I said on the floor this morning and listening to my esteemed colleague on the other side, I must tell you that I am a bit upset, for he talks about common sense and balance. These two words, “common sense” and “balance,” are something that I talk about all the time. As the ranking member of the Government Oversight and Reform Committee, we talk about common sense; and we talk about balance.

And part of common sense and balance is trying to make sure our children are educated. Part of common sense and balance is making sure that I helped my neighbor who just died of cancer. I would have to go into my pocket over and over again to give him the money to supplement his chemo. Common sense and balance.

Common sense and balance is trying to make sure that people will have jobs when I appear at my jobs fair in a few weeks, and that it won’t be just like last year where 9,000 people showed up at 6 o’clock in the morning and circled around the buildings. Common sense and balance means that the students at Morgan State University will not have their Pell Grants reduced by \$800 when they are struggling right now. They’re working and trying to get a job if they can get one, and working doing the best that they can, and then it’s their turn. Common sense and balance says we don’t cut them off.

And so as I listen, I think about all of this, and I’m trying to figure out, how do the American people get common sense and balance out of what is going on in this House?

Now, with regard to I heard my friend talk about regulations, just this morning in a hearing that we had in Government Reform, we had all of these execs from corporations come and talk about how they wanted to get rid of “job-killing” regulations. Every one of them agreed with me that regulations are important because they protect the health, welfare and safety of people. And as I told them this morning, I said to them, and I was very clear, I said, when I was a young student, a high school student, and I would go to Bethlehem Steel every summer to work, when I blew my nose after being there for an hour, when the mucus came out, it was black. It was regulations that addressed that. And there were men who had been there 40 years who were breathing that every day, 8 hours a day. And many of them died early. Common sense and balance.

Common sense and balance. And then I said to my constituents, and I said it to them at a town hall meeting this week, I said, I wish the Congress would

address issues like we deal with our family problems. If you’ve got a family problem, if you have got a daughter or a son who wants to go to college, maybe go to an expensive college, you don’t say to them, you’re not going to go to college. You find a way to, yeah, cut back on some things. You don’t cut back on everything. You don’t say to that child, you cannot go to school because it’s now their turn. You just don’t turn your back on them. You don’t cut off people’s jobs and their training when they’re trying to be retrained, when that father who’s lost his job is trying to be retrained—

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. CUMMINGS. So common sense and balance.

I rise today in strong opposition to this rule, which provides for consideration of H.R. 836, a bill that seeks to kill the Emergency Homeowner Loan Program. This program was created to provide limited, low-cost loans to enable borrowers who are unemployed through no fault of their own—through no fault of their own—or who face debilitating medical costs to continue paying their mortgages until they have made their way through the storm.

□ 1310

By the way, a lot of people say they will never face these medical costs. Well, all of us are the walking wounded. All of us will face difficult problems. The question is: Will America be the America it has always been? We do not get our authority by might; we get it by the way we treat each other.

And so these folks are going through some difficult times. These are the same people that this loan program is about; these are the same people who have shown up time after time sitting in the front row of something I call my foreclosure prevention program with tears running down their faces. Many of them have never missed a mortgage payment, have worked hard every day and have done everything that was required of them. These are our American neighbors. They are the American neighbors who sit in Ohio. They are the ones in California and New York. Those are our neighbors. They are in a time of need.

We are talking about a billion-dollar program to try to help people as they are struggling, trying to get up after an economy—by the way, where regulations failed them. They find themselves in these difficulties in many instances because people were not regulated properly.

And, yes, it upsets me because I go back to a district every night, 40 miles away from here, where people are sad and there are areas in my district where you probably have 25 percent unemployment. So I care about the jobs. They are important to me. I care about people living and staying in their homes.

And so if anything was said by the November elections, it was about we need to sit down and get together and work through people's problems like any family would address family problems. And we must be about the business of making sure that we do those things to have a future. I don't want any child in America—I don't care whether he is in your district, Mr. Speaker, or anybody else's district—I want every child to have an opportunity. I want the same opportunities for your children, Mr. Speaker, as I want for mine.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to inform the gentlewoman from New York that I have no further requests for time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, the facts of this case state very clearly that this Nation is being overrun; it is being overrun by too much taxing, too much borrowing, too much spending. Just last month, we hit a record deficit, \$223 billion. This is unacceptable. The status quo of where we are moving is not acceptable. With the debt looming at \$14 trillion and unemployment hovering across the country at 9 percent, and much higher in many areas of the country, including congressional districts that are hurting even more, and I understand this because those who first lose their jobs many times are disabled people and I understand disabled people and their plight that they have also and it is sad, and it hurts us as Members of Congress and it hurts the American people. The American people asked Congress to rein in the spending and do something about jobs, and that is what we are doing. We are not making excuses; we are getting the job accomplished.

Eliminating this program will save taxpayers hundreds of millions of dollars. By gaining control of government spending and eliminating wasteful Washington government spending and handouts, the private sector can gain some confidence in the economy and start investing in jobs and a brighter economic future.

I applaud my friend, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING), for bringing this legislation, and to the chairman of the Rules Committee, the young chairman, DAVID DREIER, favorite son from California, San Dimas, California. DAVID comes here and so ably runs our Rules Committee for us. We thank them for providing an open and transparent process.

I encourage a "yes" vote on the rule.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 830, FHA REFINANCE PROGRAM TERMINATION ACT

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 150 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 150

*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. 830) to rescind the unobligated funding for the FHA Refinance Program and to terminate the program. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair 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. Each section of 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. No amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those received for printing in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII in a daily issue dated March 9, 2011, or earlier and except pro forma amendments for the purpose of debate. Each amendment so received may be offered only by the Member who caused it to be printed or a designee and shall be considered as read if printed. 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.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, this resolution provides for a modified

open rule for the consideration of H.R. 830, the FHA Refinance Program Termination Act. It provides for 1 hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services, and for consideration of any amendments proposed by Members that conform to House rules and which were preprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD no later than March 9, today.

Mr. Speaker, I am also pleased to stand before the House today in support of this rule and the underlying legislation, H.R. 830, the FHA Refinance Program Termination Act.

I appreciate the hard work of the distinguished chairman of the Financial Services Committee, Mr. BACHUS, as well as the hard work of the bill's chief sponsor, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DOLD), in creating this piece of legislation which will help this Congress continue to take concrete steps to rein in the out-of-control Federal mandatory spending.

The FHA Refinance Program was originally promoted by the current administration as a way to bail out the so-called underwater borrowers who for whatever reason found themselves in over their heads in personal and mortgage debt and unable to pay their mortgages.

The 110th Congress passed TARP, which was enabling legislation for this new program, thereby effectively allowing lenders to transfer high-risk mortgages, through the FHA, onto the backs of taxpayers in the case of likely default. The \$8 billion in TARP funds was originally identified for this new expansive program.

While no one likes to see homeowners in distress and at risk of losing their homes, the fact of the matter is that this new program, no matter how well intentioned, is expensive and has also proven to be a woefully ineffective program at its best.

□ 1320

Originally it was asserted by the administration that this program would allow up to 1½ million homeowners or, as some reports in the papers said, 3 million to 4 million distressed homeowners to obtain more favorable mortgage terms, all guaranteed by U.S. taxpayers in case of ultimate default.

However, Mr. Speaker, there are several problems with this new mortgage bailout program.

First, in some and perhaps in many cases, this program would subsidize irresponsible lenders and borrowers and insulate them from the consequences of bad choices and, in some cases, intentionally speculative financial choices that were made during the housing boom, thus shifting the economic impact of those bad choices and decisions onto the backs of responsible homeowners and the taxpayers. This is troubling, for this should not be the role of the Federal Government—to pick winners and losers in the marketplace.