

makes sure that we do not go backward, but we go forward; that we enable, if you will, the individuals who need public housing to have good, clean public housing.

I would like to yield to the gentleman, because I am offering to withdraw this particular amendment, even as it has been softened, to be able to work further on the generic problem, and the generic problem is trying to get housing in communities that do not have 50,000 units, 25,000 units, 10,000 units or 5,000 units, but have under that, and through demolishing have lost the ability to serve those communities and individuals in those communities.

Mr. LAZIO of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LAZIO of New York. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from Texas. I appreciate the spirit with which we have been entering into discussions on the part of the gentlewoman. She has offered, and I appreciate that, to continue speaking with me and with members of my staff, the committee staff, rather, to ensure that we try and meet the needs of low-income people in terms of housing in rural areas. I understand that there is an equal need for housing in rural areas, and that we need to look to new tools to try and enhance what we have right now.

With respect to the gentlewoman's particular amendment, we are going to take a look at it, because we have no hearing record. I want to make sure that I understand the implications and consequences of the amendment, and then I hope we will have several different discussions about this, to see if we can explore some ways of trying to meet on mutual concerns to try and deliver more and better housing for low-income people in rural areas.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas was allowed to proceed for 30 additional seconds.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I appreciate that, Mr. Chairman. I was hoping we could work in tandem and look at this issue so it could be represented in conference that there is a problem, not only with rural areas, I mentioned that, but cities that are not cities that have larger than 5,000 units.

In my instance, Houston is probably representative of some other cities that have less than that, or 2,500 units, who may have some problems on the replacement, and need to have that incentive to do so for those individuals.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAZIO of New York. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the

following Members be permitted to offer their amendments to title II, even after the reading has progressed beyond that title. That would be Mr. MORAN, printed amendment No. 51; the gentlewoman from New York, [Ms. VELAZQUEZ], printed amendment No. 43. That would preserve their rights to offer their amendments tomorrow.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAZIO of New York. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment of the gentleman from Texas, [Mr. DELAY], also be protected, which is a correlary or related to the amendment of Mr. MORAN, and that he be permitted to offer his amendment to title II even after the reading has progressed beyond that title.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, the Klink-Doyle amendment will provide the general public with a simple practical protection from overzealous bureaucratic decisionmaking. It amends the local cooperation provision of section 202 of the bill to ensure that public housing authorities notify and consult with potentially impacted local governments when initiating new public housing programs, including those which stem from an order, judgment, or decree of any court.

Current law does contain limited notification requirements, and H.R. 2 improves on these stipulations. Some might assume that such provisions are adequate to guarantee that communities receive expedient notification and consultation. However, based on experiences in Allegheny County, PA and in cities across the country, we feel that the clarification provided by this amendment is essential.

For 2 years now, the citizens of Allegheny County have been working to comply with the provisions of a consent decree designed to redistribute public housing throughout the county. As HUD and the housing authority began to implement the decree, towns and boroughs were often treated as if their interests and input were unnecessary and unwanted. Thousands of citizens and numerous councils of government were outraged by their nearly total exclusion from any part of the decisionmaking process.

To address this situation, I brought local officials in Allegheny County together into an intermunicipal working group. This group has come to stand together and demand the notification that the people deserve. Many citizens and elected officials in this group have worked tirelessly and have had some success in bringing more openness to the implementation process. Unfortunately, our extraordinary efforts have not been enough. The people need the force of law to guarantee that, at a bare minimum, public housing authorities will keep them apprised of their activities.

Usually, when a housing authority seeks funding from HUD for a new public housing initiative, they must gain some degree of local approval. However, because funding for compliance with a consent decree does not come through normal HUD channels, notification requirements do not have to be adhered to. In

other words, housing authorities can and do legally turn a blind eye to local interests. Mr. Chairman, I believe that this is clearly a loophole which needs to be closed.

Regardless if a public housing initiative is the result of a bureaucratic decision or a judicial decree, the public should have the right to review proposals which will affect their communities. A judicial mandate should not provide a license to ignore the rights of citizens, or be used as a justification to avoid public scrutiny. We must insist these decisions and debates are taking place in the light of day, not behind closed doors, and this amendment does simply that. It guarantees the public's right to know. I thank the Committee for agreeing to include Amendment No. 47 in the en bloc amendment which was earlier today approved by voice vote.

Mr. LAZIO of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. JENKINS) having assumed the chair, Mr. GOODLATTE, chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill, H.R. 2, to repeal the U.S. Housing Act of 1937, deregulate the public housing program and the program for rental housing assistance for low-income families, and increase community control over such programs, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 478, FLOOD PREVENTION AND FAMILY PROTECTION ACT OF 1997

Mr. SOLOMON, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 105-88) on the resolution (H. Res. 142) providing for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 478 to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to improve the ability of individuals and local, State, and Federal agencies to comply with that Act in building, operating, maintaining, or repairing flood control projects, facilities, or structures, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3, JUVENILE CRIME CONTROL ACT OF 1997

Mr. SOLOMON, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 105-89) on the resolution (H. Res. 143) providing for consideration of the bill, H.R. 3 to combat violent youth crime and increase accountability for juvenile criminal offenses, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, and under a previous order