

Love
Lucas
Luettkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry

Peterson
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratchiffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)

Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stivers
Stutzman
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vela
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Keating
Nugent
Roe (TN)
Stewart

Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—7

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DOLD) (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1905

So the bill was passed.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained and missed the last two votes in this evening's series. Had I been present I would have voted as follows: 1) Democrat Motion to Recommit—"no," 2) Passage of H.R. 2578—FY16 Commerce, Justice, Science Appropriations Act—"yes."

TRANSPORTATION, HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2016

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the bill, H.R. 3577, and that I may include tabular material on the same.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 287 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 2577.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1908

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2577) making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes, with Mr. BISHOP of Utah in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART) and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to present to the House today for consideration H.R. 2577, the Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act for fiscal year 2016.

The committee has put forth a bill that conforms to our 302(b) allocation of \$55.3 billion in budget authority and is in line with the budget cap of 1.016, "ten sixteen."

Under such an allocation, we prioritized programs and spending to achieve, really, three very important basic goals: first, we continue the oblim funding levels of MAP-21 contingent upon reauthorization; we keep the commercial airspace running smoothly; and also we preserve the housing option for all current HUD-assisted families.

Mr. Chairman, I think this is a balanced bill with the allocation that has been given to us by the chairman. The Department of Transportation is funded at \$17.2 billion in budget authority and \$70.6 billion in total budgetary resources to ensure, Mr. Chairman, the safe and effective transportation of goods and people in America.

The Department of Housing and Urban Development is funded at \$42 billion to provide housing opportunities and assistance to the most vulnerable in both cities and rural areas across our great Nation.

Mr. Chairman, as you know, we are a diverse body and this is a very diverse bill, and I know some Members will speak for increased funding. I would like to remind my colleagues that if you are going to be voting against this bill, you are voting against the commercial airspace system and our air traffic controllers and control system; against housing programs for the most vulnerable, including the elderly and families; and frankly, you would also be voting against community development block grants that are vital to the cities and counties that we all represent.

Some, however, Mr. Chairman, will speak for lower spending. Here it is also important to remember that the House passed a budget resolution, which this bill adheres to, Mr. Chairman, and the Congress and the President are currently bound by the Budget Control Act, which does include sequester. So this bill takes the responsible steps of setting funding priorities for the next fiscal year, many of which are shared, frankly, between both parties, and again, very important, without doing it with across-the-board cuts or across-the-board sequester.

The whole House of Representatives now has the opportunity for full consideration of this legislation. It is imperative that we move this bill to final passage reflecting the amendments obviously adopted by the House, and we move this bill to conference in time for the new fiscal year.

I really need to first thank my friend, the gentleman from North Carolina and the ranking member of this

NAYS—183

Aguilar
Amash
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Buck
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clever
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael
F.
Duckworth
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr

Fattah
Fleming
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Grayson
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsock
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lynch
Maloney,
Carolyn
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney

Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Pitts
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schradler
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas

subcommittee, Mr. PRICE, for his ideas and his support in drafting this piece of legislation. The gentleman, as anyone who has dealt with him knows, gives a lot of thought and careful consideration to the many programs under our jurisdiction, and I appreciate his willingness to collaborate on this bill that is now before us.

I would also like to thank, in particular, Chairman ROGERS and also Ranking Member LOWEY plus the members of the committee, and yes, I must say, especially the members of the subcommittee for the hours and hours spent in hearings, markups, and meetings, working together in a cooperative effort to bring this bill to the floor and

eventually signed into law. Finally, as we can never do enough, I want to thank the staff on both sides of the aisle for their incredible hard work.

I urge the expeditious adoption of this bill, Mr. Chairman, and at this time, I reserve the balance of my time.

DEPARTMENTS OF TRANSPORTATION, AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES
 APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2016 (H.R. 2577)
 (Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2015 Enacted	FY 2016 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE I - DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION					
Office of the Secretary					
Salaries and expenses.....	105,000	113,657	105,000	---	-8,657
Immediate Office of the Secretary.....	(2,696)	---	(2,734)	(+38)	(+2,734)
Immediate Office of the Deputy Secretary.....	(1,011)	---	(1,025)	(+14)	(+1,025)
Office of the General Counsel.....	(19,900)	---	(20,066)	(+166)	(+20,066)
Office of the Under Secretary of Transportation for Policy.....	(9,800)	---	(9,310)	(-490)	(+9,310)
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Budget and Programs.....	(12,500)	---	(12,808)	(+308)	(+12,808)
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Governmental Affairs.....	(2,500)	---	(2,500)	---	(+2,500)
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Administration.....	(25,385)	---	(26,029)	(+664)	(+26,029)
Office of Public Affairs.....	(2,000)	---	(2,029)	(+29)	(+2,029)
Office of the Executive Secretariat.....	(1,714)	---	(1,769)	(+55)	(+1,769)
Office of Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization.....	(1,414)	---	---	(-1,414)	---
Office of Intelligence, Security, and Emergency Response.....	(10,600)	---	(10,793)	(+193)	(+10,793)
Office of the Chief Information Officer.....	(15,500)	---	(15,937)	(+437)	(+15,937)
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Innovative Finance.....	---	---	---	---	---
Research and Technology.....	13,000	14,582	11,386	-1,614	-3,196
National Infrastructure Investments.....	500,000	1,250,000	100,000	-400,000	-1,150,000
Infrastructure Permitting Center.....	---	4,000	---	---	-4,000
Financial Management Capital.....	5,000	5,000	1,000	-4,000	-4,000
Cyber Security Initiatives.....	5,000	8,000	7,000	+2,000	-1,000
DATA Act Compliance.....	---	3,000	---	---	-3,000
U.S. Digital Services.....	---	9,000	---	---	-9,000
Office of Civil Rights.....	9,600	9,678	9,600	---	-78
Transportation Planning, Research, and Development....	6,000	10,019	5,976	-24	-4,043
Working Capital Fund.....	(181,500)	---	(181,500)	---	(+181,500)
Minority Business Resource Center Program.....	925	933	933	+8	---
(Limitation on guaranteed loans).....	(18,367)	---	(18,367)	---	(+18,367)
Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization and Outreach (Minority Business Outreach).....	3,099	4,518	4,518	+1,419	---
Safe Transport of Oil.....	---	5,000	---	---	-5,000
Payments to Air Carriers (Airport & Airway Trust Fund)	155,000	175,000	155,000	---	-20,000
Total, Office of the Secretary.....	802,624	1,612,387	400,413	-402,211	-1,211,974
Federal Aviation Administration					
Operations.....	9,740,700	9,915,000	9,847,700	+107,000	-67,300
Air traffic organization.....	(7,396,654)	(7,505,293)	(7,505,293)	(+108,639)	---
Aviation safety.....	(1,218,458)	(1,258,411)	(1,258,411)	(+39,953)	---
Commercial space transportation.....	(16,605)	(18,114)	(16,605)	---	(-1,509)
Finance and management.....	(756,047)	(764,621)	(725,000)	(-31,047)	(-39,621)
NextGen.....	(60,089)	(60,582)	(60,089)	---	(-493)
Staff offices.....	(292,847)	(207,099)	(282,302)	(-10,545)	(+75,203)
Security and Hazardous Materials Safety.....	---	(100,880)	---	---	(-100,880)
Facilities and Equipment (Airport & Airway Trust Fund)	2,600,000	2,855,000	2,500,000	-100,000	-355,000
Research, Engineering, and Development (Airport & Airway Trust Fund).....	156,750	166,000	156,750	---	-9,250
Grants-in-Aid for Airports (Airport and Airway Trust Fund)(Liquidation of contract authorization).....	(3,200,000)	(3,500,000)	(3,600,000)	(+400,000)	(+100,000)
(Limitation on obligations).....	(3,350,000)	(2,900,000)	(3,350,000)	---	(+450,000)
Administration.....	(107,100)	(107,100)	(107,100)	---	---
Airport cooperative research program.....	(15,000)	(15,000)	(15,000)	---	---
Airport technology research.....	(29,750)	(31,000)	(31,000)	(+1,250)	---
Small community air service development program.....	(5,500)	---	---	(-5,500)	---

DEPARTMENTS OF TRANSPORTATION, AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES
 APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2016 (H.R. 2577)
 (Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2015 Enacted	FY 2016 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Rescission of contract authority.....	-260,000	---	---	+260,000	---
Pop-up contract authority.....	130,000	---	---	-130,000	---
Total, Federal Aviation Administration.....	12,367,450	12,936,000	12,504,450	+137,000	-431,550
Limitations on obligations.....	(3,350,000)	(2,900,000)	(3,350,000)	---	(+450,000)
Total budgetary resources.....	(15,717,450)	(15,836,000)	(15,854,450)	(+137,000)	(+18,450)
Federal Highway Administration					
Limitation on Administrative Expenses.....	(426,100)	(442,248)	(429,348)	(+3,248)	(-12,900)
Federal-Aid Highways (Highway Trust Fund):					
(Liquidation of contract authorization).....	(40,995,000)	(50,807,248)	(40,995,000)	---	(-9,812,248)
(Limitation on obligations).....	(40,256,000)	(50,068,248)	(40,256,000)	---	(-9,812,248)
Fixing and Accelerating Surface Transportation					
(Liquidation of contract authorization).....	---	(500,000)	---	---	(-500,000)
(Limitation on obligations).....	---	(500,000)	---	---	(-500,000)
(Exempt contract authority).....	(739,000)	(739,000)	(739,000)	---	---
Total, Federal Highway Administration.....	---	---	---	---	---
Limitations on obligations.....	(40,256,000)	(50,568,248)	(40,256,000)	---	(-10,312,248)
Exempt contract authority.....	(739,000)	(739,000)	(739,000)	---	---
Total budgetary resources.....	(40,995,000)	(51,307,248)	(40,995,000)	---	(-10,312,248)
Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration					
Motor Carrier Safety Operations and Programs (Highway Trust Fund) (Liquidation of contract authorization)...					
(Limitation on obligations).....	(271,000)	(329,180)	(259,000)	(-12,000)	(-70,180)
(Limitation on obligations).....	(271,000)	(329,180)	(259,000)	(-12,000)	(-70,180)
Motor Carrier Safety Grants (Highway Trust Fund)					
(Liquidation of contract authorization).....	(313,000)	(339,343)	(313,000)	---	(-26,343)
(Limitation on obligations).....	(313,000)	(339,343)	(313,000)	---	(-26,343)
Total, Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration.....	---	---	---	---	---
Limitations on obligations.....	(584,000)	(668,523)	(572,000)	(-12,000)	(-96,523)
Total budgetary resources.....	(584,000)	(668,523)	(572,000)	(-12,000)	(-96,523)
National Highway Traffic Safety Administration					
Operations and Research (general fund).....					
Operations and Research (general fund).....	130,000	179,000	150,000	+20,000	-29,000
Operations and Research (Highway Trust Fund)					
(Liquidation of contract authorization).....	(138,500)	(152,000)	(125,000)	(-13,500)	(-27,000)
(Limitation on obligations).....	(138,500)	(152,000)	(125,000)	(-13,500)	(-27,000)
Subtotal, Operations and Research.....	268,500	331,000	275,000	+6,500	-56,000
Highway Traffic Safety Grants (Highway Trust Fund)					
(Liquidation of contract authorization).....	(561,500)	(577,000)	(561,500)	---	(-15,500)
(Limitation on obligations).....	(561,500)	(577,000)	(561,500)	---	(-15,500)
Highway safety programs (23 USC 402).....	(235,000)	(241,146)	(235,000)	---	(-6,146)
National priority safety programs (23 USC 405).....	(272,000)	(278,705)	(272,000)	---	(-6,705)
High visibility enforcement.....	(29,000)	(29,000)	(29,000)	---	---
Administrative expenses.....	(25,500)	(28,149)	(25,500)	---	(-2,649)
Total, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration.....	130,000	179,000	150,000	+20,000	-29,000
Limitations on obligations.....	(700,000)	(729,000)	(686,500)	(-13,500)	(-42,500)
Total budgetary resources.....	(830,000)	(908,000)	(836,500)	(+6,500)	(-71,500)

DEPARTMENTS OF TRANSPORTATION, AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES
 APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2016 (H.R. 2577)
 (Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2015 Enacted	FY 2016 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Federal Railroad Administration					
Safety and Operations.....	186,870	203,800	186,870	---	-16,930
Railroad Research and Development.....	39,100	39,250	39,100	---	-150
Rail Service Improvement Program.....	---	2,325,000	---	---	-2,325,000
National Railroad Passenger Corporation:					
Operating Grants to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation.....	250,000	---	288,500	+38,500	+288,500
Capital and Debt Service Grants to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation.....	1,140,000	---	850,000	-290,000	+850,000
Current Rail Passenger Service.....	---	2,450,000	---	---	-2,450,000
Subtotal.....	1,390,000	2,450,000	1,138,500	-251,500	-1,311,500
Administrative Provisions					
Rail Safety Grants.....	10,000	---	---	-10,000	---
Total, Federal Railroad Administration.....	1,625,970	5,018,050	1,364,470	-261,500	-3,653,580
Federal Transit Administration					
Administrative Expenses.....	105,933	114,400	102,933	-3,000	-11,467
Public Transportation Emergency Relief Program.....	---	25,000	---	---	-25,000
Transit Formula Grants (Hwy Trust Fund, Mass Transit Account (Liquidation of contract authorization).....	(9,500,000)	(13,800,000)	(9,500,000)	---	(-4,300,000)
(Limitation on obligations).....	(8,595,000)	(13,800,000)	(8,595,000)	---	(-5,205,000)
Fixing and Acceleration Surface Transportation (Liquidation of contract authorization).....	---	(500,000)	---	---	(-500,000)
(Limitation on obligations).....	---	(500,000)	---	---	(-500,000)
Transit Research.....	33,000	---	26,000	-7,000	+26,000
Technical Assistance and Training.....	4,500	---	3,000	-1,500	+3,000
Transit Research and Training.....	---	60,000	---	---	-60,000
Rapid-Growth Area Bus Rapid Transit Corridor Program (Liquidation of contract authorization).....	---	(500,000)	---	---	(-500,000)
(Limitation on obligations).....	---	(500,000)	---	---	(-500,000)
Capital Investment Grants.....	2,120,000	3,250,000	1,921,395	-198,605	-1,328,605
Rescission.....	-121,546	---	---	+121,546	---
Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority Capital and Preventive Maintenance.....	150,000	150,000	100,000	-50,000	-50,000
Total, Federal Transit Administration.....	2,291,887	3,599,400	2,153,328	-138,559	-1,446,072
Limitations on obligations.....	(8,595,000)	(14,800,000)	(8,595,000)	---	(-6,205,000)
Total budgetary resources.....	(10,886,887)	(18,399,400)	(10,748,328)	(-138,559)	(-7,651,072)
Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation					
Operations and Maintenance (Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund).....	32,042	36,400	32,042	---	-4,358
Maritime Administration					
Maritime Security Program.....	186,000	211,000	186,000	---	-25,000
Operations and Training.....	148,050	184,637	164,158	+16,108	-20,479
Ship Disposal.....	4,000	8,000	4,000	---	-4,000
Maritime Guaranteed Loan (Title XI) Program Account: Administrative expenses.....	3,100	3,135	3,135	+35	---
Total, Maritime Administration.....	341,150	406,772	357,293	+16,143	-49,479

DEPARTMENTS OF TRANSPORTATION, AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES
 APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2016 (H.R. 2577)
 (Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2015 Enacted	FY 2016 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration					
Operational Expenses:					
General Fund.....	22,225	22,500	20,725	-1,500	-1,775
Pipeline Safety Fund (transfer out).....	(-1,500)	(-1,500)	---	(+1,500)	(+1,500)
Subtotal.....	22,225	22,500	20,725	-1,500	-1,775
Hazardous Materials Safety:					
General Fund.....	52,000	64,254	60,500	+8,500	-3,754
Special Permit and Approval Fees.....	---	-6,000	---	---	+6,000
Subtotal.....	52,000	58,254	60,500	+8,500	+2,246
Pipeline Safety:					
General Fund.....	---	1,500	1,870	+1,870	+370
Pipeline Safety Fund.....	124,500	152,104	124,500	---	-27,604
Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund.....	19,500	19,500	19,500	---	---
Pipeline Safety Design Review Fund.....	2,000	2,000	---	-2,000	-2,000
Pipeline Safety information grants (by transfer).....	(1,500)	(1,500)	---	(-1,500)	(-1,500)
Subtotal.....	146,000	175,104	145,870	-130	-29,234
Subtotal, Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration.....	220,225	255,858	227,095	+6,870	-28,763
Pipeline safety user fees.....	-124,500	-152,104	-124,500	---	+27,604
Pipeline Safety Design Review fee.....	-2,000	-2,000	---	+2,000	+2,000
Emergency Preparedness Grants:					
Limitation on emergency preparedness fund.....	(28,318)	(28,318)	(28,318)	---	---
(Emergency preparedness fund).....	(188)	(188)	(188)	---	---
Total, Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration.....	93,725	101,754	102,595	+8,870	+841
Office of Inspector General					
Salaries and Expenses.....	86,223	87,472	86,223	---	-1,249
Surface Transportation Board					
Salaries and Expenses.....	31,375	32,499	31,375	---	-1,124
Offsetting collections.....	-1,250	-1,250	-1,250	---	---
Total, Surface Transportation Board.....	30,125	31,249	30,125	---	-1,124
=====					
Total, title I, Department of Transportation....	17,801,196	24,008,484	17,180,939	-620,257	-6,827,545
Appropriations.....	(18,183,992)	(24,015,734)	(17,182,189)	(-1,001,803)	(-6,833,545)
Rescissions.....	(-121,546)	---	---	(+121,546)	---
Rescissions of contract authority.....	(-260,000)	---	---	(+260,000)	---
Offsetting collections.....	(-1,250)	(-7,250)	(-1,250)	---	(+6,000)
(By transfer).....	(1,500)	(1,500)	---	(-1,500)	(-1,500)
(Transfer out).....	(-1,500)	(-1,500)	---	(+1,500)	(+1,500)
Limitations on obligations.....	(53,485,000)	(69,665,771)	(53,459,500)	(-25,500)	(-16,206,271)
Total budgetary resources.....	(71,286,196)	(93,674,255)	(70,640,439)	(-645,757)	(-23,033,816)
=====					
TITLE II - DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT					
Management and Administration					
Executive Offices.....	14,500	14,646	14,500	---	-146
Administration Support Offices.....	518,100	577,861	547,000	+28,900	-30,861

DEPARTMENTS OF TRANSPORTATION, AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES
 APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2016 (H.R. 2577)
 (Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2015 Enacted	FY 2016 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Program Office Salaries and Expenses:					
Public and Indian Housing.....	203,000	210,002	203,000	---	-7,002
Community Planning and Development.....	102,000	112,115	102,000	---	-10,115
Housing.....	379,000	397,174	372,000	-7,000	-25,174
Policy Development and Research.....	22,700	23,907	22,700	---	-1,207
Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity.....	68,000	81,132	73,000	+5,000	-8,132
Office of Lead Hazard Control and Healthy Homes...	6,700	7,812	6,700	---	-1,112
Subtotal.....	781,400	832,142	779,400	-2,000	-52,742
Total, Management and Administration.....	1,314,000	1,424,649	1,340,900	+26,900	-83,749
Public and Indian Housing					
Tenant-based Rental Assistance:					
Renewals.....	17,486,000	18,333,816	18,151,000	+665,000	-182,816
Tenant protection vouchers.....	130,000	150,000	130,000	---	-20,000
Administrative fees.....	1,530,000	2,020,037	1,530,000	---	-490,037
Incremental rental vouchers.....	---	277,000	---	---	-277,000
Incremental family unification vouchers.....	---	20,000	---	---	-20,000
Veterans affairs supportive housing.....	75,000	---	---	-75,000	---
Sec. 811 mainstream voucher renewals.....	83,160	107,643	107,643	+24,483	---
Special purpose vouchers.....	---	215,000	---	---	-215,000
Transformation initiative (transfer out).....	---	(-20,000)	---	---	(+20,000)
Subtotal (available this fiscal year).....	19,304,160	21,123,496	19,918,643	+614,483	-1,204,853
Advance appropriations.....	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	---	---
Less appropriations from prior year advances.....	-4,000,000	-4,000,000	-4,000,000	---	---
Total, Tenant-based Rental Assistance appropriated in this bill.....	19,304,160	21,123,496	19,918,643	+614,483	-1,204,853
Rental Assistance Demonstration.....	---	50,000	---	---	-50,000
Public Housing Capital Fund.....	1,875,000	1,970,000	1,681,000	-194,000	-289,000
Transformation initiative (transfer out).....	---	(-15,000)	---	---	(+15,000)
Drug elimination (rescission).....	-1,101	---	---	+1,101	---
Public Housing Operating Fund.....	4,440,000	4,600,000	4,440,000	---	-160,000
Transformation initiative (transfer out).....	---	(-18,000)	---	---	(+18,000)
Choice Neighborhoods.....	80,000	250,000	20,000	-60,000	-230,000
Transformation initiative (transfer out).....	---	(-2,000)	---	---	(+2,000)
Family Self-Sufficiency.....	75,000	85,000	75,000	---	-10,000
Transformation initiative (transfer out).....	---	(-1,000)	---	---	(+1,000)
Native American Housing Block Grants.....	650,000	660,000	650,000	---	-10,000
Transformation initiative (transfer out).....	---	(-5,000)	---	---	(+5,000)
Native Hawaiian Housing Block Grant.....	9,000	---	---	-9,000	---
Indian Housing Loan Guarantee Fund Program Account....	7,000	8,000	8,000	+1,000	---
(Limitation on guaranteed loans).....	(744,047)	(1,269,841)	(1,269,841)	(+525,794)	---
Native Hawaiian Loan Guarantee Fund Program Account....	100	---	---	-100	---
(Limitation on guaranteed loans).....	(16,130)	---	---	(-16,130)	---
Total, Public and Indian Housing.....	26,439,159	28,746,496	26,792,643	+353,484	-1,953,853
Community Planning and Development					
Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS.....	330,000	332,000	332,000	+2,000	---
Transformation initiative (transfer out).....	---	(-3,000)	---	---	(+3,000)
Community Development Fund:					
CDBG formula.....	3,000,000	2,800,000	3,000,000	---	+200,000
Indian CDBG.....	66,000	80,000	60,000	-6,000	-20,000
Subtotal.....	3,066,000	2,880,000	3,060,000	-6,000	+180,000
Transformation initiative (transfer out).....	---	(-20,000)	---	---	(+20,000)

DEPARTMENTS OF TRANSPORTATION, AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES
 APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2016 (H.R. 2577)
 (Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2015 Enacted	FY 2016 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request

Youth Build (rescission).....	-460	---	---	+460	---
Community Development Loan Guarantees (Section 108):					
(Limitation on guaranteed loans).....	(500,000)	(300,000)	(300,000)	(-200,000)	---
Rescission.....	---	---	-2,000	-2,000	-2,000
HOME Investment Partnerships Program.....	900,000	1,060,000	767,000	-133,000	-293,000
Transfer from Housing Trust Fund.....	---	---	133,000	+133,000	+133,000
Transformation initiative (transfer out).....	---	(-8,000)	---	---	(+8,000)
Subtotal.....	900,000	1,060,000	900,000	---	-160,000
Housing Trust Fund (transfer out).....	---	---	-133,000	-133,000	-133,000
Self-help and Assisted Homeownership Opportunity					
Program.....	50,000	---	50,000	---	+50,000
Homeless Assistance Grants.....	2,135,000	2,480,000	2,185,000	+50,000	-295,000
Brownfields (rescission).....	-2,913	---	---	+2,913	---
Total, Community Planning and Development.....	6,477,627	6,752,000	6,392,000	-85,627	-360,000
Housing Programs					
Project-based Rental Assistance:					
Renewals.....	9,520,000	10,545,000	10,504,000	+984,000	-41,000
Contract administrators.....	210,000	215,000	150,000	-60,000	-65,000
Transformation initiative (transfer out).....	---	(-20,000)	---	---	(+20,000)
Subtotal (available this fiscal year).....	9,730,000	10,760,000	10,654,000	+924,000	-106,000
Advance appropriations.....	400,000	400,000	400,000	---	---
Less appropriations from prior year advances.....	-400,000	-400,000	-400,000	---	---
Total, Project-based Rental Assistance					
appropriated in this bill.....	9,730,000	10,760,000	10,654,000	+924,000	-106,000
Housing for the Elderly.....	420,000	455,000	414,000	-6,000	-41,000
Transformation initiative (transfer out).....	---	(-3,000)	---	---	(+3,000)
Housing for Persons with Disabilities.....	135,000	177,000	152,000	+17,000	-25,000
Transformation initiative (transfer out).....	---	(-1,000)	---	---	(+1,000)
Housing Counseling Assistance.....	47,000	60,000	47,000	---	-13,000
Transformation initiative (transfer out).....	---	(-1,000)	---	---	(+1,000)
Rental Housing Assistance.....	18,000	30,000	30,000	+12,000	---
Manufactured Housing Fees Trust Fund.....	10,000	11,000	11,000	+1,000	---
Offsetting collections.....	-10,000	-11,000	-11,000	-1,000	---
Total, Housing Programs.....	10,350,000	11,482,000	11,297,000	+947,000	-185,000
Federal Housing Administration					
Mutual Mortgage Insurance Program Account:					
(Limitation on guaranteed loans).....	(400,000,000)	(400,000,000)	(400,000,000)	---	---
(Limitation on direct loans).....	(20,000)	(5,000)	(5,000)	(-15,000)	---
Offsetting receipts.....	-7,951,000	-7,003,000	-7,003,000	+948,000	---
Proposed offsetting receipts (HECM).....	-36,000	-97,000	-97,000	-61,000	---
Additional offsetting receipts (Pres. Sec. 244)....	---	-29,000	---	---	+29,000
Administrative contract expenses.....	130,000	174,000	130,000	---	-44,000
Transformation initiative (transfer out).....	---	(-1,000)	---	---	(+1,000)
General and Special Risk Program Account:					
(Limitation on guaranteed loans).....	(30,000,000)	(30,000,000)	(30,000,000)	---	---
(Limitation on direct loans).....	(20,000)	(5,000)	(5,000)	(-15,000)	---
Offsetting receipts.....	-876,000	-657,000	-657,000	+219,000	---
Rescission.....	-10,000	---	---	+10,000	---
Total, Federal Housing Administration.....	-8,743,000	-7,612,000	-7,627,000	+1,116,000	-15,000

DEPARTMENTS OF TRANSPORTATION, AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES
 APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2016 (H.R. 2577)
 (Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2015 Enacted	FY 2016 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Government National Mortgage Association					
Guarantees of Mortgage-backed Securities Loan					
Guarantee Program Account:					
(Limitation on guaranteed loans).....	(500,000,000)	(500,000,000)	(500,000,000)	---	---
Administrative expenses.....	23,000	28,320	23,000	---	-5,320
Offsetting receipts.....	-94,000	-118,000	-118,000	-24,000	---
Offsetting receipts.....	-742,000	-747,000	-747,000	-5,000	---
Proposed offsetting receipts (HECM).....	-28,000	-21,000	-21,000	+7,000	---
Additional contract expenses.....	1,000	1,000	---	-1,000	-1,000
Total, Gov't National Mortgage Association.....	-840,000	-856,680	-863,000	-23,000	-6,320
Policy Development and Research					
Research and Technology.....	72,000	50,000	52,500	-19,500	+2,500
Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity					
Fair Housing Activities.....	65,300	71,000	65,300	---	-5,700
Transformation initiative (transfer out).....	---	(-1,000)	---	---	(+1,000)
Office of Lead Hazard Control and Healthy Homes					
Lead Hazard Reduction.....	110,000	120,000	75,000	-35,000	-45,000
Transformation initiative (transfer out).....	---	(-1,000)	---	---	(+1,000)
Information Technology Fund.....	250,000	334,000	100,000	-150,000	-234,000
Office of Inspector General.....	126,000	129,000	126,000	---	-3,000
Transformation Initiative.....	---	---	---	---	---
(by transfer).....	---	(120,000)	---	---	(-120,000)
General Provisions					
Unobligated balances (Sec. 233) (rescission).....	---	---	-7,000	-7,000	-7,000
Rural Housing and Development unobligated balances (Sec. 234) (rescission).....	---	---	-3,000	-3,000	-3,000
Management and Administration unobligated balances (Sec. 234) (rescission).....	---	---	-2,000	-2,000	-2,000
=====					
Total, title II, Department of Housing and Urban Development.....	35,621,086	40,640,465	37,739,343	+2,118,257	-2,901,122
Appropriations.....	(40,972,560)	(44,923,465)	(42,007,343)	(+1,034,783)	(-2,916,122)
Rescissions.....	(-14,474)	---	(-14,000)	(+474)	(-14,000)
Advance appropriations.....	(4,400,000)	(4,400,000)	(4,400,000)	---	---
Offsetting receipts.....	(-9,727,000)	(-8,672,000)	(-8,643,000)	(+1,084,000)	(+29,000)
Offsetting collections.....	(-10,000)	(-11,000)	(-11,000)	(-1,000)	---
(by transfer).....	---	120,000	---	---	-120,000
(transfer out).....	---	-120,000	---	---	+120,000
(Limitation on direct loans).....	(40,000)	(10,000)	(10,000)	(-30,000)	---
(Limitation on guaranteed loans).....	(931,260,177)	(931,569,841)	(931,569,841)	(+309,664)	---
=====					
TITLE III - OTHER INDEPENDENT AGENCIES					
Access Board.....	7,548	8,023	7,548	---	-475
Federal Housing Finance Agency, Office of Inspector General (legislative proposal).....	---	50,000	---	---	-50,000
Offsetting collections (legislative proposal).....	---	-50,000	---	---	+50,000
Federal Maritime Commission.....	25,660	27,387	25,660	---	-1,727
National Railroad Passenger Corporation Office of Inspector General.....	23,999	24,499	23,999	---	-500
National Transportation Safety Board.....	103,981	105,170	103,981	---	-1,189
Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation.....	185,000	182,300	177,000	-8,000	-5,300

DEPARTMENTS OF TRANSPORTATION, AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES
 APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2016 (H.R. 2577)
 (Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2015 Enacted	FY 2016 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
United States Interagency Council on Homelessness.....	3,530	3,530	3,530	---	---
Total, title III, Other Independent Agencies....	349,718	350,909	341,718	-8,000	-9,191
Grand total.....	53,772,000	64,999,858	55,262,000	+1,490,000	-9,737,858
Appropriations.....	(59,506,270)	(69,340,108)	(59,531,250)	(+24,980)	(-9,808,858)
Rescissions.....	(-136,020)	---	(-14,000)	(+122,020)	(-14,000)
Rescissions of contract authority.....	(-260,000)	---	---	(+260,000)	---
Advance appropriations.....	(4,400,000)	(4,400,000)	(4,400,000)	---	---
Offsetting receipts.....	(-9,727,000)	(-8,672,000)	(-8,643,000)	(+1,084,000)	(+29,000)
Offsetting collections.....	(-11,250)	(-68,250)	(-12,250)	(-1,000)	(+56,000)
(by transfer).....	1,500	121,500	---	-1,500	-121,500
(transfer out).....	-1,500	-121,500	---	+1,500	+121,500
(Limitation on obligations).....	(53,485,000)	(69,665,771)	(53,459,500)	(-25,500)	(-16,206,271)
Total budgetary resources.....	(107,257,000)	(134,665,629)	(108,721,500)	(+1,464,500)	(-25,944,129)

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, as we begin consideration of H.R. 2577, the fiscal year 2016 Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies Appropriations bill, I want to start by thanking our chairman, Chairman DIAZ-BALART, for the hard work he has put in on this bill. He has been open and accessible throughout this year's process, and he has been receptive to my concerns and the concerns that other subcommittee members and other colleagues have raised. It has been a pleasure working with him, and I look forward to continuing to do that throughout this process.

I also want to echo the thanks he just expressed to our hardworking staff, to Dena Baron and her colleagues in the majority, to Kate Hallahan and Joe Carlile on our side of the aisle, as well as Laura Thrift and Kate Roetzer from my personal staff.

Now, unfortunately, I have to add that there is going to be a lot of further work to do. It is necessary, and it is going to be difficult. That is not the chairman's fault. He was dealt an impossible hand in the Republican budget and an allocation that is simply unworkable.

At first glance, it might appear that this bill is a relative winner when compared to other appropriations bills, as Chairman ROGERS did increase the subcommittee's allocation by \$1.5 million. However, the reality is that once you factor in declining Federal Housing Administration receipts, increased Section 8 renewal costs, and other inflationary adjustments, this bill is actually \$1.5 billion below last year's funding level, resulting in fewer services and less capital investment than last year.

Mr. Chairman, the programs under the jurisdiction of this subcommittee are critical to our Nation's economic and social well-being: providing necessary funding to improve housing and transportation options, creating infrastructure jobs for hardworking American families, and ensuring safe and adequate transportation networks for goods, commuters, and travelers. But our Nation's transportation and housing systems face daunting challenges, and on almost every count, this bill falls short.

□ 1915

The President requested a robust increase for this bill for fiscal 2016, calling on Congress to provide the critical investments necessary to accelerate and sustain economic growth. Unfortunately, the bill before us would not even begin to address our infrastructure needs.

In transportation, the bill levies deep cuts to capital programs. As we learned from the Amtrak derailment last month in Philadelphia, these cuts can have clear, direct consequences for the safety of our transportation system.

The bill before us cuts Amtrak by 18 percent—18 percent—below last year. There is no funding for the expansion of safety mechanisms, including Positive Train Control, which regulates the excessive speeds that caused the Philadelphia derailment.

Now, no one can say whether Positive Train Control would have prevented the tragedy in Philadelphia, but cutting funding certainly isn't making our transportation system any safer. How many train derailments, how many bridge collapses is it going to take before the majority agrees that we must invest in our crumbling transportation infrastructure?

The bill before us would also reduce funding for the New Starts program in the Federal Transit Administration by 8 percent below this year, 40 percent below the President's request. It would cut DOT's enormously popular TIGER program by 80 percent. It cuts the Federal Aviation Administration's capital program by \$355 million below the President's request, \$100 million below last year. That will hamper FAA's ability to maintain and improve aging facilities and will slow down progress on the critical NextGen program.

The bill doesn't just provide insufficient funding for critical investments; it also contains toxic provisions completely unrelated to the appropriations process. For instance, riders on truck length and weight have no place in this bill. They should be left to the authorizing committees. The bill also continues to delay full implementation of the Department of Transportation's hours-of-service rule for driver safety by including additional, unmanageable study requirements. These riders, I regret to say, value the bottom line of the trucking industry over driver safety. They will actually make our roads more dangerous.

The bill also attempts to undermine President Obama's new policy related to the United States' relationship with Cuba. Some of the riders aim to prevent scheduled air services and cruise ship travel to Cuban ports of entry.

On the housing side, the bill fails to adequately address the capital needs of public housing. For example, the bill provides only the token amount of \$20 million for the Department of Housing and Urban Development's Choice Neighborhoods Initiative. At such a low funding level, the program won't be able to fulfill its mission—transforming clusters of poverty into functioning, sustainable mixed-income neighborhoods and allowing the children who live there to have the opportunities that all Americans deserve.

The bill contains \$1.68 billion for the Public Housing Capital Fund, which is a \$194 million cut from last year. If enacted, this level would be about the same as the funding level in 1989. That is 26 years ago! Given that new maintenance needs accrue at \$3.4 billion per year, this level of funding would cover less than half the need while doing nothing to address a backlog that now amounts to \$25 billion.

The majority's bill transforms—or, more accurately, devolves—the Housing for the Elderly and Housing for the Disabled programs into purely rental renewal programs. Without capital funding, the supply of safe, decent, and affordable housing for the elderly and for the disabled will not keep up with the demand.

Mr. Chairman, for centuries, our country's economic competitiveness has been built upon a world-class infrastructure that enabled innovation and ingenuity to flourish. This bill and the budgetary levels it reflects undermine the continued viability of our Nation's infrastructure and our economic vitality. We simply cannot write a credible bill until we have a new budget agreement.

This bill clearly illustrates the folly of dogmatically insisting on domestic appropriations cuts as the sole focus of deficit reduction—that is the majority's strategy—while leaving the main drivers of the deficit unaddressed. Under sequestration funding levels, any advancement of appropriations bills is simply delaying the day of reckoning. So let's stop this charade now. Let's not wait for Presidential vetoes or for governmental shutdowns. Let's confront it now! Let's begin serious, broad budget negotiations.

I know we can responsibly chart a course to fiscal balance; we have done it before, as recently as the 1990s. We achieved budget surpluses as the result of a concerted, bipartisan effort to balance the budget through a comprehensive approach. And I mean comprehensive. Revenues, entitlements, military and domestic appropriations, everything was on the table. We balanced the budget 4 years in a row. We paid off more than \$400 billion of this Nation's debt. Why is that lesson so hard to recollect?

By contrast, the current Republican budget gives us the worst of both worlds. It fails as fiscal policy, and it decimates the investments a great country must make.

In its current form, Mr. Chairman, I cannot support the fiscal 2016 T-HUD Appropriations bill. I do remain hopeful, however, that this bill could be improved as it goes through the appropriations process. I will continue working with the chairman as we move forward. I am confident that a new agreement on funding levels can give this bill and America's transportation and housing infrastructure the resources that our national interest requires.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, at this time, I yield as much time as he may use to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS), a friend, a leader, a teacher, and the chairman of the full Appropriations Committee.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I thank the chairman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill, obviously, the fiscal 2016 Transportation, Housing and Urban Development Appropriations bill.

Mr. Chairman, I am proud that we have this piece of legislation. It is our fifth appropriations bill of this year on the floor today. It is the next step in our ongoing effort to fully fund the government before the end of the fiscal year, as is our congressional duty.

This bill, as the chairman has said, funds a wide range of Federal programs that affect every citizen of every district of every State. From the transportation infrastructure that moves goods, people, and businesses around the country to the housing options that help most those in need, the benefits of the programs in this bill are felt far and wide.

In total, the bill provides \$55.3 billion in discretionary spending due to reduced offsets, including lower FHA receipts. The bill represents a \$25 million increase above the current year.

This is a tight budget, Mr. Chairman. Yet the bill targets funds to provide adequate investments in critical infrastructure and much-relied-upon housing programs.

Of the total, \$17.2 billion goes toward discretionary funding for DOT, prioritizing projects that have great benefits to our Nation as a whole and that will help make this Nation's transportation systems safer and more efficient.

This includes \$15.9 billion for the Federal Aviation Administration. A portion of that money will go to what is called the NextGen program to improve efficiency in our airways and reduce congestion and delays.

The Federal highway program gets \$40.2 billion from the highway trust fund, an amount equal to last year, but that is subject to continued authorization. This funding will ensure our roadways, bridges, and tunnels can safely and smoothly facilitate the flow of American commerce.

The Federal Railroad Administration is funded at \$1.4 billion. That includes \$289 million for Amtrak operations, the same as last year, and \$850 million for capital grants, as well as \$187 million for critical safety and research programs. Total FRA funding is reduced by \$262 million, but rail safety, which is so important, is held harmless from any reductions.

In fact, safety was a priority throughout the bill, and that is evident in the funding levels. For instance, the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration received \$6.5 million more than last year, and the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration receives a \$6.9 million bump up to help address safety concerns regarding the transport of energy products.

Beyond these important infrastructure investments, the bill also includes a total of \$42 billion for the Department of Housing and Urban Development. This level will guarantee that all individuals and families currently receiving housing assistance will continue to be served by this program, and it ensures that the 77,000 VASH vouchers which support our veterans remain in circulation.

Important housing programs for some of our most vulnerable citizens, the elderly and persons with disabilities, also receive targeted increases. To help bolster economic growth in local communities, the bill provides \$6.4 billion in grant funding for economic development. Investing in our communities through programs like Community Development Block Grants will allow funds to be targeted to local areas to meet their unique needs.

Now, as with all appropriations bills, particularly in these tight budget times, we had to take a close look at what was mission critical and what was lower on the priority list. Some tough choices had to be made and some programs had to be reduced. Overall, I believe this bill puts everything in its proper place and does the very best within its allotted resources.

I want to thank the chairman of the subcommittee, Congressman DIAZ-BALART. This is his maiden voyage as a cardinal, a chairman of a subcommittee, his first voyage at sea. We hope it is a safe and smooth one. And I am proud to say to him, "Job well done so far." So we wish for you the very best.

Thanks to DAVID PRICE and the members of the committee, subcommittee, all the staff; my counterpart Mrs. LOWEY. I thank all of you for working hard on this bill.

I am proud to support this bill, and I ask my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), our distinguished ranking member of the full committee.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I, too, would like to congratulate Chairman DIAZ-BALART and Ranking Member PRICE in their new roles on the subcommittee. You have worked so hard, you have worked together, and I really do want to express my appreciation. And to Chairman ROGERS, thank you for your work. I would particularly like to thank the chairman for his support of my grade crossing safety requests.

However, the Republican bill to fund transportation and housing priorities drastically shortchanges job-creating investments critical to hard-working American families, like roads, bridges, rail systems, and access to safe and affordable housing. At the same time, it includes special interest giveaways for the trucking industry and other policy riders that make our roads less safe and our rail system less competitive and meddles foolishly in foreign policy.

Despite the fact that our infrastructure needs are increasing, the bill before us takes a giant step backward. We cannot meet tomorrow's challenges by slashing investments in TIGER, transit, and air traffic modernization.

Even though the bill was considered in full committee the morning after last month's tragic Amtrak crash in Philadelphia, the majority voted down amendments to increase funds for Am-

trak capital investments and positive train control, which the NTSB has said would have prevented the derailment. Yet it does not receive any funding in the bill.

□ 1930

While we do not yet have all of the answers to the horrific accident in Philadelphia, we do know that starving Amtrak of funding will inhibit safety upgrades, track, and capital improvements. Our continued failure to invest in road and rail infrastructure is not just unwise; it is plainly a public safety hazard.

Before I turn to housing, it is important to mention the plentiful legislative riders. Christmas came early for the trucking industry: longer, heavier trucks; the stalled enforcement of hours-of-service rules; and inadequate insurance requirements.

Controversial riders have no place in an already difficult appropriations process. At a time when roads and bridges are crumbling and when there is a national crisis of affordable housing, it makes no sense to use this critical bill to meddle in foreign policy by including riders on Cuba.

With regard to housing, adequate funding to renew existing vouchers is provided, but it isn't sufficient to meet our country's actual housing needs.

Significantly cutting Lead Hazard Control will slow the progress on eliminating household toxins despite the fact that the successful program has resulted in lower lead poisoning and in better educational and behavioral outcomes.

Slashing Choice Neighborhoods by \$230 million, or 92 percent below the President's request, guts resources to transform clusters of poverty into functioning, sustainable mixed-income neighborhoods; and it prevents the children who live there from having the opportunities that all Americans deserve.

Employing gimmicks to fund HOME through the housing trust fund perpetuates another gap in the spectrum of affordable housing.

Democrats are more than willing to support bills that make investments to grow our economy and create opportunity for hard-working Americans. Unfortunately, this bill falls far short of that goal.

Again, in conclusion, I want to thank the chairman, the ranking member, and all of the hard-working staff. Although I urge my colleagues to vote "no," I do hope we can move forward and get to real bills so we can work together and complete this process on especially this very important piece of legislation.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. YODER), an indispensable member of the subcommittee.

Mr. YODER. I appreciate the chairman for yielding time in this debate.

I want to thank Chairman DIAZ-BALART, Chairman ROGERS, Ranking

Member PRICE, and Ranking Member LOWEY for their work in putting together what is, I think, one of the best bills to come through Congress as we debate how to balance our challenges with our budget and how to make sure we enhance safety and improve our economy all at the same time.

Mr. Chairman, this is one of the earliest opportunities we have had to debate this piece of legislation in the appropriations process since 1974, which is a commendable achievement. I want to thank Chairman DIAZ-BALART for his leadership, and I ask for the body to support this good piece of legislation.

There are really three great reasons to support this bill.

First of all, it is great for the economy as we invest in our Nation's critical transportation projects and programs and invest in housing projects to help America's poverty families all across our districts.

It helps to promote safety enhancement on our infrastructure by ensuring that our roads, rails, and airways are safe for all Americans. It increases funding for the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration; it increases funding for the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration, and it increases funding for the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration—all to help protect the safety of Americans.

It works to enhance the responsible efforts to spend money in this capital. Most Americans know Washington is spending too much money, and our budget is not in balance. It is a tough job, and I commend the committee for doing the hard work to ensure that we are good stewards of taxpayer dollars, so as to keep to the balanced budget agreement that the House and Senate passed for the first time since 2001.

The bill also works towards needed policy achievements that would help farmers in my State of Kansas or that would help keep the cost of goods down for hard-working Americans because the prices at the grocery stores are too high.

In Kansas, for example, the bill helps to ensure that Kansas laws are in parity with States like Nebraska and Oklahoma when it comes to the length of a trailer that custom harvesters can use. This is a provision that is supported by the Kansas Highway Patrol, the Kansas Department of Transportation, the Kansas Department of Agriculture.

I would ask my colleagues from across the aisle to listen to the leaders in Kansas. The leaders of public safety in Kansas and those within the highway patrol support this provision. Let's not subject the will of Washington over the will of people in Kansas when it comes to helping farmers with truck length for custom harvesters.

It works to eliminate the number of trucks that are on the road. This bill's actually extending the trailer length will eliminate 6.6 million truck trips;

it will save 1.3 billion miles driven; it will reduce carbon emissions by 4.4 billion pounds annually, and it will eliminate the need for every ninth truck in our economy. Truck tonnage is projected to grow by 23 percent over the next 12 years, so it makes sense to move freight in fewer trucks.

The bill also works to enhance a program we started last year for short line rail safety, which would help short line rail companies across this country have the ability to have a stronger and sustainable safety culture as they move more and more of our goods.

Mr. Chairman, this is a good bill. It promotes safety; it promotes our economy, and it creates jobs.

I urge the bipartisan support of this legislation to help the American economy.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO), our colleague who is the ranking member of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, we have all heard about America and American exceptionalism, and tonight, we see here a great new example for the 21st century the Republican majority version of American exceptionalism. A country that used to be the envy of the world with its infrastructure has now become a laughingstock of the industrial world because it is falling apart.

There are 150,000 bridges on the National Highway System that need repair or replacement, and with this bill, next year, it will be 160,000 that will need repair or replacement. There is 40 percent of the road surface on the National Highway System that needs not just resurfacing; it is so bad that it has to be dug up. Next year, there will be more miles that are deficient.

And our transit? There is an \$80 billion backlog just to bring our existing transit systems up to a state of good repair. It is so bad that we are killing people unnecessarily here in the Nation's Capital on the mass transit system; and what does the Republican budget do? It cuts the allocation to the Metro system here in D.C. In the greatest country on Earth, it will be dangerous to ride on the Metro system because we can't afford to fix it.

They failed to distinguish between investment—investment in moving our people and our goods more efficiently—and spending. They rail about spending, but they cut indiscriminately, and they add money in places we don't need it.

Let's go down the list.

In aviation, we want to build a 21st century air traffic control system, but they cut that budget \$100 million.

The Coast Guard is spread so thin it can't meet its own criteria for search and rescue, but they are \$17 million below what the President proposed, and there is no money in here for a new Coast Guard icebreaker. We are a great

maritime nation. We are down to one 50-year-old, decrepit icebreaker. That is not going to serve our country too well.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Then Amtrak, they cut Amtrak by \$251 million in its capital accounts. On the day that we had the Amtrak crash, they cut the capital acquisition account for Amtrak by \$251 million, despite the fact that Amtrak has a \$20 billion backlog.

There are 140-year-old tunnels that are near collapse, which will paralyze the East Coast. There are bridges that are 100, 110, 120 years old—and, yes, we do not yet have the positive train control system on all of Amtrak's routes.

That has been something that has only been recommended for 25 years by the National Transportation Safety Board. This is pretty pathetic.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ROUZER).

Mr. ROUZER. I thank the chairman.

I am proud to lend my full support to the chairman's bill to fund our transportation systems that are so vital to moving this country forward.

Mr. Chairman, important needs of our industries and countless businesses in North Carolina are addressed by this legislation.

First, a marginal increase in the length of twin trailers carrying freight over North Carolina's roads will allow more freight to be carried per trip, thus decreasing the number of trucks on the road. This modest change to 33 feet in length has a large impact on productivity. Slightly longer trailers improve stability because you have a longer wheelbase.

More productivity means a slower growth rate of truck trips on our roads. With this change, there would be 6.6 million fewer truck trips per year; and, according to the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration's data, it would prevent at least 912 highway accidents every year.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is important to note that the North Carolina Troopers Association is focused on supporting policies that promote safety and improve law enforcement in the State of North Carolina and across this country. They support modernizing freight transportation regulations to allow for 33 feet in length.

Mr. Chairman, I submit for the RECORD their letter in support of this change.

MAY 6, 2015.

Secretary ANTHONY FOXX,
Department of Transportation,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SECRETARY FOXX: The North Carolina Troopers Association, founded in 1977, is focused on supporting policies that promote safety and improve law enforcement in the state of North Carolina and the United States of America. We are grateful for your leadership on policies at the intersection of

safety, law enforcement and transportation. From the Charlotte City Council and Mayor's Office to the Department of Transportation and the President's Cabinet, the central questions remain the same. Which policy choices will do the most to keep people safe?

We often work alongside the North Carolina Trucking Association on matters concerning the transportation of freight on the national highway system as well as the extensive network of North Carolina highways and roads. From Murphy to Manteo, we partner with professional drivers to keep everyone safe on the roads.

We support truck safety advances such as lane departure technologies and adaptive speed controls and encourage the continued adoption of modern technology and training techniques.

The less than truckload (LTL) market has a significant footprint in North Carolina not least in the areas around Greensboro and Charlotte. We understand the American Trucking Associations along with other leading LTL companies, the United States Chamber of Commerce, and the National Association of Manufacturers, back a proposal to increase the length of twin trailers in the LTL freight market by five feet with no change to federal weight limits. We support the proposal for several reasons.

First, a marginal increase to the length of twin trailers carrying freight on North Carolina's roads will result in an increase in cubic capacity allowing more freight to be carried per trip, thus decreasing the number of trucks on the road. A modest change in length has a large impact on productivity. More productivity makes it easier to slow the growth rate of truck trips on our road system.

Modernizing freight transportation regulations to allow for 33-ft. doubles means 6.6 million fewer truck trips per year and according to Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration data it would prevent at least 912 highway accidents every year.

Second, studies from the experts at the University of Michigan and the federal Department of Transportation show that an increase to the length of the wheel base without an increase to weight limitations creates a more stable truck for both straight line driving and cornering. Indeed, the proposal for five more feet on twin trailers came from a 2002 analysis from the Transportation Research Board (Special Report 267, 2002).

In addition, fewer trucks on the road will inevitably lead to much needed relief for North Carolina's infrastructure. In 2013, some 9.7 billion tons of freight was carried by truck. The proposal for twin 33s would shift a portion of that freight—the LTL market—into trailers with a slightly longer wheelbase providing benefit for North Carolina bridges.

We are encouraged by your advocacy for better, smarter, safer transportation policies. When the proposal for a five foot extension—with no change in weight limits for twin trailers—comes before Congress we ask you to provide the full support of your office. Sincerely,

*Daniel S. Jenkins, Jr.,
President, North Carolina Troopers
Association.*

Mr. ROUZER. I am also pleased to support the committee's language that would continue to prohibit the use of funds to enforce the restart provisions of hours-of-service rules for our truck drivers. The trucking industry does not need more regulations imposed upon them in the name of safety.

Safety is an absolute priority for their industry. Trucking companies

know that, without good safety records, they will not be the carriers of choice for businesses that need to move freight.

Mr. Chairman, each of these provisions will help spur economic growth throughout our Nation and enable us to better compete and thrive globally. My constituents in the manufacturing and agricultural industries are interested in making Federal transportation policies more conducive to the productive and efficient movement of the goods, and these provisions will help facilitate that.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time both sides have remaining?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from North Carolina has 14 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Florida has 15 minutes remaining.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

As for the ideas that are being thrown back and forth here tonight about highway safety and driver safety, the advocates for highway and auto safety who are looking at this bill and evaluating this bill include the Teamsters and the Short Line Railroad Association.

My own highway patrol in North Carolina came to see me; they came on their own volition, and they had pictures, Mr. Chairman, of carnage on our highways. It left no doubt that they were not interested in seeing heavier and longer trucks and relaxed rules on our highways.

I suggest that Members might want to check in with safety advocates and with law enforcement in their own States and see what kind of assessments they get of this highly irregular effort that is going on here tonight of writing into appropriations bills provisions that haven't had hearings, that haven't had thorough evaluations.

In some cases, they overturn evaluations that are already in the process—evaluations that this body has ordered up—prejudging the consequences and the conclusions of those studies and are moving ahead with ill-advised relaxations in truck and auto safety.

I suggest that Members will want to take a critical look at that.

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

□ 1945

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), one of those additional speakers, a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman for yielding but also for his very thoughtful leadership on the subcommittee as our ranking member.

I rise to express my grave concerns regarding the funding levels for our transportation and housing programs provided in this bill. Once again, the majority has brought a bill to the floor that includes drastic and misguided sequester cuts to programs that are critical to the American economy and to the lives of the most vulnerable and to creating jobs.

Under the transportation title, the bill funds TIGER grants \$1.15 billion below the President's request. Similarly, Small Starts and New Starts are underfunded from the President's request by over \$1 billion. These are programs that create jobs and create economic growth. It is completely nonsensical to starve our communities of the proven Federal investments in transportation that we so desperately need.

The bill before us drastically underfunds our critical housing programs, including \$25 million less than the President's request for elderly and disabled housing. Yes, that is elderly and disabled housing. It zeroes out the housing trust fund, which helps the lowest income Americans, and it is \$320 million less than the request for Choice Neighborhoods. These cuts keep people living on the margins and push more people into poverty and homelessness.

Before I conclude, let me just say how inappropriate it is in this bill, like all these bills that we are seeing, they contain language that would turn, now, this bill, the Treasury-HUD bill, into an ideological and wrongheaded foreign policy document by restricting travel to Cuba. I introduced an amendment to strike this language and will be introducing a bipartisan amendment with my friend Representative MARK SANFORD to do the same on this bill. We need a 21st century approach to our relations with the nation that is 90 miles from our shores, not to cling to cold war era policies.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I yield an additional 1 minute to my colleague.

Ms. LEE. Americans deserve the right to travel to wherever they would so desire. They travel to China and Vietnam; Americans have that right. Why shouldn't they have the right to travel to a country 90 miles off of our shores? Cold war era policies are just that, 50-year-old policies that have failed. They are wrong, first of all. They are very ridiculous at this point, and they don't make any sense. So to keep trying to put these amendments into nongermane bills where it makes no sense is mind-boggling to me. I hope that we can get that amendment out.

I just want to thank the ranking member for his efforts, given the tremendous constraints allotted by Republican austerity budgeting.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CUELLAR), a

distinguished member of our Subcommittee on Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies.

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Chairman, first of all, I want to thank the ranking member, Mr. PRICE, for the leadership that he has provided in this committee, and also, thank you to his staff.

I also want to thank my friend Chairman MARIO DIAZ-BALART for his leadership in working on this bill in a bipartisan way. There are a couple things I just want to point out that are important to the State of Texas. First of all, one of the issues that we worked on together was to make sure that we direct the Federal highway authority to continue to develop a freight network that connects to our high-volume land ports of entry.

Some of the maps that I have seen show that they don't connect to the land ports; but just to give you an idea, in my hometown of Laredo, the largest inland port, if you look at the trucks that come in, those are 12,000 trailers every single day. This is why this particular language got added: to make sure that the freight is connected to land ports of entry and will make sure that American communities are able to get products that are coming into the United States.

The other thing I do want to emphasize that was put in in this particular bill has to do with encouraging the standardization of passenger rail standards between the U.S. and Mexico, which means basically from the San Antonio area to the Laredo area to the Monterrey area, and this is something that will be one of the first. I want to thank the chairman and the ranking member for putting in that language.

Finally, the last thing I want to bring up is the language that helps HUD pay a little bit more attention to colonias. As you know, colonias are third-world communities that have no water and no sewage. Putting in this type of language will help thousands of people that live in third-world conditions. After speaking to Secretary Castro and speaking to the chairman and the ranking member, Mr. PRICE, this will put a focus on that.

I want to thank the ranking member for his good work. I also thank my friend, the chairman, so much for working with me on this language.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I have no further speakers, so I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, I also yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to this bill for many reasons, but one short-sited cut stands out. This bill cuts HUD's Office of Lead Hazard Control and Healthy Homes by \$35 million. Let me explain in the simplest terms I can what a \$35 million cut would mean: thousands of children in the United States will be poisoned.

Thousands of housing units identified as containing lead paint hazards will not be made

safe for the children who live there. Thousands of children will be needlessly subjected to decreased IQ and cognitive function across their entire lifespan, developmental delays, behavior problems, learning disabilities, seizures, coma, and even death. Lead poisoning impacts the decision making center of the brain. Children with lead poisoning are 7 times more likely to drop out of school, more likely to engage in risk-taking behaviors, and more likely to engage in criminal activity.

Lead poisoning is entirely preventable—but to save a few dollars, this Majority will let them suffer. And it doesn't even save a few dollars. The total annual costs of lead poisoning to society are over \$50 billion. Every dollar spent on lead hazard control activities has a benefit of \$17 to \$220 in medical, educational, and criminal justice costs. A \$35 million cut will create a minimum of \$600 million, and possibly nearly \$8 billion in additional costs to society.

In my district in Rochester, NY, 200 children were confirmed with lead poisoning in 2014. Two hundred children. That's ten kindergarten classrooms full of kids. That is simply not acceptable. This \$35 million cut would let another 119 children be poisoned in my district alone. When lead poisoning is entirely preventable, I do not know how we can stand to have the lifelong negative impacts on those children's lives on our conscience.

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

During consideration of the bill for amendment each amendment shall be debatable for 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent and shall not be subject to amendment. No pro forma amendment shall be in order except that the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their respective designees may offer up to 10 pro forma amendments each at any point for the purpose of debate. The chair of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD designated for that purpose. Amendments so printed shall be considered read.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2577

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Secretary, \$105,000,000, of which not to exceed \$2,734,000 shall be available for the im-

mediate Office of the Secretary; not to exceed \$1,025,000 shall be available for the immediate Office of the Deputy Secretary; not to exceed \$20,066,000 shall be available for the Office of the General Counsel; not to exceed \$9,310,000 shall be available for the Office of the Under Secretary of Transportation for Policy; not to exceed \$12,808,000 shall be available for the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Budget and Programs; not to exceed \$2,500,000 shall be available for the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Governmental Affairs; not to exceed \$26,029,000 shall be available for the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Administration; not to exceed \$2,029,000 shall be available for the Office of Public Affairs; not to exceed \$1,769,000 shall be available for the Office of the Executive Secretariat; not to exceed \$10,793,000 shall be available for the Office of Intelligence, Security, and Emergency Response; and not to exceed \$15,937,000 shall be available for the Office of the Chief Information Officer: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Transportation is authorized to transfer funds appropriated for any office of the Office of the Secretary to any other office of the Office of the Secretary: *Provided further*, That no appropriation for any office shall be increased or decreased by more than 5 percent by all such transfers: *Provided further*, That notice of any change in funding greater than 5 percent shall be submitted for approval to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$60,000 shall be for allocation within the Department for official reception and representation expenses as the Secretary may determine: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, excluding fees authorized in Public Law 107-71, there may be credited to this appropriation up to \$2,500,000 in funds received in user fees: *Provided further*, That none of the funds provided in this Act shall be available for the position of Assistant Secretary for Public Affairs.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DENT

Mr. DENT. I have an amendment at the desk I would like to offer.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 13, after the first dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$3,000,000)".

Page 2, line 16, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$2,000,000)".

Page 2, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$1,000,000)".

Page 47, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$9,000,000)".

Page 50, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$3,000,000)".

Page 56, line 14, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$3,000,000)".

Mr. DENT (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading of the amendment.

The CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Pennsylvania and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer this amendment to increase Amtrak's capital account by \$9 million, which is the amount that we are told it will cost to equip all of Amtrak trains with inward-facing cameras in their engine cars.

It has been over 3 weeks since Amtrak Northeast Regional number 188 derailed just north of Philadelphia, killing at least eight people and injuring over 200. We still do not know exactly what caused this tragic accident, but had the train been equipped with an inward-facing camera, we very well might.

This is a simple and relatively inexpensive reform that the National Transportation Safety Board has been advocating for years, and it is past time that we act. Like the infamous black boxes on airplanes, inward-facing cameras on trains would provide inspectors with critical information after an accident.

Northeast Regional 188 was traveling over twice the posted speed limit on the stretch of track where it derailed. I should also let you know, I rode on that same regional train that morning, from Wilmington, Delaware, down to Washington, so I know this particular line, the Northeast corridor. I travel it regularly, so I am very much personally interested, as are so many of my constituents and friends in the northeastern part of the United States.

Had an inward-facing camera been installed on that train, we might now know whether that was due to some mechanical failure, negligence on the engineer's part, or perhaps some medical incident beyond his control. With that information in hand, we would be that much closer to taking the appropriate steps to ensure that this never happens again.

Our thoughts and prayers remain with the victims of this tragedy and their loved ones, and we owe it to them to do everything we can to prevent future incidents like the one we saw in Philadelphia. The installation of inward-facing cameras in all Amtrak trains is an important step in that direction.

I would like to thank Chairman DIAZ-BALART and his staff for their support and for working with me to identify an acceptable offset, especially given the extremely tight constraints under which this bill was drafted. I urge a "yes" vote on this amendment.

I also would like to say, I know that the offsets are of some concern to some of the Members. We are going to do our best to try to work with them on that matter.

At this time, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition so as to raise objections about the offsets proposed in this amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, my friend Mr. DENT has proposed an increase in an appropriation for a worthy purpose, to install inward-facing cameras on Amtrak locomotives, but his amendment offers another example of why the overall allocation in this T-HUD bill is completely inadequate.

The offsets may represent relatively small reductions in DOT's administrative accounts, each of these accounts: the DOT Secretary's salaries and expenses, the Federal Transit Administration's administrative expenses account, the Saint Lawrence Seaway. All of these would be cut below last year's level.

At this point, I yield the balance of my time to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), my colleague from the full committee.

Ms. KAPTUR. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment, respectfully, and I implore the majority to take a close look at where they have obtained the money for this important Amtrak investment. Amtrak is important to Ohio, to the Pennsylvania-Ohio corridor, and there would be nothing I would do to hurt Amtrak. I have been one of Amtrak's greatest advocates.

Of the \$9 million to fix this problem for Amtrak, you don't take the majority of it, \$3 million, from the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Administration, the Great Lakes-Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation. In effect, what they have done is they have taken \$3 million of the \$9 million they need for Amtrak out of the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, which is, in effect, a 10 percent cut to the smallest entity inside of the Department of Transportation.

Why is the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation important? First of all, the current funding level is the smallest budget within the Department of Transportation. Our amendment inside the full Committee on Appropriations allowed that budget not to be cut any further.

The seaway is the only binational instrumentality between Canada and the United States. It connects an entire region of the country from Duluth to Massena, New York, to global markets. They have threatened problems within the seaway, such as locks collapsing and inadequate areas for our ships to pass through. Sailing on the Great Lakes can be very, very dangerous, as many of our sailors know.

That corridor is the shortest distance between Europe and the United States, and last year, the seaway had an 8 percent increase in its shipping growth. It serves a part of America that has been battered economically. Manufacturing has been fighting its way back. This really isn't the time to tamper with the seaway's budget.

I understand the problems of Amtrak, and I know that it needs funding, but I am just asking the majority to please look at the budget you have offered. Your offsets in the case of the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation are truly unacceptable, and in doing so, the seaway will be harmed. It will harm ports like Erie, Pennsylvania; Massena, New York; Duluth, Minnesota; Milwaukee, Wis-

consin; Gary, Indiana; Toledo, Ohio; Detroit, Michigan. The list is a very, very long list.

We have an aging infrastructure in the Great Lakes as well. We don't have the power of the Intracoastal. We wish we did. But I have to raise my voice in strong objection to the offset related to the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation.

I respect very much the gentleman from Pennsylvania. I know what you are trying to do for Amtrak. I want to help you in that effort, but not at the expense of the seaway.

□ 2000

I am hoping that the respective staffs can work together as this bill moves forward to find a more reasonable offset. I have many more ideas about that, but the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation should be allowed to remain functional and not be harmed by a 10 percent cut.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I certainly appreciate the comments of the gentlewoman from Ohio, and I understand the difficult choices here. I do intend to work with her and any other concerned Members about these offsets and maybe find a way to alter them at some point, but I just didn't have time to do it tonight.

Again, I believe this is a reasonable amendment and it will do what we need to at least help with respect to the inward-facing cameras on Amtrak trains.

At this time I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LANCE), my friend, who is a frequent Amtrak rider himself.

Mr. LANCE. Mr. Chairman, 3 weeks ago, the tragic Amtrak accident in north Philadelphia led to deaths, injuries, and destruction. Those who were injured included two of my constituents with whom I had been meeting with earlier in the day here in Washington.

While the circumstances surrounding the incident remain under investigation, we do know that certain measures can be taken to ensure safety and preparedness, and changes can be implemented moving forward for public safety.

Inward-facing cameras are an appropriate step in modernizing train transportation safety. The National Transportation Safety Board has been advocating for this simple and relatively inexpensive reform for years.

I urge support of Mr. DENT's amendment to bring this reform to fruition.

Mr. DENT. Again, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment that would provide \$9 million for inward-facing cameras on Amtrak trains. This is absolutely essential, I believe, to helping us hopefully prevent and—certainly, after the fact—determine the causes of these types of tragedies when they occur.

I wish we weren't at this point, but we need to do this. It is important.

Amtrak wants to move in this direction. The National Transportation Safety Board has urged this for some time. And it is now time that Congress act.

So, again, I urge a "yes" vote on the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR (Ms. ROSLEHTINEN). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. BUSTOS

Mrs. BUSTOS. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 13, after the first dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$500,000)".

Page 2, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$500,000)".

Page 60, line 16, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$500,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentlewoman from Illinois and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Mrs. BUSTOS. Madam Chairman, I would like to thank Chairman DIAZ-BALART and Ranking Member PRICE for their hard work on this legislation.

I rise today to urge my colleagues to join with me in improving rail and pipeline safety by supporting my amendment to increase funding by \$500,000 to the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration. This important agency's mission is to protect our communities from the risks of hazardous materials transportation, including moving crude oil by rail and pipeline.

Until just a few years ago, our Nation's railroads transported very little crude oil. Now, in part due to the boom in oil production from the Bakken formation in North Dakota and in other areas, approximately 1.1 billion barrels are transported by rail in the United States every single day.

The Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration conducted tests on Bakken crude and found it to have a higher degree of volatility than most other U.S. crudes.

Last year, railroads carried almost 650,000 carloads of oil, compared to only 9,500 carloads in 2008. This impact is especially felt in Illinois, my home State, where we have the second-most number of miles of rail track in the entire country. In fact, about 25 percent of all U.S. rail traffic passes through Chicago, Illinois.

Improving rail safety is extremely important to our region, our State, and to our entire country. This issue is especially personal to me and the people I serve in my congressional district. That is because in March, earlier this year, a train carrying crude oil derailed near Galena, Illinois. It is in the northwest corner of my State and is one of the most beautiful regions of not

only my congressional district but the entire State of Illinois—and I think in the entire country.

While we were lucky that no one was harmed, several tanker cars exploded and the Bakken crude spilled just a few feet from a slough that flows straight into the Mississippi River, which is the drinking water supply for millions of people.

Because of the bravery and the dedication of first responders and local, State, and Federal cleanup crews, no water was contaminated. We were also lucky that the derailment took place in a largely rural and uninhabited area. Imagine what would have happened if a derailment like this were to occur in Chicago, Los Angeles, or New York, or any more populated area.

In light of several other high-profile train derailments, including those in West Virginia and North Dakota, involving cars carrying crude oil, communities across the country are becoming increasingly concerned about the safe movement of crude oil—and with very good reason.

While I am encouraged that Federal agencies and industry leaders are working together to make transportation of hazardous material safer, Congress must also do its job and step up and provide adequate resources to keep our energy transport system safe and secure.

That is why I ask today for your support for my effort to ensure this appropriations bill includes additional funding for the agency that helps ensure the safe transportation of energy products, including the shipment of crude oil by pipeline and rail.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BUSTOS).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MEEHAN

Mr. MEEHAN. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$4,000,000)".

Page 2, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$4,000,000)".

Page 44, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$3,500,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Pennsylvania and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MEEHAN. Madam Chairman, I want to thank my good friend and colleague from Florida for his indulgence and working with me on this amendment.

We have benefited here across the United States in recent times with a boom in energy and moving towards energy self-sufficiency. Much of this has been due to the ability to take advantage of our natural resources, including crude oil, which is increasingly

being developed from the Western parts of our country. In fact, more than 33 million barrels of crude oil are shipped by rail each month in the United States, and that is a fifty-fold increase from more than 5 years ago.

Shipments from the Bakken region have brightened the future of oil workers and refineries in my own Seventh District of Pennsylvania, and indeed the entire Philadelphia area, and in fact they have created energy opportunities throughout our Nation.

But now, despite the fact that nearly all of the shipments reach their destinations safely, accidents, sadly, are on the rise. Recent incidents in Ontario, West Virginia, and Pennsylvania call to mind the need for improved safety measures.

Madam Chairman, my amendment seeks to transfer funding from the Office of the Secretary salaries and expense account and puts \$3.5 million into the Federal Railroad Administration to fund additional cars to inspect the more than 14,000 miles of crude oil rail routes nationwide.

This funding would also expedite the use of remote automated track inspection capability, which will increase inspection mileage while reducing costs.

For more than 30 years, the FRA's automated track inspection program, called ATIP, has provided accurate track geometry and performance data to assess compliance with the Federal Track Safety Standards.

Collected data is used by the FRA, railroad inspectors, and railroads to ensure that track safety is being maintained. Immediately following ATIP track surveys, the railroads use the data to help locate and correct problems. Often railroads use the ATIP data as a quality assurance check on their own track inspection and maintenance programs.

Madam Chairman, America's energy boom has brightened communities across the country, and as crude oil by rail grows, I want to help protect those communities. My amendment would enable the FRA to increase its ATIP capability to meet this challenge.

Madam Chairman, I thank the chairman and Ranking Member PRICE for their willingness to work with me on this issue. I urge the amendment's adoption, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MEEHAN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BURGESS

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 13, after the first dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$4,000,000)".

Page 2, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$500,000)".

Page 2, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$1,000,000)".

Page 2, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$250,000)”.

Page 2, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$2,000,000)”.

Page 3, line 2, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$250,000)”.

Page 40, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$4,000,000)”.

Mr. BURGESS (during the reading). Madam Chair, I ask unanimous consent the amendment be considered read.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Texas and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Chairman, this is an amendment to add an additional \$4 million to the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration's operations and research.

Madam Chair, at the beginning of this Congress, I took the gavel of the Energy and Commerce Subcommittee on Commerce, Manufacturing, and Trade. This was the gavel previously held by our good friend, Chairman Lee Terry.

There was some unfinished business as this Congress started, and one of the biggest issues left over from the previous Congress was the issue of airbag energetic deployments and ruptures, and the subsequent recall of those airbags.

There was a hearing done in December right at the end of the last Congress, and it seemed like there was no activity from the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. But just 2 weeks ago, they announced a recall of 34 million vehicles. The recall massively expanded. And the manufacturer of the airbags, Takata, finally admitted that six of their manufacturing designs were indeed defective. Takata has identified 11 auto manufacturers that use the defective air bag inflators.

Again, 34 million vehicles have been subject to this recall. And this may not be the end.

The National Highway Traffic Safety Administration and Takata have not identified what is the cause of these energetic disruptions of the air bag inflators.

Yesterday, the Commerce, Manufacturing, and Trade Subcommittee held a hearing to receive an update on the situation. Among the witnesses was the Administrator of the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Dr. Mark Rosekind. Dr. Rosekind took over the Administration just weeks after the subcommittee's Takata hearing in December.

During yesterday's hearing, one of the themes we heard repeatedly from Administrator Rosekind was that NHTSA would have been better able to identify and mandate recalls had they had more resources. It is a refrain we are used to hearing here in Congress. His argument was that with more

money, the agency could save more lives. I will take him at his word on that.

For fiscal year 2016, Congress is proposing funding the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration operations and research, the account responsible for the policing of the safety of auto manufacturers' products, at \$150 million. This indeed is an increase of \$20 million from fiscal year 2015, and for that I am extremely grateful.

In the interest of good faith, however, from the new chairman of the subcommittee to the new Administrator of NHTSA, I want to take one more step and offer an additional \$4 million to this account to provide NHTSA with the resources it needs to ensure that more lives are not disrupted by these defects.

□ 2015

It is my hope that NHTSA can use this additional funding to find a permanent solution to the problem.

The Commerce, Manufacturing, and Trade Subcommittee is closely watching and awaiting the release of a report by NHTSA's inspector general on their Office of Defects Investigation. We hope it will be released soon.

The offset comes from the Department of Transportation Office of the Secretary for salaries and expenses. This seems like an extremely worthwhile investment, and I urge the subcommittee's adoption of my amendment.

Again, I want to thank the subcommittee for hearing my amendment. I certainly want to congratulate the chairman and ranking member of the subcommittee. I think they have done good work on this. I urge adoption of the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

RESEARCH AND TECHNOLOGY

For necessary expenses related to the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Research and Technology, \$11,386,000, of which \$8,218,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2018: *Provided*, That there may be credited to this appropriation, to be available until expended, funds received from States, counties, municipalities, other public authorities, and private sources for expenses incurred for training: *Provided further*, That any reference in law, regulation, judicial proceedings, or elsewhere to the Research and Innovative Technology Administration shall continue to be deemed to be a reference to the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Research and Technology of the Department of Transportation.

NATIONAL INFRASTRUCTURE INVESTMENTS (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For capital investments in surface transportation infrastructure, \$100,000,000, to remain available through September 30, 2018: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Transportation shall distribute funds provided under this heading as discretionary grants to be

awarded to a State, local government, transit agency, or a collaboration among such entities on a competitive basis for projects that will have a significant impact on the Nation, a metropolitan area, or a region: *Provided further*, That projects eligible for funding provided under this heading shall include, but not be limited to, highway or bridge projects eligible under title 23, United States Code; public transportation projects eligible under chapter 53 of title 49, United States Code; passenger and freight rail transportation projects; and port infrastructure investments (including inland port infrastructure and land ports of entry): *Provided further*, That the Secretary may use up to 20 percent of the funds made available under this heading for the purpose of paying the subsidy and administrative costs of projects eligible for Federal credit assistance under chapter 6 of title 23, United States Code, if the Secretary finds that such use of the funds would advance the purposes of this paragraph: *Provided further*, That in distributing funds provided under this heading, the Secretary shall take such measures so as to ensure an equitable geographic distribution of funds, an appropriate balance in addressing the needs of urban and rural areas, and the investment in a variety of transportation modes: *Provided further*, That a grant funded under this heading shall be not less than \$2,000,000 and not greater than \$15,000,000: *Provided further*, That not more than 20 percent of the funds made available under this heading may be awarded to projects in a single State: *Provided further*, That the Federal share of the costs for which an expenditure is made under this heading shall be, at the option of the recipient, up to 50 percent: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall give priority to projects that require a contribution of Federal funds in order to complete an overall financing package: *Provided further*, That not less than 10 percent of the funds provided under this heading shall be for projects located in rural areas: *Provided further*, That for projects located in rural areas, the minimum grant size shall be \$1,000,000 and the Secretary may increase the Federal share of costs above 80 percent: *Provided further*, That projects conducted using funds provided under this heading must comply with the requirements of subchapter IV of chapter 31 of title 40, United States Code: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall conduct a new competition to select the grants and credit assistance awarded under this heading: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may retain up to \$5,000,000 of the funds provided under this heading, and may transfer portions of those funds to the Administrators of the Federal Highway Administration, the Federal Transit Administration, the Federal Railroad Administration and the Maritime Administration, to fund the award and oversight of grants and credit assistance made under the National Infrastructure Investments program.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. MAXINE WATERS OF CALIFORNIA

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 4, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$1,150,000,000)”.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Madam Chair, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentlewoman from California and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Madam Chair, I rise to offer an amendment to invest in transportation infrastructure for the 21st century.

The transportation funding in this bill is woefully insufficient to meet our country's infrastructure needs. The cuts to the TIGER program are particularly egregious.

TIGER, formally known as Transportation Investment Generating Economic Recovery, is a competitive grant program that creates jobs by funding investments in transportation infrastructure. This bill cuts TIGER from the 2015 level of \$500 million down to a mere \$100 million in 2016.

America needs new infrastructure for the 21st century. The American Society of Civil Engineers gave the public infrastructure of the United States a grade of D-plus in 2013 and estimated that we will need to invest \$3.6 trillion by 2020 in order to improve the conditions of our infrastructure.

Indeed, TIGER needs to be expanded, not cut. The President requested \$1.25 billion for TIGER in the coming fiscal year, as part of an expanded TIGER program that will create jobs, encourage innovation, and modernize transportation infrastructure for the 21st century.

Earlier this year, I sent a letter to the Appropriations Committee urging support for the President's request, and 144 Members of Congress signed my letter.

Our economy is still struggling to recover from the recession. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, our Nation's unemployment rate stands at 5.4 percent. Furthermore, unemployment among Hispanics is 6.9 percent. Among African Americans, it is 9.6 percent, and among teenagers, it is 17.1 percent.

An expanded TIGER program will create meaningful employment building safe roads, bridges, and public transit systems in communities throughout the United States.

My amendment increases TIGER funding to \$1.25 billion in order to fully fund the President's request for this critical program.

Madam Chair, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE).

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Madam Chairman, I want to commend my colleague, who does such distinguished work in housing and financial services on her committee, for coming in to this debate today and calling attention to the importance of the TIGER program, and I would just like to ask her to respond.

I am looking at the figures for this year. There is a \$500 million appropriation for that program in the current year. Is the gentlewoman aware that the Department of Transportation has

already received 950 preapplications, totaling \$14.5 billion? That is 29 times the amount available.

What does that suggest about the need for this program?

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Well, you have accurately and appropriately identified the need for the program, based on those applications. Not only is it a very popular program, it is a program that creates jobs, and our local communities need this very much, and they are strong advocates for it.

I would hope that my colleagues here in the Congress, on both sides of the aisle, who have benefitted from the TIGER program, would see the need and remove all obstacles, support this program, and let us move forward with getting the infrastructure repairs and the building that we need to do.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I thank my colleague for offering this amendment. It calls attention to the gross underfunding in this bill, not just of TIGER, but of virtually every HUD and transportation program so that it is very hard, of course, to find offsets. There is very little money in this bill.

We should be breaking out of that mold. We should be going after a budget agreement that will let us write a decent bill and meet this country's needs. Her amendment, better than anything we have heard thus far tonight, underscores that need.

I thank the gentlewoman.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. I thank the gentleman from North Carolina, and I yield back the balance of my time.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Madam Chair, the amendment proposes a net increase in budget authority in the bill.

The amendment is not in order under section 3(d)3 of House Resolution 5 of the 114th Congress, which states the following:

"It shall not be in order to consider an amendment to a general appropriations bill proposing a net increase in budget authority in the bill unless considered en bloc with another amendment or amendments proposing an equal or greater decrease in such budget authority pursuant to clause 2(f) of rule XXI."

The amendment does propose a net increase in budget authority in the bill in violation of such section.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order? If not, the Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from Florida makes a point of order that the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California violates section 3(d)3 of House Resolution 5.

Section 3(d)3 establishes a point of order against an amendment proposing a net increase in budget authority in the pending bill.

As persuasively asserted by the gentleman from Florida, the amendment

proposes a net increase in budget authority in the bill. Therefore, the point of order is sustained. The amendment is not in order.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. MAXINE WATERS OF CALIFORNIA

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 4, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$400,000,000)".

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Madam Chair, I reserve a point of order on the gentlewoman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentlewoman from California and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Madam Chair, I rise to offer an amendment to restore some of the transportation funding that was cut drastically in this bill.

This is my second of two amendments to increase funds for the innovative TIGER transportation grant program. This amendment increases fiscal year 2016 TIGER funding to \$500 million, thereby restoring TIGER to the 2015 level.

States, local governments, and transit agencies depend upon the TIGER program to finance projects to repair aging infrastructure and develop new highway and transit systems. A safe, efficient, modern, and accessible transportation system is vital for a growing economy.

Madam Chair, we cannot afford to cut TIGER below the current funding level, and I am here this evening to urge my colleagues to vote for my amendment and invest in infrastructure for the 21st century.

I recognize that a point of order has been raised on this issue, but I also recognize that what I am advocating is vital for this economy and for this country. I would hope that somehow we would be wise enough, creative enough, and caring enough to dispense with the rule, as it has been identified on my first amendment, and move forward in a very creative way to do what is necessary to help our failing infrastructure in this country.

The stories about the failing bridges, the stories about the unsafe highways, the stories about the need for transit system improvements are stories that we hear, day in and day out.

Given the information that has been made available to us about the needs for infrastructure repairs, I would hope that we would not simply treat this in such an ordinary fashion and apply the rule that basically says: Well, if I did not find the money to fund it, then somehow it cannot be in order.

Certainly, this amount of money is not easy to locate; certainly, I do not

have an answer to where this money would necessarily come from, but I would hope that my colleagues would take into consideration again the desperate need of our economy and our communities and not rule this out of order.

I yield back the balance of my time.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Madam Chair, this amendment proposes a net increase in budget authority in the bill.

The amendment is not in order under section 3(d)3 of House Resolution 5 of the 114th Congress which states the following:

“It shall not be in order to consider an amendment to a general appropriations bill proposing a net increase in budget authority in the bill unless considered en bloc with another amendment or amendments proposing an equal or greater decrease in such budget authority pursuant to clause 2(f) of rule XXI.”

The amendment proposes a net increase in budget authority in the bill in violation of such section.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order? If not, the Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from Florida makes a point of order that the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California violates section 3(d)3 of House Resolution 5.

For the reasons stated in the previous ruling, and as persuasively asserted by the gentleman from Florida, the amendment proposes a net increase in budget authority in the bill. Therefore, the point of order is sustained. The amendment is not in order.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DOLD

Mr. DOLD. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 6, line 9, strike “and the Secretary” and all that follows through “percent” on line 10.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Illinois and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DOLD. Madam Chairman, I rise today in support of this amendment to change a provision in the bill relating to TIGER grants.

Put simply, this amendment would put all transportation projects on an even playing field and allow all qualified projects to fairly compete for these grants, regardless of whether they take place in an urban area or a rural area.

□ 2030

Madam Chair, my district is heavily reliant on all forms of transportation. The Chicagoland area is the hub for the Nation’s transportation network. Over 925 million tons of freight move in and

out of Chicago each and every year, and each workday, tens of thousands of citizens of the 10th Congressional District use commuter rail.

The Chicago Regional Transportation Authority estimates that it needs to find \$13.4 billion over the next decade just to maintain the system in its current condition. That is why it is more important than ever to find the funds to pay to maintain and rebuild our Nation’s transportation system.

In the Transportation Appropriations funding bill, there is a provision which discriminates against urban districts, like Illinois’ 10th Congressional District. TIGER grants, which are competitive grants to fund capital investments in surface transportation projects, can be awarded to projects across the entire Nation.

However, the bill also provides that projects in urban areas receive a Federal match of 50 percent of the project funding, while projects in rural areas can receive up to 80 percent of the project’s funding.

Madam Chair, this is unfair and unjust. The TIGER grants are competitive, discretionary grants that should be awarded to the most deserving projects. The bill’s language allows rural areas to leverage local dollars at a 4 to 1 ratio, allowing them to put up just \$2 out of every \$10 needed for a project. Urban areas may only leverage at a 1 to 1 ratio.

This language harms urban areas and makes it more difficult to secure the funding needed to complete these projects. My amendment is a common-sense and just solution to this problem and would place all projects, no matter where they occur, on an even playing field.

Madam Chair, it is time to bring equity back to transportation funding, and I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and put all qualified projects on an even playing field.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Madam Chair, I respectfully oppose the gentleman’s well-intentioned amendment.

TIGER is a national program, and we support cities of all sizes having a chance to get a grant, and we work to ensure there is a balance between urban and rural areas. I am afraid that the well-intentioned amendment from the gentleman seeks to undo that delicate balance at this time.

Madam Chair, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE).

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I, too, want to reluctantly express my opposition to this amendment.

Madam Chair, I take second place to no one in this body as the champion of the TIGER program, as I hope was evident in my support for the gentle-

woman from California’s (Ms. MAXINE WATERS) amendments just now; but we are underscoring in this amendment, while it is worthy in its intent—and I would love to be able to add a lot more money than this to the TIGER program—its offset is very worrisome and one that I think should lead us to oppose this amendment.

It comes out of the Federal Aviation Administration’s operations account, \$100 million out of that account.

Now, the bill provides a slight increase for FAA operations, but it is still \$67 million below the President’s request. This is the account that provides the funds needed to ensure aviation safety and security, so cutting this account is ill advised.

Mr. DOLD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DOLD. I think the gentleman is talking about a different amendment. My amendment doesn’t take anything out of any account. This is talking about simply changing the percentages between urban and rural to allow competitive grants so that it competes at a level playing field.

I just respectfully think you have got a different amendment, which I appreciate, but it is not the one that I think that we are talking about right now.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. The gentleman does have an amendment that fits my description; is that true?

Mr. DOLD. Yes, but we have withdrawn that one, but I do appreciate the gentleman talking about that one.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I thank the gentleman for that clarification. My remarks will await the proper amendment.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DOLD. Madam Chair, as we talk about transportation and infrastructure, it is so critically important, critically important for our economy, critically important certainly for our urban areas, and if you look at a map of the city of Chicago in the center of our country, we have got six of seven major rail lines that go through there.

It used to be that a third of all the freight in the country would go through Chicago. Now, it is about a quarter, but it is still a tremendous amount, and it really impacts the Nation’s economy.

We can get a railcar from Los Angeles to Chicago in 2 days. It takes nearly 2 days to go from one side of Chicago to the other side of Chicago. This does have an impact.

The same rail that we are talking about here also has commuter rails on it, and we are dealing with infrastructure that goes back to the Roosevelt administration. I don’t mean FDR; I mean Teddy Roosevelt. We need to make sure that there is some additional funding going here.

This amendment that we are talking about is not talking about moving dollars around. It is talking about trying to provide equity so that urban

projects, which I would argue we desperately need, are on the same level as the rural projects.

If we were to lose mass transit or some of these other projects in the city of Chicago, we are talking about a 50 percent increase in congestion on our roadways.

This is an amendment that I hope that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle would embrace—at least let's talk about a level playing field, where we are not giving preference to the rural areas versus the urban areas, urban areas which I would argue use the rail a pretty significant amount in terms of how we are moving people around, not to mention our goods and services.

This is an amendment that I think is a commonsense amendment, and I would hope that I would get some support from my good friend from Florida and maybe we could get him to even reconsider, but I hope I am not tilting at windmills on that one, Madam Chair.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DOLD).

The amendment was rejected.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT CAPITAL

For necessary expenses for upgrading and enhancing the Department of Transportation's financial systems and re-engineering business processes, \$1,000,000, to remain available through September 30, 2017.

CYBER SECURITY INITIATIVES

For necessary expenses for cyber security initiatives, including necessary upgrades to wide area network and information technology infrastructure, improvement of network perimeter controls and identity management, testing and assessment of information technology against business, security, and other requirements, implementation of Federal cyber security initiatives and information infrastructure enhancements, implementation of enhanced security controls on network devices, and enhancement of cyber security workforce training tools, \$7,000,000 to remain available through September 30, 2017.

OFFICE OF CIVIL RIGHTS

For necessary expenses of the Office of Civil Rights, \$9,600,000.

TRANSPORTATION PLANNING, RESEARCH, AND DEVELOPMENT

For necessary expenses for conducting transportation planning, research, systems development, development activities, and making grants, to remain available until expended, \$5,976,000.

WORKING CAPITAL FUND

For necessary expenses for operating costs and capital outlays of the Working Capital Fund, not to exceed \$181,500,000 shall be paid from appropriations made available to the Department of Transportation: *Provided*, That such services shall be provided on a competitive basis to entities within the Department of Transportation: *Provided further*, That the above limitation on operating expenses shall not apply to non-DOT entities: *Provided further*, That no funds appropriated in this Act to an agency of the Department shall be transferred to the Working Capital Fund without majority approval of the

Working Capital Fund Steering Committee and approval of the Secretary: *Provided further*, That no assessments may be levied against any program, budget activity, sub-activity or project funded by this Act unless notice of such assessments and the basis therefor are presented to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations and are approved by such Committees.

MINORITY BUSINESS RESOURCE CENTER PROGRAM

For the cost of guaranteed loans, \$336,000, as authorized by 49 U.S.C. 332: *Provided*, That such costs, including the cost of modifying such loans, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974: *Provided further*, That these funds are available to subsidize total loan principal, any part of which is to be guaranteed, not to exceed \$18,367,000.

In addition, for administrative expenses to carry out the guaranteed loan program, \$597,000.

SMALL AND DISADVANTAGED BUSINESS UTILIZATION AND OUTREACH

For necessary expenses for small and disadvantaged business utilization and outreach activities, \$4,518,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017: *Provided*, That notwithstanding 49 U.S.C. 332, these funds may be used for business opportunities related to any mode of transportation.

PAYMENTS TO AIR CARRIERS

(AIRPORT AND AIRWAY TRUST FUND)

In addition to funds made available from any other source to carry out the essential air service program under 49 U.S.C. 41731 through 41742, \$155,000,000, to be derived from the Airport and Airway Trust Fund, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That in determining between or among carriers competing to provide service to a community, the Secretary may consider the relative subsidy requirements of the carriers: *Provided further*, That basic essential air service minimum requirements shall not include the 15-passenger capacity requirement under subsection 41732(b)(3) of title 49, United States Code: *Provided further*, That none of the funds in this Act or any other Act shall be used to enter into a new contract with a community located less than 40 miles from the nearest small hub airport before the Secretary has negotiated with the community over a local cost share: *Provided further*, That amounts authorized to be distributed for the essential air service program under subsection 41742(b) of title 49, United States Code, shall be made available immediately from amounts otherwise provided to the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration: *Provided further*, That the Administrator may reimburse such amounts from fees credited to the account established under section 45303 of title 49, United States Code.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MCCLINTOCK

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 9, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced to \$0)".

Page 156, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$155,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from California and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Madam Chair, this amendment eliminates the \$155

million of discretionary spending that is wasted on one of the least essential programs in the entire United States Government, the so-called Essential Air Service. That is the program that subsidizes empty and near-empty planes to fly from small airports to regional hubs just a few hours or less away by car.

This was supposed to be a temporary program to allow local communities and airports to readjust to airline deregulation in 1978. Not only is it still going on today, but it has doubled in cost in the last 4 years, from \$130 million in 2011 to roughly \$260 million in 2015, and \$155 million of that is in our control. This amendment zeros it out and puts it toward deficit reduction.

Now, we are often told: Well, don't worry. We have enacted all of these reforms. We have caps on subsidies.

All those caps, \$200 per ticket, are only for flights under 210 miles. It continues unlimited subsidies over that distance. Actual subsidies per passenger can be as high as \$980 per ticket, paid by hard-working taxpayers. Year after year, we are promised reform; and year after year, the cost goes up and up.

By the way, Essential Air Service flights are flown out of Merced and Visalia airports, serving my district in the Sierra. Trust me, a tiny number of people actually use it. The alternative is hardly catastrophic; it is typically an extra hour's drive to a regional airport. I guarantee you that everybody who hears about this waste of their money is outraged by it.

It is true there are a few tiny communities in Alaska, like Kake's 700 citizens, that have no highway connections to hub airports, but they have plenty of alternatives. In the case of Kake, they enjoy year-round ferry service to Juneau. In addition, Alaska is well served by a thriving general aviation market and the ubiquitous bush pilot.

Rural life has great advantages. It also has some disadvantages, but it is not the job of hard-working taxpayers who choose to live elsewhere to level out the differences.

Now, apologists for this wasteful spending tell us it is an important economic driver for these small airports and airlines, and I am sure that is so. Whenever you give away money, the folks you are giving it to are always better off, but the folks you are taking it from are always worse off to exactly the same extent. Indeed, it's economic drivers like this that have driven Europe's economy right off a cliff.

Two years ago, one Member rushed to the microphone to suggest that this was essential for emergency medical evacuations. It has nothing to do with that. This program subsidizes regularly scheduled commercial service that practically nobody uses. If it actually had a passenger base, it wouldn't need, in effect, to hand out \$100 bills to the few passengers who use it.

An airline so reckless with its funds would quickly bankrupt itself. Well,

the same principle holds true of governments.

The Washington Post is not known as a bastion of fiscal conservatism, but I cannot improve upon an editorial a few years ago when it said, "Ideally, EAS would be zeroed out, and the \$200 million we waste on it devoted to a truly national purpose: perhaps deficit reduction, military readiness, or the social safety net."

The Washington Post goes on to write, "Alas, if Congress and the White House were capable of making such choices, we probably never would have had sequestration in the first place."

Madam Chair, there are many tough calls in setting fiscal priorities, but this isn't one of them. If the House of Representatives—where all appropriations begin, where the Republican majority pledged to stop wasting money—can't even agree to cut this useless program off from the trough, how does it expect to be taken seriously on the much tougher choices that lie ahead?

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Madam Chair, this amendment that the gentleman from California has offered is about as indiscriminate as it gets. He apparently has ideas, and those ideas ought to be heard to reform this program, to make it more efficient and more effective and more targeted. The place to do that is in the authorizing committee. We have forums where we can discuss those ideas and act on them.

To come in tonight and offer this indiscriminate amendment which, by the way, not only cuts this overall program by more than half, but also cuts the allocation for this bill, which is already so inadequate, it is not an approach that this body should endorse.

□ 2045

The program we are talking about, Essential Air Services, was created after deregulation. It has remained essential to keep service going to many, many small communities in this country, including Crescent City, El Centro, Merced, and Visalia in California. It is funded through annual appropriations, and also funded through overflight fees that are collected when foreign air carriers traverse through U.S. airspace. If this amendment were adopted, many small communities would lose air service.

Madam Chair, this isn't the way to reform the program, so I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Madam Chair, this is the kindest cut of all. It is a temporary program that was established 37 years ago and has become a poster child for wasteful Federal spending, and I believe the authorization ran out years ago. Our national debt has doubled in 8 years. American taxpayers

pay \$230 billion a year just in interest costs on that debt. That means if you are an average family paying average taxes, \$2,000 of those taxes did nothing more than rent the money that we have already spent.

Continuing to pay for this obsolete and wasteful program with money we don't have is obscene and makes a mockery of any claim that we have cut spending to the bone, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. McCLINTOCK).

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

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California will be postponed.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

SEC. 101. None of the funds made available in this Act to the Department of Transportation may be obligated for the Office of the Secretary of Transportation to approve assessments or reimbursable agreements pertaining to funds appropriated to the modal administrations in this Act, except for activities underway on the date of enactment of this Act, unless such assessments or agreements have completed the normal reprogramming process for Congressional notification.

SEC. 102. The Secretary or his designee may engage in activities with States and State legislators to consider proposals related to the reduction of motorcycle fatalities.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WALBERG

Mr. WALBERG. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 11, strike lines 1 through 3.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Michigan and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WALBERG. I want to begin by thanking Chairman DIAZ-BALART and his staff for their hard work on this legislation before us.

Madam Chair, I rise today to offer a commonsense amendment with Mr. SENSENBRENNER and Mr. RIBBLE of Wisconsin which makes it clear that Federal Government agencies should not be in the business—again, I say should not be—in the business of lobbying State and local legislators with Federal taxpayers' money. Federal law already prohibits Federal agencies from lobbying Congress in support of or against legislation.

Thanks in part to the leadership of Mr. SENSENBRENNER in 1998, Congress

passed similar antilobbying language to prohibit the Department of Transportation from lobbying State and local elected officials.

At that time, the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration was sending staff to State capitols at taxpayers' expense to lobby in favor of motorcycle helmet laws. At the cost of tens of thousands of taxpayer dollars, these officials traveled across the country to testify before State legislative committees, participate in conferences, and produce videotapes and other printed materials with the goal of advancing mandatory motorcycle helmet laws.

As the co-chairman of the Congressional Motorcycle Caucus and a rider myself who wears a helmet, I believe the most effective way to reduce motorcycle injuries and fatalities is to prevent these crashes from occurring in the first place. Madam Chair, that means putting between the ears as opposed to simply putting on the head.

I believe the NHTSA has an appropriate role in promoting vehicle and highway safety, whether that is focusing on efforts on crash prevention or rider education. Unfortunately, language pushed by the administration has made it into the recent omnibus legislation to reverse the lobby ban, and that provision is carried over into this bill.

Whether you ride or not, I would hope all my colleagues agree that this is an inappropriate use of taxpayer dollars. It violates the rights of States and local communities we represent to make their own decisions on helmet laws.

Madam Chair, I ask my colleagues to support this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Madam Chair, we have an amendment before us that would strike a provision that has been carried in every transportation appropriations bill since 2009. The section simply grants the Secretary or his representatives the authority to engage in activities with States and State legislators to consider proposals related to the reduction of motorcycle fatalities. This consultation is entirely voluntary.

Madam Chair, in 2013, we had 5,000 motorcycle fatalities in this country. That is the last year for which we have data.

The research and expertise of the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration can be extremely helpful—helpful to State highway traffic safety agencies as they consider measures they might want to undertake to improve motorcycle safety. Why wouldn't we want to be in partnership with the States as they address this important safety issue?

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WALBERG. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. WALBERG. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan will be postponed.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 103. Notwithstanding section 3324 of title 31, United States Code, in addition to authority provided by section 327 of title 49, United States Code, the Department's Working Capital Fund is hereby authorized to provide payments in advance to vendors that are necessary to carry out the Federal transit pass transportation fringe benefit program under Executive Order 13150 and section 3049 of Public Law 109-59: *Provided*, That the Department shall include adequate safeguards in the contract with the vendors to ensure timely and high-quality performance under the contract.

SEC. 104. The Secretary shall post on the Web site of the Department of Transportation a schedule of all meetings of the Credit Council, including the agenda for each meeting, and require the Credit Council to record the decisions and actions of each meeting.

SEC. 105. In addition to authority provided by section 327 of title 49, United States Code, the Department's Working Capital Fund is hereby authorized to provide partial or full payments in advance and accept subsequent reimbursements from all Federal agencies for transit benefit distribution services that are necessary to carry out the Federal transit pass transportation fringe benefit program under Executive Order 13150 and section 3049 of Public Law 109-59: *Provided*, That the Department shall maintain a reasonable operating reserve in the Working Capital Fund, to be expended in advance to provide uninterrupted transit benefits to Government employees, provided that such reserve will not exceed one month of benefits payable: *Provided further*, that such reserve may be used only for the purpose of providing for the continuation of transit benefits, provided that the Working Capital Fund will be fully reimbursed by each customer agency for the actual cost of the transit benefit.

FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION
OPERATIONS
(AIRPORT AND AIRWAY TRUST FUND)

For necessary expenses of the Federal Aviation Administration, not otherwise provided for, including operations and research activities related to commercial space transportation, administrative expenses for research and development, establishment of air navigation facilities, the operation (including leasing) and maintenance of aircraft, subsidizing the cost of aeronautical charts and maps sold to the public, lease or purchase of passenger motor vehicles for replacement only, in addition to amounts made available by Public Law 112-95, \$9,847,700,000 of which \$8,831,250,000 shall be derived from the Airport and Airway Trust Fund, of which not to exceed \$7,505,293,000 shall be available for air traffic organization activities; not to exceed \$1,258,411,000 shall be available for aviation safety activities; not to exceed \$16,605,000 shall be available for

commercial space transportation activities; not to exceed \$725,000,000 shall be available for finance and management activities; not to exceed \$60,089,000 shall be available for NextGen and operations planning activities; and not to exceed \$282,302,000 shall be available for staff offices: *Provided*, That not to exceed 2 percent of any budget activity, except for aviation safety budget activity, may be transferred to any budget activity under this heading: *Provided further*, That no transfer may increase or decrease any appropriation by more than 2 percent: *Provided further*, That any transfer in excess of 2 percent shall be treated as a reprogramming of funds under section 405 of this Act and shall not be available for obligation or expenditure except in compliance with the procedures set forth in that section: *Provided further*, That not later than March 31 of each fiscal year hereafter, the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration shall transmit to Congress an annual update to the report submitted to Congress in December 2004 pursuant to section 221 of Public Law 108-176: *Provided further*, That the amount herein appropriated shall be reduced by \$100,000 for each day after March 31 that such report has not been submitted to the Congress: *Provided further*, That not later than March 31 of each fiscal year hereafter, the Administrator shall transmit to Congress a companion report that describes a comprehensive strategy for staffing, hiring, and training flight standards and aircraft certification staff in a format similar to the one utilized for the controller staffing plan, including stated attrition estimates and numerical hiring goals by fiscal year: *Provided further*, That the amount herein appropriated shall be reduced by \$100,000 per day for each day after March 31 that such report has not been submitted to Congress: *Provided further*, That funds may be used to enter into a grant agreement with a non-profit standard-setting organization to assist in the development of aviation safety standards: *Provided further*, That none of the funds in this Act shall be available for new applicants for the second career training program: *Provided further*, That none of the funds in this Act shall be available for the Federal Aviation Administration to finalize or implement any regulation that would promulgate new aviation user fees not specifically authorized by law after the date of the enactment of this Act: *Provided further*, That there may be credited to this appropriation as offsetting collections funds received from States, counties, municipalities, foreign authorities, other public authorities, and private sources for expenses incurred in the provision of agency services, including receipts for the maintenance and operation of air navigation facilities, and for issuance, renewal or modification of certificates, including airman, aircraft, and repair station certificates, or for tests related thereto, or for processing major repair or alteration forms: *Provided further*, That of the funds appropriated under this heading, not less than \$154,400,000 shall be for the contract tower program, including the contract tower cost share program: *Provided further*, That none of the funds in this Act for aeronautical charting and cartography are available for activities conducted by, or coordinated through, the Working Capital Fund.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LOBIONDO

Mr. LOBIONDO. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 12, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$3,000,000)".

Page 13, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$3,000,000)".

Page 16, line 9, after the first dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$3,000,000)".

Page 16, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$3,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from New Jersey and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. LOBIONDO. Madam Chair, I would like to start by thanking Chairman DIAZ-BALART for cooperating with this amendment.

Madam Chair, the Federal Aviation Administration is dealing with an increasing threat of cyberattacks against the National Airspace System. This critical threat was recently detailed in a GAO report as well as identified in news reports of a reported attempt to hack into the flight control system of a U.S. airliner through the plane's in-flight entertainment system.

The FAA must protect the safety of our citizens and prevent negative impact to the U.S. economy by developing a comprehensive and multilayered approach to mitigating new and emerging cybersecurity threats.

My amendment will transfer \$3 million within the FAA to develop an integrated cybersecurity testbed to evaluate and certify all NextGen and National Airspace systems. The FAA currently possesses the capability to establish such a testbed at its existing integrated testing environment at the FAA Tech Center in southern New Jersey. The Tech Center presents a natural host for FAA partnership with industry and academia to leverage the best ideas and technology to continually mitigate evolving cybersecurity threats.

Madam Chair, increasing FAA capability for creating, identifying, defending, and solving cybersecurity-related problems for existing National Airspace System and future NextGen systems is vital to the future safety and proposals of our American airspace.

Once again, Madam Chair, I thank Chairman MARIO DIAZ-BALART. I thank Ranking Member PRICE. I urge adoption of this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LOBIONDO).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. ESTY

Ms. ESTY. I have an amendment at the desk, Madam Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 12, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$3,000,000)".

Page 13, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$3,000,000)".

Page 44, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$3,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentlewoman from Connecticut and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Connecticut.

Ms. ESTY. Madam Chair, I come to the floor once again to urge this House to invest in rail safety. My amendment adds \$3 million to the Federal Railroad Administration for safety and operations to fund vital rail safety education programs, like Operation Lifesaver.

Railroads move the goods that fuel our economy, and thousands of commuters in my district rely on passenger rail lines every day. In fact, over 11½ million Americans took the trains along the Northeast corridor last year, a record high ridership.

Freight rail traffic is also increasing, reflecting a growing economy and a booming energy sector. However, as we have seen in the news almost monthly, there have been a disturbing number of rail accidents in the last few years, many of them preventable train derailments and collisions. We in this House stood in silence a few weeks ago to mourn the loss of the eight passengers killed in last month's Amtrak derailment near Philadelphia. Those deaths were tragic and completely avoidable. We must do more to promote safe and reliable rail travel.

I have worked hard on the Transportation Committee and advocated in this House to implement positive train control and other innovative technologies that can protect passengers against the most dangerous rail accidents. But technologies like positive train control cannot prevent all train-related accidents.

On February 3, 2015, six people died when a northbound Metro-North Railroad commuter train collided with an SUV that was stopped at a highway rail crossing. Aditya Tomar, a resident of Danbury, Connecticut, and one of my constituents, was one of those passengers killed.

□ 2100

According to the Federal Railroad Administration, these sorts of highway-rail grade crossing accidents lead to 270 deaths every year.

Just this morning, media outlets were featuring a viral video from an Amtrak Silver Star train colliding with a car and slicing it in half after the driver drove around the lowered gate at a rail crossing in Jacksonville, Florida. Miraculously, every passenger survived with only minor injuries.

This video demonstrates that even when crossings are equipped with gates and warning lights, human error and miscalculation can have devastating consequences.

That is why we need to educate drivers, passengers, and pedestrians on how to avoid accidents along railroad tracks and at highway-rail grade crossings.

Technological safety advances are essential, make no mistake, but they are not enough. We must educate people about the dangers of walking along railroads or ignoring rail crossing warning signals.

The Operation Lifesaver program is an effective public safety campaign that encourages drivers and pedestrians to "stop, look, and listen" at highway-rail grade crossings and increases awareness in all 50 States.

Congress authorized Operation Lifesaver in 2008, but has failed to provide adequate funding.

My amendment to increase funding for the Operation Lifesaver rail safety program is also fiscally responsible and does not increase spending. Instead, this investment is offset by a very small reduction in Federal Government staff offices for the Federal Aviation Administration, an account that will still receive \$75 million above the administration's request.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Madam Chair, just moments ago we increased the FRA safety and operations by \$3.5 million.

This amendment, however, would result in, really, an unsustainable cut to FAA's operations account. Air traffic control facilities would have to close and communities would lose service. Frankly, critical operational support staff would have to be furloughed or even laid off. Safety could be compromised for flights, and flights could be potentially canceled.

Therefore, I cannot support this well-intentioned offset and, therefore, I cannot support this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. ESTY. Madam Chair, I urge passage of this commonsense amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. ESTY).

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

Ms. ESTY. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Connecticut will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DOLD

Mr. DOLD. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 12, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$290,000,000)".

Page 13, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$81,203,000)".

Page 13, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$208,797,000)".

Page 47, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$290,000,000)".

Mr. DOLD (during the reading). Madam Chair, I ask unanimous consent

that the amendment be considered as read.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Illinois and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DOLD. Madam Chair, I rise today in support of an amendment to increase funding for Amtrak's capital account. The bill as is cuts \$290 million from Amtrak's capital account, which is used to upgrade or replace the infrastructure that Amtrak owns, along with the acquisition and maintenance of Amtrak's fleet of locomotives, passenger cars, and other equipment.

Madam Chair, the Chicago area, which I represent, is the hub of our Nation's transportation network. Over 30 million people ride Amtrak every year nationwide, and many of those passengers ride through the city of Chicago. However, in the Chicago area, Amtrak trains are running on infrastructure that has not been updated in decades, including switches that date back to the administration of Teddy Roosevelt.

As we have seen in recent months, safety concerns on Amtrak are at a premium. Now is not the time to reduce the amount of money that we have made available for Amtrak and for our needed infrastructure upgrades. We need to make investments in our tracks, our trains, our stations, and the rest of our transportation system.

My amendment would take a step towards addressing that problem. All it does is restore capital investment grants to the level at which they were appropriated last year. This is a small step but one that will help rebuild our crumbling infrastructure and will help improve the mass transit systems that so many of our citizens use each and every day.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Madam Chair, this amendment would result in a deep and, frankly, unsustainable reduction to FAA's operations account. FAA would have to suspend contracts that run the information technology systems that keep our air traffic control flowing.

Air traffic control facilities would have to be closed and communities, frankly, would lose service. Critical operational support staff would be furloughed or, again, laid off. Safety could be compromised. Flights, again, would be canceled.

Therefore, I cannot support this offset and, respectfully, cannot support the gentleman's amendment.

At this time, I would like to yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I, too, reluctantly oppose this amendment. The discussion we had earlier about this offset certainly pertains here. We really cannot afford to make this kind of cut—safety-related cut, I might say—to the Federal Aviation Administration's funding.

The amendment is worthy in purpose. Again, funding for Amtrak's capital accounts is woefully inadequate in this bill. But this is simply not the way to make it up. In fact, there is no way to make it up within the confines of this bill. We are robbing Peter to pay Paul. This is what is wrong with this bill—an inadequate allocation. That means there is no way to get adequate funding for things we care about without doing equivalent damage somewhere else. It is an impossible dilemma.

What we need to do is do the responsible thing: get a budget agreement, get numbers we can work with, and write a decent bill. In the meantime, this amendment, while well-intentioned, really is not acceptable, and I urge rejection.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DOLD. Madam Chair, as we look at our transportation and infrastructure system, we know that investment is needed.

I urge adoption of the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DOLD). The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LYNCH

Mr. LYNCH. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 12, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$25,000,000)".

Page 13, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$25,000,000)".

Page 44, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$25,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Massachusetts and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. LYNCH. Madam Chair, what I am trying to do in this amendment is to really address a wider problem in my congressional district. My district surrounds the Logan International Airport in Boston.

What this amendment would do is remove \$25 million from the FAA budget and transfer it to rail. The reason for that is because the FAA has steadfastly refused to do part of their job in my district. I have tried to get them to come to the town of Milton, Massachusetts, to address the overflights in that

area. The new NextGen RNAV system concentrates flight after flight, thousands of flights a month, over the town of Milton, Massachusetts.

I requested the FAA to come out and meet with my neighbors—the people that I represent—just like everybody else represents people in their districts, and the FAA has flatly refused. So since they have refused to do part of the job that we fund them for, I figured I would take \$25 million out of their budget because they are not doing their job.

All I am looking for is a meeting with the FAA in my district, and I've got to resort to this. It is shameful. I would say that their attitude towards my constituents—the people I work for—has been utter contempt and disrespectful. So here I am trying to cut their budget to get their attention. It is a sad statement of the way the FAA operates.

But my real issue is getting the FAA to respond to my constituents, not about cutting their budgets. I know the chair and the ranking member have worked wonderfully, and I give you great credit for the work you have done.

What I am wondering is, would the chair and the ranking member help me just get the FAA to respond by having a meeting in my district in the town of Milton? I would withdraw my amendment and leave the money that you have wisely appropriated where it is. I am just looking to get this agency, this bureaucracy, to respond to the people I represent. It is as simple as that, Mr. Chairman.

I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I will tell the gentleman that one of the responsibilities that we have is to make sure that we hold government accountable. I don't think it is acceptable to not get answers. So I look forward to working with the gentleman to make sure that we move to address those concerns of your community. I don't want to speak for the ranking member, but I know that I look forward to working with you to make sure that we get answers that you need to get.

Mr. LYNCH. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LYNCH. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Madam Chair, I appreciate the chairman's response.

I, too, will work with you. This isn't acceptable. We will do our best to help you get the kind of response you need.

Mr. LYNCH. Madam Chair, I want to thank the chairman, and I want to thank the ranking member for the courtesy, not only to me, but to my constituents as well.

I yield back the balance of my time, and I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DOLD

Mr. DOLD. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 12, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$200,000,000)".

Page 13, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$200,000,000)".

Page 52, line 16, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$200,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Illinois and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DOLD. Madam Chair, I rise today in support of an amendment to increase funding for capital investment grants to help our Nation's mass transit rail systems. The bill as is cuts \$200 million from the account, and my amendment would restore that funding.

While I recognize, and as we have heard from the chairman and the ranking member, there is not really a good spot to be able to take some of these additional funds from, I do think it is important though, Madam Chair, that we talk about our infrastructure system, especially our rail system. And as we look specifically in the greater Chicago area, the Chicago Transit Authority's rail system, the El, serves around 725,000 riders each and every day, and the Metra, which serves the suburban areas like the 10th District in Illinois, serves over 300,000 riders each and every day. Over a million people are using these rail systems.

□ 2115

Again, as we talked about before, Metra estimates that it needs to find roughly \$13.4 billion over the next decade just to maintain the system in its current condition. That is why it is more important than ever before to find the funds to pay to maintain and rebuild our Nation's transportation infrastructure system.

Madam Chair, we hear all the time from our constituents that we need good, high-paying jobs. Frankly, a transportation infrastructure system for manufacturers—how do we get raw material and a finished product out? How do we get people around?—is absolutely critical to our economy.

I saw an estimate from UPS that read that every additional 5 minutes of idling time costs them \$100 million. We have switches in the Chicago area that delay rail up to 15 minutes one way. That is 30 minutes a day; and, if you are a regular commuter, that is 10½ hours in a given month, 10½ hours that you could be more productive or could be spending time with your family or spending time doing homework with your children.

If we as a country want to be more productive, if we want to encourage more good, high-paying jobs, we have to find a way to make sure that we invest in our transportation infrastructure system.

When we use this transportation infrastructure system and if it goes away, we are talking about an increase in congestion—at least I can tell you in the Chicago area—of an additional 50 percent. In talking to the rail, we would need an additional 29 lanes of traffic.

What is the cost of that? We just don't have it. If we don't have this type of funding, the car in front of you could have been somebody who was sitting on the rail, who could have been using mass transit.

Madam Chair, this bill is a step backward for our Nation's mass transit systems, not a step forward. Instead of providing funds to maintain and improve world-class mass transit systems, we are, instead, taking money away and making it harder and harder for the public to find the funds needed to keep their systems operational, much less to improve them. A reliable and consistent stream of capital funding is essential for these systems, but this bill does not meet that need.

My amendment would take a step toward addressing that problem. I recognize it is just a step, but I am anxious to work with the chairman and the ranking member, and I am anxious to work with those on the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee to make sure that we are coming up with outside-the-box thinking in how we can improve our mass transit systems.

It is vitally important for our urban areas, and it is certainly important for the Nation's transportation hub, which, I would argue, is in the heartland, in the Chicago area.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Madam Chair, one has to frankly respect and admire Mr. DOLD's knowledge and passion in these amendments that he is doing. I am sensitive to that, and I look forward to working with him. I know that he will make sure that we work with him on these issues that he brings up and that he is very passionate about, which I think are very important.

Respectfully, I have to oppose this amendment. This amendment would result in deep reductions to the FAA's operations account and would result in breaches of contract for air traffic control information technology systems. In addition, it would result in staff layoffs, which would again compromise safety.

I look forward to continuing to work with the gentleman. He brings up, obviously, some very important points; but again, respectfully, I must object to this amendment at this time.

Madam Chair, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE), the ranking member of the subcommittee.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Madam Chair, I appreciate the chairman's yielding.

I want to echo his opposition to this amendment, and I want to echo his praise for the reality check that the gentleman from Illinois has provided us tonight. At various times in the course of the evening, we have talked about TIGER grants; we have talked about Amtrak; we have talked about transit investments—all of which are underfunded in this bill.

I am also pleased that the chairman has expressed the willingness to cooperate in going forward. I want to echo that on my part, too, because we do believe a better day will come and, hopefully, not only at the end of the fiscal year but soon, where we get a budget agreement, where we get better numbers, and where we are able to address each of these accounts that the gentleman has highlighted.

He is exactly right about the need in all of these areas. The offset is not acceptable. It is even dangerous.

For that reason, I oppose the amendment, but the larger message is we have got to get a better budget number, and we have got to revisit many of the accounts in this bill.

Mr. DOLD. Madam Chair, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Illinois has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. DOLD. I certainly want to thank the chairman and the ranking member for their thoughts.

Madam Chair, there is no question as we look at the debt that we have—we have an \$18 trillion debt in our country—that it is jeopardizing our children's opportunity for the American Dream. One of the things that I talk about in terms of how we get out of it is by talking about: How do we grow, Madam Chair?

We grow, I think, by creating this opportunity and environment so people want to come and put their businesses here, becoming globally competitive. When entrepreneurs look at where to go to place their businesses, one of the things they are going to look at is our transportation infrastructure system. We need to know how we are going to get our raw materials in and our finished product out if we want to be globally competitive and if we want to manufacture. I would argue that we do.

I recognize where the committee is. I also appreciate the chairman's and the ranking member's willingness to work with us in going forward, but we have to, each and every one of us, come together and put our differences aside and invest in our infrastructure system so that we can grow our economy and have greater dollars coming into the Federal Treasury so that we can have these resources.

Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DOLD).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BRIDENSTINE

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 13, line 5, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$250,000)".

Page 13, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert "(decreased by \$250,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Oklahoma and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. Madam Chair, the Bridenstine-Rohrabacher-Posey amendment, which is supported by the Commercial Spaceflight Federation, transfers \$250,000 from the FAA's finance and management activities to the Office of Commercial Space Transportation. This is a small amount, but it is extremely important if we are to support the booming commercial spaceflight industry.

The FAA Office of Commercial Space Transportation's mission is as follows: "to ensure protection of the public, property, and the national security and foreign policy interests of the United States during commercial launch or re-entry activities and to encourage, facilitate, and promote commercial space transportation."

To carry out this mission, AST, as the office is known, is tasked with overseeing commercially licensed launches, test launches under experimental permits, licenses and permits for new vehicle designs, supporting NASA and the Commercial Crew contractors, taking the lead role in coordinating space traffic at the White House's request, and many other duties.

Over the past few years, the number of activities AST oversees has grown significantly; yet funding and staffing levels have remained absolutely flat.

Just last month, the House of Representatives passed the SPACE Act on an overwhelmingly bipartisan basis. That bill establishes a statutory and regulatory regime that provides stability and encourages private sector investment in order to facilitate the growth of commercial space activities. If we are passing legislation to encourage growth, we need to provide this office with increased resources to keep up.

We rely on the commercial space sector for many things: reliable, frequent, and inexpensive launches; communications, navigation, and imaging satellites; and services such as the Internet, telephone, television, and radio, which are staples of modern life.

Going forward, there are companies whose goal is to provide space tourism services. There are also ventures planning missions to harvest precious resources from celestial bodies. This is just the tip of the iceberg for this growth industry.

This is an industry that is constantly innovating. It is also an industry we have come to increasingly rely on. If AST does not get the additional resources, it could lead to slips of planned launch dates for some companies as the office is unable to process inspections, permits, and licenses in a timely manner. On top of being a hindrance to this growth industry, it could also reduce the functionality and capabilities we take for granted in our everyday lives.

This funding will give AST additional resources to accomplish its mission. As its workload continues to grow, I encourage the Office of Commercial Space Transportation to continue to work alongside industry in developing and supporting consensus safety standards that can streamline the inspection process.

I appreciate Chairman DIAZ-BALART's leadership and his recognition of the importance of this office. I thank him for working with me on this amendment, particularly given the constraints he is under while crafting this appropriations bill.

I understand we are in tough fiscal times; however, we need to ensure we do not strangle the unlimited potential of the commercial spaceflight industry. An important piece of this is ensuring that the Office of Commercial Space Transportation can keep up with the growth of this burgeoning industry.

I urge my colleagues to support my amendment and the underlying legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. BRIDENSTINE).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT
(AIRPORT AND AIRWAY TRUST FUND)

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, for acquisition, establishment, technical support services, improvement by contract or purchase, and hire of national airspace systems and experimental facilities and equipment, as authorized under part A of subtitle VII of title 49, United States Code, including initial acquisition of necessary sites by lease or grant; engineering and service testing, including construction of test facilities and acquisition of necessary sites by lease or grant; construction and furnishing of quarters and related accommodations for officers and employees of the Federal Aviation Administration stationed at remote localities where such accommodations are not available; and the purchase, lease, or transfer of aircraft from funds available under this heading, including aircraft for aviation regulation and certification; to be derived from the Airport and Airway Trust Fund, \$2,500,000,000, of which \$460,000,000 shall re-

main available until September 30, 2016, and \$2,040,000,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2018: *Provided*, That there may be credited to this appropriation funds received from States, counties, municipalities, other public authorities, and private sources, for expenses incurred in the establishment, improvement, and modernization of national airspace systems: *Provided further*, That upon initial submission to the Congress of the fiscal year 2017 President's budget, the Secretary of Transportation shall transmit to the Congress a comprehensive capital investment plan for the Federal Aviation Administration which includes funding for each budget line item for fiscal years 2017 through 2021, with total funding for each year of the plan constrained to the funding targets for those years as estimated and approved by the Office of Management and Budget: *Provided further*, That the amount herein appropriated shall be reduced by \$100,000 per day for each day after the initial submission of the fiscal year 2017 President's budget that such report has not been submitted to Congress.

RESEARCH, ENGINEERING, AND DEVELOPMENT
(AIRPORT AND AIRWAY TRUST FUND)

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, for research, engineering, and development, as authorized under part A of subtitle VII of title 49, United States Code, including construction of experimental facilities and acquisition of necessary sites by lease or grant, \$156,750,000, to be derived from the Airport and Airway Trust Fund and to remain available until September 30, 2018: *Provided*, That there may be credited to this appropriation as offsetting collections, funds received from States, counties, municipalities, other public authorities, and private sources, which shall be available for expenses incurred for research, engineering, and development.

GRANTS-IN-AID FOR AIRPORTS
(LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)
(LIMITATION ON OBLIGATIONS)
(AIRPORT AND AIRWAY TRUST FUND)

For liquidation of obligations incurred for grants-in-aid for airport planning and development, and noise compatibility planning and programs as authorized under subchapter I of chapter 471 and subchapter I of chapter 475 of title 49, United States Code, and under other law authorizing such obligations; for procurement, installation, and commissioning of runway incursion prevention devices and systems at airports of such title; for grants authorized under section 41743 of title 49, United States Code; and for inspection activities and administration of airport safety programs, including those related to airport operating certificates under section 44706 of title 49, United States Code, \$3,600,000,000, to be derived from the Airport and Airway Trust Fund and to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That none of the funds under this heading shall be available for the planning or execution of programs the obligations for which are in excess of \$3,350,000,000 in fiscal year 2016, notwithstanding section 47117(g) of title 49, United States Code: *Provided further*, That none of the funds under this heading shall be available for the replacement of baggage conveyor systems, reconfiguration of terminal baggage areas, or other airport improvements that are necessary to install bulk explosive detection systems: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, of funds limited under this heading, not more than \$107,100,000 shall be obligated for administration, not less than \$15,000,000 shall be available for the Airport Cooperative Research Program, and not less than \$31,000,000 shall be available for Airport Technology Research.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

SEC. 110. None of the funds in this Act may be used to compensate in excess of 600 technical staff-years under the federally funded research and development center contract between the Federal Aviation Administration and the Center for Advanced Aviation Systems Development during fiscal year 2016.

SEC. 111. None of the funds in this Act shall be used to pursue or adopt guidelines or regulations requiring airport sponsors to provide to the Federal Aviation Administration without cost building construction, maintenance, utilities and expenses, or space in airport sponsor-owned buildings for services relating to air traffic control, air navigation, or weather reporting: *Provided*, That the prohibition of funds in this section does not apply to negotiations between the agency and airport sponsors to achieve agreement on below-market rates for these items or to grant assurances that require airport sponsors to provide land without cost to the FAA for air traffic control facilities.

SEC. 112. The Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration may reimburse amounts made available to satisfy 49 U.S.C. 41742(a)(1) from fees credited under 49 U.S.C. 45303 and any amount remaining in such account at the close of that fiscal year may be made available to satisfy section 41742(a)(1) for the subsequent fiscal year.

SEC. 113. Amounts collected under section 40113(e) of title 49, United States Code, shall be credited to the appropriation current at the time of collection, to be merged with and available for the same purposes of such appropriation.

SEC. 114. None of the funds in this Act shall be available for paying premium pay under subsection 5546(a) of title 5, United States Code, to any Federal Aviation Administration employee unless such employee actually performed work during the time corresponding to such premium pay.

SEC. 115. None of the funds in this Act may be obligated or expended for an employee of the Federal Aviation Administration to purchase a store gift card or gift certificate through use of a Government-issued credit card.

SEC. 116. None of the funds in this Act may be obligated or expended for retention bonuses for an employee of the Federal Aviation Administration without the prior written approval of the Assistant Secretary for Administration of the Department of Transportation.

SEC. 117. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of the funds made available under this Act or any prior Act may be used to implement or to continue to implement any limitation on the ability of any owner or operator of a private aircraft to obtain, upon a request to the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration, a blocking of that owner's or operator's aircraft registration number from any display of the Federal Aviation Administration's Aircraft Situational Display to Industry data that is made available to the public, except data made available to a Government agency, for the noncommercial flights of that owner or operator.

SEC. 118. None of the funds in this Act shall be available for salaries and expenses of more than 9 political and Presidential appointees in the Federal Aviation Administration.

SEC. 119. None of the funds made available under this Act may be used to increase fees pursuant to section 44721 of title 49, United States Code, until the FAA provides to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations a report that justifies all fees related to aeronautical navigation products and explains how such fees are consistent with Executive Order 13642.

SEC. 119A. None of the funds in this Act may be used to close a regional operations center of the Federal Aviation Administration or reduce its services unless the Administrator notifies the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations not less than 90 full business days in advance.

SEC. 119B. None of the funds appropriated or limited by this Act may be used to change weight restrictions or prior permission rules at Teterboro airport in Teterboro, New Jersey.

FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION
LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES
(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)
(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Contingent upon enactment of authorization legislation, not to exceed \$426,100,000, together with advances and reimbursements received by the Federal Highway Administration, shall be obligated for necessary expenses for administration and operation of the Federal Highway Administration. In addition, not to exceed \$3,248,000 shall be transferred to the Appalachian Regional Commission in accordance with section 104 of title 23, United States Code.

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAYS
(LIMITATION ON OBLIGATIONS)
(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

Contingent upon enactment of authorization legislation, funds available for the implementation or execution of Federal-aid highway and highway safety construction programs authorized under titles 23 and 49, United States Code, and the provisions of such authorization legislation shall not exceed total obligations of \$40,256,000,000 for fiscal year 2016: *Provided*, That the Secretary may collect and spend fees, as authorized by title 23, United States Code, to cover the costs of services of expert firms, including counsel, in the field of municipal and project finance to assist in the underwriting and servicing of Federal credit instruments and all or a portion of the costs to the Federal Government of servicing such credit instruments: *Provided further*, That such fees are available until expended to pay for such costs: *Provided further*, That such amounts are in addition to administrative expenses that are also available for such purpose, and are not subject to any obligation limitation or the limitation on administrative expenses under section 608 of title 23, United States Code.

(LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)
(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

Contingent upon enactment of authorization legislation, for the payment of obligations incurred in carrying out Federal-aid highway and highway safety construction programs authorized under title 23, United States Code, \$40,995,000,000 derived from the Highway Trust Fund (other than the Mass Transit Account), to remain available until expended.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS—FEDERAL
HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 120. Contingent upon enactment of authorization legislation:

(a) For fiscal year 2016, the Secretary of Transportation shall—

(1) not distribute from the obligation limitation for Federal-aid highways—

(A) amounts authorized for administrative expenses and programs by section 104(a) of title 23, United States Code; and

(B) amounts authorized for the Bureau of Transportation Statistics;

(2) not distribute an amount from the obligation limitation for Federal-aid highways that is equal to the unobligated balance of amounts—

(A) made available from the Highway Trust Fund (other than the Mass Transit Account) for Federal-aid highway and highway safety construction programs for previous fiscal years the funds for which are allocated by the Secretary (or apportioned by the Secretary under sections 202 or 204 of title 23, United States Code); and

(B) for which obligation limitation was provided in a previous fiscal year;

(3) determine the proportion that—

(A) the obligation limitation for Federal-aid highways, less the aggregate of amounts not distributed under paragraphs (1) and (2) of this subsection; bears to

(B) the total of the sums authorized to be appropriated for the Federal-aid highway and highway safety construction programs (other than sums authorized to be appropriated for provisions of law described in paragraphs (1) through (11) of subsection (b) and sums authorized to be appropriated for section 119 of title 23, United States Code, equal to the amount referred to in subsection (b)(12) for such fiscal year), less the aggregate of the amounts not distributed under paragraphs (1) and (2) of this subsection;

(4) distribute the obligation limitation for Federal-aid highways, less the aggregate amounts not distributed under paragraphs (1) and (2), for each of the programs (other than programs to which paragraph (1) applies) that are allocated by the Secretary under such authorization legislation and title 23, United States Code, or apportioned by the Secretary under sections 202 or 204 of that title, by multiplying—

(A) the proportion determined under paragraph (3); by

(B) the amounts authorized to be appropriated for each such program for such fiscal year; and

(5) distribute the obligation limitation for Federal-aid highways, less the aggregate amounts not distributed under paragraphs (1) and (2) and the amounts distributed under paragraph (4), for Federal-aid highway and highway safety construction programs that are apportioned by the Secretary under such authorization legislation or title 23, United States Code (other than the amounts apportioned for the National Highway Performance Program in section 119 of title 23, United States Code, that are exempt from the limitation under subsection (b)(12) and the amounts apportioned under sections 202 and 204 of that title) in the proportion that—

(A) amounts authorized to be appropriated for the programs that are apportioned under title 23, United States Code, or such authorization legislation to each State for such fiscal year; bears to

(B) the total of the amounts authorized to be appropriated for the programs that are apportioned under title 23, United States Code, or such authorization legislation to all States for such fiscal year.

(b) EXCEPTIONS FROM OBLIGATION LIMITATION.—The obligation limitation for Federal-aid highways shall not apply to obligations under or for—

(1) section 125 of title 23, United States Code;

(2) section 147 of the Surface Transportation Assistance Act of 1978 (23 U.S.C. 144 note; 92 Stat. 2714);

(3) section 9 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1981 (95 Stat. 1701);

(4) subsections (b) and (j) of section 131 of the Surface Transportation Assistance Act of 1982 (96 Stat. 2119);

(5) subsections (b) and (c) of section 149 of the Surface Transportation and Uniform Relocation Assistance Act of 1987 (101 Stat. 198);

(6) sections 1103 through 1108 of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 (105 Stat. 2027);

(7) section 157 of title 23, United States Code (as in effect on June 8, 1998);

(8) section 105 of title 23, United States Code (as in effect for fiscal years 1998 through 2004, but only in an amount equal to \$639,000,000 for each of those fiscal years);

(9) Federal-aid highway programs for which obligation authority was made available under the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (112 Stat. 107) or subsequent Acts for multiple years or to remain available until expended, but only to the extent that the obligation authority has not lapsed or been used;

(10) section 105 of title 23, United States Code (as in effect for fiscal years 2005 through 2012, but only in an amount equal to \$639,000,000 for each of those fiscal years);

(11) section 1603 of SAFETEA-LU (23 U.S.C. 118 note; 119 Stat. 1248), to the extent that funds obligated in accordance with that section were not subject to a limitation on obligations at the time at which the funds were initially made available for obligation; and

(12) section 119 of title 23, United States Code (but, for each of fiscal years 2013 through 2016, only in an amount equal to \$639,000,000).

(c) REDISTRIBUTION OF UNUSED OBLIGATION AUTHORITY.—Notwithstanding subsection (a), the Secretary shall, after August 1 of such fiscal year—

(1) revise a distribution of the obligation limitation made available under subsection (a) if an amount distributed cannot be obligated during that fiscal year; and

(2) redistribute sufficient amounts to those States able to obligate amounts in addition to those previously distributed during that fiscal year, giving priority to those States having large unobligated balances of funds apportioned under sections 144 (as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of Public Law 112-141) and 104 of title 23, United States Code.

(d) APPLICABILITY OF OBLIGATION LIMITATIONS TO TRANSPORTATION RESEARCH PROGRAMS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the obligation limitation for Federal-aid highways shall apply to contract authority for transportation research programs carried out under—

(A) chapter 5 of title 23, United States Code; and

(B) the transportation research programs sections of such authorization legislation.

(2) EXCEPTION.—Obligation authority made available under paragraph (1) shall—

(A) remain available for a period of 4 fiscal years; and

(B) be in addition to the amount of any limitation imposed on obligations for Federal-aid highway and highway safety construction programs for future fiscal years.

(e) REDISTRIBUTION OF CERTAIN AUTHORIZED FUNDS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date of distribution of obligation limitation under subsection (a), the Secretary shall distribute to the States any funds (excluding funds authorized for the program under section 202 of title 23, United States Code) that—

(A) are authorized to be appropriated for such fiscal year for Federal-aid highway programs; and

(B) the Secretary determines will not be allocated to the States (or will not be apportioned to the States under section 204 of title 23, United States Code), and will not be available for obligation, for such fiscal year because of the imposition of any obligation limitation for such fiscal year.

(2) RATIO.—Funds shall be distributed under paragraph (1) in the same proportion as the distribution of obligation authority under subsection (a)(5).

(3) AVAILABILITY.—Funds distributed to each State under paragraph (1) shall be available for any purpose described in section 133(b) of title 23, United States Code.

SEC. 121. Notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302, funds received by the Bureau of Transportation Statistics from the sale of data products, for necessary expenses incurred pursuant to chapter 63 of title 49, United States Code, may be credited to the Federal-aid highways account for the purpose of reimbursing the Bureau for such expenses: *Provided*, That such funds shall be subject to the obligation limitation for Federal-aid highway and highway safety construction programs.

SEC. 122. Not less than 15 days prior to waiving, under his or her statutory authority, any Buy America requirement for Federal-aid highways projects, the Secretary of Transportation shall make an informal public notice and comment opportunity on the intent to issue such waiver and the reasons therefor: *Provided*, That the Secretary shall provide an annual report to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations on any waivers granted under the Buy America requirements.

SEC. 123. None of the funds in this Act to the Department of Transportation may be used to provide credit assistance unless not less than 3 days before any application approval to provide credit assistance under sections 603 and 604 of title 23, United States Code, the Secretary of Transportation provides notification in writing to the following committees: the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations; the Committee on Environment and Public Works and the Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs of the Senate; and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives: *Provided*, That such notification shall include, but not be limited to, the name of the project sponsor; a description of the project; whether credit assistance will be provided as a direct loan, loan guarantee, or line of credit; and the amount of credit assistance.

SEC. 124. Section 127 of title 23, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(m) LONGER COMBINATION VEHICLES IN IDAHO.—No limit or other prohibition under this section, except as provided in this subsection, applies to a longer combination vehicle operating on a segment of the Interstate System in the State of Idaho if such vehicle—

“(1) has a gross vehicle weight of 129,000 pounds or less;

“(2) complies with the single axle, tandem axle, and bridge formula limits set forth in subsection (a); and

“(3) is authorized to operate on such segment under Idaho State Law.”.

SEC. 125. Section 3111(b)(1)(A) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking “or of less than 28 feet on a semitrailer or trailer operating in a truck tractor-semitrailer-trailer combination,” and inserting “or, notwithstanding section 31112, of less than 33 feet on a semitrailer or trailer operating in a truck tractor-semitrailer-trailer combination.”.

SEC. 126. EXEMPTION.—

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 3112(c)(5) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking “Nebraska may” and inserting “Nebraska and Kansas may”; and

(2) by striking “the State of Nebraska” and inserting “the relevant state”.

(b) CONFORMING AND TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.—Section 3112(c) of such title is amended—

(1) by striking the subsection designation and heading and inserting the following:

“(c) SPECIAL RULES FOR WYOMING, OHIO, ALASKA, IOWA, NEBRASKA, AND KANSAS.—”;

(2) by striking “; and” at the end of paragraph (3) and inserting a semicolon; and

(3) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (4) and inserting “; and”.

SEC. 127. Section 130(e)(1) of title 23, United States Code, is amended by striking “\$220,000,000” and inserting “\$350,000,000”.

FEDERAL MOTOR CARRIER SAFETY
ADMINISTRATION
MOTOR CARRIER SAFETY OPERATIONS AND
PROGRAMS
(LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)
(LIMITATION ON OBLIGATIONS)
(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

Contingent upon enactment of authorization legislation, for payment of obligations incurred in the implementation, execution and administration of motor carrier safety operations and programs pursuant to section 31104(i) of title 49, United States Code, and sections 4127 and 4134 of Public Law 109-59, as amended by Public Law 112-141, and as extended by Public Law 113-159, \$259,000,000, to be derived from the Highway Trust Fund (other than the Mass Transit Account), together with advances and reimbursements received by the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration, the sum of which shall remain available until expended: *Provided*, That funds available for implementation, execution or administration of motor carrier safety operations and programs authorized under title 49, United States Code, and sections 4127 and 4134 of Public Law 109-59, as amended by Public Law 112-141, and as extended by Public Law 113-159, shall not exceed total obligations of \$259,000,000 for “Motor Carrier Safety Operations and Programs” for fiscal year 2016, of which \$9,000,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2018, is for the research and technology program, and of which \$34,545,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2018, is for information management: *Provided further*, That \$1,000,000 shall be made available for commercial motor vehicle operator grants to carry out section 4134 of Public Law 109-59, as amended by Public Law 112-141, and as extended by Public Law 113-159.

MOTOR CARRIER SAFETY GRANTS
(LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)
(LIMITATION ON OBLIGATIONS)
(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

Contingent upon enactment of authorization legislation, for payment of obligations incurred in carrying out sections 31102, 31104(a), 31106, 31107, 31109, 31309, 31313 of title 49, United States Code, and sections 4126 and 4128 of Public Law 109-59, as amended by Public Law 112-141, as extended by Public Law 113-159, \$313,000,000, to be derived from the Highway Trust Fund (other than the Mass Transit Account) and to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That funds available for the implementation or execution of motor carrier safety programs shall not exceed total obligations of \$313,000,000 in fiscal year 2016 for “Motor Carrier Safety Grants”; of which \$218,000,000 shall be available for the motor carrier safety assistance program, \$30,000,000 shall be available for commercial driver’s license program improvement grants, \$32,000,000 shall be available for border enforcement grants, \$5,000,000 shall be available for performance and registration information system management grants, \$25,000,000 shall be available for the commercial vehicle information systems and networks deployment program, and \$3,000,000 shall be available for safety data improvement grants: *Provided further*, That, of the funds made available herein for the motor carrier safety assistance program, \$32,000,000 shall be available for audits of new entrant motor carriers.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS—FEDERAL MOTOR
CARRIER SAFETY ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 130. Funds appropriated or limited in this Act shall be subject to the terms and conditions stipulated in section 350 of Public Law 107-87 and section 6901 of Public Law 110-28.

SEC. 131. The Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration shall send notice of 49 CFR section 385.308 violations by certified mail, registered mail, or another manner of delivery, which records the receipt of the notice by the persons responsible for the violations.

SEC. 132. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act or any other Act may be used to implement, administer, or enforce sections 395.3(c) and 395.3(d) of title 49, Code of Federal Regulations, and such section shall have no force or effect on submission of the final report issued by the Secretary, as required by section 133 of Division K of Public Law 113-235, unless the Secretary and the Inspector General of the Department of Transportation each review and determine that the final report—

(1) meets the statutory requirements set forth in such section; and

(2) establishes that commercial motor vehicle drivers who operated under the restart provisions in effect between July 1, 2013, and the day before the date of enactment of such Public Law demonstrated statistically significant improvement in all outcomes related to safety, operator fatigue, driver health and longevity, and work schedules, in comparison to commercial motor vehicle drivers who operated under the restart provisions in effect on June 30, 2013.

SEC. 133. None of the funds limited or otherwise made available under the heading “Motor Carrier Safety Operations and Programs” may be used to deny an application to renew a Hazardous Materials Safety Program permit for a motor carrier based on that carrier’s Hazardous Materials Out-of-Service rate, unless the carrier has the opportunity to submit a written description of corrective actions taken, and other documentation the carrier wishes the Secretary to consider, including submitting a corrective action plan, and the Secretary determines the actions or plan is insufficient to address the safety concerns that resulted in that Hazardous Materials Out-of-Service rate.

SEC. 134. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to develop, issue, or implement any regulation that increases levels of minimum financial responsibility for transporting passengers or property as in effect on January 1, 2014, under regulations issued pursuant to sections 31138 and 31139 of title 49, United States Code.

□ 2130

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CARTWRIGHT
Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Madam Chair, I rise to offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike section 134.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Pennsylvania and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Madam Chair, tonight I urge the adoption of my amendment, which would allow the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration to continue its congressionally mandated ongoing work to improve

safety and accountability in the trucking and bus industry. I do so out of a concern that we need to exhibit common sense in what we do. We need to be fiscally prudent, we need to promote safe highways in our Nation, and we need to recognize the importance of promoting personal responsibility and accountability.

My amendment would strike a section of this bill that would halt the FMCSA's work toward issuing a rule that would make our highways safer for everyone by creating an incentive for motor carriers to make safety a greater priority. We have to allow the FMCSA to proceed with the development of a rule to increase insurance minimums for motor carriers, which have not been updated in, fully, 35 years in this Nation and, thus, have become outdated to the point of uselessness.

The first point I make is that it is simply common sense that we adjust for inflation. Not adjusting for inflation for 35 years is not prudent, and it makes no sense. It allows carriers to travel on our Nation's highways in a financially irresponsible manner, in a manner that would allow them not to be accountable for whatever harm they might cause.

Adjusting for inflation is common sense. It is also fiscally prudent, because what happens? Right now in this Nation, tractor-trailers are allowed to travel around with \$750,000 of liability insurance. The FMCSA is studying that number to see what it should be updated to after 35 years. \$750,000 is not enough money.

Just this morning in my district in northeastern Pennsylvania, there was a horrendous truck and bus accident in which three people were killed and a dozen others were seriously injured. When three people are killed, asking their families to share \$750,000 is not fiscally responsible. Look who pays the difference.

If somebody is killed or if somebody is rendered, for example, a paraplegic, they are going to incur incredible amounts of medical bills; they are not going to be able to work. Who picks up the difference when that happens? It is the Social Security system, it is the Medicare system, it is John Q. Taxpayer that ends up paying the bill when the trucking company doesn't have enough insurance to pay the damages.

That is why it is fiscally prudent that we allow the FMCSA to continue its important work, and it is important work that was mandated by the MAP-21 bill that required the FMCSA to do this work.

It also promotes safe highways, because if we raise insurance minimums up to modern and responsible levels, that means insurance companies will have to engage in actual real underwriting. They will have to go out from the home office and visit the headquarters of trucking companies to make sure they are acting properly and

safely and responsibly. If they do that, if you want to buy insurance at reasonable levels, you have to act safely.

Finally, Madam Chair, this is about personal responsibility. If you don't have enough insurance, you get away without being personally responsible when these horrendous crashes happen.

Madam Chair, I yield to Mr. PRICE for a colloquy.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I want to commend him for offering this amendment.

Madam Chair, as he has stressed very effectively, this is simply irrational to freeze these claims where they were in the early 1980s, and it also defies our own body's directions to the DOT to look at this and to think about what kind of future changes might be in order. This simply preempts that whole process; is that right?

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. That is correct. For that very reason, I urge everyone to support my amendment to allow the FMCSA to finish its important work of examining and developing a rule that is critical to preventing devastating trucking accidents and keeping our highways safe and secure for everyone.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Madam Chair, I claim time in opposition.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chair, I oppose this amendment. As is frequently the case in Washington, D.C., the proposed rules requiring truckers to increase their liability insurance is a solution in search of a problem. The provision currently included in the bill must remain. It must remain because it protects job creators so they can stay in business. When you consider that 99.9 percent of crashes are already covered by existing insurance requirements, you can see that increasing insurance and, thus, costs at the expense of jobs is just not a credible solution.

Safety is important. We all know that. We all want to make sure that our roadways are safe. But the Department of Transportation readily admits that raising the cost does not necessarily improve safety. The DOT's own study expresses a crippling revelation to proponents of a cost increase on our job creators. There may be more effective ways that reduce crashes at a lower cost.

Bottom line, we need to strike a balance. If the proposed regulations went into effect, our smaller trucking companies in Iowa and other rural areas in States around the country would be unable to absorb the increased costs, and it could threaten their ability to stay in business. Too frequently in this town we are working to fix the mistakes that were made by so-called Washington solutions. I strongly encourage the rejection of this amendment tonight.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Madam Chair, on the one point about 99.9 percent of crashes settling within existing insurance minimums, there we have the opponents of my amendment speaking really out of both sides of their mouth, because if they say it is so rare that a crash will cost more than the minimum insurance, then what that means is that the expense of insuring against that minimal risk has to be minimal itself, but these are the same people saying that it will be a crippling additional insurance premium. It doesn't make sense.

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Reclaiming my time, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY).

Mr. PERRY. Madam Chair, I, too, oppose this amendment. Increasing insurance requirements will not improve highway safety. I mean, what incentive does it create? How does increasing the insurance requirement improve safety? It is not backed by any sound data.

The agency's own data shows that current requirements cover damages in more—more—than 99 percent of all crashes. Think about that, more than 99 percent of all crashes. But to the gentleman's point, my friend from Pennsylvania, the agency is planning on tying these requirements to medical inflation, and that results in increases of 500 percent or more. Think about that, medical inflation, this administration. I mean, isn't that the height of irony? I thought they were driving the cost of medical inflation down. That is another whole story.

The fact is the industry has a remarkable safety record compared to all commercial motor vehicles. As a matter of fact, motor coaches average only 20 fatalities per year and schoolbuses only 5. Now, that is not meant to minimize those losses because every life is precious, but in a highway environment that produces 35,000 fatalities per year, the DOT study did not even consider accident data, claims data, or talk to insurance carriers about the impacts of increasing insurance or whether there is even a need for it.

Indeed, this is a solution that is looking for a problem, a problem that does not exist. I urge the Members to vote "no" on this amendment.

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. CARTWRIGHT).

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

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania will be postponed.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 135. None of the funds made available by this Act or previous appropriations Acts under the heading “Motor Carrier Safety Operations and Programs” shall be used to pay for costs associated with design, development, testing, or implementation of a wireless roadside inspection program until 180 days after the Secretary of Transportation certifies to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations that such program does not conflict with existing non-Federal electronic screening systems, create capabilities already available, or require additional statutory authority to incorporate generated inspection data into safety determinations or databases, and has restrictions to specifically address privacy concerns of affected motor carriers and operators: *Provided*, That nothing in this section shall be construed as affecting the Department’s ongoing research efforts in this area.

NATIONAL HIGHWAY TRAFFIC SAFETY
ADMINISTRATION
OPERATIONS AND RESEARCH

For expenses necessary to discharge the functions of the Secretary, with respect to traffic and highway safety authorized under chapter 301 and part C of subtitle VI of title 49, United States Code, \$150,000,000, of which \$20,000,000 shall remain available through September 30, 2017.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

Mr. GOSAR. I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia). The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 40, line 12, after the dollar amount insert “(reduced by \$1,200,000)”.

Page 142, line 9, after the dollar amount insert “(increased by \$500,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Arizona and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

□ 2145

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment which seeks to bolster funds for the inspector general of the National Railroad Passenger Corporation, or Amtrak.

I am a strong proponent of government oversight, and I believe the revelatory work of the inspector general should be staunchly supported within each agency of the Federal Government.

Today, given the dismal financial record of Amtrak through its history, compounded with recent safety failures, it is clear that the scrupulous, objective oversight of the inspector general is needed for this agency now more than ever.

This amendment redirects \$500,000 to the Amtrak Office of the Inspector General salaries and expenses account to bring it up to the budget request level.

Since the Inspector General Act was passed into law, the IG community has saved taxpayers billions of dollars and has uncovered countless examples of wrongdoing in the Federal Govern-

ment. The inspector general community does good work. Let’s give them the resources they need.

The committee has noted the good work of the Amtrak OIG in the committee report, stating: “The OIG’s efforts have resulted in valuable studies and recommendations for this committee and for the Corporation that have yielded cost savings and management improvements. These studies have been in a number of areas, including food and beverage service, capital planning, overtime, and fraud.”

I commend the committee for the work they have done to support efficient and effective government.

This amendment is directly in line with the high value the committee places on the thorough work of the OIG and will ensure additional transparency and accountability within Amtrak.

There is a wide agreement about the need to reform, streamline, and improve Amtrak. A valuable first step in that reform is supporting the objective, rigorous auditing information which the OIG is uniquely qualified to produce.

I ask my colleagues to join me in support of government accountability by giving the Amtrak OIG the resources they need to identify the waste, fraud, and abuse within a government agency that is in desperate need of reform.

I thank the chairman and the ranking member for their leadership on this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

OPERATIONS AND RESEARCH
(LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)
(LIMITATION ON OBLIGATIONS)
(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

Contingent upon enactment of authorization legislation, for payment of obligations incurred in carrying out the provisions of 23 U.S.C. 403, and chapter 303 of title 49, United States Code, \$125,000,000, to be derived from the Highway Trust Fund (other than the Mass Transit Account) and to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That none of the funds in this Act shall be available for the planning or execution of programs the total obligations for which, in fiscal year 2016, are in excess of \$125,000,000, of which \$120,000,000 shall be for programs authorized under 23 U.S.C. 403 and \$5,000,000 shall be for the National Driver Register authorized under chapter 303 of title 49, United States Code: *Provided further*, That within the \$120,000,000 obligation limitation for operations and research, \$20,000,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2017, and shall be in addition to the amount of any limitation imposed on obligations for future years: *Provided further*, That \$6,500,000 of the total obligation limitation for operations and research in fiscal year 2016 shall be applied toward unobligated balances of contract authority provided in prior Acts for carrying out the provisions of 23 U.S.C. 403, and chapter 303 of title 49, United States Code.

HIGHWAY TRAFFIC SAFETY GRANTS
(LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)
(LIMITATION ON OBLIGATIONS)
(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

Contingent on the enactment of authorization legislation, for payment of obligations incurred in carrying out provisions of 23 U.S.C. 402 and 405, section 2009 of Public Law 109-59, as amended by Public Law 112-141, and section 31101(a)(6) of Public Law 112-141, to remain available until expended, \$561,500,000, to be derived from the Highway Trust Fund (other than the Mass Transit Account): *Provided*, That none of the funds in this Act shall be available for the planning or execution of programs the total obligations for which, in fiscal year 2016, are in excess of \$561,500,000 for programs authorized under 23 U.S.C. 402 and 405, section 2009 of Public Law 109-59, as amended by Public Law 112-141, and section 31101(a)(6) of Public Law 112-141, of which \$235,000,000 shall be for “Highway Safety Programs” under 23 U.S.C. 402; \$272,000,000 shall be for “National Priority Safety Programs” under 23 U.S.C. 405; \$29,000,000 shall be for the “High Visibility Enforcement Program” under section 2009 of Public Law 109-59, as amended by Public Law 112-141; \$25,500,000 shall be for “Administrative Expenses” under section 31101(a)(6) of Public Law 112-141: *Provided further*, That none of these funds shall be used for construction, rehabilitation, or remodeling costs, or for office furnishings and fixtures for State, local or private buildings or structures: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$500,000 of the funds made available for “National Priority Safety Programs” under 23 U.S.C. 405 for “Impaired Driving Countermeasures” (as described in subsection (d) of that section) shall be available for technical assistance to the States: *Provided further*, That with respect to the “Transfers” provision under 23 U.S.C. 405(a)(1)(G), any amounts transferred to increase the amounts made available under section 402 shall include the obligation authority for such amounts: *Provided further*, That the Administrator shall notify the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations of any exercise of the authority granted under the previous proviso or under 23 U.S.C. 405(a)(1)(G) within 60 days.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS—NATIONAL
HIGHWAY TRAFFIC SAFETY ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 140. An additional \$130,000 shall be made available to the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, out of the amount limited for section 402 of title 23, United States Code, to pay for travel and related expenses for State management reviews and to pay for core competency development training and related expenses for highway safety staff.

SEC. 141. The limitations on obligations for the programs of the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration set in this Act shall not apply to obligations for which obligation authority was made available in previous public laws but only to the extent that the obligation authority has not lapsed or been used.

SEC. 142. None of the funds in this Act shall be used to implement section 404 of title 23, United States Code.

SEC. 143. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to obligate or award funds for the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration’s National Roadside Survey.

SEC. 144. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to mandate global positioning system (GPS) tracking in private passenger motor vehicles without providing full and appropriate consideration of privacy concerns under 5 U.S.C. chapter 5, subchapter II.

FEDERAL RAILROAD ADMINISTRATION
SAFETY AND OPERATIONS

For necessary expenses of the Federal Railroad Administration, not otherwise provided for, \$186,870,000, of which \$15,400,000 shall remain available until expended.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GARRETT

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 44, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$16,930,000)”.

Page 52, line 16, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$83,000,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from New Jersey and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment that will bolster our Nation’s rail safety and operations.

First, I would like to thank the gentleman from Florida for his dedication and important work on this bill.

Mr. Chairman, the number of train derailments and accidents in our local communities is a growing concern among my constituents and Americans all across the country.

In the first 2 months of 2015, there were 18 Amtrak accidents, as well as recent oil train derailments in West Virginia and in North Dakota. Most recently, Mr. Chairman, an Amtrak train crash in Philadelphia killed eight people and injured dozens more.

In New Jersey alone, there are 2,400 miles of freight lines and over 1,000 passenger rail miles, and we must ensure, Mr. Chairman, that these existing lines are operating safely.

So what do we have here? My amendment fully funds the Federal Railroad Administration’s safety and operations account without increasing spending in the underlying bill. The FRA’s safety and operations account provides funding for the FRA’s safety program activities related to passenger and freight railroads.

So how do we do this? By reallocating a mere 4 percent of funding from capital investment grants, we can fund the safe operation of our Nation’s trains at the President’s requested levels.

Mr. Chairman, we do not build a new section onto our house if our roof is caving in. So we should not be adding on to these systems if they are caving in or failing.

So why are we funding new projects before we ensure that our current rail lines have enough dollars, enough funding for their safety?

My amendment would simply prioritize safety and maintenance of our existing infrastructure over the ribbon-cutting ceremonies associated with system expansion.

In light of the recent upsurge in deadly rail accidents, now is the time to adequately fund the safety and oper-

ations of our trains. Additionally, with our rising national debt, it is very important that we remain fiscally responsible and prioritize how we spend our constituents’ hard-earned tax dollars.

That is why, in conclusion, my amendment does not increase spending, but only prioritizes a commonsense directive. And so I urge my colleagues to support my amendment to fund train safety, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, while I know and I am absolutely certain that the gentleman from New Jersey’s heart is in the right place, unfortunately, I cannot support the offset.

The committee carefully calculated the New Start numbers to be able to accommodate the signed FFGAs and Small Starts Grant Agreements at the beginning of the fiscal year, and I am a firm believer that once you sign a grant, once you make that commitment, we should honor it. This reduction would impact those signed agreements, so I reluctantly oppose this amendment.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE), the ranking member.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I want to echo his opposition to this amendment, although I do commend Mr. GARRETT for his focus on safety and operations. I, too, would like to raise that appropriation to the request level. That is a good objective.

There are a couple of problems here, though. One, is that because of differences in outlay rates, to pick up \$17 million on the safety and operations side you have to cut \$83 million from the transit New Starts. That has to do with differences in outlay rates. But the fact is, it is a substantial cut. And these New Starts in the bill, I remind colleagues, are already \$1.3 billion below the President’s request. They are \$198 million below what we have this year.

These are badly underfunded items. So we simply, again, are robbing Peter to pay Paul. But because of the disproportionate impact here, and the fact that New Starts are already so underresourced, I reluctantly oppose this amendment.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, two points. The first is, I understand the gentleman’s opposition on procedural grounds as far as the differences in outlays and what have you. But when you go back home and talk to your district and say you are trying to do something for safety, as we are in this case, and you say: Well, the reason we can’t do this is the procedural aspect of outlays versus the actual amount of money going in and the amount of money

being cut, and so on and so forth, and you go through all the rubric and the matrix that we use around here and all the buzz words on the floor to try to explain things, the eyes of the people back home glaze over, rightfully so, because they say: Those are your rules, not ours. Why don’t you just get something done.

What they are asking to get done is rail safety. And that is what this amendment does.

I just want to end with one quote. Back in 2010, the head of the FTA—at that time, the administrator was Peter Rogoff—chastised local transit agencies for promoting rail construction for so many new rail lines. He said on one hand, agencies were unable to maintain the rail lines they already had. The FTA had recently at that point estimated that rail transit systems suffered from close to a \$60 billion maintenance backlog—and the backlog was growing even then.

And he said this: “If you can’t afford to operate the systems you have,” he asked the agencies, “why does it make sense for us to partner with you in new expansions?”

That is a great question. If they can’t fix up what is already out there and all the problems on the rail lines out there on important things like safety, then why on Earth are we spending all these tens of millions of dollars on brand new programs that we know that they are not going to be able to maintain as well? Let’s do first things first.

As I said in my little example before, if your roof is collapsing on your house, you don’t add a new deck, you don’t put in a new pool, you don’t put in a paved new driveway, you don’t do anything else. You repair the roof, first and foremost, and then everything else comes after that.

And that is really all I am asking. Let’s maintain the safety, first and foremost, so that everyone riding on the rails can feel confident that they are operating right. Then, after that, let’s come back here to the floor and fix up the other funding mechanism for new programs and what have you, and go forward.

Right now, let’s make sure that our constituents back home can feel confident every time they ride on a transit system, be it a bus or train or something else, that they know that it is adequately funded and taken care of and maintained.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT).

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

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey will be postponed.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

RAILROAD RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

For necessary expenses for railroad research and development, \$39,100,000, to remain available until expended.

RAILROAD REHABILITATION AND IMPROVEMENT FINANCING PROGRAM

The Secretary of Transportation is authorized to issue direct loans and loan guarantees pursuant to sections 501 through 504 of the Railroad Revitalization and Regulatory Reform Act of 1976 (Public Law 94-210), as amended, such authority to exist as long as any such direct loan or loan guarantee is outstanding. *Provided*, That pursuant to section 502 of such Act, as amended, no new direct loans or loan guarantee commitments shall be made using Federal funds for the credit risk premium during fiscal year 2016.

OPERATING GRANTS TO THE NATIONAL RAILROAD PASSENGER CORPORATION

To enable the Secretary of Transportation to make quarterly grants to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation, in amounts based on the Secretary's assessment of the Corporation's seasonal cash flow requirements, for the operation of intercity passenger rail, as authorized by section 101 of the Passenger Rail Investment and Improvement Act of 2008 (division B of Public Law 110-432), \$288,500,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the amounts available under this paragraph shall be available for the Secretary to approve funding to cover operating losses for the Corporation only after receiving and reviewing a grant request for each specific train route: *Provided further*, That each such grant request shall be accompanied by a detailed financial analysis, revenue projection, and capital expenditure projection justifying the Federal support to the Secretary's satisfaction: *Provided further*, That not later than 60 days after enactment of this Act, the Corporation shall transmit, in electronic format, to the Secretary and the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations the annual budget, business plan, the 5-Year Financial Plan for fiscal year 2016 required under section 204 of the Passenger Rail Investment and Improvement Act of 2008 and the comprehensive fleet plan for all Amtrak rolling stock: *Provided further*, That the budget, business plan and the 5-Year Financial Plan shall include annual information on the maintenance, refurbishment, replacement, and expansion for all Amtrak rolling stock consistent with the comprehensive fleet plan: *Provided further*, That the Corporation shall provide monthly performance reports in an electronic format which shall describe the work completed to date, any changes to the business plan, and the reasons for such changes as well as progress against the milestones and target dates of the 2012 performance improvement plan: *Provided further*, That the Corporation's budget, business plan, 5-Year Financial Plan, semiannual reports, monthly reports, comprehensive fleet plan and all supplemental reports or plans comply with requirements in Public Law 112-55: *Provided further*, That none of the funds provided in this Act may be used to support any route on which Amtrak offers a discounted fare of more than 50 percent off the normal peak fare: *Provided further*, That the preceding proviso does not apply to routes where the operating loss as a result of the discount is covered by a State and the State participates in the setting of fares.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. TITUS

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 45, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$1,000,000) (increased by \$1,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentlewoman from Nevada and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Nevada.

□ 2200

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Chairman, I rise today with this very simple amendment. It is one that is meant to shed light on inadequate investments that are being made in our Nation's passenger rail service.

The bill before us appropriates nearly \$16 billion for aviation, over \$40 billion for our roads, over \$10 billion for public transit, but just \$1.1 billion for our Nation's passenger rail service.

I represent Las Vegas, where we import everything from tourists to lobsters, so we certainly understand the importance of transportation mobility.

It is interesting, many international and domestic travelers alike are shocked to learn, when they are coming to Las Vegas, that a major metropolitan city, home to more than 2 million residents and playground and boardroom to over 42 million visitors a year, we just don't have access to passenger rail service.

Visitors from Europe or Asia are accustomed to taking trains from one city to another, and they face a sad reality when traveling to Las Vegas from other Southwestern tourist destinations.

From Los Angeles, for example, you would have to take a 7-hour train ride that drops you off in Kingman, Arizona, at 1:30 in the morning. There, you would have to find the bus station, which is 4 miles away, get on a bus at 4 in the morning to travel another 3 hours to downtown Las Vegas. That is just crazy.

The last Amtrak train on the Desert Wind line departed the back of the Plaza Hotel in May of 1997, bound for Los Angeles.

Well, a lot has changed since the late 1990s. Over the last 17 years, southern Nevada's population has grown by a million new residents, and 10 million more visitors travel to southern Nevada annually, putting enormous strain on our area's highways and the airport, which is among the top 10 busiest airports in the country.

More than 42,000 vehicles also cross the I-15 border between California and Nevada daily. If you have traveled along that busy stretch of road, you know the kind of traffic nightmares that you might encounter.

In fact, I recently spoke with an airline pilot who frequently makes the short flight between Los Angeles and Las Vegas, and he remarked that you can't get lost. All you have to do is follow the red brake lights on I-15 all the way to McCarran.

We can and we must do better; but this isn't just about Las Vegas. Cities like Phoenix, Arizona; Nashville, Tennessee; Columbus, Ohio; Louisville, Kentucky; and Boise, Idaho, don't have passenger rail service either.

In addition, there is no direct rail service between major metropolitan areas like Houston and Dallas, Atlanta and Orlando, and Kansas City and Oklahoma City. I believe that expanding rail service to unserved communities like those in southern Nevada should be a priority, but, unfortunately, this legislation before us does not really get us there.

At the end of April, I organized a roundtable back in my district to discuss the need to restore passenger service to Las Vegas, and I was really surprised by the high level of interest from local stakeholders.

We had participants from our State and local transportation authorities, the gaming and hotel industries, the chamber of commerce, labor unions and economic development organizations, all in agreement that southern Nevada should have passenger rail service as part of our long-term economic viability plans. This type of development is a regional and should be a national priority.

Now, a lot of attention has been paid to the Northeast corridor, where travelers frequent Amtrak service along the East Coast, but we should not forget that it was the railroad that built the West and still, today, remains a critical piece of our transportation network.

China is investing \$128 million in rail in 2015 alone and India, \$137 billion over the next 5 years; yet we are investing only \$1.1 billion.

Mr. Chairman, since this amendment really has no monetary impact, I would respectfully ask that you accept it. It is my hope that we recognize this mode of transportation that is so tied to our Nation's history and that we can continue to work together to see that it gets the attention and support that it deserves.

Thank you very much for your time and your consideration. I hope that, together, we can work to be sure that passenger rail service is expanded throughout the country and especially in the Southwest.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. TITUS).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROOKS OF ALABAMA

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 45, strike line 6 and all that follows through page 47, line 3.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Alabama and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, America recently suffered four straight trillion dollar deficits. In the past few months, America's debt blew through the \$18 trillion mark.

America pays over \$200 billion per year in debt service, which is more than four times what the Federal Government spends on highways, bridges, and interstates each year. America's Comptroller General warns that America's deficits and debt paths are unsustainable.

The nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office warns that our debt service cost is on a path to increase by another \$600 billion within a decade, to more than \$800 billion per year. That is more than America spends each year on national defense. The CBO also warns that, within a decade, if current trends continue, America will face yearly trillion dollar deficits in perpetuity.

Per then-Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Admiral Mike Mullen's testimony before the House Armed Services Committee, debt is America's "greatest threat to our national security."

As a result of America's debt, in a few short years, America's uniformed military personnel numbers will be our smallest since before World War II, America's Navy will have the smallest number of operational naval vessels since World War I, and America's Air Force will have its smallest number of operational aircraft in its history. Debt, not our enemies, is slowly but surely stripping America of its ability to defend itself.

In sum, Washington's financial irresponsibility, this House of Representatives' financial irresponsibility, is pushing America into a debilitating insolvency and bankruptcy that will destroy the American Dream for our children and grandchildren.

It is in this setting that I beseech this House of Representatives to be financially responsible by supporting my amendment that eliminates Federal Government operating subsidies of Amtrak, thus forcing Amtrak to operate in the black.

How bad is the Amtrak subsidy problem? The Congressional Research Service reports that, from 1971 to 2015, Federal Amtrak subsidies totaled \$78 billion in constant 2015 dollars. In fiscal year 2014, Amtrak had a net loss of \$1.1 billion. Who paid for that loss? America's children and grandchildren, that is who.

How so? It is because America does not have the money and had to borrow every penny of that \$1.1 billion, thus burdening Americans for generations to come.

Mr. Chairman, a business that relies on subsidies and tax dollars to cover losses has little incentive to operate efficiently or effectively or, for that matter, as safely as it should.

It is appalling that the Federal Government undermines and threatens the

future of America's children and grandchildren in order to subsidize Amtrak passenger service that would be self-sufficient if Amtrak riders stopped mooching off of hard-working American taxpayers and, instead, simply paid for the actual cost of their rides.

Amtrak supporters often claim that Amtrak will go out of business if it is not subsidized by American taxpayers. That is bunk unsupported by facts.

This same "woe is me" argument was made about freight train subsidies; yet, when freight rail subsidies ended and freight rail was sold to private investors in the 1980s, freight rail did not go out of business and still operates today.

Similarly, the Federal Government does not operate or subsidize national airlines or national bus services; yet airlines and buses operate profitably in the private sector, despite Federal Government subsidies for Amtrak, their competitor.

Just as airlines, bus services, and freight rail operate without government subsidies, Amtrak will do the same if this House of Representatives has the courage to wean Amtrak from the taxpayer nipple.

Mr. Chairman, after more than 40 years, it is time to stop the runaway Amtrak train. It is time to force Amtrak riders to pay their own way by ending their subsidized rides on the backs of American taxpayers.

I urge adoption of my amendment to do just that.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I seek time in opposition.

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment which, purely and simply, would end intercity passenger rail for our Nation.

I remind colleagues, there is not a single mode of transportation in this country that is not subsidized, contrary to what we have just heard.

To make the case further, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. BROWN), a distinguished member of the authorizing committee.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, when I was coming up, I used to like this television show, "Robin Hood." My colleagues practice what I call reverse Robin Hood, robbing from the working people and the poor people and the transit people to give tax breaks to the rich.

Just a few weeks ago, the House Republicans passed a bill cutting taxes by \$269 billion—I guess that didn't affect the deficit—for their wealthiest friends, but can't find the \$2 billion that we need for Amtrak—shameful.

The funding cuts proposed in this amendment would simply force Amtrak to shut down, strand millions of rail passengers, disrupt commuter operations, add to our already congested

roads and airports, eliminate over 20,000 jobs nationwide, and jeopardize local economies and businesses that depend on Amtrak's service.

Amtrak provides the majority of all intercity passenger rail service in the United States, with more States and localities across America turning to passenger rail to meet the transportation needs of our citizens.

Amtrak has done an excellent job, based on the fact that 9/11, when we were attacked, Amtrak was the only means that you could move away.

When we had Hurricane Katrina, Amtrak is the only way that we could move people out of harm's way by evacuating and delivering food and water and supplies.

Amtrak has made significant improvement in its system over the last several years, has steady increase in ridership numbers, played a vital role in disaster recovery, and has an ambitious agenda for future growth.

I encourage all Members to vote against this ill-willed and ill-thought-out amendment.

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

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I would respond that there is no factual basis for the gentlewoman's comments that have just been made.

Socialism does not work. We need to get Amtrak passengers off the backs of all taxpayers, including those that are poor, that can't afford the taxes that they are already having to pay to benefit those Amtrak riders. Let's set them free.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield to my colleague from Pennsylvania (Mr. FATTAH).

Mr. FATTAH. Let me thank the ranking member.

The fact of the matter is, notwithstanding what was offered to the House as the picture of America, we actually live in the greatest country in the world. We have the strongest economy. We are the wealthiest country. There is no country, based on the IMF, that would want to trade our position vis-a-vis debt-to-wealth ratio.

I hear the gentleman saying, Woe is America, and we can't afford to subsidize rail. I think the ranking member makes it clear that there is no form of transportation that is not subsidized.

I heard this utterance that we don't subsidize airplane travel. This is nonsensical. Just the facts of this bill itself outline some of our country's subsidies for our airline industry.

□ 2215

But I want to talk about Amtrak.

When it is said that there is a \$1 billion subsidy and that somehow we can't afford that from last year, I want

to remind this House that for each and every month we have been in Afghanistan, we have been spending \$2 billion a week for well over a decade, as a Nation. The idea that we can't afford to have a first-rate passenger rail system defies logic. It is just a matter of political will.

We need to make a decision about America's place in the world, and our economy is dependent on our ability to transport not just freight but human beings, and Amtrak is critical to that.

I thank the gentleman from North Carolina for yielding me time.

I hope this House will reconsider this thrust of the majority to move away from passenger rail. I heard some talk from the gentleman that we have got to stop this runaway train, but we tried to stop a train in Philadelphia, and if we had made the investments, there would be people who would be alive today.

We need to make these investments, and we need to move our country forward. It is not about political philosophy. It is about practicality.

Our economic competitors are subsidizing rail. And if we want to make our economy work, we are going to have to make Amtrak work. And we can do that through some of the efforts on this bill today.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I thank the gentleman for his wise words and join him in wholeheartedly opposing this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BROOKS).

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

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama will be postponed.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

CAPITAL AND DEBT SERVICE GRANTS TO THE NATIONAL RAILROAD PASSENGER CORPORATION

To enable the Secretary of Transportation to make grants to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation for capital investments as authorized by sections 101(c), 102, and 219(b) of the Passenger Rail Investment and Improvement Act of 2008 (division B of Public Law 110-432), \$850,000,000, to remain available until expended, of which not to exceed \$160,200,000 shall be for debt service obligations as authorized by section 102 of such Act: *Provided*, That of the amounts made available under this heading, not less than \$50,000,000 shall be made available to bring Amtrak-served facilities and stations into compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act: *Provided further*, That after an initial distribution of up to \$200,000,000, which shall be used by the Corporation as a working capital account, all remaining funds shall be provided to the Corporation only on a reimbursable basis: *Provided further*, That of the amounts made available under this heading, up to \$20,000,000 may be used by the

Secretary to subsidize operating losses of the Corporation should the funds provided under the heading "Operating Grants to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation" be insufficient to meet operational costs for fiscal year 2016: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may retain up to one-half of 1 percent of the funds provided under this heading to fund the costs of project management and oversight of activities authorized by subsections 101(a) and 101(c) of division B of Public Law 110-432: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall approve funding for capital expenditures, including advance purchase orders of materials, for the Corporation only after receiving and reviewing a grant request for each specific capital project justifying the Federal support to the Secretary's satisfaction: *Provided further*, That except as otherwise provided herein, none of the funds under this heading may be used to subsidize operating losses of the Corporation: *Provided further*, That none of the funds under this heading may be used for capital projects not approved by the Secretary of Transportation or on the Corporation's fiscal year 2016 business plan: *Provided further*, That in addition to the project management oversight funds authorized under section 101(d) of division B of Public Law 110-432, the Secretary may retain up to an additional \$3,000,000 of the funds provided under this heading to fund expenses associated with implementing section 212 of division B of Public Law 110-432, including the amendments made by section 212 to section 24905 of title 49, United States Code: *Provided further*, That Amtrak shall conduct a business case analysis on capital investments that exceed \$10,000,000 in life-cycle costs: *Provided further*, That each contract for a capital acquisition that exceeds \$10,000,000 in life cycle costs shall state that funding is subject to the availability of appropriated funds provided by an appropriations Act.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. BROWN OF FLORIDA

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 47, line 11, after the dollar amount insert "(increased by \$861,500,000)".

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

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentlewoman from Florida and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, my amendment increases capital grants to Amtrak by \$861 million. This will bring the total funding for Amtrak in the bill to \$2 billion, equal to Amtrak's fiscal year 2016 budget request to Congress.

This bill, as if it wasn't bad enough, cut \$290 million from Amtrak's capital program, which is used to repair and replace aging infrastructure on the Northeast corridor, including 140-year-old bridges and tunnels, and implement positive train control, a system that, according to the National Transportation Safety Board, would have prevented the recent Amtrak derailment in Philadelphia.

According to the April 2015 report to Congress, "At the current rate of available funding, it would take over 300 years to replace all of the bridges on the Northeast corridor, well beyond the timeframe in which assets would simply be shut down."

The list of critical needs extends far beyond just bridges and tunnels. Major portions of Amtrak's electrical power supply system date back to 1930.

According to the commission, in total, \$21.1 billion is needed to achieve a state of good repair on the corridor, \$8.7 billion of which is needed to address critical infrastructure needs over the next 5 years.

We cannot point to the recent Amtrak derailment and say that it was directly caused by a lack of investment. That is true. But we do know from the NTSB that it was preventable had positive train control been installed on that section of track.

Amtrak included \$36.4 million in their \$2 billion fiscal year 2016 budget request to Congress. Amtrak testified at a hearing in the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee yesterday that had they been provided adequate funding from the get-go, they would have been able to implement positive train control sooner.

The impact of this tragic accident could also have been lessened had the Republican-controlled Congress not denied Amtrak's request for funding to replace passenger cars that date back to 1975 with newer cars.

At this time, I yield to the gentleman from Philadelphia, Pennsylvania (Mr. FATTAH).

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment.

I think it is critically important that we understand that the President requested an increase in capital allotments for Amtrak. Not only was that not honored, but we actually went with the wisdom of the majority: we actually cut last year's number by over \$250-plus million.

This is a move in the wrong direction for our country, and I hope that through the gentlewoman's amendment, we can reverse that. So I stand in support of it, and I hope that the majority would allow us to proceed to a vote.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. I reserve the balance of my time.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, the amendment proposes a net increase in budget authority in the bill.

The amendment is not in order under section 3(d)(3) of House Resolution 5 of the 114th Congress, which states the following:

"It shall not be in order to consider an amendment to a general appropriations bill proposing a net increase in budget authority in the bill unless considered en bloc with another amendment or amendments proposing an equal or greater decrease in such budget authority pursuant to clause 2(f) of rule XXI."

The amendment proposes a net increase in budget authority in the bill in violation of such section.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I wish to be heard on the point of order.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Florida is recognized.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, just a few short weeks ago, House Republicans passed a bill cutting taxes by \$269 billion for their wealthiest friends, yet we can't find \$2 billion for Amtrak to make it safe?

My friend from Florida, this is unacceptable; shame.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman needs to confine her remarks to the point of order.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. I thought I was speaking to the point of order, sir.

That is my point. We cut \$269 billion, and we can't find \$2 billion to make Amtrak safe? That is the point.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from Florida makes a point of order that the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Florida violates section 3(d)(3) of House Resolution 5.

Section 3(d)(3) establishes a point of order against an amendment proposing a net increase in budgetary authority in the pending bill.

As persuasively asserted by the gentleman from Florida, the amendment proposes a net increase in budget authority in the bill. Therefore, the point of order is sustained. The amendment is not in order.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROOKS OF ALABAMA

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 47, strike line 4 and all that follows through page 49, line 8.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Alabama and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, my first amendment, Brooks No. 19, strikes \$288.5 million in operating subsidies for Amtrak. This second amendment, which is Brooks No. 21, strikes capital and debt service subsidies that total \$850 million per year to get to the point where we can strike all taxpayer subsidies for Amtrak.

I would rely on the arguments previously made with respect to my first amendment to support this second amendment.

I would add, however, that I have heard some comments about the safety associated with Amtrak. I would emphasize at this point that if you want safety with rail service, probably the

best thing to do is to put it in the private sector and eliminate Amtrak altogether.

Look at airlines, air carriers; they are private sector and are much safer than Amtrak. Look at buses; they are private sector and are safer than Amtrak. And I would submit that if lives are what concern the opponents to these amendments that they would propose putting Amtrak into private hands in order to have the same kind of safety record that we have with buses, air carriers, and other modes of private transportation.

Mr. Chairman, at this point, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I very strongly oppose this amendment which, like the gentleman's previous amendment, would essentially end passenger rail service in this country. It is just that drastic. It is also targeting passenger rail in a way that obscures the fact that every mode of transportation in this country is subsidized. It is in the public interest to maintain diverse modes of transportation that serve our various transportation needs and our various population centers.

Amtrak provides an invaluable service to this country: 500 destinations in 46 States, connecting small communities that don't have access to air service.

Amtrak is popular with the American people. It is increasingly being taken advantage of. In the last 11 years, 10 consecutive years of record ridership, serving nearly 32 million passengers last year.

Without Amtrak's service in the Northeast corridor, where would we be? There would be virtual gridlock in New York's airports, but it is not just the Northeast corridor. I come from a State that had the insight years ago to invest in State Amtrak service, and now Amtrak is the preferred mode of transportation for thousands of people between Raleigh and Charlotte, with three full routes a day in each direction.

This is an irresponsible amendment. It will eliminate thousands of jobs. It will harm local economies. And it will violate labor agreements. There is so much wrong with this.

I urge its rejection and yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I would submit that the argument that this would end rail service is absolutely false and is not supported by history. Nothing in history supports the gentleman's argument. However well-intentioned, the evidence is clear.

Freight rail, the same kind of argument was made. Subsidies were ended. It went into the private sector. It survives and thrives today.

There is an argument that buses and air carriers are somehow or another

subsidized. I would submit that what we are talking about, there are user fees and there are gasoline taxes and diesel taxes that pay for those roads that buses use, and there are air passenger charges that pay for the cost of those airports that air carriers use.

So with that as a backdrop, I would submit that it is time for Amtrak passengers to pay their own way. It is time for Amtrak passengers to quit riding on the backs of other taxpayers. They have the ability to pay their own way. The rest of the country is expected to pay their own way when they travel. As such, I would ask this body to adopt my amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BROOKS).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama will be postponed.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS—FEDERAL RAILROAD ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 150. The Secretary of Transportation may receive and expend cash, or receive and utilize spare parts and similar items, from non-United States Government sources to repair damages to or replace United States Government owned automated track inspection cars and equipment as a result of third-party liability for such damages, and any amounts collected under this section shall be credited directly to the Safety and Operations account of the Federal Railroad Administration, and shall remain available until expended for the repair, operation and maintenance of automated track inspection cars and equipment in connection with the automated track inspection program.

SEC. 151. None of the funds provided to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation may be used to fund any overtime costs in excess of \$35,000 for any individual employee: *Provided*, That the President of Amtrak may waive the cap set in the previous proviso for specific employees when the President of Amtrak determines such a cap poses a risk to the safety and operational efficiency of the system: *Provided further*, That Amtrak shall report to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations each quarter of the calendar year on waivers granted to employees and amounts paid above the cap for each month within such quarter and delineate the reasons each waiver was granted: *Provided further*, That the President of Amtrak shall report to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations by March 1, 2016, a summary of all overtime payments incurred by the Corporation for 2015 and the three prior calendar years: *Provided further*, That such summary shall include the total number of employees that received waivers and the total overtime payments the Corporation paid to those employees receiving waivers for each month for 2015 and for the three prior calendar years.

FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION
ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

For necessary administrative expenses of the Federal Transit Administration's programs authorized by chapter 53 of title 49, United States Code, \$102,933,000, of which not more than \$4,000,000 shall be available to carry out the provisions of 49 U.S.C. 5329 and not less than \$750,000 shall be available to carry out the provisions of 49 U.S.C. 5326: *Provided*, That none of the funds provided or limited in this Act may be used to create a permanent office of transit security under this heading: *Provided further*, That upon submission to the Congress of the fiscal year 2017 President's budget, the Secretary of Transportation shall transmit to Congress the annual report on New Starts, including proposed allocations for fiscal year 2017.

□ 2230

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LANGEVIN

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 50, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert "(decreased by \$2,000,000)".

Page 52, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$2,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Rhode Island and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment I am offering today with my good friends Congressmen QUIGLEY and BUTTERFIELD will return funding for FTA Technical Assistance and Training back to its 2014 level. Older adults and individuals with disabilities disproportionately rely on public transit to live, learn, get to work and access recreation in their communities. The Technical Assistance and Training dollars made available by this amendment will help increase mobility for people with disabilities and older adults. By providing this assistance to our transit systems and services, we can ensure that they become more accessible for those who rely on them the most.

Mr. Chairman, FTA has a long history of working with Easter Seals, the National Association of Area Agencies on Aging, and others to provide training, technical assistance, and other problem-solving support to the transit industry, people with disabilities, and older adults; and it is imperative that this work continue as more people age and more people with disabilities seek to live as independently as possible.

Now, in order to realize this goal, FTA needs adequate resources to support these technical assistance activities. To that end, my amendment will increase funding by \$2 million for FTA Technical Assistance and Training and reduce, by an equivalent amount, funding for FTA administrative expenses.

Mr. Chairman, the House adopted this exact amendment last year to restore FTA Technical Assistance and

Training to \$5 million. Unfortunately, it was cut to \$3 million in this bill. My amendment will simply restore the funds back to the fiscal year '15 House-adopted level of \$5 million.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I ask that my colleagues support this amendment, which will provide a world of benefit to all those that it serves.

I thank my colleagues today for their consideration.

Again, I urge passage of the amendment, and with that, Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk will read.

Clerk read as follows:

TRANSIT FORMULA GRANTS

(LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

(LIMITATION ON OBLIGATIONS)

(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

Contingent upon enactment of authorization legislation, for payment of obligations incurred in the Federal Public Transportation Assistance Program in this account, and for payment of obligations incurred in carrying out the provisions of 49 U.S.C. 5305, 5307, 5310, 5311, 5318, 5322(d), 5329(e)(6), 5335, 5337, 5339, and 5340, as amended by Public Law 112-141, and section 20005(b) of Public Law 112-141, \$9,500,000,000, to be derived from the Mass Transit Account of the Highway Trust Fund and to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That funds available for the implementation or execution of programs authorized under 49 U.S.C. 5305, 5307, 5310, 5311, 5318, 5322(d), 5329(e)(6), 5335, 5337, 5339, and 5340, as amended by Public Law 112-141, and section 20005(b) of Public Law 112-141, shall not exceed total obligations of \$8,595,000,000 in fiscal year 2016.

TRANSIT RESEARCH

For necessary expenses to carry out 49 U.S.C. 5312, \$26,000,000.

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND TRAINING

For necessary expenses to carry out 49 U.S.C. 5314 \$3,000,000.

CAPITAL INVESTMENT GRANTS

For necessary expenses to carry out 49 U.S.C. 5309, \$1,921,395,000, to remain available until expended.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GROTHMAN

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 52, line 16, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$230,000,000)".

Page 156, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$230,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Wisconsin and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Chairman, as you know, we are very in debt in this country. This budget is on path to balance the budget eventually years down the road, but, really, we should be looking to cut spending right now.

You look at things the Federal Government is paying for that should be

done locally, and one of those things is these new capital improvements on mass transit projects. I think normally these things do not get the ridership that justifies these projects, and we would not be doing these projects, local governments would not be applying for these projects or building these projects if they had to pay their money themselves. The only reason these things go ahead is the Federal Government is paying for them, and the Federal Government has no money.

Mr. Chairman, this proposal will bring back down the funding on this line to what the Appropriations Committee wanted only 2 years ago, and for whatever reason, apparently in negotiations, this amount went up last year. But I don't think it is too much to ask that this House not zero out this line—and we could argue that we shouldn't be doing this at all—but at least go back to the levels of 2013, especially given the huge amount of debt that is being piled up at this time.

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

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, the committee carefully calculated the New Start number to be able to accommodate the signed FFGAs and Small Starts Grant Agreements at the beginning of the fiscal year.

Again, as I submitted before, I am a firm believer that once you sign a grant agreement, then we should, frankly, honor that. This reduction would impact those signed agreements, and I reluctantly oppose the gentleman's amendment. I know the passion that he has for this, but I again have to reluctantly oppose the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE), the ranking member.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the chairman's yielding. I would like to echo his opposition to this amendment.

I have just retrieved here a list of New Start projects that, under the present funding levels of the bill, probably aren't going to be able to be addressed. We are talking about the Westside project in Los Angeles. We are talking about San Diego, Denver, Baltimore, the Washington, D.C. area, the Maryland National Capital Purple Line, Minneapolis, Fort Worth. These are ready to go. These are ready to go with strong support in their communities, a strong impact on moving people and providing jobs. It is just unthinkable that we would cut this further.

Transit is an extremely important mode of transportation in many of our cities and suburban areas too, and the bill is inadequate. We need to find ways to make it more adequate going forward.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment would move exactly in the wrong direction, so I urge its defeat.

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

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, it is all fine and good to move forward, but we are going to borrow about 14 percent of this budget, and we have got to stop saying whenever we see a spending item it is time to move forward. I think what we have to do here is—I can certainly understand if we made commitments today, I can understand how people of goodwill would not want this amendment. But if this amendment doesn't pass, then I think we have to make doubly certain that a year from now we have a dramatic reduction here.

If there are any of these projects that are that important, the local unit of government can fund it. There is no surer way to overspend than have the Federal Government give grants to local units of government that they would never dream of spending themselves.

That is what is going on here, Mr. Chairman, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN).

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

GRANTS TO THE WASHINGTON METROPOLITAN
AREA TRANSIT AUTHORITY

For grants to the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority as authorized under section 601 of division B of Public Law 110-432, \$100,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the Secretary shall approve grants for capital and preventive maintenance expenditures for the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority only after receiving and reviewing a request for each specific project: *Provided further*, That prior to approving such grants, the Secretary shall certify that the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority is making significant progress in eliminating the material weaknesses, significant deficiencies, and minor control deficiencies identified in the most recent Financial Management Oversight Review: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall determine that the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority has placed the highest priority on those investments that will improve the safety of the system before approving such grants: *Provided further*, That the Secretary, in order to ensure safety throughout the rail system, may waive the requirements of section 601(e)(1) of title VI of Public Law 110-432 (112 Stat. 4968).

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. MICA

Mr. MICA. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 53, line 11, strike the colon and all that follows through line 15 and insert a period.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman

from Florida (Mr. MICA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. MICA. My colleagues, at this late hour, this is a simple amendment. It strikes a waiver that was granted to the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority, and it is a waiver that has been in place for several years. It waives the requirements for them to complete installation of cellular service in the tunnels of the Metro system in Washington, D.C. That waiver allows them to continue to receive Federal funds but not have made the installation.

It is funny because congressional staffers said: Well, Mr. MICA, why are you doing this? I am doing this because, as the chairman of a subcommittee on transportation oversight, I had to conduct a hearing after the January 12 deadly incident in the Washington area Metro. You may recall at L'Enfant Plaza, on the Yellow Line, there was an incident in which smoke filled the tunnel. A passenger train was left outside of the station.

I might say that, back in 2008, we set up a requirement that we have at the stations, within 1 year, Metro cellular service, and then by 4 years later, the entire system. So they were given from 2008 to 2012 to complete the system. They never completed the system. One individual died, others were injured, and we disrupted service. It was a day from hell in Washington, D.C.

Mr. Chairman, they never completed the job. They said they were going to complete the job right after 2012. They did not complete the job. They said it would be done in 2015. The last time I checked, it is 2015. It won't be done in 2015. They will not even sit down with the carriers who will install this equipment, and it is really at no cost to Metro.

I have talked to Mr. CONNOLLY, the gentleman from Virginia; I have talked to Mrs. COMSTOCK, the gentlewoman from Virginia; I have talked to Mr. HOYER, the gentleman from Maryland; and others. We have all had it with Metro not complying with us.

This waiver was put in to give them the opportunity to comply, and they haven't complied. Now it is in here again, and I am offering, in this amendment, to take it out.

I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART), the chairman, for comment.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. I want to thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, when the gentleman from Florida is talking about this issue, I think all of us should be very, very concerned. I will tell you I think that the gentleman from Florida has been beyond reasonable, has tried to get folks to do what they were, again, supposed to do, and they have not done it.

So I just want to let the gentleman from Florida know that I am looking

forward, and I am committed to making sure that this issue is solved one way or another. I am hoping that it is solved in a nice, positive way. But otherwise, I want to let the gentleman from Florida know that I will be working with him to make sure that we hold folks accountable.

Mr. MICA. Again, Mr. Chairman, I am willing to work with everyone. Again, I have had to conduct oversight over a tragedy that could have and should have been prevented.

Here is the latest headline: "Can You Hear Me Now? In Metro Tunnels, Answer Is 'Not Yet.'"

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY).

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend.

Mr. Chairman, I sympathize deeply with the concerns expressed by my friend and colleague from Florida (Mr. MICA), and I know Metro is committed to working with the wireless carriers to ensure seamless coverage throughout the rail system. I appreciate his willingness ultimately to withdraw the amendment so as not to jeopardize other vital safety improvements underway at Metro by conditioning the Federal commitment, which has already been reduced and which is matched by our State and local partners, on completion of this wireless upgrade.

Without question, the January arc-scoring incident at L'Enfant Plaza underscored the urgent need for having working communications in Metro's underground stations and tunnels. While faulty electrical wiring was to blame for the fire and hazardous smoke, a breakdown in communications, as Mr. MICA has indicated, led to passengers being stranded in dangerous conditions aboard that Yellow Line train for an extended period of time. It wasn't just public safety personnel who experienced problems communicating. Stranded riders also reported having spotty or no cellular service in the tunnel.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY), our colleague, so he can complete his statement.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend from North Carolina, the distinguished ranking member.

Tragically, one rider—Carol Glover of Virginia, my home State—died as a result of smoke inhalation, and dozens of others required medical treatment and/or hospitalization.

□ 2245

This was, and remains, an unacceptable situation, and I and all of the members of the national capital region delegation are committed to working with the NSTB, FTA, Metro, and our

regional partners to ensure corrective actions are taken to restore public confidence.

I would note for my colleagues, the current Federal law already includes language requiring Metro riders to have underground access to wireless telecommunications services if the service providers work with Metro to install such services. Unfortunately, they have lagged behind again, as my friend from Florida has indicated.

Congress approved that requirement as part of the Passenger Rail Investment and Improvement Act of 2008. One year later, as required by the law, the wireless providers did successfully establish service in the 20 busiest underground rail stations. However, Congress has granted an extension on the timeline to install wireless service to the tunnels and the rest of the system because Metro and the wireless providers have run into delays with scheduling work while Metro trains are not running, performing higher priority safety improvements as directed by the NTSB, and other factors. However, they continue to work toward meeting this requirement, albeit at a very slow and glacial pace.

Metro is particularly motivated to complete this work as it also involves a parallel upgrade of its own underground radio communications services. Metro is an essential component of this region's transportation network, moving hundreds of thousands of commuters every day, including a significant portion of Federal employees. It also serves as America's subway, transporting 12 million visitors from across the country to the Nation's Capital each year.

It is critical that we maintain this bipartisan commitment to match local and State funding so that Metro can continue working with the NTSB and FTA on its critical safety upgrades.

Mr. MICA is right, and all of us from the national capital region agree with him. I pledge upon withdrawal of this amendment we will work with Mr. MICA to ensure that Metro meets deadlines at a much more expeditious pace than has been the case in the past.

Again, I thank my friend from North Carolina for yielding, and I thank Mr. MICA for his leadership.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. MICA. Will the gentleman from North Carolina yield?

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Chairman, I just want to conclude. I want to thank Mr. CONNOLLY. I want to thank Mrs. COMSTOCK, and the chairman particularly, for working on this.

I think we have gotten the attention of the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority. We have an agreement to bring the parties together as a result of this pending amendment. That is set. If it does not go through, I can assure you we will find a way to put this waiver in.

At this time, though, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amend-

ment. I will bring the parties together and hopefully common sense and good faith will prevail.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CONNOLLY

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

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

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 52, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$50,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Virginia and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chair.

I rise to offer an amendment with my colleagues in the national capital region that would restore full funding of the Federal commitment for vital rider safety improvements to "America's Subway," the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority, or Metro.

Let me remind my colleagues, this is not like the traditional transit or capital funding under the Department of Transportation. The Passenger Rail Investment Improvement Act of 2008 specifically authorized a \$150 million annual Federal commitment for 10 years, and Congress has worked in bipartisan fashion the past 6 years to fulfill that. It was a Republican initiative initiated and authored by my predecessor, Republican member Tom Davis of Virginia.

As required by law, the Federal funding is matched dollar for dollar, with \$150 million coming from Virginia, Maryland, and the District of Columbia.

I appreciate the efforts of my fellow Virginian, Mr. RIGELL, and the subcommittee chairman, my friend, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, to try to work with us to restore some of the funding at full committee markup. But reducing any of this funding would renege on the Federal commitment and jeopardize the successful local-State-Federal partnership we have worked so hard to create.

It would also open the door for our partners to pull back on their commitments commensurately, which would only exacerbate Metro's challenge in upgrading its aging infrastructure.

This partnership is funding critical safety improvements throughout the system identified by Metro itself, the National Transportation Safety Board, and the Federal Transit Administration following the tragic 2009 Red Line accident and the recent tragedy on the Yellow Line this past January. The

most visible improvement is the purchase of 7000-series new rail cars with advanced crash-resilient technology and extra capacity to replace the oldest and original cars in the fleet.

Congress and the Federal Government have a responsibility in the operation and safety of Metro. Half of all Metro stations are located on Federal property, and approximately 40 percent of rush-hour riders on Metro are, in fact, Federal employees, including many Members of Congress and their staffs.

It is critical we maintain this bipartisan commitment to match local and State funding so that Metro can continue making these safety upgrades.

I want to thank Mr. HOYER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. BEYER, and my friend Mrs. COMSTOCK for working with us on this regional priority.

I now yield the balance of my time to the distinguished delegate from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank my good friend for yielding and as a cosponsor of this amendment, which has profound safety implications for America's subway. I think it is so urgent that a member of the Appropriations Committee has already restored \$25 million.

This was a partnership, a partnership between the Federal Government and Maryland, Virginia, and the District of Columbia. It became real after there was a crash that took the lives of nine District of Columbia residents in 2009.

This is a unique transit agency. This is where staff of this body, this is where visitors from all over the world ride. If this funding is delayed, it will delay the crashworthy 7000-series trains. It is in trains that were not crashworthy that we lost lives. We beg that this funding be restored.

The District, Maryland, and Virginia are each fulfilling their part of the partnership. It is up to the Federal Government to do our part and fulfill our part. Don't break the partnership open now.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition, and I continue to reserve my point of order.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentlewoman from Virginia (Mrs. COMSTOCK), who, obviously, is very passionate about this issue.

Ms. COMSTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I rise as a cosponsor of the amendment in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, as been pointed out by my colleagues, Congress did make a 10-year statutory commitment as a Federal partner, a 50-50 partner, to provide capital grant money to the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority. This funding has been used for vital

capital and safety improvements on the Metro system that so many of our constituents and our staff and tourists, people from all over the world, travel on every day.

As part of that agreement, matching grant money from the Commonwealth of Virginia, the District of Columbia, and the State of Maryland have all supplemented this in a full 50-50 match. This is truly a good partnership that has worked well since the bill was passed in 2008, and we should continue to fulfill that commitment.

This amendment would restore the already obligated funding to the bill and keep the promise that we have already made. Metro needs these important funds for capital improvements that will address important safety concerns.

I appreciate the opportunity to join my colleagues in the national capital area in support of this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, I insist on my point of order.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, the amendment proposes a net increase in budget authority in the bill.

The amendment is not in order under section 3(d)(3) of House Resolution 5, 114th Congress, which states the following:

“It shall not be in order to consider an amendment to a general appropriations bill proposing a net increase in budget authority in the bill unless considered en bloc with another amendment or amendments proposing an equal or greater decrease in such budget authority pursuant to clause 2(f) of rule XXI.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment proposes a net increase in budget authority in the bill in violation of such section.

I respectfully ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the invocation of the point of order.

This is a provision that has been in law for the past 6 years, and I believe that it ought to be enshrined in law for a 7th. We represent the entire National Capital Region. This is a unique region. This is the Nation's Capital. And we ought not to be reneging on a deal that was worked out with great effort 6 years ago based on a point of order.

With that, I oppose the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from Florida makes a point of order that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia violates section 3(d)(3) of House Resolution 5.

Section 3(d)(3) establishes a point of order against an amendment proposing

a net increase in budget authority in the pending bill.

As persuasively asserted by the gentleman from Florida, the amendment proposes a net increase in budget authority in the bill. Therefore, the point of order is sustained. The amendment is not in order.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS—FEDERAL
TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 160. The limitations on obligations for the programs of the Federal Transit Administration shall not apply to any authority under 49 U.S.C. 5338, previously made available for obligation, or to any other authority previously made available for obligation.

SEC. 161. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds appropriated or limited by this Act under the heading Fixed Guideway Capital Investment of the Federal Transit Administration for projects specified in this Act or identified in reports accompanying this Act not obligated by September 30, 2020, and other recoveries, shall be directed to projects eligible to use the funds for the purposes for which they were originally provided.

SEC. 162. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any funds appropriated before October 1, 2015, under any section of chapter 53 of title 49, United States Code, that remain available for expenditure, may be transferred to and administered under the most recent appropriation heading for any such section.

SEC. 163. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of the funds made available in this Act shall be used to enter into a full funding grant agreement for a project with a New Starts share greater than 50 percent.

SEC. 164. (a) LOSS OF ELIGIBILITY.—Except as provided in subsection (b), none of the funds in this or any other Act may be available to advance in any way a new light or heavy rail project towards a full funding grant agreement as defined by 49 U.S.C. 5309 for the Metropolitan Transit Authority of Harris County, Texas if the proposed capital project is constructed on or planned to be constructed on Richmond Avenue west of South Shepherd Drive or on Post Oak Boulevard north of Richmond Avenue in Houston, Texas.

(b) EXCEPTION FOR A NEW ELECTION.—The Metropolitan Transit Authority of Harris County, Texas, may attempt to construct or construct a new fixed guideway capital project, including light rail, in the locations referred to in subsection (a) if—

(1) voters in the jurisdiction that includes such locations approve a ballot proposition that specifies routes on Richmond Avenue west of South Shepherd Drive or on Post Oak Boulevard north of Richmond Avenue in Houston, Texas; and

(2) the proposed construction of such routes is part of a comprehensive, multi-modal, service-area wide transportation plan that includes multiple additional segments of fixed guideway capital projects, including light rail for the jurisdiction set forth in the ballot proposition. The ballot language shall include reasonable cost estimates, sources of revenue to be used and the total amount of bonded indebtedness to be incurred as well as a description of each route and the beginning and end point of each proposed transit project.

SAINT LAWRENCE SEAWAY DEVELOPMENT
CORPORATION

The Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation is hereby authorized to make

such expenditures, within the limits of funds and borrowing authority available to the Corporation, and in accord with law, and to make such contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal year limitations as provided by section 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended, as may be necessary in carrying out the programs set forth in the Corporation's budget for the current fiscal year.

OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE

(HARBOR MAINTENANCE TRUST FUND)

For necessary expenses to conduct the operations, maintenance, and capital asset renewal activities of those portions of the Saint Lawrence Seaway owned, operated, and maintained by the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, \$32,042,000, to be derived from the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund, pursuant to Public Law 99-662.

MARITIME ADMINISTRATION

MARITIME SECURITY PROGRAM

For necessary expenses to maintain and preserve a U.S.-flag merchant fleet to serve the national security needs of the United States, \$186,000,000, to remain available until expended.

OPERATIONS AND TRAINING

For necessary expenses of operations and training activities authorized by law, \$164,158,000, of which \$22,000,000 shall remain available until expended for maintenance and repair of training ships at State Maritime Academies, and of which \$5,000,000 shall remain available until expended for National Security Multi-Mission Vessel design for State Maritime Academies and National Security, and of which \$2,400,000 shall remain available through September 30, 2017, for the Student Incentive Program at State Maritime Academies, and of which \$1,200,000 shall remain available until expended for training ship fuel assistance payments, and of which \$19,700,000 shall remain available until expended for facilities maintenance and repair, equipment, and capital improvements at the United States Merchant Marine Academy, and of which \$3,000,000 shall remain available through September 30, 2017, for Maritime Environment and Technology Assistance grants, contracts, and cooperative agreement: *Provided*, That amounts apportioned for the United States Merchant Marine Academy shall be available only upon allotments made personally by the Secretary of Transportation or the Assistant Secretary for Budget and Programs: *Provided further*, That the Superintendent, Deputy Superintendent and the Director of the Office of Resource Management of the United States Merchant Marine Academy may not be allotment holders for the United States Merchant Marine Academy, and the Administrator of the Maritime Administration shall hold all allotments made by the Secretary of Transportation or the Assistant Secretary for Budget and Programs under the previous proviso: *Provided further*, That 50 percent of the funding made available for the United States Merchant Marine Academy under this heading shall be available only after the Secretary, in consultation with the Superintendent and the Maritime Administrator, completes a plan detailing by program or activity how such funding will be expended at the Academy, and this plan is submitted to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations.

SHIP DISPOSAL

For necessary expenses related to the disposal of obsolete vessels in the National Defense Reserve Fleet of the Maritime Administration, \$4,000,000, to remain available until expended.

MARITIME GUARANTEED LOAN (TITLE XI)
PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary administrative expenses of the maritime guaranteed loan program, \$3,135,000 shall be paid to the appropriations for "Maritime Administration—Operations and Training".

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS—MARITIME
ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 170. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, in addition to any existing authority, the Maritime Administration is authorized to furnish utilities and services and make necessary repairs in connection with any lease, contract, or occupancy involving Government property under control of the Maritime Administration: *Provided*, That payments received therefor shall be credited to the appropriation charged with the cost thereof and shall remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That rental payments under any such lease, contract, or occupancy for items other than such utilities, services, or repairs shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

SEC. 171. None of the funds available or appropriated in this Act shall be used by the United States Department of Transportation or the United States Maritime Administration to negotiate or otherwise execute, enter into, facilitate or perform fee-for-service contracts for vessel disposal, scrapping or recycling, unless there is no qualified domestic ship recycler that will pay any sum of money to purchase and scrap or recycle a vessel owned, operated or managed by the Maritime Administration or that is part of the National Defense Reserve Fleet: *Provided*, That such sales offers must be consistent with the solicitation and provide that the work will be performed in a timely manner at a facility qualified within the meaning of section 3502 of Public Law 106-398: *Provided further*, That nothing contained herein shall affect the Maritime Administration's authority to award contracts at least cost to the Federal Government and consistent with the requirements of 54 U.S.C. 308704, section 3502, or otherwise authorized under the Federal Acquisition Regulation.

PIPELINE AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS SAFETY
ADMINISTRATION

OPERATIONAL EXPENSES

For necessary operational expenses of the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, \$20,725,000.

HAZARDOUS MATERIALS SAFETY

For expenses necessary to discharge the hazardous materials safety functions of the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, \$60,500,000, of which \$7,570,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2018: *Provided*, That up to \$800,000 in fees collected under 49 U.S.C. 5108(g) shall be deposited in the general fund of the Treasury as offsetting receipts: *Provided further*, That there may be credited to this appropriation, to be available until expended, funds received from States, counties, municipalities, other public authorities, and private sources for expenses incurred for training, for reports publication and dissemination, and for travel expenses incurred in performance of hazardous materials exemptions and approvals functions.

PIPELINE SAFETY

(PIPELINE SAFETY FUND)

(OIL SPILL LIABILITY TRUST FUND)

For expenses necessary to conduct the functions of the pipeline safety program, for grants-in-aid to carry out a pipeline safety program, as authorized by 49 U.S.C. 60107, and to discharge the pipeline program re-

sponsibilities of the Oil Pollution Act of 1990, \$145,870,000, of which \$19,500,000 shall be derived from the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund and shall remain available until September 30, 2018; and of which \$124,500,000 shall be derived from the Pipeline Safety Fund, of which \$66,309,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2018: *Provided*, That not less than \$1,000,000 of the funds provided under this heading shall be for the One-Call state grant program.

□ 2300

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. CAPPS

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 61, line 22, strike the period at the end insert the following: "": *Provided further*, That not less than \$1,000,000 of the funds provided under this heading shall be for the finalization and implementation of rules required under section 60102(n) of title 49, United States Code, and section 8(b)(3) of the Pipeline Safety, Regulatory Certainty, and Job Creation Act of 2011 (49 U.S.C. 60108 note; 125 Stat. 1911)."

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentlewoman from California and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment that will take a modest step forward to improve pipeline safety. This issue is of particular importance to me and to my constituents.

Two weeks ago, more than 100,000 gallons of crude oil spilled from the ruptured Plains All American Pipeline along the treasured Gaviota Coast, in my district, just north of Santa Barbara. The oil quickly flowed under the highway, onto the beach, and into the ocean where the oil slick spread south for miles along the coastline, affecting pristine environmental habitats, recreational interests, and commercial fishing operations.

While the exact causes of this spill are still being investigated, it is already clear that woefully inadequate Federal pipeline safety standards played a significant role, but it didn't have to be this way.

In 2011, the House worked in a bipartisan way to pass the Pipeline Safety, Regulatory Certainty, and Job Creation Act. This law, which passed the House unanimously, directed the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, or PHMSA, to update and strengthen key pipeline safety standards.

The law called on PHMSA to issue a rule requiring automatic shutoff valves on new pipelines and to strengthen requirements for the inclusion of leak detection technologies on pipelines.

The law required these rules to be finalized by January of last year; yet, here today, we are still waiting. PHMSA has not even issued a proposed rule on these commonsense regulations, which passed the House unanimously. PHMSA continues to drag its feet, and communities like mine con-

tinue to pay the price. It is time for PHMSA to follow the law and the bipartisan will of Congress.

My amendment is simple. It would set aside \$1 million of PHMSA's own budget for the finalization and implementation of these overdue pipeline safety and spill mitigation rules.

My amendment would simply help ensure that section 4 and section 8 of the bipartisan 2011 pipeline safety law are finally implemented so that our Federal regulations are in line with today's reality.

My amendment does not cost a dime, and it does not authorize any new programs. Section 4 requires new pipelines to install automatic shutoff valves, and section 8 requires pipeline operators to use the latest leak detection technologies. Both of these provisions were enacted unanimously by this House in 2011.

The pipeline that burst in my district did not have an automatic shutoff valve despite the fact that other comparable pipelines in the area do use this technology. An automatic shutoff valve would not have prevented the spill necessarily, but it certainly would have minimized it. It took over 2 hours for the pipeline operator to even identify where the pipeline had ruptured, let alone to actually stop the flow of crude oil.

That is unacceptable. If the standards required under section 4 and section 8 had been required of the Plains pipeline in my district, the spill likely would have been much less severe. My amendment would take a small, yet important step forward to address these troubling issues by pushing PHMSA to get its act together and finalize these rules.

Mr. Chairman, oil and gas development, by its nature, is a dangerous and dirty business. The mere fact that the Plains and other companies have oil spill contingency funds shows that there is no such thing as a safe pipeline. Spills do happen, and they will continue to happen as long as we depend on fossil fuels for our energy needs. We have a responsibility, therefore, to do all we can to make these pipelines as safe as possible.

Congress has repeatedly directed PHMSA to strengthen its standards; yet this agency has done little. My amendment would help hold their feet to the fire and get commonsense safety standards finalized and implemented. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. CAPPS

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 61, line 14, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$27,604,000)".

Page 61, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$27,604,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentlewoman from California and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Chairman, it is no secret that Federal pipeline safety standards are in serious need of improvement. Despite repeated bipartisan efforts to strengthen these standards, the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, PHMSA, has dragged its feet on implementing the new rules.

Not only has this agency failed to keep up with new statutory requirements, they struggle to even enforce the rules they already have on the books. There are several reasons for this, including rapid growth in the miles of new pipelines to inspect and the need to compete with the private sector for the best talent while using limited resources.

PHMSA's preliminary estimate of serious incidents on pipelines showed an increase in 2014; and, with the miles of pipelines only multiplying, these numbers will surely grow. That is why my amendment would increase funding for PHMSA's pipeline safety program by \$27 million, to simply match the President's own fiscal year 2016 budget request. While this would not solve the multitude of problems facing the agency, it would certainly make a big difference in two key areas.

First, it would help PHMSA retain and recruit the best inspectors and staff. Last year, Congress provided funding for 100 additional full-time employees to help PHMSA adjust to the increasing demand; and, as part of its fiscal year 2016 request, PHMSA requested \$15 million to fully fund and annualize these employees. The current bill only provides enough funding for 1 year of salaries for these new employees.

How is the agency supposed to attract the best talent when they can't count on paying their new employees for more than a year at a time?

Second, my amendment would also provide requested funding for the national pipeline information exchange. This information exchange would be a comprehensive database of integrated pipeline safety information from PHMSA, from State regulators, industry, and other Federal resources.

Of the 2.6 million miles of pipeline in the United States, PHMSA inspects only 20 percent, while States monitor the remaining 80 percent. However, the information the States gather through inspections is neither shared among the States, nor with PHMSA. That is kind of unbelievable. It makes no sense. We should be doing everything we can to analyze and understand this data.

My amendment would fund this exchange to help regulators be more effective and to better protect commu-

nities like mine from future spills. There are currently pilot information exchange programs in 7 States, and the funding provided by my amendment would allow PHMSA to expand these information exchanges to 25 States.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment costs absolutely nothing from the American taxpayers, not one dime. The increased funding would come from a modest increase in user fees paid into the pipeline safety fund. These user fees are paid for by the oil companies that profit enormously from the oil and gas flowing through the pipelines that PHMSA oversees.

Oil companies are seeing record profits from a booming oil and gas development industry. This is leading to more miles of pipeline and more risks for local communities like mine. The least they can do is ensure that the Federal oversight of the industry is keeping pace with the growth because, when pipelines fail, it is our local communities and our constituents, not the oil companies, who suffer the most.

My amendment takes a small step forward to help strengthen the pipeline safety and oversight, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. CAPPS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I commend my colleague for offering this amendment, and I want to offer my strong support.

Mr. Chairman, we are talking here about annualizing the funding—in other words, bringing these people on board permanently—for pipeline safety inspectors who were hired in fiscal year 2015. We are also talking about the better coordination of enforcement activities between Federal, State, and local officials.

I would like to remind my colleagues we have 2.6 million miles of pipeline across this country. I think the number is maybe 548 personnel in the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration.

This is an enormous task. The gentlewoman's amendment would greatly improve our capacity to address this challenge, and I urge its adoption.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. The authorization for this program expires this year, Mr. Chairman. Frankly, there are many questions, and it is not really clear whether or not the next authorization would accommodate this funding fee level. I understand the gentlewoman's passion, but I must respectfully urge a “no” vote on this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Chairman, again, I urge the adoption of this amendment. I

have a classic example of why it is needed, and I ask for your consideration.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS).

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

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California will be postponed.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS GRANTS
(EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS FUND)

For necessary expenses to carry out 49 U.S.C. 5128(b), \$188,000, to be derived from the Emergency Preparedness Fund, to remain available until September 30, 2017: *Provided*, That notwithstanding the fiscal year limitation specified in 49 U.S.C. 5116, not more than \$28,318,000 shall be made available for obligation in fiscal year 2016 from amounts made available by 49 U.S.C. 5116(i), and 5128(b) and (c): *Provided further*, That notwithstanding 49 U.S.C. 5116(i)(4), not more than 4 percent of the amounts made available from this account shall be available to pay administrative costs: *Provided further*, That none of the funds made available by 49 U.S.C. 5116(i), 5128(b), or 5128(c) shall be made available for obligation by individuals other than the Secretary of Transportation, or his or her designee.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Inspector General to carry out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, \$86,223,000: *Provided*, That the Inspector General shall have all necessary authority, in carrying out the duties specified in the Inspector General Act, as amended (5 U.S.C. App. 3), to investigate allegations of fraud, including false statements to the government (18 U.S.C. 1001), by any person or entity that is subject to regulation by the Department: *Provided further*, That the funds made available under this heading may be used to investigate, pursuant to section 41712 of title 49, United States Code: (1) unfair or deceptive practices and unfair methods of competition by domestic and foreign air carriers and ticket agents; and (2) the compliance of domestic and foreign air carriers with respect to item (1) of this proviso: *Provided further*, That hereafter funds transferred to the Office of the Inspector General through forfeiture proceedings or from the Department of Justice Assets Forfeiture Fund or the Department of the Treasury Forfeiture Fund, as a participating agency, as an equitable share from the forfeiture of property in investigations in which the Office of Inspector General participates, or through the granting of a Petition for Remission or Mitigation, shall be deposited to the credit of this account for law enforcement activities authorized under the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, to remain available until expended.

SURFACE TRANSPORTATION BOARD
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Surface Transportation Board, including services authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, \$31,375,000: *Provided*,

That notwithstanding any other provision of law, not to exceed \$1,250,000 from fees established by the Chairman of the Surface Transportation Board shall be credited to this appropriation as offsetting collections and used for necessary and authorized expenses under this heading: *Provided further*, That the sum herein appropriated from the general fund shall be reduced on a dollar-for-dollar basis as such offsetting collections are received during fiscal year 2016, to result in a final appropriation from the general fund estimated at no more than \$30,125,000.

GENERAL PROVISIONS—DEPARTMENT OF
TRANSPORTATION

SEC. 180. During the current fiscal year, applicable appropriations to the Department of Transportation shall be available for maintenance and operation of aircraft; hire of passenger motor vehicles and aircraft; purchase of liability insurance for motor vehicles operating in foreign countries on official department business; and uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901–5902).

SEC. 181. Appropriations contained in this Act for the Department of Transportation shall be available for services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, but at rates for individuals not to exceed the per diem rate equivalent to the rate for an Executive Level IV.

SEC. 182. None of the funds in this Act shall be available for salaries and expenses of more than 110 political and Presidential appointees in the Department of Transportation: *Provided*, That none of the personnel covered by this provision may be assigned on temporary detail outside the Department of Transportation.

SEC. 183. (a) No recipient of funds made available in this Act shall disseminate personal information (as defined in 18 U.S.C. 2725(3)) obtained by a State department of motor vehicles in connection with a motor vehicle record as defined in 18 U.S.C. 2725(1), except as provided in 18 U.S.C. 2721 for a use permitted under 18 U.S.C. 2721.

(b) Notwithstanding subsection (a), the Secretary shall not withhold funds provided in this Act for any grantee if a State is in noncompliance with this provision.

SEC. 184. Funds received by the Federal Highway Administration, Federal Transit Administration, and Federal Railroad Administration from States, counties, municipalities, other public authorities, and private sources for expenses incurred for training may be credited respectively to the Federal Highway Administration's "Federal-Aid Highways" account, the Federal Transit Administration's "Technical Assistance and Training" account, and to the Federal Railroad Administration's "Safety and Operations" account, except for State rail safety inspectors participating in training pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 20105.

SEC. 185. None of the funds in this Act to the Department of Transportation may be used to make a loan, loan guarantee, line of credit, or grant unless the Secretary of Transportation notifies the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations not less than 3 full business days before any project competitively selected to receive a discretionary grant award, any discretionary grant award, letter of intent, loan commitment, loan guarantee commitment, line of credit commitment, or full funding grant agreement totaling \$750,000 or more is announced by the department or its modal administrations from:

(1) any discretionary grant or federal credit program of the Federal Highway Administration including the emergency relief program;

(2) the airport improvement program of the Federal Aviation Administration;

(3) any program of the Federal Railroad Administration;

(4) any program of the Federal Transit Administration other than the formula grants and fixed guideway modernization programs;

(5) any program of the Maritime Administration; or

(6) any funding provided under the headings "National Infrastructure Investments" in this Act:

Provided, That the Secretary gives concurrent notification to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations for any "quick release" of funds from the emergency relief program: *Provided further*, That no notification shall involve funds that are not available for obligation.

SEC. 186. Rebates, refunds, incentive payments, minor fees and other funds received by the Department of Transportation from travel management centers, charge card programs, the subleasing of building space, and miscellaneous sources are to be credited to appropriations of the Department of Transportation and allocated to elements of the Department of Transportation using fair and equitable criteria and such funds shall be available until expended.

SEC. 187. Amounts made available in this or any other Act that the Secretary determines represent improper payments by the Department of Transportation to a third-party contractor under a financial assistance award, which are recovered pursuant to law, shall be available—

(1) to reimburse the actual expenses incurred by the Department of Transportation in recovering improper payments; and

(2) to pay contractors for services provided in recovering improper payments or contractor support in the implementation of the Improper Payments Information Act of 2002: *Provided*, That amounts in excess of that required for paragraphs (1) and (2)—

(A) shall be credited to and merged with the appropriation from which the improper payments were made, and shall be available for the purposes and period for which such appropriations are available: *Provided further*, That where specific project or accounting information associated with the improper payment or payments is not readily available, the Secretary may credit an appropriate account, which shall be available for the purposes and period associated with the account so credited; or

(B) if no such appropriation remains available, shall be deposited in the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts: *Provided further*, That prior to the transfer of any such recovery to an appropriations account, the Secretary shall notify the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations of the amount and reasons for such transfer: *Provided further*, That for purposes of this section, the term "improper payments" has the same meaning as that provided in section 2(d)(2) of Public Law 107–300.

SEC. 188. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, if any funds provided in or limited by this Act are subject to a reprogramming action that requires notice to be provided to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations, transmission of said reprogramming notice shall be provided solely to the Committees on Appropriations, and said reprogramming action shall be approved or denied solely by the Committees on Appropriations: *Provided*, That the Secretary may provide notice to other congressional committees of the action of the Committees on Appropriations on such reprogramming but not sooner than 30 days following the date on which the reprogramming action has been approved or denied by the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations.

SEC. 189. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available under this Act may

be used by the Surface Transportation Board of the Department of Transportation to charge or collect any filing fee for rate or practice complaints filed with the Board in an amount in excess of the amount authorized for district court civil suit filing fees under section 1914 of title 28, United States Code.

SEC. 190. Funds appropriated in this Act to the modal administrations may be obligated for the Office of the Secretary for the costs related to assessments or reimbursable agreements only when such amounts are for the costs of goods and services that are purchased to provide a direct benefit to the applicable modal administration or administrations.

SEC. 191. The Secretary of Transportation is authorized to carry out a program that establishes uniform standards for developing and supporting agency transit pass and transit benefits authorized under section 7905 of title 5, United States Code, including distribution of transit benefits by various paper and electronic media.

SEC. 192. None of the funds made available by this Act shall be used by the Surface Transportation Board to take any actions with respect to the construction of a high speed rail project in California unless the permit is issued by the Board with respect to the project in its entirety.

SEC. 193. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to facilitate new scheduled air transportation originating from the United States if such flights would land on, or pass through, property confiscated by the Cuban Government, including property in which a minority interest was confiscated, as the terms confiscated, Cuban Government, and property are defined in paragraphs (4), (5), and (12)(A), respectively, of section 4 of the Cuban Liberty and Democratic Solidarity (LIBERTAD) Act of 1996 (22 U.S.C. 6023 (4), (5), and (12)(A)): *Provided*, That for this section, new scheduled air transportation shall include any flights not already regularly scheduled prior to March 31, 2015.

This title may be cited as the "Department of Transportation Appropriations Act, 2016".

TITLE II

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN
DEVELOPMENT

MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATION

EXECUTIVE OFFICES

For necessary salaries and expenses for Executive Offices, which shall be comprised of the offices of the Secretary, Deputy Secretary, Adjudicatory Services, Congressional and Intergovernmental Relations, Public Affairs, Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization, and the Center for Faith-Based and Neighborhood Partnerships, \$14,500,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$25,000 of the amount made available under this heading shall be available to the Secretary for official reception and representation expenses as the Secretary may determine.

ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT OFFICES

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary salaries and expenses for Administrative Support Offices, \$547,000,000, of which \$45,600,000, to remain available until expended, in addition to amounts made available under this heading for the Office of the Chief Financial Officer and the Office of the Chief Human Capital Officer, shall be for funding shared service agreements between the Department of Housing and Urban Development and the Department of the Treasury; \$39,000,000 shall be available for the Office of the Chief Financial Officer; \$93,000,000 shall be available for the Office of the General Counsel; \$199,000,000 shall be available for the Office of Administration; \$40,000,000 shall be

available for the Office of the Chief Human Capital Officer; \$49,000,000 shall be available for the Office of Field Policy and Management; \$16,000,000 shall be available for the Office of the Chief Procurement Officer; \$3,000,000 shall be available for the Office of Departmental Equal Employment Opportunity; \$4,000,000 shall be available for the Office of Strategic Planning and Management; \$44,000,000 shall be available for the Office of the Chief Information Officer; and of which the remaining amount shall be available through September 30, 2017, for transfer to the appropriations for offices specified under this heading or the heading "Program Office Salaries and Expenses" in this title: *Provided*, That funds provided under this heading may be used for necessary administrative and non-administrative expenses of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, not otherwise provided for, including purchase of uniforms, or allowances therefor, as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 5901-5902; hire of passenger motor vehicles; and services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds appropriated under this heading may be used for advertising and promotional activities that directly support program activities funded in this title: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall provide the Committees on Appropriations quarterly written notification regarding the status of pending congressional reports: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall provide in electronic form all signed reports required by Congress.

PROGRAM OFFICE SALARIES AND EXPENSES

PUBLIC AND INDIAN HOUSING

For necessary salaries and expenses of the Office of Public and Indian Housing, \$203,000,000.

COMMUNITY PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT

For necessary salaries and expenses of the Office of Community Planning and Development, \$102,000,000.

HOUSING

For necessary salaries and expenses of the Office of Housing, \$372,000,000.

POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND RESEARCH

For necessary salaries and expenses of the Office of Policy Development and Research, \$22,700,000.

FAIR HOUSING AND EQUAL OPPORTUNITY

For necessary salaries and expenses of the Office of Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity, \$73,000,000.

OFFICE OF LEAD HAZARD CONTROL AND HEALTHY HOMES

For necessary salaries and expenses of the Office of Lead Hazard Control and Healthy Homes, \$6,700,000.

PUBLIC AND INDIAN HOUSING PROGRAMS

TENANT-BASED RENTAL ASSISTANCE

For activities and assistance for the provision of tenant-based rental assistance authorized under the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1437 et seq.) ("the Act" herein), not otherwise provided for, \$15,918,643,000 to remain available until September 30, 2018, shall be available on October 1, 2015 (in addition to the \$4,000,000,000 previously appropriated under this heading that became available on October 1, 2015), and \$4,000,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2019, shall be available on October 1, 2016: *Provided*, That the amounts made available under this heading are provided as follows:

(1) \$18,151,000,000 shall be available for renewals of expiring section 8 tenant-based annual contributions contracts (including renewals of enhanced vouchers under any provision of law authorizing such assistance

under section 8(t) of the Act) and including renewal of other special purpose or incremental vouchers: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, from amounts provided under this paragraph and any carryover, the Secretary for the calendar year 2016 funding cycle shall provide renewal funding for each public housing agency based on validated voucher management system (VMS) leasing and cost data for the prior calendar year and by applying an inflation factor as established by the Secretary, by notice published in the Federal Register, and by making any necessary adjustments for the costs associated with the first-time renewal of vouchers under this paragraph including tenant protection, HOPE VI, and Choice Neighborhoods vouchers: *Provided further*, That in determining calendar year 2016 funding allocations under this heading for public housing agencies, including agencies participating in the Moving To Work (MTW) demonstration, the Secretary may take into account the anticipated impact of changes in targeting and utility allowances, on public housing agencies' contract renewal needs: *Provided further*, That none of the funds provided under this paragraph may be used to fund a total number of unit months under lease which exceeds a public housing agency's authorized level of units under contract, except for public housing agencies participating in the MTW demonstration, which are instead governed by the terms and conditions of their MTW agreements: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall, to the extent necessary to stay within the amount specified under this paragraph (except as otherwise modified under this paragraph), prorate each public housing agency's allocation otherwise established pursuant to this paragraph: *Provided further*, That except as provided in the following provisos, the entire amount specified under this paragraph (except as otherwise modified under this paragraph) shall be obligated to the public housing agencies based on the allocation and pro rata method described above, and the Secretary shall notify public housing agencies of their annual budget by the latter of 60 days after enactment of this Act or March 1, 2016: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may extend the notification period with the prior written approval of the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations: *Provided further*, That public housing agencies participating in the MTW demonstration shall be funded pursuant to their MTW agreements and shall be subject to the same pro rata adjustments under the previous provisos: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may offset public housing agencies' calendar year 2016 allocations based on the excess amounts of public housing agencies' net restricted assets accounts, including HUD held programmatic reserves (in accordance with VMS data in calendar year 2015 that is verifiable and complete), as determined by the Secretary: *Provided further*, That public housing agencies participating in the MTW demonstration shall also be subject to the offset, as determined by the Secretary, excluding amounts subject to the single fund budget authority provisions of their MTW agreements, from the agencies' calendar year 2016 MTW funding allocation: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall use any offset referred to in the previous two provisos throughout the calendar year to prevent the termination of rental assistance for families as the result of insufficient funding, as determined by the Secretary, and to avoid or reduce the proration of renewal funding allocations: *Provided further*, That up to \$75,000,000 shall be available only: (1) for adjustments in the allocations for public housing agencies, after application for an adjustment by a public housing agency that ex-

perienced a significant increase, as determined by the Secretary, in renewal costs of vouchers resulting from unforeseen circumstances or from portability under section 8(r) of the Act; (2) for vouchers that were not in use during the 12-month period in order to be available to meet a commitment pursuant to section 8(o)(13) of the Act; (3) for adjustments for costs associated with HUD-Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing (HUD-VASH) vouchers; (4) for adjustments for public housing agencies with voucher leasing rates at the end of the calendar year that exceed the average leasing for the 12-month period used to establish the allocation, and for additional leasing of vouchers that were issued but not leased prior to the end of such calendar year; (5) for public housing agencies that despite taking reasonable cost savings measures, as determined by the Secretary, would otherwise be required to terminate rental assistance for families as a result of insufficient funding; and (6) for adjustments in the allocations for public housing agencies that experienced a significant increase, as determined by the Secretary, in renewal costs as a result of participation in the Small Area Fair Market Rent demonstration: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall allocate amounts under the previous proviso based on need, as determined by the Secretary;

(2) \$130,000,000 shall be for section 8 rental assistance for relocation and replacement of housing units that are demolished or disposed of pursuant to section 18 of the Act, conversion of section 23 projects to assistance under section 8, the family unification program under section 8(x) of the Act, relocation of witnesses in connection with efforts to combat crime in public and assisted housing pursuant to a request from a law enforcement or prosecution agency, enhanced vouchers under any provision of law authorizing such assistance under section 8(t) of the Act, HOPE VI and Choice Neighborhood vouchers, mandatory and voluntary conversions, and tenant protection assistance including replacement and relocation assistance or for project-based assistance to prevent the displacement of unassisted elderly tenants currently residing in section 202 properties financed between 1959 and 1974 that are refinanced pursuant to Public Law 106-569, as amended, or under the authority as provided under this Act: *Provided*, That when a public housing development is submitted for demolition or disposition under section 18 of the Act, the Secretary may provide section 8 rental assistance when the units pose an imminent health and safety risk to residents: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may only provide replacement vouchers for units that were occupied within the previous 24 months that cease to be available as assisted housing, subject only to the availability of funds: *Provided further*, That of the amounts made available under this paragraph, \$5,000,000 may be available to provide tenant protection assistance, not otherwise provided under this paragraph, to residents residing in low vacancy areas and who may have to pay rents greater than 30 percent of household income, as the result of (1) the maturity of a HUD-insured, HUD-held or section 202 loan that requires the permission of the Secretary prior to loan prepayment; (2) the expiration of a rental assistance contract for which the tenants are not eligible for enhanced voucher or tenant protection assistance under existing law; or (3) the expiration of affordability restrictions accompanying a mortgage or preservation program administered by the Secretary: *Provided further*, That such tenant protection assistance made available under the previous proviso may be provided under the authority of section 8(t) or section 8(o)(13) of the

United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f(t)): *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall issue guidance to implement the previous provisos, including, but not limited to, requirements for defining eligible at-risk households within 120 days of the enactment of this Act: *Provided further*, That any tenant protection voucher made available from amounts under this paragraph shall not be reissued by any public housing agency, except the replacement vouchers as defined by the Secretary by notice, when the initial family that received any such voucher no longer receives such voucher, and the authority for any public housing agency to issue any such voucher shall cease to exist: *Provided further*, That the Secretary, for the purpose under this paragraph, may use unobligated balances, including recaptures and carryovers, remaining from amounts appropriated in prior fiscal years under this heading for voucher assistance for nonelderly disabled families and for disaster assistance made available under Public Law 110-329;

(3) \$1,530,000,000 shall be for administrative and other expenses of public housing agencies in administering the section 8 tenant-based rental assistance program, of which up to \$10,000,000 shall be available to the Secretary to allocate to public housing agencies that need additional funds to administer their section 8 programs, including fees associated with section 8 tenant protection rental assistance, the administration of disaster related vouchers, Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing vouchers, and other special purpose incremental vouchers: *Provided*, That no less than \$1,520,000,000 of the amount provided in this paragraph shall be allocated to public housing agencies for the calendar year 2016 funding cycle based on section 8(q) of the Act (and related Appropriation Act provisions) as in effect immediately before the enactment of the Quality Housing and Work Responsibility Act of 1998 (Public Law 105-276): *Provided further*, That if the amounts made available under this paragraph are insufficient to pay the amounts determined under the previous proviso, the Secretary may decrease the amounts allocated to agencies by a uniform percentage applicable to all agencies receiving funding under this paragraph or may, to the extent necessary to provide full payment of amounts determined under the previous proviso, utilize unobligated balances, including recaptures and carryovers, remaining from funds appropriated to the Department of Housing and Urban Development under this heading from prior fiscal years, excluding special purpose vouchers, notwithstanding the purposes for which such amounts were appropriated: *Provided further*, That all public housing agencies participating in the MTW demonstration shall be funded pursuant to their MTW agreements, and shall be subject to the same uniform percentage decrease as under the previous proviso: *Provided further*, That amounts provided under this paragraph shall be only for activities related to the provision of tenant-based rental assistance authorized under section 8, including related development activities;

(4) \$107,643,210 for the renewal of tenant-based assistance contracts under section 811 of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act (42 U.S.C. 8013), including necessary administrative expenses: *Provided*, That administrative and other expenses of public housing agencies in administering the special purpose vouchers in this paragraph shall be funded under the same terms and be subject to the same pro rata reduction as the percent decrease for administrative and other expenses to public housing agencies under paragraph (3) of this heading;

(5) The Secretary shall separately track all special purpose vouchers funded under this heading.

□ 2315

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. AL GREEN OF TEXAS

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 74, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$75,000,000)”.

Page 75, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$75,000,000)”.

Page 77, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$75,000,000)”.

Page 78, line 9, before the semicolon insert the following: “, except that of the amount made available by this proviso, \$75,000,000 shall be used only for the purpose under this clause”.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas (during the reading). Mr. Chair, I ask that the amendment be considered as read.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman?

There was no objection.

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

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Texas and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise tonight in support of the people who make it possible for us to be here. Of course, I speak of those persons who go to distant places, those persons who serve us in our military who don't always return the same way they left.

I rise tonight because we have had a successful program. The HUD VASH program has been successful, and it has contributed to the decline in homelessness among those persons who make it possible for us to be here, who make real the great and noble American ideals: liberty and justice for all; government of the people, by the people, for the people.

Mr. Chairman, homelessness has declined 33 percent among our veteran population since 2010, and this is because the President made it a priority. President Obama indicated that he would reduce homelessness among veterans, and he had 2015 as a targeted date.

I am proud to say that in my city of Houston, Texas, our mayor, Annise Parker, had an event just recently with three HUD Secretaries, and it was announced at that event that in Houston, Texas, the resources were available to accommodate a veteran in need of a place to call home.

Tonight, Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment that would accord \$75 million to the HUD VASH program. This \$75 million would be used to make sure that what we have done we will not only continue to do, but we can do even better.

I believe that the people who have served us and who find themselves now

living on the streets of life should have a better quality of life. For this reason, I will promote this amendment tonight, understanding that a point of order has been made, but also understanding that it is necessary for us to continue to remind ourselves that we have people who are willing to make the sacrifice and that we should make sacrifices for them.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. I want to thank the gentleman, again, for his passion for this issue and for talking to me about this issue, and I look forward to continuing to work with the gentleman.

Obviously, all of us know that there is never anything, there is never enough that we could ever do for our veterans. So again, I thank the gentleman, and I look forward to continuing to work with the gentleman.

I thank you for yielding your time.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman and I thank the Congress of the United States of America because Congress has appropriated money for these VASH vouchers, this program. I have always tried to get more because I think our veterans deserve as much as we can give them, but I am appreciative for what Congress has done, and I am appreciative for what the chairman has done.

So tonight I will withdraw my amendment, Mr. Chairman, but I do so with the understanding that as we move forward, knowing that we have done a great job, the President has done well, that the cities and municipalities have worked well with the President, this has been an integrated system, holistic approach to ending homelessness among our veterans, but I still believe that we cannot allow ourselves to relax. We must never assume that we have done enough for those who are willing to do all for us.

With that, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. NORTON

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 74, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$512,000,000)”.

Page 75, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$512,000,000)”.

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

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer an amendment to H.R. 2577, the Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, that would fully fund the existing Housing Choice Vouchers and replenish the 67,000 vouchers lost to the fiscal year 2013 sequestration.

It is difficult, Mr. Chair, to think of a more urgent issue confronting the American people. Affordable housing has reached zero in many communities of our country. It is estimated that 2.1 million low-income families utilize the Housing Choice Voucher program. These are the most vulnerable among us, including children, senior citizens, veterans, and persons with disabilities who rely on this important program to keep their families from becoming homeless.

Most families must make roughly \$18.92 per hour to afford a two-bedroom apartment, which is more than 2½ times the Federal minimum wage. In the District of Columbia, where affordable housing has virtually disappeared, families must make \$28.25 per hour to afford a two-bedroom apartment, making the Nation's Capital one of the most expensive housing markets in the Nation.

The District mirrors cities and suburbs throughout the country, however. For over a decade, District residents have faced increasing rents, stagnant incomes, and the disappearance of affordable rental units. As a result, the city has had to close—actually close altogether—its housing waiting list, which includes vouchers, leaving more than 72,000 people waiting to be placed and thousands more waiting for a chance even to get on the list.

My amendment would fund President Obama's budget request to restore 67,000 vouchers lost during the fiscal year 2013 sequestration, bringing urgently needed relief to struggling families across the country. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment. What is Congress here for if not to bring some relief to millions of families across the country, those who are most in need?

I reserve the balance of my time.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, I insist on my point of order.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Florida may state his point of order.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is not in order under section 3(d)(3) of House Resolution 5 of the 114th Congress which states the following:

"It shall not be in order to consider an amendment to a general appropriations bill proposing a net increase in budget authority in the bill unless considered en bloc with another amendment or amendments proposing an equal or greater decrease in such budget authority pursuant to clause 2(f) of rule XXI."

The amendment proposes a net increase in budget authority in the bill in violation of such section.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from the District of Columbia is recognized.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, but for sequestration probably most of these housing vouchers would have gone through. They are already cut. These are cuts that were never anticipated. These were sequestration cuts. The Congress cannot ignore forever the neediest people for housing as homelessness increases and as there is no relief whatsoever.

I understand the point of order. I can't agree with it. I think at some point this Congress must face what it must do for people who but for sequestration, something none of us wanted, none of us anticipated, would at least among them have some who would have these housing vouchers.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from Florida makes a point of order that the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia violates section 3(d)(3) of House Resolution 5.

Section 3(d)(3) establishes a point of order against an amendment proposing a net increase in budget authority in the pending bill.

As persuasively asserted by the gentleman from Florida, the amendment proposes a net increase in budget authority in the bill. Therefore, the point of order is sustained. The amendment is not in order.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. NADLER

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 74, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$1,204,853,210)".

Page 75, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$182,816,000)".

Page 79, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$20,000,000)".

Page 81, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$490,037,000)".

Page 83, after line 10, insert the following:

(5) \$277,000,000 shall be for incremental rental voucher assistance under section 8(o) of the Act to be distributed based on relative need, as determined by the Secretary: *Provided*, That the Secretary shall make such funding available, notwithstanding section 204 (competition provision) of this title;

(6) \$177,500,000 shall be used for incremental rental voucher assistance for use by families, veterans, and tribal families who are experiencing homelessness, as well as victims of domestic and dating violence: *Provided*, That eligibility for veterans is made without regard to discharge status: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall make such funding available through a competitive process to public housing agencies that partner with eligible Continuums of Care, as identified by the Secretary and to recipients eligible to

receive block grants under the Native American Housing Assistance and Determination Act of 1996 (NAHASDA) (25 U.S.C. 4101 et seq.): *Provided further*, That assistance provided to recipients eligible under NAHASDA shall be subject to requirements of NAHASDA: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may waive, or specify alternative requirements for any provision or statute or regulation that the Secretary administers in connection with the use of funds made available under this paragraph upon a finding by the Secretary that any such waivers or alternative requirements are necessary for the effective delivery and administration of such voucher assistance: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall issue guidance to implement the previous proviso;

(7) \$37,500,000 shall be made available to provide incremental rental voucher assistance for victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking, as defined by the Violence Against Women Act Reauthorization Act of 2013 (Public Law 113-4), who require an emergency transfer: *Provided*, That the Secretary shall issue guidance to implement this paragraph;

(8) \$20,000,000 shall be made available for new incremental voucher assistance through the Family Unification Program: *Provided*, That the assistance made available under this paragraph shall continue to remain available for family unification upon turnover: *Provided further*, That the amounts made available under this paragraph shall be used only in connection with tenant-based assistance on behalf of—

(A) any family—

(i) who is otherwise eligible for such assistance; and

(ii) who the public child welfare agency for the jurisdiction has certified is a family for whom the lack of adequate housing is a primary factor in the imminent placement of the family's child or children in out-of-home care; and

(B) for a period not to exceed 60 months, otherwise eligible youths who have attained at least 18 years of age and not more than 21 years of age and who have left foster care at age 16 or older.

Page 83, line 11, strike "(5)" and insert "(9)".

Mr. NADLER (during the reading). Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent to waive the reading of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

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

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from New York and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the funding levels provided in this bill are unrealistic and unsustainable and clearly demonstrate that our current budget process has failed. This bill reveals where the majority's priorities lie, and they clearly do not lie in serving the most basic function of government: to provide for the safety and well-being of its citizens.

This bill makes major cuts to critical HUD programs. The public housing

capital fund is slashed by \$200 million, barely reaching its 1989 level, almost 30 years ago. This will cover less than half of the basic maintenance needs and does nothing to address the \$25 billion in deferred projects.

For the first time since 2007, this body will provide no new funding to provide housing and support to homeless veterans. The Healthy Homes and Lead Hazard Control program is cut by 32 percent, even as The Washington Post reported 2 months ago that in low-income West Baltimore neighborhoods, more than 3 percent of children under the age of 6 had dangerously high levels of lead in their blood, which we know leads to learning disabilities and can lead to lifelong dependency, not to mention lifelong dependency on the taxpayers.

But perhaps most startling is the bill's failure to provide low-income seniors and hard-working families adequate access to affordable housing through HUD's Section 8 program. Rental assistance helps 2.1 million very-low-income households to rent modest homes in the private market at affordable costs. Households that use vouchers have an average income of \$13,000 per year, well below the Federal poverty line, and nearly all include children, seniors, or people with disabilities. Only about one in four eligible low-income families receives Federal rental assistance. Long waiting lists remain in nearly every community, and these long waits are exacerbated by a lack of administrative funding for public housing agencies.

Sequestration has only made this situation worse. As of June of last year, an estimated 100,000 fewer families were receiving assistance from Section 8 due to the sequestration cuts; 100,000 families cut off. These cuts have had a severe impact on communities at a time when the number of very-low-income renters with worst case housing needs remains 30 percent higher than it was before the Great Recession.

Through the fiscal year 2014 and fiscal year 2015 appropriations bills, Congress began the work of reversing the deep cuts in assistance caused by sequestration, but nearly 67,000 vouchers have yet to be restored. My amendment would finally restore those lost vouchers by providing an additional \$512 million to the voucher renewal account. This amendment mirrors the President's request and targets 30,000 vouchers to those families and individuals most in need of housing assistance: homeless families; veterans, including those not covered by the VASH program; victims of domestic violence; and Native Americans.

□ 2330

The bill does include important and helpful language directing HUD to target vouchers to the vulnerable populations as they become available but provides no funds for HUD to do so.

My amendment sets aside specific funding for these targeted vouchers to

make sure the most vulnerable populations have access to safe, affordable housing.

This additional funding will go a long way toward ensuring that every family that qualifies for rental assistance finds a home. However, at the funding levels for administrative fees in this legislation, it would be impossible for public housing agencies to hire and maintain enough staff to process and renew vouchers.

We cannot continue to undermine our hard-working public housing agencies by failing to provide them enough money to function. My amendment would finally address the undercutting of public housing agencies by providing an additional \$490 million to match the President's request.

Mr. Chairman, this is the minimum we can do to meet the vital needs of our lowest-income citizens and of our veterans. I urge adoption of this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, I insist on the point of order.

The amendment is not in order under section 3(d)(3) of House Resolution 5, 114th Congress, which states:

"It shall not be in order to consider an amendment to a general appropriations bill proposing a net increase in budget authority in the bill unless considered en bloc with another amendment or amendments proposing an equal or greater decrease in such budget authority pursuant to clause 2(f) of rule XXI."

The amendment proposes a net increase in budget authority in the bill in violation of such section.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, we can all agree that this amendment is necessary. We are talking about denying tens of thousands of families and seniors access to an efficient, cost-effective program that keeps families together and lowers the government's costs over the long term. Without this amendment, we will see a spike in homelessness, a spike in medical costs, and a spike in hungry children.

I understand the point of order. I understand that the rules demand an offset for any funding increase in the bill. I also appreciate the chairman's efforts to support Section 8 and public housing. However, when funding levels are as restrictive as this bill provides across the board, it is impossible to offset such drastic underfunding without hurting other people in need.

When faced with a funding bill—

The Acting CHAIR. Does the gentleman from New York wish to speak to the point of order?

The gentleman will confine his remarks to the point of order.

Mr. NADLER. When faced with a funding bill that fails to provide any new funding to support homeless vet-

erans and is leaving victims of domestic violence and homeless families with no access to secure housing, we need to take action to support the most vulnerable among us.

I hope that as we go forward, we can find a way to provide these funds so that kids, working families, and seniors are not out on the street.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from Florida makes a point of order that the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York violates section 3(d)(3) of House Resolution 5.

Section 3(d)(3) establishes a point of order against an amendment proposing a net increase in budget authority in the pending bill.

As persuasively asserted by the gentleman from Florida, the amendment proposes a net increase in budget authority in the bill. Therefore, the point of order is sustained. The amendment is not in order.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I think it is very important that this moment not pass without us expressing appreciation to Mr. NADLER and to Ms. NORTON for these amendments they have offered, because they are addressing a critical issue, a critical deficiency in this bill. And believe me, Mr. Chairman, this is just the tip of the iceberg.

The President proposed in his budget to provide additional rental vouchers to compensate for those lost earlier to sequestration. He also proposed funding for 30,000 new targeted vouchers, as Mr. NADLER was indicating: homeless families, veterans, Native Americans, victims of domestic violence and stalking, reuniting families.

Because of this budget policy that has us so hamstrung, we are simply not addressing in this bill any of these desperate needs. I invite colleagues to talk to their local housing authorities, if they haven't already. Ask how many are on the waiting list. Ask how many people are desperate for decent housing. There is nothing more basic to our communities' well-being than decent housing.

I don't know of a single housing program that isn't underresourced, and all this because of a budget policy that really isn't working as fiscal policy. That is what it is supposed to be doing, but it is decimating these investments that our country needs to be making.

I said the tip of the iceberg. Here is what I mean. The Choice Neighborhoods initiative is the successor to HOPE VI. That has been an enormously successful program in my area of Raleigh-Durham in North Carolina. That is \$20 million. That is a token amount. I hope we will revisit that amount later.

Public housing capital fund, \$1.68 billion. That is \$194 million cut from last year. That goes back to where we were 26 years ago. And then we have a \$25 billion backlog—not even beginning to address that.

Mr. Chairman, my district displays rental housing for the elderly, housing for the disabled. Local congregations have taken on these projects. We have group homes for the disabled that have done a wonderful job. This budget simply turns them into rental renewal programs. No capital funding, no increase in the supply. And so it goes.

So Mr. NADLER and Ms. NORTON have done us a great service tonight in pressing the case for tenant-based rental assistance—for these vouchers—and for addressing some of these very needy categories of our fellow citizens. But it is the tip of the iceberg. It is only one of an array of programs that we very much need to address.

I am hopeful that the inadequacy of this bill tonight, and the kind of debate we are having tonight, the kind of sharp relief that these needs are being put into, will motivate us very strongly sooner rather than later.

Let's not wait for a Presidential veto. Let's not wait for some kind of governmental shutdown. Let's show that we can govern. Let's show that we can take hold of our situation, invest the way a great country should invest, and do a budget agreement that secures our fiscal future but also makes room for the kind of investments that we should make.

So I thank my colleagues for bringing up these critical housing needs. We simply must address them in the weeks ahead.

I yield back the balance of my time.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GROTHMAN

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 74, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$614,000,000)”.

Page 75, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$434,000,000)”.

Page 81, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$180,000,000)”.

Page 81, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$180,000,000)”.

Page 156, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$614,000,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Wisconsin and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Chairman, I am glad to be here. It shows different people look at this budget and see different things.

I look at this budget and see a \$614 million increase in Section 8 housing, and I look at the huge debt we have, and I say: Why are we spending more? Other people apparently look at the \$614 million increase and say: Why, that is just a pittance.

Obviously, a 3 percent increase in any program at a time we are in the

huge debt we are should be viewed skeptically. I have an amendment here to get rid of the \$614 million increase.

Now, as I understand, the reason there is an increase is because we are getting in less receipts on the Section 8 housing and, therefore, we feel that the citizens of this country have to make up the difference.

My opinion is they have done nothing that we have to take more out of their pocket, either in taxes or by way of inflation, and we should not be increasing this funding by \$614 million.

In the debate over the last amendment it was said that there is a waiting list on a lot of these programs. That doesn't mean we have to spend more money on the programs. If we are giving away something for free, there is always going to be a waiting list. If you go out in society, if a store says, we are going to give away something for free, you have a waiting list, right?

This is a flawed program for a couple of reasons. I don't object to using it for disabled people. I don't object to using it for elderly people. But like many welfare-related programs, two things help you in eligibility for this program.

First of all, you are required not to work very hard. And the gentleman made a point that the income level of a lot of these people in the projects isn't that high. That is because if they made more money, they wouldn't be eligible for the generous subsidies. So, of course they are not making a lot of money. It is wrong to set up a program that discourages industry.

The second thing wrong with this program is it discourages marriage. A lot of these housing things are set up such that if somebody marries the mother or father of their children who is working harder, you lose the subsidy. I can't imagine anything more foolish than setting up a program that says we will give you an apartment if you raise a child out of wedlock, but if you get married, we will take away your apartment.

The last time we really looked at this program was 1994. It is time we look at it again. And the idea of pouring another \$614 million into this program is out of line.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition with considerable enthusiasm.

It is as though what I said 5 minutes ago about the deficiencies of this bill—this whole budget strategy that has left us so unable to address our needs—it is as though the gentleman took that and went in exactly the opposite direction.

His amendment reduced an allocation that is already far too low, and it takes these rental assistance programs and reduces them further. Not only does it not meet the need that we are seeing but actually reduces what we are al-

ready doing. This means evictions. I promise you, it means large-scale evictions. It means a cutting back in communities across this country of the housing alternatives that people have.

I have always thought, Mr. Chairman, that rental assistance—Section 8—should be a housing program that conservatives should love because it is market-based. It is not, contrary to what the gentleman says, a total free ride. As a matter of fact, people pay a third of their income in rent. What Section 8 provides is a modest boost so that these housing developments and these apartment buildings can work. People can live there. They put their own money in, and they get a boost. They are able to move toward self-sufficiency.

So it is not public housing. It is housing for people who are able to do more for themselves and who are receiving support as they do that. This would be unconscionable to cut this program further.

With great conviction I believe this would be a mistaken amendment, a hard-hearted amendment, and one that this body should reject.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN).

The amendment was rejected.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

HOUSING CERTIFICATE FUND
(INCLUDING RESCISSIONS)

Unobligated balances, including recaptures and carryover, remaining from funds appropriated to the Department of Housing and Urban Development under this heading, the heading “Annual Contributions for Assisted Housing” and the heading “Project-Based Rental Assistance”, for fiscal year 2016 and prior years may be used for renewal of or amendments to section 8 project-based contracts and for performance-based contract administrators, notwithstanding the purposes for which such funds were appropriated: *Provided*, That any obligated balances of contract authority from fiscal year 1974 and prior that have been terminated shall be rescinded: *Provided further*, That amounts heretofore recaptured, or recaptured during the current fiscal year, from section 8 project-based contracts from source years fiscal year 1975 through fiscal year 1987 are hereby rescinded, and an amount of additional new budget authority, equivalent to the amount rescinded is hereby appropriated, to remain available until expended, for the purposes set forth under this heading, in addition to amounts otherwise available.

PUBLIC HOUSING CAPITAL FUND

For the Public Housing Capital Fund Program to carry out capital and management activities for public housing agencies, as authorized under section 9 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437g) (“the Act”), \$1,681,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2019: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law or regulation, during fiscal year 2016 the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development may not delegate to any Department official other than the Deputy Secretary and the Assistant Secretary for Public and Indian

Housing any authority under paragraph (2) of section 9(j) regarding the extension of the time periods under such section: *Provided further*, That for purposes of such section 9(j), the term “obligate” means, with respect to amounts, that the amounts are subject to a binding agreement that will result in outlays, immediately or in the future: *Provided further*, That up to \$3,000,000 shall be to support ongoing Public Housing Financial and Physical Assessment activities: *Provided further*, That of the total amount provided under this heading, not to exceed \$20,000,000 shall be available for the Secretary to make grants, notwithstanding section 204 of this Act, to public housing agencies for emergency capital needs including safety and security measures necessary to address crime and drug-related activity as well as needs resulting from unforeseen or unpreventable emergencies and natural disasters excluding Presidentially declared emergencies and natural disasters under the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.) occurring in fiscal year 2016: *Provided further*, That of the total amount provided under this heading \$30,000,000 shall be for supportive services, service coordinator and congregate services as authorized by section 34 of the Act (42 U.S.C. 1437z-6) and the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act of 1996 (25 U.S.C. 4101 et seq.): *Provided further*, That of the total amount made available under this heading, up to \$15,000,000 may be used for a Jobs-Plus initiative modeled after the Jobs-Plus demonstration: *Provided further*, That the funding provided under the previous proviso shall provide competitive grants to partnerships between public housing authorities, local workforce investment boards established under section 117 of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998, and other agencies and organizations that provide support to help public housing residents obtain employment and increase earnings: *Provided further*, That applicants must demonstrate the ability to provide services to residents, partner with workforce investment boards, and leverage service dollars: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may set aside a portion of the funds provided for the Resident Opportunity and Self-Sufficiency program to support the services element of the Jobs-Plus Pilot initiative: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may allow PHAs to request exemptions from rent and income limitation requirements under sections 3 and 6 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 as necessary to implement the Jobs-Plus program, on such terms and conditions as the Secretary may approve upon a finding by the Secretary that any such waivers or alternative requirements are necessary for the effective implementation of the Jobs-Plus initiative as a voluntary program for residents: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall publish by notice in the Federal Register any waivers or alternative requirements pursuant to the preceding proviso no later than 10 days before the effective date of such notice: *Provided further*, That for funds provided under this heading, the limitation in section 9(g)(1) of the Act shall be 25 percent: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may waive the limitation in the previous proviso to allow public housing agencies to fund activities authorized under section 9(e)(1)(C) of the Act: *Provided further*, That from the funds made available under this heading, the Secretary shall provide bonus awards in fiscal year 2016 to public housing agencies that are designated high performers: *Provided further*, That the Department shall notify public housing agencies of their formula allocation within 60 days of enactment of this Act.

PUBLIC HOUSING OPERATING FUND

For 2016 payments to public housing agencies for the operation and management of

public housing, as authorized by section 9(e) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437g(e)), \$4,440,000,000.

CHOICE NEIGHBORHOODS INITIATIVE

For competitive grants under the Choice Neighborhoods Initiative (subject to section 24 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437v), unless otherwise specified under this heading), for transformation, rehabilitation, and replacement housing needs of both public and HUD-assisted housing and to transform neighborhoods of poverty into functioning, sustainable mixed income neighborhoods with appropriate services, schools, public assets, transportation and access to jobs, \$20,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2018: *Provided*, That grant funds may be used for resident and community services, community development, and affordable housing needs in the community, and for conversion of vacant or foreclosed properties to affordable housing: *Provided further*, That the use of funds made available under this heading shall not be deemed to be public housing notwithstanding section 3(b)(1) of such Act: *Provided further*, That grantees shall commit to an additional period of affordability determined by the Secretary of not fewer than 20 years: *Provided further*, That grantees shall undertake comprehensive local planning with input from residents and the community, and that grantees shall provide a match in State, local, other Federal or private funds: *Provided further*, That grantees may include local governments, tribal entities, public housing authorities, and nonprofits: *Provided further*, That for-profit developers may apply jointly with a public entity: *Provided further*, That for purposes of environmental review, a grantee shall be treated as a public housing agency under section 26 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437x), and grants under this heading shall be subject to the regulations issued by the Secretary to implement such section: *Provided further*, That such grantees shall create partnerships with other local organizations including assisted housing owners, service agencies, and resident organizations: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall consult with the Secretaries of Education, Labor, Transportation, Health and Human Services, Agriculture, and Commerce, the Attorney General, and the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to coordinate and leverage other appropriate Federal resources: *Provided further*, That unobligated balances, including recaptures, remaining from funds appropriated under the heading “Revitalization of Severely Distressed Public Housing (HOPE VI)” in fiscal year 2011 and prior fiscal years may be used for purposes under this heading, notwithstanding the purposes for which such amounts were appropriated.

FAMILY SELF-SUFFICIENCY

For the Family Self-Sufficiency program to support family self-sufficiency coordinators under section 23 of the United States Housing Act of 1937, to promote the development of local strategies to coordinate the use of assistance under sections 8 and 9 of such Act with public and private resources, and enable eligible families to achieve economic independence and self-sufficiency, \$75,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017: *Provided*, That the Secretary may, by Federal Register notice, waive or specify alternative requirements under sections b(3), b(4), b(5), or c(1) of section 23 of such Act in order to facilitate the operation of a unified self-sufficiency program for individuals receiving assistance under different provisions of the Act, as determined by the Secretary: *Provided further*, That owners of multifamily properties with project-based subsidy contracts under section 8 may com-

pete for funding under this heading and/or voluntarily make a Family Self-Sufficiency program available to the assisted tenants of such property in accordance with procedures established by the Secretary: *Provided further*, That such procedures established pursuant to the previous proviso shall permit participating tenants to accrue escrow funds in accordance with section 23(d)(2) and shall allow owners to use funding from residual receipt accounts to hire coordinators for their own Family Self-Sufficiency program.

NATIVE AMERICAN HOUSING BLOCK GRANTS

For the Native American Housing Block Grants program, as authorized under title I of the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act of 1996 (NAHASDA) (25 U.S.C. 4111 et seq.), \$650,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2020: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act of 1996, to determine the amount of the allocation under title I of such Act for each Indian tribe, the Secretary shall apply the formula under section 302 of such Act with the need component based on single-race census data and with the need component based on multi-race census data, and the amount of the allocation for each Indian tribe shall be the greater of the two resulting allocation amounts: *Provided further*, That of the amounts made available under this heading, \$3,500,000 shall be contracted for assistance for national or regional organizations representing Native American housing interests for providing training and technical assistance to Indian housing authorities and tribally designated housing entities as authorized under NAHASDA: *Provided further*, That of the funds made available under the previous proviso, not less than \$2,000,000 shall be made available for a national organization as authorized under section 703 of NAHASDA (25 U.S.C. 4212): *Provided further*, That of the amounts made available under this heading, \$2,000,000 shall be to support the inspection of Indian housing units, contract expertise, training, and technical assistance in the training, oversight, and management of such Indian housing and tenant-based assistance, including up to \$300,000 for related travel: *Provided further*, That of the amount provided under this heading, \$2,000,000 shall be made available for the cost of guaranteed notes and other obligations, as authorized by title VI of NAHASDA: *Provided further*, That such costs, including the costs of modifying such notes and other obligations, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended: *Provided further*, That these funds are available to subsidize the total principal amount of any notes and other obligations, any part of which is to be guaranteed, not to exceed \$17,452,007: *Provided further*, That the Department will notify grantees of their formula allocation within 60 days of the date of enactment of this Act: *Provided further*, notwithstanding section 302(d) of NAHASDA, if on January 1, 2016, a recipient's total amount of undisbursed block grants in the Department's line of credit control system is greater than three times the formula allocation it would otherwise receive under this heading, the Secretary shall adjust that recipient's formula allocation down by the difference between its total amount of undisbursed block grants in the Department's line of credit control system on January 1, 2016, and three times the formula allocation it would otherwise receive: *Provided further*, That grant amounts not allocated to a recipient pursuant to the previous proviso shall be allocated under the need component of the formula proportionately among all other Indian tribes not subject to an adjustment: *Provided further*, That the two previous

provisos shall not apply to any Indian tribe that would otherwise receive a formula allocation of less than \$5,000,000: *Provided further*, That to take effect, the three previous provisos do not require the issuance of any regulation.

INDIAN HOUSING LOAN GUARANTEE FUND
PROGRAM ACCOUNT

For the cost of guaranteed loans, as authorized by section 184 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1992 (12 U.S.C. 1715z-13a), \$8,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That such costs, including the costs of modifying such loans, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974: *Provided further*, That these funds are available to subsidize total loan principal, any part of which is to be guaranteed, up to \$1,269,841,270, to remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That up to \$750,000 of this amount may be for administrative contract expenses including management processes and systems to carry out the loan guarantee program.

COMMUNITY PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT
HOUSING OPPORTUNITIES FOR PERSONS WITH
AIDS

For carrying out the Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS program, as authorized by the AIDS Housing Opportunity Act (42 U.S.C. 12901 et seq.), \$332,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017, except that amounts allocated pursuant to section 854(c)(3) of such Act shall remain available until September 30, 2018: *Provided*, That the Secretary shall renew all expiring contracts for permanent supportive housing that initially were funded under section 854(c)(3) of such Act from funds made available under this heading in fiscal year 2010 and prior fiscal years that meet all program requirements before awarding funds for new contracts under such section: *Provided further*, That the Department shall notify grantees of their formula allocation within 60 days of enactment of this Act.

□ 2345

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. NADLER

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 94, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$3,000,000)".

Page 116, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$3,000,000)".

Mr. NADLER (during the reading). Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent to waive the reading of the amendment.

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

There was no objection.

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

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from New York and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, since 1992, the Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS has provided a vital safety net.

In the United States, 50,000 people become infected with HIV every year, and 1.2 million people are living with HIV/AIDS. More than 500,000 of these individuals will need some form of housing assistance during the course of their illness, but 145,000 individuals have unmet housing needs.

HOPWA combines housing support with additional services to help people living with HIV/AIDS and their families stay in stable, safe housing; manage their illness; and remain active in their communities. Housing interventions are critical in our continued fight against HIV/AIDS, and research clearly shows that stable housing leads to better health outcomes.

Providing stable housing to people living with HIV/AIDS reduces the risk of transmission to a partner by 96 percent; it reduces emergency room visits and expense to the public by 36 percent and hospitalizations by 57 percent. In other words, investing a modest amount in HOPWA today saves us millions, if not billions of Federal taxpayer dollars in the future.

HOPWA is the only Federal housing program to provide cities and States with dedicated resources to address the housing crisis facing people living with HIV/AIDS, and the program traditionally enjoys strong bipartisan support.

Congressional support for HOPWA is clear in this legislation. While nearly every other program in the bill has been slashed by millions of dollars and often funded at levels below the point of actually functioning, HOPWA saw a slight increase in funding during the committee's consideration of the bill.

Some hail the bill's slim \$332 million for HOPWA as a victory. I also applaud any additional funding for HOPWA, but I cannot call it a victory to fund this program below its 2010 funding level when wait lists for HOPWA services continue to grow and thousands of Americans die on the streets and in shelters because we refuse to provide a few extra million dollars to provide them with the care they need.

I will not claim that my amendment completely solves that problem. The National AIDS Housing Coalition estimates that, in FY16, they will need \$364 million to provide HOPWA services to those who need them and to fund vital administrative support to improve the program.

To reach that goal, we would need to find \$32 million somewhere in this bill to transfer to HOPWA, but the funding levels we are considering today are so abysmally low, it is nearly impossible to move that much money without gutting other important programs.

What we do, at the very least, is pass my amendment to restore HOPWA to its FY10 funding level of \$335 million, a scant \$3 million increase. That funding level makes only a small dent in HOPWA's real need, but it will give hundreds more people and families access to lifesaving services. It is a very small step, but it is in the right direction, and I believe if we have the

chance to save even one life, let alone hundreds, we have a duty to act.

To protect those living with HIV/AIDS and to stay within the House rules, my amendment offsets this additional funding to cuts to HUD's information technology fund.

I recognize the importance of providing HUD with phones and computers and understand the chairman and ranking member's concerns about additional cuts to this account, but nothing is more important than, quite simply, saving lives.

We must pass this amendment and give those families battling HIV/AIDS a fighting chance. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of a point of order.

The Acting CHAIR. The reservation of the point of order is withdrawn.

Does any Member seek time in opposition?

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, let me inquire of the chairman, does he plan to claim the time in opposition?

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, I will not be claiming the time in opposition.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, although, as a formality, I will then claim that time, although I am not opposed; I am enthusiastically in support of Mr. NADLER's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I do want to take a little extra time to mention some things connected to this that I think need to come to our colleagues' attention.

First of all, this is not an ideal offset that Mr. NADLER has chosen. This is simply an example of the problem we have had all evening. Any funding amendment will fill only one hole by digging another, and so that is just the reality we are dealing with.

I do support this amendment. It runs the risk of further delaying HUD's acquisition of improved IT systems. We are going to need to attend to that. In this bill, HUD's IT account is already \$150 million below the fiscal year '15 level and \$234 million below the President's request. This is not an account that has a lot to spare, so I hope we can revisit that.

It may be relatively easy to target this funding line. We have got to provide HUD with the tools it needs to properly administer HOPWA and other programs.

We need, of course, eventually, a bipartisan budget agreement that will allow for a more credible bill that will adequately fund HOPWA and HUD's IT account both, both of those.

Let me say, Mr. Chairman, I, in addition, hope that the chairman and other longtime supporters of HOPWA are

going to be able to work—we are all going to be able to work together moving forward to get this HOPWA formula updated once and for all.

The formula hasn't been updated for the distribution of funds, the allocation of funds, that formula hasn't been updated since the inception of program in the early nineties. Without an update, many Americans who are living with HIV in areas of the country with the fastest growing infection rates—namely, the South and rural America—are not getting the housing support they desperately need.

As a Member from a State with an AIDS death rate higher than the national average, this issue, getting this formula right, is a matter of life and death for many of my constituents.

As we work on this bill in the months to come, try to get the funding levels where they need to be, we also very much need to address that formula issue, and I pledge my readiness to work with colleagues to have an equitable funding formula.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time. I won't use it.

I simply want to express my appreciation first to the ranking member for supporting the amendment, despite the very painful offset which he will have to deal with, which I won't have to deal with, except as a single Member of the House.

I want to thank the chairman for not opposing this amendment. This amendment is a matter of life or death for a large number of people, and I urge my colleagues to adopt it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT FUND

For assistance to units of State and local government, and to other entities, for economic and community development activities, and for other purposes, \$3,060,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2018, unless otherwise specified: *Provided*, That of the total amount provided, \$3,000,000,000 is for carrying out the community development block grant program under title I of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, as amended ("the Act" herein) (42 U.S.C. 5301 et seq.): *Provided further*, That unless explicitly provided for under this heading, not to exceed 20 percent of any grant made with funds appropriated under this heading shall be expended for planning and management development and administration: *Provided further*, That a metropolitan city, urban county, unit of general local government, or Indian tribe, or insular area that directly or indirectly receives funds under this heading may not sell, trade, or otherwise transfer all or any portion of such funds

to another such entity in exchange for any other funds, credits or non-Federal considerations, but must use such funds for activities eligible under title I of the Act: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding section 105(e)(1) of the Act, no funds provided under this heading may be provided to a for-profit entity for an economic development project under section 105(a)(17) unless such project has been evaluated and selected in accordance with guidelines required under subparagraph (e)(2): *Provided further*, That none of the funds made available under this heading may be used for grants for the Economic Development Initiative ("EDI") or Neighborhood Initiatives activities, Rural Innovation Fund, or for grants pursuant to section 107 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5307): *Provided further*, That the Department shall notify grantees of their formula allocation within 60 days of enactment of this Act: *Provided further*, That of the total amount provided under this heading \$60,000,000 shall be for grants to Indian tribes notwithstanding section 106(a)(1) of such Act, of which, notwithstanding any other provision of law (including section 204 of this Act), up to \$3,960,000 may be used for emergencies that constitute imminent threats to health and safety.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT LOAN GUARANTEES PROGRAM ACCOUNT (INCLUDING RESCISSION)

Subject to section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, during fiscal year 2016, commitments to guarantee loans under section 108 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5308), any part of which is guaranteed, shall not exceed a total principal amount of \$300,000,000, notwithstanding any aggregate limitation on outstanding obligations guaranteed in subsection (k) of such section 108: *Provided*, That the Secretary shall collect fees from borrowers, notwithstanding subsection (m) of such section 108, to result in a credit subsidy cost of zero for guaranteeing such loans, and any such fees shall be collected in accordance with section 502(7) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974: *Provided further*, That all unobligated balances, including recaptures and carryover, remaining from funds appropriated to the Department of Housing and Urban Development under this heading are hereby permanently rescinded.

HOME INVESTMENT PARTNERSHIPS PROGRAM (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the HOME investment partnerships program, as authorized under title II of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act, as amended, \$767,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2019: *Provided*, That notwithstanding the amount made available under this heading, the threshold reduction requirements in sections 216(10) and 217(b)(4) of such Act shall not apply to allocations of such amount: *Provided further*, That the requirements under provisos 2 through 6 under this heading for fiscal year 2012 and such requirements applicable pursuant to the "Full-Year Continuing Appropriations Act, 2013", shall not apply to any project to which funds were committed on or after August 23, 2013, but such projects shall instead be governed by the Final Rule titled "Home Investment Partnerships Program; Improving Performance and Accountability; Updating Property Standards" which became effective on such date: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding paragraphs (1)(B)(i) or (2)(B)(i) of section 1337(a) of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1992 (12 U.S.C. 4567(a)), amounts allocated under such paragraphs shall be credited to, made available, and merged with this account: *Provided further*, That no amounts

made available by any provision of law may be transferred, reprogrammed, or credited to the Housing Trust Fund.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. AL GREEN OF TEXAS

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

In the "Department of Housing and Urban Development—Community Planning and Development—HOME Investment Partnerships Program" account, after the aggregate dollar amount insert "(increased by \$293,000,000)".

In the "Department of Housing and Urban Development—Community Planning and Development—HOME Investment Partnerships Program" account, strike the last two provisos.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas (during the reading). Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Texas and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, let me please start by acknowledging the Honorable MAXINE WATERS. What I present tonight is an amendment that she actually authored, and I would like to present it. In so doing, I want to remind us that this amendment deals with two programs that are near and dear to my heart, the affordable housing trust fund and the HOME program.

These programs are near and dear to my heart because the greatness of a nation will not be measured by how we treat people who live in the suites of life, how we treat the well off, the well heeled, and the well to do.

The greatness of a nation is often measured by how we treat people who live in the streets of life, those who are too often among the least, the last, and the lost.

This amendment seeks to provide aid and comfort for those who, but for the grace of God, could be you or me, but those who find themselves living in the streets of life. This amendment, in dealing with the affordable housing trust fund, will restore it.

The current bill would actually eliminate the affordable housing trust fund. This amendment provides some degree of aid and comfort for those who are living at 30 percent of the area median income, wherever they happen to live.

In Ms. MAXINE WATERS' district, this would mean an annual income of \$20,200 for a family of four. I would dare say that there are few among us who

would dare attempt to live off of \$20,200 as an individual. This helps a family of four with \$20,200. This is what the affordable housing trust fund does. It helps people who are extremely low of income.

My hope is that we will be able to prevent this elimination of the affordable housing trust fund, and this amendment does it.

This amendment also will help those who can benefit from the HOME program. The HOME program can serve a family of four that earns up to \$53,900 per year. This program is a partnership, if you will, between State, municipal, and Federal Government.

It has been a program that has been of great benefit across the length and breadth of this country. There is not a State in the country, I would dare say, that has not benefited from the HOME program.

It is my hope that we can meet the President's request for the HOME program. Right now, it is about \$293 million short of the President's request. This amendment would add that \$293 million that the President has requested.

I started by indicating that these are two programs that are near and dear to me. Mr. Chairman, I believe that Ruth Meltzer was right when she indicated that some measure their lives by days and years, others by heartthrobs, passions, and tears; but the surest measure under God's sun is what for others in your lifetime have you done.

These programs afford us an opportunity to do for others, to be a blessing to those that have not been as blessed as we. My hope is that we will find a way to salvage both of these programs, restore the HOME program to what the President has requested, and prevent the affordable housing trust fund from finding its way to the ash heap of history.

I reserve the balance of my time.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, I insist on my point of order.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Florida is recognized.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, the amendment proposes a net increase in budget authority in the bill.

The amendment is not in order under section 3(d)3 of House Resolution 5, 114th Congress, which states the following:

"It shall not be in order to consider an amendment to a general appropriations bill proposing a net increase in budget authority in the bill unless considered en bloc with another amendment or amendments proposing an equal or greater decrease in such budget authority pursuant to clause 2(f) of rule XXI."

The amendment proposes a net increase in budget authority in the bill in violation of such section.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. If I may, Mr. Chairman.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized on the point of order.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, on the point of order, understanding the rules, I still would beseech us, Mr. Chairman, to give some consideration to the salvation of these programs.

Perhaps I will be able to work with the chairman and in some way help those who are not in a position to help themselves.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from Florida makes a point of order that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas violates section 3(d)(3) of House Resolution 5.

Section 3(d)(3) establishes a point of order against an amendment proposing a net increase in budget authority in the pending bill.

As persuasively asserted by the gentleman from Florida, the amendment proposes a net increase in budget authority in the bill. Therefore, the point of order is sustained. The amendment is not in order.

□ 0000

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SELF-HELP AND ASSISTED HOMEOWNERSHIP OPPORTUNITY PROGRAM

For the Self-Help and Assisted Homeownership Opportunity Program, as authorized under section 11 of the Housing Opportunity Program Extension Act of 1996, as amended, \$50,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2018: *Provided*, That of the total amount provided under this heading, \$10,000,000 shall be made available to the Self-Help and Assisted Homeownership Opportunity Program as authorized under section 11 of the Housing Opportunity Program Extension Act of 1996, as amended: *Provided further*, That of the total amount provided under this heading, \$35,000,000 shall be made available for the second, third, and fourth capacity building activities authorized under section 4(a) of the HUD Demonstration Act of 1993 (42 U.S.C. 9816 note), of which not less than \$5,000,000 shall be made available for rural capacity building activities: *Provided further*, That of the total amount provided under this heading, \$5,000,000 shall be made available for capacity building by national rural housing organizations with experience assessing national rural conditions and providing financing, training, technical assistance, information, and research to local nonprofits, local governments and Indian Tribes serving high need rural communities.

HOMELESS ASSISTANCE GRANTS (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the emergency solutions grants program as authorized under subtitle B of title IV of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act, as amended; the continuum of care program as authorized under subtitle C of title IV of such Act; and the rural housing stability assistance program as authorized under subtitle D of title IV of such Act, \$2,185,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2018: *Provided*, That any rental assistance amounts that are recaptured under such continuum of care program shall remain available until expended: *Provided fur-*

ther, That not less than \$250,000,000 of the funds appropriated under this heading shall be available for such emergency solutions grants program: *Provided further*, That not less than \$1,905,000,000 of the funds appropriated under this heading shall be available for such continuum of care and rural housing stability assistance programs: *Provided further*, That up to \$5,000,000 of the funds appropriated under this heading shall be available for the national homeless data analysis project: *Provided further*, That all funds awarded for supportive services under the continuum of care program and the rural housing stability assistance program shall be matched by not less than 25 percent in cash or in kind by each grantee: *Provided further*, That for all match requirements applicable to funds made available under this heading for this fiscal year and prior years, a grantee may use (or could have used) as a source of match funds other funds administered by the Secretary and other Federal agencies unless there is (or was) a specific statutory prohibition on any such use of any such funds: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall establish minimum project performance thresholds for each grantee under the continuum of care program based on program performance data: *Provided further*, That none of the funds provided under this heading shall be available to renew any expiring contract or amendment to a contract funded under the continuum of care program unless the Secretary determines that the expiring contract or amendment to a contract is needed under the applicable continuum of care and meets appropriate program requirements, financial standards, and performance measures, including the minimum performance thresholds established in the previous proviso: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall prioritize funding under the continuum of care program to grant applications that demonstrate a capacity to reallocate funding from lower performing projects to higher performing projects: *Provided further*, That all awards of assistance under this heading shall be required to coordinate and integrate homeless programs with other mainstream health, social services, and employment programs for which homeless populations may be eligible: *Provided further*, That with respect to funds provided under this heading for the continuum of care program for fiscal years 2013, 2014, 2015, and 2016 provision of permanent housing rental assistance may be administered by private nonprofit organizations: *Provided further*, That any unobligated amounts remaining from funds appropriated under this heading in fiscal year 2012 and prior years for project-based rental assistance for rehabilitation projects with 10-year grant terms may be used for purposes under this heading, notwithstanding the purposes for which such funds were appropriated: *Provided further*, That all balances for Shelter Plus Care renewals previously funded from the Shelter Plus Care Renewal account and transferred to this account shall be available, if recaptured, for continuum of care renewals in fiscal year 2016: *Provided further*, That the Department shall notify grantees of their formula allocation from amounts allocated (which may represent initial or final amounts allocated) for the emergency solutions grant program within 60 days of enactment of this Act.

HOUSING PROGRAMS

PROJECT-BASED RENTAL ASSISTANCE

For activities and assistance for the provision of project-based subsidy contracts under the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437 et seq.) ("the Act"), not otherwise provided for, \$10,254,000,000, to remain available until expended, shall be available on October 1, 2015 (in addition to the

\$400,000,000 previously appropriated under this heading that became available October 1, 2015), and \$400,000,000, to remain available until expended, shall be available on October 1, 2016: *Provided*, That the amounts made available under this heading shall be available for expiring or terminating section 8 project-based subsidy contracts (including section 8 moderate rehabilitation contracts), for amendments to section 8 project-based subsidy contracts (including section 8 moderate rehabilitation contracts), for contracts entered into pursuant to section 441 of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11401), for renewal of section 8 contracts for units in projects that are subject to approved plans of action under the Emergency Low Income Housing Preservation Act of 1987 or the Low-Income Housing Preservation and Resident Homeownership Act of 1990, and for administrative and other expenses associated with project-based activities and assistance funded under this paragraph: *Provided further*, That of the total amounts provided under this heading, not to exceed \$150,000,000 shall be available for performance-based contract administrators for section 8 project-based assistance, for carrying out 42 U.S.C. 1437(f): *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development may also use such amounts in the previous proviso for performance-based contract administrators for the administration of: interest reduction payments pursuant to section 236(a) of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1715z-1(a)); rent supplement payments pursuant to section 101 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 (12 U.S.C. 1701s); section 236(f)(2) rental assistance payments (12 U.S.C. 1715z-1(f)(2)); project rental assistance contracts for the elderly under section 202(c)(2) of the Housing Act of 1959 (12 U.S.C. 1701q); project rental assistance contracts for supportive housing for persons with disabilities under section 811(d)(2) of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act (42 U.S.C. 8013(d)(2)); project assistance contracts pursuant to section 202(h) of the Housing Act of 1959 (Public Law 86-372; 73 Stat. 667); and loans under section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959 (Public Law 86-372; 73 Stat. 667): *Provided further*, That amounts recaptured under this heading, the heading "Annual Contributions for Assisted Housing", or the heading "Housing Certificate Fund", may be used for renewals of or amendments to section 8 project-based contracts or for performance-based contract administrators, notwithstanding the purposes for which such amounts were appropriated: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, upon the request of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, project funds that are held in residual receipts accounts for any project subject to a section 8 project-based Housing Assistance Payments contract that authorizes HUD or a Housing Finance Agency to require that surplus project funds be deposited in an interest-bearing residual receipts account and that are in excess of an amount to be determined by the Secretary, shall be remitted to the Department and deposited in this account, to be available until expended: *Provided further*, That amounts deposited pursuant to the previous proviso shall be available in addition to the amount otherwise provided by this heading for uses authorized under this heading.

HOUSING FOR THE ELDERLY

For amendments to capital advance contracts for housing for the elderly, as authorized by section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959, as amended, and for project rental assistance for the elderly under section 202(c)(2) of such Act, including amendments to contracts for such assistance and renewal of expiring con-

tracts for such assistance for up to a 1-year term, and for senior preservation rental assistance contracts, including renewals, as authorized by section 811(e) of the American Housing and Economic Opportunity Act of 2000, as amended, and for supportive services associated with the housing, \$414,000,000 to remain available until September 30, 2019: *Provided*, That of the amount provided under this heading, up to \$77,000,000 shall be for service coordinators and the continuation of existing congregate service grants for residents of assisted housing projects: *Provided further*, That amounts under this heading shall be available for Real Estate Assessment Center inspections and inspection-related activities associated with section 202 projects: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may waive the provisions of section 202 governing the terms and conditions of project rental assistance, except that the initial contract term for such assistance shall not exceed 5 years in duration: *Provided further*, That upon request of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, project funds that are held in residual receipts accounts for any project subject to a section 202 project rental assistance contract, and that upon termination of such contract are in excess of an amount to be determined by the Secretary, shall be remitted to the Department and deposited in this account, to be available until September 30, 2019, for purposes under this heading, and shall be in addition to the amounts otherwise provided under this heading for such purposes: *Provided further*, That in addition, of the prior year unobligated balances of funds, including recaptures and carryover, made available under this heading, \$47,000,000 shall be used for an additional amount for the purposes provided under this heading, notwithstanding any purpose for which originally appropriated.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GRAYSON

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 105, line 9, after the dollar amount insert "(increased by \$2,500,000)".

Page 113, line 6, after the dollar amount insert "(reduced by \$2,500,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Florida and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Chairman, this amendment seeks to increase the housing for the elderly account in this bill by \$2.5 million and decrease the policy development and research account within the Department of Housing and Urban Development by an equal amount.

I hope my good friend from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART) across the aisle agrees with me on this one. I urge all of my colleagues to join me in support of this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

HOUSING FOR PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES

For amendments to capital advance contracts for supportive housing for persons

with disabilities, as authorized by section 811 of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act (42 U.S.C. 8013), for project rental assistance for supportive housing for persons with disabilities under section 811(d)(2) of such Act and for project assistance contracts pursuant to section 202(h) of the Housing Act of 1959 (Public Law 86-372; 73 Stat. 667), including amendments to contracts for such assistance and renewal of expiring contracts for such assistance for up to a 1-year term, for project rental assistance to State housing finance agencies and other appropriate entities as authorized under section 811(b)(3) of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Housing Act, and for supportive services associated with the housing for persons with disabilities as authorized by section 811(b)(1) of such Act, \$152,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2019: *Provided*, That amounts made available under this heading shall be available for Real Estate Assessment Center inspections and inspection-related activities associated with section 811 projects: *Provided further*, That, in this fiscal year, upon the request of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, project funds that are held in residual receipts accounts for any project subject to a section 811 project rental assistance contract and that upon termination of such contract are in excess of an amount to be determined by the Secretary shall be remitted to the Department and deposited in this account, to be available until September 30, 2019: *Provided further*, That amounts deposited in this account pursuant to the previous proviso shall be available in addition to the amounts otherwise provided by this heading for the purposes authorized under this heading: *Provided further*, That unobligated balances, including recaptures and carryover, remaining from funds transferred to or appropriated under this heading may be used for the current purposes authorized under this heading notwithstanding the purposes for which such funds originally were appropriated.

HOUSING COUNSELING ASSISTANCE

For contracts, grants, and other assistance excluding loans, as authorized under section 106 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968, as amended, \$47,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017, including up to \$4,500,000 for administrative contract services: *Provided*, That grants made available from amounts provided under this heading shall be awarded within 180 days of enactment of this Act: *Provided further*, That funds shall be used for providing counseling and advice to tenants and homeowners, both current and prospective, with respect to property maintenance, financial management/literacy, and such other matters as may be appropriate to assist them in improving their housing conditions, meeting their financial needs, and fulfilling the responsibilities of tenancy or homeownership; for program administration; and for housing counselor training: *Provided further*, That for purposes of providing such grants from amounts provided under this heading, the Secretary may enter into multiyear agreements as is appropriate, subject to the availability of annual appropriations.

RENTAL HOUSING ASSISTANCE

For amendments to contracts under section 101 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 (12 U.S.C. 1701s) and section 236(f)(2) of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1715z-1) in State-aided, noninsured rental housing projects, \$30,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That such amount, together with unobligated balances from recaptured amounts appropriated prior to fiscal year 2006 from terminated contracts under such sections of law, and any unobligated balances, including recaptures and carryover, remaining from funds appropriated

under this heading after fiscal year 2005, shall also be available for extensions of up to one year for expiring contracts under such sections of law.

PAYMENT TO MANUFACTURED HOUSING FEES
TRUST FUND

For necessary expenses as authorized by the National Manufactured Housing Construction and Safety Standards Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5401 et seq.), up to \$11,000,000, to remain available until expended, of which \$11,000,000 is to be derived from the Manufactured Housing Fees Trust Fund: *Provided*, That not to exceed the total amount appropriated under this heading shall be available from the general fund of the Treasury to the extent necessary to incur obligations and make expenditures pending the receipt of collections to the Fund pursuant to section 620 of such Act: *Provided further*, That the amount made available under this heading from the general fund shall be reduced as such collections are received during fiscal year 2016 so as to result in a final fiscal year 2016 appropriation from the general fund estimated at zero, and fees pursuant to such section 620 shall be modified as necessary to ensure such a final fiscal year 2016 appropriation: *Provided further*, That for the dispute resolution and installation programs, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development may assess and collect fees from any program participant: *Provided further*, That such collections shall be deposited into the Fund, and the Secretary, as provided herein, may use such collections, as well as fees collected under section 620, for necessary expenses of such Act: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding the requirements of section 620 of such Act, the Secretary may carry out responsibilities of the Secretary under such Act through the use of approved service providers that are paid directly by the recipients of their services.

FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION
MUTUAL MORTGAGE INSURANCE PROGRAM
ACCOUNT

New commitments to guarantee single family loans insured under the Mutual Mortgage Insurance Fund shall not exceed \$400,000,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017: *Provided*, That during fiscal year 2016, obligations to make direct loans to carry out the purposes of section 204(g) of the National Housing Act, as amended, shall not exceed \$5,000,000: *Provided further*, That the foregoing amount in the previous proviso shall be for loans to nonprofit and governmental entities in connection with sales of single family real properties owned by the Secretary and formerly insured under the Mutual Mortgage Insurance Fund: *Provided Further*, That for administrative contract expenses of the Federal Housing Administration, \$130,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017.

GENERAL AND SPECIAL RISK PROGRAM ACCOUNT

New commitments to guarantee loans insured under the General and Special Risk Insurance Funds, as authorized by sections 238 and 519 of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1715z-3 and 1735c), shall not exceed \$30,000,000,000 in total loan principal, any part of which is to be guaranteed, to remain available until September 30, 2017: *Provided*, That during fiscal year 2016, gross obligations for the principal amount of direct loans, as authorized by sections 204(g), 207(1), 238, and 519(a) of the National Housing Act, shall not exceed \$5,000,000, which shall be for loans to nonprofit and governmental entities in connection with the sale of single family real properties owned by the Secretary and formerly insured under such Act.

GOVERNMENT NATIONAL MORTGAGE
ASSOCIATION
GUARANTEES OF MORTGAGE-BACKED SECURITIES
LOAN GUARANTEE PROGRAM ACCOUNT

New commitments to issue guarantees to carry out the purposes of section 306 of the National Housing Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1721(g)), shall not exceed \$500,000,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017: *Provided*, That \$23,000,000 shall be available for necessary salaries and expenses of the Office of Government National Mortgage Association: *Provided further*, That receipts from Commitment and Multiclass fees collected pursuant to title III of the National Housing Act, as amended, shall be credited as offsetting collections to this account.

POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND RESEARCH
RESEARCH AND TECHNOLOGY

For contracts, grants, and necessary expenses of programs of research and studies relating to housing and urban problems, not otherwise provided for, as authorized by title V of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1970 (12 U.S.C. 1701z-1 et seq.), including carrying out the functions of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development under section 1(a)(1)(i) of Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1968, \$52,500,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017: *Provided*, That with respect to amounts made available under this heading, notwithstanding section 204 of this title, the Secretary may enter into cooperative agreements funded with philanthropic entities, other Federal agencies, or State or local governments and their agencies for research projects: *Provided further*, That with respect to the previous proviso, such partners to the cooperative agreements must contribute at least a 50 percent match toward the cost of the project: *Provided further*, That for non-competitive agreements entered into in accordance with the previous two provisos, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall comply with section 2(b) of the Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act of 2006 (Public Law 109-282, 31 U.S.C. note) in lieu of compliance with section 102(a)(4)(C) with respect to documentation of award decisions: *Provided further*, That prior to obligation of technical assistance funding, the Secretary shall submit a plan, for approval, to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations on how it will allocate funding for this activity.

FAIR HOUSING AND EQUAL OPPORTUNITY
FAIR HOUSING ACTIVITIES

For contracts, grants, and other assistance, not otherwise provided for, as authorized by title VIII of the Civil Rights Act of 1968, as amended by the Fair Housing Amendments Act of 1988, and section 561 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1987, as amended, \$65,300,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017: *Provided*, That notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302, the Secretary may assess and collect fees to cover the costs of the Fair Housing Training Academy, and may use such funds to provide such training: *Provided further*, That no funds made available under this heading shall be used to lobby the executive or legislative branches of the Federal Government in connection with a specific contract, grant, or loan: *Provided further*, That of the funds made available under this heading, \$300,000 shall be available to the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development for the creation and promotion of translated materials and other programs that support the assistance of persons with limited English proficiency in utilizing the services provided by the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. STIVERS

Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 114, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$28,375,000) (increased by \$28,375,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Ohio and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank Chairman DIAZ-BALART as well as Ranking Member PRICE for their hard work on this bill and for preparing a bill that is the best we can do.

I do rise in support of an amendment that seeks to curb lawsuit abuse and help fund our local governments. This creates congressional intent to redirect funds away from the private enforcement account to the administrative enforcement account.

My amendment would decrease by \$28.375 million the Private Enforcement Initiative and redirect those resources to the Administrative Enforcement Initiative in the Fair Housing Initiatives Program.

I believe that the most efficient and effective way to protect Fair Housing is through the Administrative Enforcement Initiative of the Fair Housing Initiatives Program, which helps State and local governments who administer laws that include rights and remedies every day. They act to help Fair Housing. They know their communities, and they can enforce in their communities best.

My amendment would help protect more consumers. In fact, I believe administrative enforcement is less expensive to taxpayers. It is more certain. It has faster resolution. It has less conflicts of interest than some of these nonprofit proxy agencies that use the Private Enforcement Initiative.

In fact, there is a 1997 GAO study, Mr. Chairman, that revealed that more than half of the Private Enforcement Initiative dollars were concentrated in just 6 of the 27 awardees. I have asked the GAO to update that study and to look at private enforcement as far as its effectiveness because, as I said, it is slower and more expensive than administrative enforcement.

Therefore, I would ask my colleagues to support my congressional intent amendment to redirect these resources to our State and local governments who can more effectively administer justice. I ask my colleagues to support this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to this amendment.

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. We have only recently received it, and I haven't fully analyzed

it; but, on the face of it, it does appear to be shifting the support among private enforcement and public enforcement, the kind of private enforcement that involves community-based groups, that involves often more flexible ways of resolving conflicts and issues.

I simply think it is ill advised here tonight to undertake that kind of internal shifting of funds and would suggest that we reject this, understanding that we can return to it and examine this more fully to see exactly what is implied by this kind of internal shifting of funds within Fair Housing accounts.

I suggest that we reject this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I would simply say to my colleague from North Carolina that administrative enforcement is more effective, it is more efficient. That is why we should redirect these resources internally inside Fair Housing. It doesn't change Fair Housing dollars one penny.

It redirects the resources to more efficient and effective means of enforcement, from folks who enforce these laws every day and can do it faster and more effectively, to make sure the people that might be discriminated against get their redress sooner.

I am excited about this amendment. I think it will lead to much more effective enforcement. It does so without the conflict of interest of these private organizations that can have conflicts of interest, and that has been another issue that I have asked the GAO to look at in my letter to them today.

I apologize that the minority is just seeing this for the first time. I did talk about it at the Rules Committee the other day. It is something I have been working on just for a couple of days since that Rules Committee meeting when it came up. I apologized for not giving the gentleman from North Carolina more notice.

I would urge my colleagues to support my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GRAYSON

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 114, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$150,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Florida and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Chair, this amendment seeks to raise the cap on funding for the Limited English Proficiency Initiative under the Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity section of the bill by 50 percent.

I want to highlight that we are not taking away anything from other programs. We are simply lifting the cap on this particular initiative. This amendment has passed by voice vote for the last 2 years, and it is my hope that it will do so again.

There are more than 40 million Americans who do not speak English as their first language. This tiny, but vital program demonstrates to the American people that we have equal protection under the law, regardless of what language we speak.

I hope to once again have the support of my friend from Florida and from the House as a whole.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF LEAD HAZARD CONTROL AND HEALTHY HOMES

LEAD HAZARD REDUCTION

For the Lead Hazard Reduction Program, as authorized by section 1011 of the Residential Lead-Based Paint Hazard Reduction Act of 1992, \$75,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017: *Provided*, That up to \$15,000,000 of that amount shall be for the Healthy Homes Initiative, pursuant to sections 501 and 502 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1970 that shall include research, studies, testing, and demonstration efforts, including education and outreach concerning lead-based paint poisoning and other housing-related diseases and hazards: *Provided further*, That for purposes of environmental review, pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) and other provisions of the law that further the purposes of such Act, a grant under the Healthy Homes Initiative, or the Lead Technical Studies program under this heading or under prior appropriations Acts for such purposes under this heading, shall be considered to be funds for a special project for purposes of section 305(c) of the Multifamily Housing Property Disposition Reform Act of 1994: *Provided further*, That amounts made available under this heading in this or prior appropriations Acts, and that still remain available, may be used for any purpose under this heading notwithstanding the purpose for which such amounts were appropriated if a program competition is undersubscribed and there are other program competitions under this heading that are oversubscribed.

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY FUND

For the development of, modifications to, and infrastructure for Department-wide and program-specific information technology systems, for the continuing operation and maintenance of both Department-wide and program-specific information systems, and for program-related maintenance activities, \$100,000,000: *Provided*, That any amounts transferred to this Fund under this Act shall remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That any amounts transferred to this Fund from amounts appropriated by previously enacted appropriations Acts may be used for the purposes specified under this Fund, in addition to any other information technology purposes for which such amounts were appropriated.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary salaries and expenses of the Office of Inspector General in carrying out

the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, \$126,000,000: *Provided*, That the Inspector General shall have independent authority over all personnel issues within this office.

GENERAL PROVISIONS—DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT (INCLUDING RESCISSIONS)

SEC. 201. Eighty five percent of the amounts of budget authority, or in lieu thereof 85 percent of the cash amounts associated with such budget authority, that are recaptured from projects described in section 1012(a) of the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Amendments Act of 1988 (42 U.S.C. 1437 note) shall be rescinded or in the case of cash, shall be remitted to the Treasury. Notwithstanding the previous sentence, the Secretary may award up to 15 percent of the budget authority or cash recaptured and not rescinded or remitted to the Treasury to provide project owners with incentives to re-finance their project at a lower interest rate. Any amounts of budget authority or cash recaptured and not rescinded, returned to the Treasury, or otherwise awarded by September 30, 2016 shall be rescinded or in the case of cash, shall be remitted to the Treasury.

SEC. 202. None of the amounts made available under this Act may be used during fiscal year 2016 to investigate or prosecute under the Fair Housing Act any otherwise lawful activity engaged in by one or more persons, including the filing or maintaining of a non-frivolous legal action, that is engaged in solely for the purpose of achieving or preventing action by a Government official or entity, or a court of competent jurisdiction.

SEC. 203. Sections 203 and 209 of division C of Public Law 112-55 (125 Stat. 693-694) shall apply during fiscal year 2016 as if such sections were included in this title, except that during such fiscal year such sections shall be applied by substituting "fiscal year 2016" for "fiscal year 2011" and for "fiscal year 2012" each place such terms appear, and shall be amended to reflect revised delineations of statistical areas established by the Office of Management and Budget pursuant to 44 U.S.C. 3504(e)(3), 31 U.S.C. 1104(d), and Executive Order No. 10253.

SEC. 204. Except as explicitly provided in law, any grant, cooperative agreement or other assistance made pursuant to title II of this Act shall be made on a competitive basis and in accordance with section 102 of the Department of Housing and Urban Development Reform Act of 1989 (42 U.S.C. 3545).

SEC. 205. Funds of the Department of Housing and Urban Development subject to the Government Corporation Control Act or section 402 of the Housing Act of 1950 shall be available, without regard to the limitations on administrative expenses, for legal services on a contract or fee basis, and for utilizing and making payment for the services and facilities of the Federal National Mortgage Association, Government National Mortgage Association, Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation, Federal Financing Bank, Federal Reserve banks or any member thereof, Federal Home Loan banks, and any insured bank within the meaning of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1811-11).

SEC. 206. Unless otherwise provided for in this Act or through a reprogramming of funds, no part of any appropriation for the Department of Housing and Urban Development shall be available for any program, project or activity in excess of amounts set forth in the budget estimates submitted to Congress.

SEC. 207. Corporations and agencies of the Department of Housing and Urban Development which are subject to the Government Corporation Control Act are hereby authorized to make such expenditures, within the

limits of funds and borrowing authority available to each such corporation or agency and in accordance with law, and to make such contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal year limitations as provided by section 104 of such Act as may be necessary in carrying out the programs set forth in the budget for 2016 for such corporation or agency except as hereinafter provided: *Provided*, That collections of these corporations and agencies may be used for new loan or mortgage purchase commitments only to the extent expressly provided for in this Act (unless such loans are in support of other forms of assistance provided for in this or prior appropriations Acts), except that this proviso shall not apply to the mortgage insurance or guaranty operations of these corporations, or where loans or mortgage purchases are necessary to protect the financial interest of the United States Government.

SEC. 208. The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall provide quarterly reports to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations regarding all uncommitted, unobligated, recaptured and excess funds in each program and activity within the jurisdiction of the Department and shall submit additional, updated budget information to these Committees upon request.

SEC. 209. The President's formal budget request for fiscal year 2017, as well as the Department of Housing and Urban Development's congressional budget justifications to be submitted to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate, shall use the identical account and sub-account structure provided under this Act.

SEC. 210. A public housing agency or such other entity that administers Federal housing assistance for the Housing Authority of the county of Los Angeles, California, and the States of Alaska, Iowa, and Mississippi shall not be required to include a resident of public housing or a recipient of assistance provided under section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 on the board of directors or a similar governing board of such agency or entity as required under section (2)(b) of such Act. Each public housing agency or other entity that administers Federal housing assistance under section 8 for the Housing Authority of the county of Los Angeles, California and the States of Alaska, Iowa and Mississippi that chooses not to include a resident of public housing or a recipient of section 8 assistance on the board of directors or a similar governing board shall establish an advisory board of not less than six residents of public housing or recipients of section 8 assistance to provide advice and comment to the public housing agency or other administering entity on issues related to public housing and section 8. Such advisory board shall meet not less than quarterly.

SEC. 211. No funds provided under this title may be used for an audit of the Government National Mortgage Association that makes applicable requirements under the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990 (2 U.S.C. 661 et seq.).

SEC. 212. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, subject to the conditions listed under this section, for fiscal years 2016 and 2017, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development may authorize the transfer of some or all project-based assistance, debt held or insured by the Secretary and statutorily required low-income and very low-income use restrictions if any, associated with one or more multifamily housing project or projects to another multifamily housing project or projects.

(b) Transfers of project-based assistance under this section may be done in phases to accommodate the financing and other requirements related to rehabilitating or con-

structing the project or projects to which the assistance is transferred, to ensure that such project or projects meet the standards under subsection (c).

(c) The transfer authorized in subsection (a) is subject to the following conditions:

(1) Number and bedroom size of units.—
(A) For occupied units in the transferring project: the number of low-income and very low-income units and the configuration (i.e., bedroom size) provided by the transferring project shall be no less than when transferred to the receiving project or projects and the net dollar amount of Federal assistance provided to the transferring project shall remain the same in the receiving project or projects.

(B) For unoccupied units in the transferring project: the Secretary may authorize a reduction in the number of dwelling units in the receiving project or projects to allow for a reconfiguration of bedroom sizes to meet current market demands, as determined by the Secretary and provided there is no increase in the project-based assistance budget authority.

(2) The transferring project shall, as determined by the Secretary, be either physically obsolete or economically nonviable.

(3) The receiving project or projects shall meet or exceed applicable physical standards established by the Secretary.

(4) The owner or mortgagor of the transferring project shall notify and consult with the tenants residing in the transferring project and provide a certification of approval by all appropriate local governmental officials.

(5) The tenants of the transferring project who remain eligible for assistance to be provided by the receiving project or projects shall not be required to vacate their units in the transferring project or projects until new units in the receiving project are available for occupancy.

(6) The Secretary determines that this transfer is in the best interest of the tenants.

(7) If either the transferring project or the receiving project or projects meets the condition specified in subsection (d)(2)(A), any lien on the receiving project resulting from additional financing obtained by the owner shall be subordinate to any FHA-insured mortgage lien transferred to, or placed on, such project by the Secretary, except that the Secretary may waive this requirement upon determination that such a waiver is necessary to facilitate the financing of acquisition, construction, and/or rehabilitation of the receiving project or projects.

(8) If the transferring project meets the requirements of subsection (d)(2), the owner or mortgagor of the receiving project or projects shall execute and record either a continuation of the existing use agreement or a new use agreement for the project where, in either case, any use restrictions in such agreement are of no lesser duration than the existing use restrictions.

(9) The transfer does not increase the cost (as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended) of any FHA-insured mortgage, except to the extent that appropriations are provided in advance for the amount of any such increased cost.

(d) For purposes of this section—

(1) the terms "low-income" and "very low-income" shall have the meanings provided by the statute and/or regulations governing the program under which the project is insured or assisted;

(2) the term "multifamily housing project" means housing that meets one of the following conditions—

(A) housing that is subject to a mortgage insured under the National Housing Act;

(B) housing that has project-based assistance attached to the structure including projects undergoing mark to market debt re-

structuring under the Multifamily Assisted Housing Reform and Affordability Housing Act;

(C) housing that is assisted under section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959, as amended by section 801 of the Cranston-Gonzales National Affordable Housing Act;

(D) housing that is assisted under section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959, as such section existed before the enactment of the Cranston-Gonzales National Affordable Housing Act;

(E) housing that is assisted under section 811 of the Cranston-Gonzales National Affordable Housing Act; or

(F) housing or vacant land that is subject to a use agreement;

(3) the term "project-based assistance" means—

(A) assistance provided under section 8(b) of the United States Housing Act of 1937;

(B) assistance for housing constructed or substantially rehabilitated pursuant to assistance provided under section 8(b)(2) of such Act (as such section existed immediately before October 1, 1983);

(C) rent supplement payments under section 101 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965;

(D) interest reduction payments under section 236 and/or additional assistance payments under section 236(f)(2) of the National Housing Act;

(E) assistance payments made under section 202(c)(2) of the Housing Act of 1959; and

(F) assistance payments made under section 811(d)(2) of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act;

(4) the term "receiving project or projects" means the multifamily housing project or projects to which some or all of the project-based assistance, debt, and statutorily required low-income and very low-income use restrictions are to be transferred;

(5) the term "transferring project" means the multifamily housing project which is transferring some or all of the project-based assistance, debt, and the statutorily required low-income and very low-income use restrictions to the receiving project or projects; and

(6) the term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

(e) PUBLIC NOTICE AND RESEARCH REPORT.—

(1) The Secretary shall publish by notice in the Federal Register the terms and conditions, including criteria for HUD approval, of transfers pursuant to this section no later than 30 days before the effective date of such notice.

(2) The Secretary shall conduct an evaluation of the transfer authority under this section, including the effect of such transfers on the operational efficiency, contract rents, physical and financial conditions, and long-term preservation of the affected properties.

SEC. 213. (a) No assistance shall be provided under section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f) to any individual who—

(1) is enrolled as a student at an institution of higher education (as defined under section 102 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1002));

(2) is under 24 years of age;

(3) is not a veteran;

(4) is unmarried;

(5) does not have a dependent child;

(6) is not a person with disabilities, as such term is defined in section 3(b)(3)(E) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437a(b)(3)(E)) and was not receiving assistance under such section 8 as of November 30, 2005; and

(7) is not otherwise individually eligible, or has parents who, individually or jointly, are

not eligible, to receive assistance under section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f).

(b) For purposes of determining the eligibility of a person to receive assistance under section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f), any financial assistance (in excess of amounts received for tuition and any other required fees and charges) that an individual receives under the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.), from private sources, or an institution of higher education (as defined under the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1002)), shall be considered income to that individual, except for a person over the age of 23 with dependent children.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill through page 156, line 8 be considered read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The text of the remainder of the bill through page 156, line 8, is as follows:

SEC. 214. The funds made available for Native Alaskans under the heading “Native American Housing Block Grants” in title II of this Act shall be allocated to the same Native Alaskan housing block grant recipients that received funds in fiscal year 2005.

SEC. 215. Notwithstanding the limitation in the first sentence of section 255(g) of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1715z-20(g)), the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development may, until September 30, 2016, insure and enter into commitments to insure mortgages under such section 255.

SEC. 216. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, in fiscal year 2016, in managing and disposing of any multifamily property that is owned or has a mortgage held by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, and during the process of foreclosure on any property with a contract for rental assistance payments under section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 or other Federal programs, the Secretary shall maintain any rental assistance payments under section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 and other programs that are attached to any dwelling units in the property. To the extent the Secretary determines, in consultation with the tenants and the local government, that such a multifamily property owned or held by the Secretary is not feasible for continued rental assistance payments under such section 8 or other programs, based on consideration of (1) the costs of rehabilitating and operating the property and all available Federal, State, and local resources, including rent adjustments under section 524 of the Multifamily Assisted Housing Reform and Affordability Act of 1997 (“MAHRAA”) and (2) environmental conditions that cannot be remedied in a cost-effective fashion, the Secretary may, in consultation with the tenants of that property, contract for project-based rental assistance payments with an owner or owners of other existing housing properties, or provide other rental assistance. The Secretary shall also take appropriate steps to ensure that project-based contracts remain in effect prior to foreclosure, subject to the exercise of contractual abatement remedies to assist relocation of tenants for imminent major threats to health and safety after written notice to and informed consent of the affected tenants and use of other available remedies, such as partial abatements or receivership. After disposition of any multi-

family property described under this section, the contract and allowable rent levels on such properties shall be subject to the requirements under section 524 of MAHRAA.

SEC. 217. The commitment authority funded by fees as provided under the heading “Community Development Loan Guarantees Program Account” may be used to guarantee, or make commitments to guarantee, notes or other obligations issued by any State on behalf of non-entitlement communities in the State in accordance with the requirements of section 108 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974: *Provided*, That any State receiving such a guarantee or commitment shall distribute all funds subject to such guarantee to the units of general local government in non-entitlement areas that received the commitment.

SEC. 218. Public housing agencies that own and operate 400 or fewer public housing units may elect to be exempt from any asset management requirement imposed by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development in connection with the operating fund rule: *Provided*, That an agency seeking a discontinuance of a reduction of subsidy under the operating fund formula shall not be exempt from asset management requirements.

SEC. 219. With respect to the use of amounts provided in this Act and in future Acts for the operation, capital improvement and management of public housing as authorized by sections 9(d) and 9(e) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437g(d) and (e)), the Secretary shall not impose any requirement or guideline relating to asset management that restricts or limits in any way the use of capital funds for central office costs pursuant to section 9(g)(1) or 9(g)(2) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437g(g)(1), (2)): *Provided*, That a public housing agency may not use capital funds authorized under section 9(d) for activities that are eligible under section 9(e) for assistance with amounts from the operating fund in excess of the amounts permitted under section 9(g)(1) or 9(g)(2).

SEC. 220. No official or employee of the Department of Housing and Urban Development shall be designated as an allotment holder unless the Office of the Chief Financial Officer has determined that such allotment holder has implemented an adequate system of funds control and has received training in funds control procedures and directives. The Chief Financial Officer shall ensure that there is a trained allotment holder for each HUD sub-office under the accounts “Executive Offices” and “Administrative Support Offices”, as well as each account receiving appropriations for “Program Office Salaries and Expenses”, “Government National Mortgage Association—Guarantees of Mortgage-Backed Securities Loan Guarantee Program Account”, and “Office of Inspector General” within the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

SEC. 221. The Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development shall, for fiscal year 2016, notify the public through the Federal Register and other means, as determined appropriate, of the issuance of a notice of the availability of assistance or notice of funding availability (NOFA) for any program or discretionary fund administered by the Secretary that is to be competitively awarded. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, for fiscal year 2016, the Secretary may make the NOFA available only on the Internet at the appropriate Government web site or through other electronic media, as determined by the Secretary.

SEC. 222. Payment of attorney fees in program-related litigation must be paid from the individual program office and Office of General Counsel personnel funding. The annual budget submissions for program offices

and Office of General Counsel personnel funding must include program-related litigation costs for attorney fees as a separate line item request.

SEC. 223. The Disaster Housing Assistance Programs, administered by the Department of Housing and Urban Development, shall be considered a “program of the Department of Housing and Urban Development” under section 904 of the McKinney Act for the purpose of income verifications and matching.

SEC. 224. (a) The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall take the required actions under subsection (b) when a multifamily housing project with a section 8 contract or contract for similar project-based assistance:

(1) receives a Real Estate Assessment Center (REAC) score of 30 or less; or

(2) receives a REAC score between 31 and 59 and:

(A) fails to certify in writing to HUD within 60 days that all deficiencies have been corrected; or

(B) receives consecutive scores of less than 60 on REAC inspections.

Such requirements shall apply to insured and noninsured projects with assistance attached to the units under section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f), but do not apply to such units assisted under section 8(o)(13) (42 U.S.C. 1437f(o)(13)) or to public housing units assisted with capital or operating funds under section 9 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437g).

(b) The Secretary shall take the following required actions as authorized under subsection (a)—

(1) The Secretary shall notify the owner and provide an opportunity for response within 30 days. If the violations remain, the Secretary shall develop a Compliance, Disposition and Enforcement Plan within 60 days, with a specified timetable for correcting all deficiencies. The Secretary shall provide notice of the Plan to the owner, tenants, the local government, any mortgagees, and any contract administrator.

(2) At the end of the term of the Compliance, Disposition and Enforcement Plan, if the owner fails to fully comply with such plan, the Secretary may require immediate replacement of project management with a management agent approved by the Secretary, and shall take one or more of the following actions, and provide additional notice of those actions to the owner and the parties specified above:

(A) impose civil money penalties;

(B) abate the section 8 contract, including partial abatement, as determined by the Secretary, until all deficiencies have been corrected;

(C) pursue transfer of the project to an owner, approved by the Secretary under established procedures, which will be obligated to promptly make all required repairs and to accept renewal of the assistance contract as long as such renewal is offered; or

(D) seek judicial appointment of a receiver to manage the property and cure all project deficiencies or seek a judicial order of specific performance requiring the owner to cure all project deficiencies.

(c) The Secretary shall also take appropriate steps to ensure that project-based contracts remain in effect, subject to the exercise of contractual abatement remedies to assist relocation of tenants for imminent major threats to health and safety after written notice to and informed consent of the affected tenants and use of other remedies set forth above. To the extent the Secretary determines, in consultation with the tenants and the local government, that the property is not feasible for continued rental

assistance payments under such section 8 or other programs, based on consideration of (1) the costs of rehabilitating and operating the property and all available Federal, State, and local resources, including rent adjustments under section 524 of the Multifamily Assisted Housing Reform and Affordability Act of 1997 (“MAHRAA”) and (2) environmental conditions that cannot be remedied in a cost-effective fashion, the Secretary may, in consultation with the tenants of that property, contract for project-based rental assistance payments with an owner or owners of other existing housing properties, or provide other rental assistance. The Secretary shall report semi-annually on all properties covered by this section that are assessed through the Real Estate Assessment Center and have physical inspection scores of less than 30 or have consecutive physical inspection scores of less than 60. The report shall include:

(1) The enforcement actions being taken to address such conditions, including imposition of civil money penalties and termination of subsidies, and identify properties that have such conditions multiple times; and

(2) Actions that the Department of Housing and Urban Development is taking to protect tenants of such identified properties.

SEC. 225. None of the funds made available by this Act, or any other Act, for purposes authorized under section 8 (only with respect to the tenant-based rental assistance program) and section 9 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437 et seq.), may be used by any public housing agency for any amount of salary, including bonuses, for the chief executive officer of which, or any other official or employee of which, that exceeds the annual rate of basic pay payable for a position at level IV of the Executive Schedule at any time during any public housing agency fiscal year 2016.

SEC. 226. None of the funds in this Act may be available for the doctoral dissertation research grant program at the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

SEC. 227. None of the funds in this Act provided to the Department of Housing and Urban Development may be used to make a grant award unless the Secretary notifies the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations not less than 3 full business days before any project, State, locality, housing authority, tribe, nonprofit organization, or other entity selected to receive a grant award is announced by the Department or its offices.

SEC. 228. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to require or enforce the Physical Needs Assessment (PNA).

SEC. 229. None of the funds made available in this Act shall be used by the Federal Housing Administration, the Government National Mortgage Administration, or the Department of Housing and Urban Development to insure, securitize, or establish a Federal guarantee of any mortgage or mortgage backed security that refinances or otherwise replaces a mortgage that has been subject to eminent domain condemnation or seizure, by a state, municipality, or any other political subdivision of a state.

SEC. 230. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to terminate the status of a unit of general local government as a metropolitan city (as defined in section 102 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5302)) with respect to grants under section 106 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 5306).

SEC. 231. Amounts made available under this Act which are either appropriated, allocated, advanced on a reimbursable basis, or transferred to the Office of Policy Development and Research in the Department of

Housing and Urban Development and functions thereof, for research, evaluation, or statistical purposes, and which are unexpended at the time of completion of a contract, grant, or cooperative agreement, may be deobligated and shall immediately become available and may be reobligated in that fiscal year or the subsequent fiscal year for the research, evaluation, or statistical purposes for which the amounts are made available to that Office subject to reprogramming requirements in Section 405 of this Act.

SEC. 232. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to require a recipient or sub-recipient of funding for the purpose of land acquisition, affordable housing construction, or affordable housing rehabilitation to meet Energy Star standards or any other energy efficiency standards that exceed the requirements of applicable State and local building codes.

SEC. 233. Of the unobligated balances, including recaptures and carryover, remaining from funds appropriated in section 1497(a) of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (Public Law 111-203; 42 U.S.C. 5301 note) and section 2301(a) of title III of division B of the Housing and Economic Recovery Act of 2008 (Public Law 110-289; 42 U.S.C. 5301 note), \$7,000,000 is hereby rescinded.

SEC. 234. (a) All unobligated balances, including recaptures and carryover, remaining from funds appropriated to the Department of Housing and Urban Development under the heading “Rural Housing and Economic Development” are hereby rescinded.

(b) Effective October 1, 2015, all unobligated balances, including recaptures and carryover, remaining from funds appropriated to the Department of Housing and Urban Development for accounts under the headings “Management and Administration” and “Program Office Salaries and Expenses” in division K of Public Law 113-235 are rescinded.

This title may be cited as the “Department of Housing and Urban Development Appropriations Act, 2016”.

TITLE III—RELATED AGENCIES

ACCESS BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the Access Board, as authorized by section 502 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended, \$7,548,000: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, there may be credited to this appropriation funds received for publications and training expenses.

FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Federal Maritime Commission as authorized by section 201(d) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (46 U.S.C. 307), including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109; hire of passenger motor vehicles as authorized by 31 U.S.C. 1343(b); and uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 5901-5902, \$25,660,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$2,000 shall be available for official reception and representation expenses.

NATIONAL RAILROAD PASSENGER CORPORATION OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General for the National Railroad Passenger Corporation to carry out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, \$23,999,000: *Provided*, That the Inspector General shall have all necessary authority, in carrying out the duties specified in the Inspector General Act, as amend-

ed (5 U.S.C. App. 3), to investigate allegations of fraud, including false statements to the government (18 U.S.C. 1001), by any person or entity that is subject to regulation by the National Railroad Passenger Corporation: *Provided further*, That the Inspector General may enter into contracts and other arrangements for audits, studies, analyses, and other services with public agencies and with private persons, subject to the applicable laws and regulations that govern the obtaining of such services within the National Railroad Passenger Corporation: *Provided further*, That the Inspector General may select, appoint, and employ such officers and employees as may be necessary for carrying out the functions, powers, and duties of the Office of Inspector General, subject to the applicable laws and regulations that govern such selections, appointments, and employment within Amtrak: *Provided further*, That concurrent with the President’s budget request for fiscal year 2017, the Inspector General shall submit to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations a budget request for fiscal year 2017 in similar format and substance to those submitted by executive agencies of the Federal Government.

NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the National Transportation Safety Board, including hire of passenger motor vehicles and aircraft; services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, but at rates for individuals not to exceed the per diem rate equivalent to the rate for a GS-15; uniforms, or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901-5902), \$103,981,000, of which not to exceed \$2,000 may be used for official reception and representation expenses. The amounts made available to the National Transportation Safety Board in this Act include amounts necessary to make lease payments on an obligation incurred in fiscal year 2001 for a capital lease.

NEIGHBORHOOD REINVESTMENT CORPORATION

PAYMENT TO THE NEIGHBORHOOD REINVESTMENT CORPORATION

For payment to the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation for use in neighborhood reinvestment activities, as authorized by the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation Act (42 U.S.C. 8101-8107), \$135,000,000, of which \$5,000,000 shall be for a multi-family rental housing program: *Provided*, That in addition, \$42,000,000 shall be made available until expended to the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation for mortgage foreclosure mitigation activities, under the following terms and conditions:

(1) The Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation (NRC) shall make grants to counseling intermediaries approved by the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) (with match to be determined by NRC based on affordability and the economic conditions of an area; a match also may be waived by NRC based on the aforementioned conditions) to provide mortgage foreclosure mitigation assistance primarily to States and areas with high rates of defaults and foreclosures to help eliminate the default and foreclosure of mortgages of owner-occupied single-family homes that are at risk of such foreclosure. Other than areas with high rates of defaults and foreclosures, grants may also be provided to approved counseling intermediaries based on a geographic analysis of the Nation by NRC which determines where there is a prevalence of mortgages that are risky and likely to fail, including any trends for mortgages that are likely to default and face foreclosure. A State Housing Finance Agency may also be eligible where the State Housing Finance Agency meets all the requirements under this paragraph. A

HUD-approved counseling intermediary shall meet certain mortgage foreclosure mitigation assistance counseling requirements, as determined by NRC, and shall be approved by HUD or NRC as meeting these requirements.

(2) Mortgage foreclosure mitigation assistance shall only be made available to homeowners of owner-occupied homes with mortgages in default or in danger of default. These mortgages shall likely be subject to a foreclosure action and homeowners will be provided such assistance that shall consist of activities that are likely to prevent foreclosures and result in the long-term affordability of the mortgage retained pursuant to such activity or another positive outcome for the homeowner. No funds made available under this paragraph may be provided directly to lenders or homeowners to discharge outstanding mortgage balances or for any other direct debt reduction payments.

(3) The use of mortgage foreclosure mitigation assistance by approved counseling intermediaries and State Housing Finance Agencies shall involve a reasonable analysis of the borrower's financial situation, an evaluation of the current value of the property that is subject to the mortgage, counseling regarding the assumption of the mortgage by another non-Federal party, counseling regarding the possible purchase of the mortgage by a non-Federal third party, counseling and advice of all likely restructuring and refinancing strategies or the approval of a work-out strategy by all interested parties.

(4) NRC may provide up to 15 percent of the total funds under this paragraph to its own charter members with expertise in foreclosure prevention counseling, subject to a certification by NRC that the procedures for selection do not consist of any procedures or activities that could be construed as a conflict of interest or have the appearance of impropriety.

(5) HUD-approved counseling entities and State Housing Finance Agencies receiving funds under this paragraph shall have demonstrated experience in successfully working with financial institutions as well as borrowers facing default, delinquency and foreclosure as well as documented counseling capacity, outreach capacity, past successful performance and positive outcomes with documented counseling plans (including past mortgage foreclosure mitigation counseling), loan workout agreements and loan modification agreements. NRC may use other criteria to demonstrate capacity in underserved areas.

(6) Of the total amount made available under this paragraph, up to \$2,000,000 may be made available to build the mortgage foreclosure and default mitigation counseling capacity of counseling intermediaries through NRC training courses with HUD-approved counseling intermediaries and their partners, except that private financial institutions that participate in NRC training shall pay market rates for such training.

(7) Of the total amount made available under this paragraph, up to 5 percent may be used for associated administrative expenses for NRC to carry out activities provided under this section.

(8) Mortgage foreclosure mitigation assistance grants may include a budget for outreach and advertising, and training, as determined by NRC.

(9) NRC shall continue to report bi-annually to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations as well as the Senate Banking Committee and House Financial Services Committee on its efforts to mitigate mortgage default.

UNITED STATES INTERAGENCY COUNCIL ON
HOMELESSNESS
OPERATING EXPENSES

For necessary expenses (including payment of salaries, authorized travel, hire of passenger motor vehicles, the rental of conference rooms, and the employment of experts and consultants under section 3109 of title 5, United States Code) of the United States Interagency Council on Homelessness in carrying out the functions pursuant to title II of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act, as amended, \$3,530,000.

TITLE IV

GENERAL PROVISIONS—THIS ACT

SEC. 401. None of the funds in this Act shall be used for the planning or execution of any program to pay the expenses of, or otherwise compensate, non-Federal parties intervening in regulatory or adjudicatory proceedings funded in this Act.

SEC. 402. None of the funds appropriated in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year, nor may any be transferred to other appropriations, unless expressly so provided herein.

SEC. 403. The expenditure of any appropriation under this Act for any consulting service through a procurement contract pursuant to section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, shall be limited to those contracts where such expenditures are a matter of public record and available for public inspection, except where otherwise provided under existing law, or under existing Executive order issued pursuant to existing law.

SEC. 404. (a) None of the funds made available in this Act may be obligated or expended for any employee training that—

(1) does not meet identified needs for knowledge, skills, and abilities bearing directly upon the performance of official duties;

(2) contains elements likely to induce high levels of emotional response or psychological stress in some participants;

(3) does not require prior employee notification of the content and methods to be used in the training and written end of course evaluation;

(4) contains any methods or content associated with religious or quasi-religious belief systems or "new age" belief systems as defined in Equal Employment Opportunity Commission Notice N-915.022, dated September 2, 1988; or

(5) is offensive to, or designed to change, participants' personal values or lifestyle outside the workplace.

(b) Nothing in this section shall prohibit, restrict, or otherwise preclude an agency from conducting training bearing directly upon the performance of official duties.

SEC. 405. Except as otherwise provided in this Act, none of the funds provided in this Act, provided by previous appropriations Acts to the agencies or entities funded in this Act that remain available for obligation or expenditure in fiscal year 2016, or provided from any accounts in the Treasury derived by the collection of fees and available to the agencies funded by this Act, shall be available for obligation or expenditure through a reprogramming of funds that:

(1) creates a new program;

(2) eliminates a program, project, or activity;

(3) increases funds or personnel for any program, project, or activity for which funds have been denied or restricted by the Congress;

(4) proposes to use funds directed for a specific activity by either the House or Senate Committees on Appropriations for a different purpose;

(5) augments existing programs, projects, or activities in excess of \$5,000,000 or 10 percent, whichever is less;

(6) reduces existing programs, projects, or activities by \$5,000,000 or 10 percent, whichever is less; or

(7) creates, reorganizes, or restructures a branch, division, office, bureau, board, commission, agency, administration, or department different from the budget justifications submitted to the Committees on Appropriations or the table accompanying the explanatory statement accompanying this Act, whichever is more detailed, unless prior approval is received from the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations: *Provided*, That not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, each agency funded by this Act shall submit a report to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and of the House of Representatives to establish the baseline for application of reprogramming and transfer authorities for the current fiscal year: *Provided further*, That the report shall include:

(A) a table for each appropriation with a separate column to display the prior year enacted level, the President's budget request, adjustments made by Congress, adjustments due to enacted rescissions, if appropriate, and the fiscal year enacted level;

(B) a delineation in the table for each appropriation and its respective prior year enacted level by object class and program, project, and activity as detailed in the budget appendix for the respective appropriation; and

(C) an identification of items of special congressional interest.

SEC. 406. Except as otherwise specifically provided by law, not to exceed 50 percent of unobligated balances remaining available at the end of fiscal year 2016 from appropriations made available for salaries and expenses for fiscal year 2016 in this Act, shall remain available through September 30, 2017, for each such account for the purposes authorized: *Provided*, That a request shall be submitted to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations for approval prior to the expenditure of such funds: *Provided further*, That these requests shall be made in compliance with reprogramming guidelines under section 405 of this Act.

SEC. 407. No funds in this Act may be used to support any Federal, State, or local projects that seek to use the power of eminent domain, unless eminent domain is employed only for a public use: *Provided*, That for purposes of this section, public use shall not be construed to include economic development that primarily benefits private entities: *Provided further*, That any use of funds for mass transit, railroad, airport, seaport or highway projects, as well as utility projects which benefit or serve the general public (including energy-related, communication-related, water-related and wastewater-related infrastructure), other structures designated for use by the general public or which have other common-carrier or public-utility functions that serve the general public and are subject to regulation and oversight by the government, and projects for the removal of an immediate threat to public health and safety or brownfields as defined in the Small Business Liability Relief and Brownfields Revitalization Act (Public Law 107-118) shall be considered a public use for purposes of eminent domain.

SEC. 408. None of the funds made available in this Act may be transferred to any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States Government, except pursuant to a transfer made by, or transfer authority provided in, this Act or any other appropriations Act.

SEC. 409. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be available to pay the salary for any person filling a position, other than a temporary position, formerly

held by an employee who has left to enter the Armed Forces of the United States and has satisfactorily completed his or her period of active military or naval service, and has within 90 days after his or her release from such service or from hospitalization continuing after discharge for a period of not more than 1 year, made application for restoration to his or her former position and has been certified by the Office of Personnel Management as still qualified to perform the duties of his or her former position and has not been restored thereto.

SEC. 410. No funds appropriated pursuant to this Act may be expended by an entity unless the entity agrees that in expending the assistance the entity will comply with sections 2 through 4 of the Act of March 3, 1933 (41 U.S.C. 10a–10c, popularly known as the “Buy American Act”).

SEC. 411. No funds appropriated or otherwise made available under this Act shall be made available to any person or entity that has been convicted of violating the Buy American Act (41 U.S.C. 10a–10c).

SEC. 412. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for first-class airline accommodations in contravention of sections 301–10.122 and 301–10.123 of title 41, Code of Federal Regulations.

SEC. 413. (a) None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to approve a new foreign air carrier permit under sections 41301 through 41305 of title 49, United States Code, or exemption application under section 40109 of that title of an air carrier already holding an air operators certificate issued by a country that is party to the U.S.–E.U.–Iceland–Norway Air Transport Agreement where such approval would contravene United States law or Article 17 bis of the U.S.–E.U.–Iceland–Norway Air Transport Agreement.

(b) Nothing in this section shall prohibit, restrict or otherwise preclude the Secretary of Transportation from granting a foreign air carrier permit or an exemption to such an air carrier where such authorization is consistent with the U.S.–E.U.–Iceland–Norway Air Transport Agreement and United States law.

SEC. 414. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Federal Maritime Commission or the Administrator of the Maritime Administration to issue a license or certificate for a commercial vessel that docked or anchored within the previous 180 days within 7 miles of a port on property that was confiscated, in whole or in part, by the Cuban Government, as the terms confiscated, Cuban Government, and property are defined in paragraphs (4), (5), and (12)(A), respectively, of section 4 of the Cuban Liberty and Democratic Solidarity (LIBERTAD) Act of 1996 (22 U.S.C. 6023).

The Acting CHAIR. Are there any amendments to that portion of the bill?

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SPENDING REDUCTION ACCOUNT

SEC. 415. The amount by which the applicable allocation of new budget authority made by the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives under Section 302(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 exceeds the amount of proposed new budget authority is \$0.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. STIVERS

Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for the Private Enforcement Initiative of the Fair Housing Initiatives Program under section 561(b) of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1987 (42 U.S.C. 3616a(b)) and section 125.401 of the regulations of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development (24 C.F.R. 125.401).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Ohio and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I will be fairly brief.

This is a followup amendment. We have already accepted the congressional intent that we will have a preference toward administrative enforcement. This is a followup limitation amendment that basically says we will not, for this calendar year, use the Private Enforcement Initiative.

As the gentleman from North Carolina said, we can always come back; but I think we need to have time for this GAO study that I have requested to come back because I would assert that administrative enforcement is less expensive to taxpayers than private enforcement.

It creates more certainty. It happens faster. It has less conflict of interest than the Private Enforcement Initiative. I would ask that my colleagues support this limitation amendment on the Private Enforcement Initiative for this year period.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 0015

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Again, Mr. Chairman, let me say how unfortunate I believe it is that we are dealing with this kind of amendment in this setting here tonight without really having much notice, much ability to understand the full implications.

I do think that we need to appreciate the role of what the gentleman calls private organizations. We are really talking here about nonprofits, about mediators, about the kind of working out of complaints, working out of problems, informal work with landlords, the kind of thing that actually helps avoid legal action and avoid litigation. There is a lot that can be mediated, a lot of things can be worked out in the fair housing arena. There are many nonprofit groups that do a good job of doing that.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman apparently has lots of complaints about this, and there have been a couple of prominent cases. I am aware of that. But the notion that we would come in here tonight and make a change of this magnitude, of this importance, I simply don't think is responsible.

So I will speak for myself. I am perfectly willing to look at this matter down the road. I understand there may

be some issues here, but this is a pretty drastic amendment, and you are taking a whole area here of mediation and informal conciliation, things that actually keep things out of the courts, keep things out of the legal system and out of litigation. I don't know why we would want to do that. It seems reckless to me.

I recommend that we reject this amendment and, at the same time, pledge to look at this carefully and work on it later.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from North Carolina, Mr. Chair, does recognize that there are problems in the private enforcement initiative. He just admitted that. There is a lot of lawsuit abuse. In fact, many of these organizations sue first and ask questions later. They don't do their due diligence. They send interns in to actually look at these places and file lawsuits before they get the facts.

The gentleman asserted that we shouldn't make these kind of changes. That is why the people sent us here, to make things better. We are supposed to do it every day, and when we see problems, we need to fix them. This is a temporary, 1-year halt of the private enforcement initiative with the GAO study that is not directed in this bill, but I asked for by letter through the GAO, and they are always good about doing those when you ask them to. They haven't looked at this program since 1997.

Mr. Chairman, it is time to look at this program in detail. I would assert that our local and State governments can also do the mediation that the gentleman from North Carolina talked about, Mr. Chairman, and they can do it better, more efficiently, and without the conflicts of interest that some of these private organizations have done.

So I think we ought to give it a try. That is the great thing about an annual appropriations bill. Guess what; we get to do it again next year. I am certainly willing to admit if I am wrong and we find out through a GAO study that the private enforcement has worked well. But there have been articles in the paper about some of the lawsuit abuse that we have seen all across the country, and I think we should just take a strategic pause here and give the money to our State and local governments who can better enforce our laws. They do it every day, and they can do it through the mediation and things that the gentleman asserts that these private enforcement initiatives can do so well.

Mr. Chairman, I would urge my colleagues to support this amendment. I think it will help make our fair housing laws better, and it will protect more consumers.

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

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

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GRAYSON

Mr. GRAYSON. I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to enter into a contract with any offeror or any of its principals if the offeror certifies, as required by the Federal Acquisition Regulation, that the offeror or any of its principals—

(1) within a three-year period preceding this offer has been convicted of or had a civil judgment rendered against it for: commission of fraud or a criminal offense in connection with obtaining, attempting to obtain, or performing a public (Federal, State, or local) contract or subcontract; violation of Federal or State antitrust statutes relating to the submission of offers; or commission of embezzlement, theft, forgery, bribery, falsification or destruction of records, making false statements, tax evasion, violating Federal criminal tax laws, or receiving stolen property; or

(2) are presently indicted for, or otherwise criminally or civilly charged by a governmental entity with, commission of any of the offenses enumerated in paragraph (1); or

(3) within a three-year period preceding this offer, has been notified of any delinquent Federal taxes in an amount that exceeds \$3,000 for which the liability remains unsatisfied.

Mr. GRAYSON (during the reading). Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent that the reading be waived.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Florida and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Chair, this amendment is identical to other amendments that have been inserted by voice vote into every appropriations bill considered under an open rule during the 113th and 114th Congresses.

My amendment would expand the list of parties with whom the Federal Government is prohibited from contracting due to serious misconduct on the part of that contractor. It is my hope that this amendment will be noncontroversial, as it always has been, and again passed unanimously by the House.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FITZPATRICK

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used in contravention of section 121.584 of title 14, Code of Federal Regulations.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Pennsylvania and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, my amendment will ensure that the FAA is doing everything that it can to certify that our aircraft are protected during a moment that pilots, flight attendants, and Federal law enforcement officers have all said that the aircraft is vulnerable to terror hijackings. Despite the effort to safeguard the cockpit after the 9/11 terror attacks, today, operational experience has highlighted that a critical vulnerability remains when a pilot must open the hardened, reinforced cockpit doors to eat, rest, or use the bathroom during long flights. Even the FAA recognizes that, "During this door transition, the flight deck is vulnerable."

Current FAA regulations require that the area outside the flight deck be secure before the reinforced cockpit door is opened. Currently, some airlines are using human shields or, in some cases, drink carts to try to block entry to the cockpit and claim it "secure." But only one method has been thoroughly studied and proven to beat the threat of a trained hijacker exploiting this particular vulnerability, and that is an installed physical secondary barrier door. These barriers are light, inexpensive wire gates that are able to protect the flight deck long enough for the pilot to shut the reinforced door.

This double door security procedure is something that Israeli airlines have been using for over a decade. They understand the risk and how to mitigate it. A Cato study has shown these secondary barrier doors to be the most cost-effective way to protect the cockpit door when the reinforced door is opened.

This is not some hypothetical threat. We know for a fact that terrorists maintain their desire to exploit vulnerabilities in our aircraft safety protocols to bring down an airliner just like they did on September 11, 2001. A recent USA Today headline read, "ISIS' Next Test Could Be a 9/11-Style Attack." In 2013, outgoing FBI Director Robert Mueller said that the terror scenario he fears most remains an attack with the use of an aircraft.

Perhaps no one knows the consequences of terrorists hijacking our aircraft more so than my constituent, Ellen Saracini. The terror hijackings of September 11 took the life of her husband, Victor Saracini, Captain of United Flight 175, which was hijacked

and flown into the South Tower of the World Trade Center by al Qaeda terrorists.

Inspired by Ellen and the pilots and flight attendants that stand with her, I have been working with a bipartisan, bicameral group of lawmakers to have these commonsense, cost-effective security features installed on every single large passenger aircraft in the United States through my bill, H.R. 911, the Saracini Aviation Safety Act.

Some have pointed to the "layered security" approach to aircraft security as proof that we don't need secondary barriers, but one only need to read current headlines to see the huge gaps in our layered security. As we recently learned, undercover agents, we saw, this week, were able to get weapons past the TSA 95 percent of the time.

Mr. Chairman, a recent Advisory Circular issued by the FAA highlights the risk to the cockpit during door transition and calls for the use of effective protection measures. Support for this amendment today would build on this positive step used by the FAA by showing that Congress is serious about this issue and that installed physical secondary barriers are the only way that we can guarantee, as FAA regulations do require, that the flight deck be secure prior to that reinforced door being opened.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GRAYSON

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to make incentive payments pursuant to 48 CFR 16.4 to contractors for contracts that are behind schedule under the terms of the contract as prescribed by 48 CFR 52.211 or over the contract amount indicated in Standard Form 33, box 20.

Mr. GRAYSON (during the reading). Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent that the reading be waived.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Florida and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Chairman, this is a good government amendment the House passed by voice vote last year. It simply states that bonus payments should not be paid to contractors whose projects are behind schedule or over budget.

I urge support for this amendment that combats waste, fraud, and abuse of taxpayer dollars, Mr. Chairman, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. ROSELEHTINEN) having assumed the chair, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Acting Chair 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. 2577) making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

—

HOOR OF MEETING ON TODAY

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. today.

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

There was no objection.

—

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported that on June 2, 2015, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill:

H.R. 2048. To reform the authorities of the Federal Government to require the production of certain business records, conduct electronic surveillance, use pen registers and trap and trace devices, and use other forms of information gathering for foreign intelligence, counterterrorism, and criminal purposes, and for other purposes.

—

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 27 minutes a.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until today, Thursday, June 4, 2015, at 9 a.m.

—

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. ELLISON (for himself, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H.R. 2623. A bill to reduce prescription drug costs by allowing the importation and reimportation of certain drugs; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia (for himself and Mr. MCKINLEY):

H.R. 2624. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to allow for fair application of the exceptions process for drugs in tiers in formularies in prescription drug plans under Medicare part D, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GARRETT (for himself and Mr. CAPUANO):

H.R. 2625. A bill to amend the Federal Reserve Act to reform the Federal Reserve System; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committees on Rules, and Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LUCAS (for himself and Mr. COLE):

H.R. 2626. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permit Indian tribal governments to be shareholders of S corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RYAN of Ohio (for himself, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. DELAURO, and Mr. FARR):

H.R. 2627. A bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to expand the use of salad bars in schools; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. FARENTHOLD (for himself and Mr. BUTTERFIELD):

H.R. 2628. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from gross income any prizes or awards won in competition in the Olympic Games; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHIMKUS (for himself and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas):

H.R. 2629. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to the approval of certain antibacterial and antifungal drugs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. JOLLY (for himself and Ms. GRAHAM):

H.R. 2630. A bill to amend the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act of 2006 to extend the moratorium on oil and gas leasing and related activities in certain areas of the Gulf of Mexico; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. RUSSELL:

H.R. 2631. A bill to require notice and comment for certain interpretive rules; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. DELAURO (for herself, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, and Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts):

H.R. 2632. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize and update the National Child Traumatic Stress Initiative for grants to address the problems of individuals who experience trauma and violence related stress; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DEUTCH (for himself, Mr. BUCHANAN, and Mr. WELCH):

H.R. 2633. A bill to establish an advisory office within the Bureau of Consumer Protection of the Federal Trade Commission to prevent fraud targeting seniors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ISRAEL (for himself and Mr. KING of New York):

H.R. 2634. A bill to provide for temporary emergency impact aid for local educational agencies; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. PIERLUISI (for himself, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. SABLON, and Ms. PLASKETT):

H.R. 2635. A bill to amend titles XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act to make improvements to the treatment of the United States territories under the Medicare and Medicaid programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. KELLY of Illinois:

H.R. 2636. A bill to require a study on the public health and environmental impacts of the production, transportation, storage, and use of petroleum coke, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. LATTA, and Mr. GUTHRIE):

H.R. 2637. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to prohibit the regulation of emissions of carbon dioxide from new or existing power plants under certain circumstances; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. MATSUI (for herself, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. BEN RAY LUJAN of New Mexico, and Mr. WELCH):

H.R. 2638. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to reform and modernize the Universal Service Fund Lifeline Assistance Program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. GIBSON, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO):

H.R. 2639. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for additional qualification requirements for individuals appointed to marriage and family therapist positions in the Veterans Health Administration of the Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself and Mr. HUNTER):

H.R. 2640. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an exclusion from gross income for discharge of consumer indebtedness; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PITTS (for himself, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Ms. ESHOO):

H.R. 2641. A bill to improve the integrity and safety of interstate horseracing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California (for herself, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. SHERMAN, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MOORE, Mr. HIMES, Mr. DELANEY, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, and Mr. CLAY):

H.R. 2642. A bill to provide sensible relief to community financial institutions, to protect consumers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. WILLIAMS (for himself, Mr. FINCHER, Ms. MOORE, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. LUCAS, and Mr. MEEKS):

H.R. 2643. A bill to direct the Attorney General to provide State officials with access to criminal history information with respect to certain financial service providers

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the men and women of the Lake County Forest Preserve District and their 100-year vision for protecting Lake County's unique and precious environment.

Led by Executive Director Ty Kovach, they have assembled a bold, 100-year vision for how to preserve our wildlife and this natural resource, not just for us today, but for our children and our children's children.

Mr. Speaker, the Lake County Forest Preserve District wants to ensure future generations can reap the benefits from a healthy and resilient environment and understand that the only way to ensure a better future is to make changes today. Their education and leadership on conservation issues will go a long way to protecting this incredible resource.

Mr. Speaker, I thank them for their efforts and humbly stand by their side to continue to champion the importance of protecting our environment.

And that is just the way it is.

EXTEND FLORIDA'S GULF COAST OIL DRILLING BAN TO YEAR 2027

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

Ms. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to speak in support of new legislation I am cosponsoring with my friend Congressman DAVID JOLLY to extend Florida's Gulf Coast oil drilling ban to the year 2027.

The drilling ban currently extends 125 miles off much of Florida's Gulf Coast and as far as 235 miles in some areas, but it is set to expire in 2022. There are some in the Senate trying to reduce the ban to just 50 miles as soon as next year.

This legislation reaffirms our commitment to protecting Florida's precious Gulf Coast beaches and will protect the environment, our economy, and military operations in the Gulf.

An oil spill like Deepwater Horizon just 50 miles off of northwest Florida's beaches would be devastating for our region. We can't allow that to happen and should pass this legislation to extend the drilling ban and protect Florida's Gulf Coast beaches.

RECOGNIZING PENN STATE CREAMERY ON 150 YEARS

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, House Majority Leader KEVIN MCCARTHY calls it "some of the best ice cream I have had outside of my hometown of Bakersfield."

The majority leader, of course, is referring to the ice cream produced at Penn State University's Berkey Creamery. I am proud to rise today in rec-

ognition of the creamery's 150th anniversary.

The creamery, located in the Rodney A. Erickson Food Science Building on Penn State University's main campus, was first established in 1865.

Penn State is home to the largest university creamery in the United States, using more than 4.5 million pounds of milk each year, supporting Pennsylvania's robust dairy industry.

To help celebrate their 150th anniversary, the creamery has launched a social media contest, which allows fans to select the special sesquicentennial flavor. Voters have a few days left to choose between birthday cake, strawberry cheesecake, or red velvet.

Mr. Speaker, as a proud graduate of Penn State University, I congratulate the Berkey Creamery on 150 years of creating countless memories, and especially the hard-working student employees and the 23 full-time employees that make the operations such a great success.

RECOGNIZING TAMPA BAY ESTUARY PROGRAM

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

Mr. JOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Tampa Bay Estuary Program and the great work they have done since their founding in 1991.

The Tampa Bay Estuary contains one of the most vibrant and productive ecosystems along the Gulf Coast because the unique mix of saltwater from the Gulf and freshwater from rivers and uplands have created abundant nurseries for juvenile fish and other sea life. More than 70 percent of all fish, shellfish, and crustaceans spend some critical stage of their development in these near-shore waters protected from larger predators that swim the open sea.

Very importantly, scientists at the Southwest Florida Water Management District have found that Tampa Bay now supports over 40,000 acres of sea grass beds. Tampa Bay is Florida's largest open water estuary. Due to the great work of the program, Tampa Bay's water quality is now as good as it was in 1950.

I want to thank the leadership of Tampa Bay's estuary program, particularly Executive Director Holly Greening, for her vision not only for the estuary program, but for the entire Tampa Bay community.

Tampa Bay is coming back to life, again assuming its position as the shimmering economic and environmental centerpiece of the vibrant southwest Florida region.

TRIBUTE TO CHUCK JOHNSON

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

Mr. ZINKE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Chuck Johnson, a

man who kept me and countless other public servants in Montana honest and accountable as the capitol bureau chief and longtime political reporter.

Chuck's 43-year journalism career began in 1977. In the decades since, Chuck has been the primary educator of government, politics, and ethics for generations of Montanans.

I had the pleasure of getting to know Chuck as a State senator and had the distinct pleasure of traveling with him across Montana. He is a straight shooter and a true professional.

In the era of online and 24-hour news outlets that push agendas and competition for cliques, Chuck's *modus operandi* was to tell the truth, tell the facts, and let the people of Montana decide. I urge future journalists to study his work and learn what they can from this true Montana professional.

I wish Chuck fair winds and following seas in his retirement. Bravo Zulu.

TRANSPORTATION, HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2016

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN). Pursuant to House Resolution 287 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2577.

Will the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) kindly take the chair.

□ 0912

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2577) making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes, with Mr. POE of Texas (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, an amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GRAYSON) had been disposed of, and the bill had been read through page 156, line 15.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MRS.

BLACKBURN

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ . Each amount made available by this Act is hereby reduced by 1 percent.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentlewoman from Tennessee and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Tennessee.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, I am certain it comes as no surprise to anyone in this body that, as we go through this appropriations season, I come back to the floor working to make another cut to get our spending levels down. The bill we have before us, the T-HUD approps, is a \$55.3 billion bill. That is discretionary funding.

□ 0915

Now, credit should go to the subcommittee chairmen and to those who have worked on this to get the spending levels down because this is \$9.7 billion below the President's request. That is really quite remarkable. And my amendment, which is another 1 percent reduction—a penny out of a dollar—would save our taxpayers \$598 million and would reduce the 2006 outlays by \$369 million.

Now, Mr. Chairman, when you look at budget authority and you look at the outlays, those are significant numbers. They are significant also, Mr. Chairman, when you look at the debt. We are \$18.3 trillion in debt; and, quite frankly, I think that that is too much debt for us to ask our children and grandchildren to handle.

I think it is imperative that we, as stewards of the taxpayers' money, put these issues on the table and say, "Yes, there are great things we would like to do," "Yes, there are projects that would be wonderful," but we have to be responsible to the taxpayers.

This is not Federal money. It doesn't just grow on trees. What we have to realize is that it all comes from taxpayers. They are overtaxed. They feel the Federal Government is overspent, and they want to see the spending brought under control. I agree with them. That is why I bring this amendment forward.

Mr. Chairman, I think, also, we have to look at the fact that our economic security, our fiscal security, and our national security are all closely linked. Because of that, Admiral Mullen said that the greatest threat to our Nation's security is our Nation's debt. We have to get serious about reducing this debt.

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

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, the bill that is in front of us is a responsible bill that adheres to the budget caps set by law and passed by this body. We set priorities in this bill, and we made targeted cuts to overhead, salaries, expenses, and also duplicative programs, Mr. Chairman. Many programs are also held at last year's level or below. Again, we made some tough decisions.

The problem is, when you are doing, frankly, an across-the-board cut with this amendment, it would have some, frankly—and I know it is well inten-

tioned—it would have some harmful effects on the priorities set by the Members of this House. Again, we have cut programs, but based on hearings, on meetings, on discussions, and on careful reviews of, again, the budget justifications and also the audits.

This amendment, and I know it is very well intentioned, would hit, for example, air traffic control operations and cause unnecessary flight delays. It could hurt our most vulnerable populations by, for example, affecting assistance to over 50,000 residents, including elderly and disabled populations.

Now, I am not telling you that there are not areas that can be reduced. We have done that. As a matter of fact, we have been in debate, and we have heard a lot of debate about some people saying that we have done too much of that. But we have done so after hours and hours of deliberations, of talking, of conversations, of study, and of hearings. So, again, I know it is a well-intended amendment, and I am a huge admirer of the sponsor of this amendment, but I have to respectfully urge a "no" vote precisely because of the time we have spent to make the right reductions as opposed to across-the-board reductions.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE), the ranking member of the subcommittee.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman of our subcommittee for yielding, and I want to join him in opposing this amendment.

This is an indiscriminate amendment. It cuts programs in transportation and housing without any thought as to their relative merits. It is the opposite of intelligent appropriating.

For example, this would result in fewer air traffic controllers, fewer pipeline safety inspectors, and the eviction—literally, the eviction—of elderly and disabled tenants. More generally, investments in our transportation and housing infrastructure would be altered. The associated jobs would be lost.

This bill is already underfunded, Mr. Chairman. It has got to be revisited when we have a budget agreement that lets us do a decent job with this bill.

So this amendment goes in exactly the wrong directions. It would encourage the agencies not to do more with less, but to do less with less, and it would be a body blow to our constituents and our communities.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge opposition to the amendment.

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, let me tell you why this is the right approach. Our States, who can't go print money in order to balance their budget, utilize across-

the-board cuts. Look at Tennessee, Massachusetts, Washington State, New Jersey, and Colorado. They all employ this. Here is why, if you want to engage State employees and Federal employees, and bring the agencies into the process, you say: Okay. We have set your budget levels, we have appropriated your money, now we are coming to you. You are a part of the team, and we need you to engage in how we best save taxpayer money.

This is why it works in the States. When I was in the State senate in Tennessee, if we didn't balance the budget, we didn't go home. It is time for the Federal Government to dig deep and engage these employees. You can talk with rank-and-file Federal employees. I have done it many times. They say we know how we can save money, but they are not incentivized to do so. Let's challenge them. Let's engage them. Let's have them bring forward their best ideas.

A penny on a dollar? Absolutely. We are doing this for the children. We are doing this for future generations. We are doing this for our Nation's fiscal health, and we are doing it to preserve our sovereignty to get these debt levels down.

It is time for us to do that. It is responsible budgeting. It is time for everybody to be a part of the team, putting this Nation back on the road to fiscal health, to a balanced budget, and being respectful of the taxpayer and a good steward of the taxpayers' money.

Mr. Chairman, I encourage my colleagues to vote "yes" on this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN).

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. NORTON

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used in contravention of the 5th or 14th Amendment to the Constitution or title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from the District of Columbia and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from the District of Columbia.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer an amendment to prohibit the use of Federal funds to stop, investigate, detain, or arrest people on highways based on their physical appearance in violation of the Fifth and 14th Amendments of the United States Constitution and title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. This is the same amendment I successfully offered to the fiscal year 2015 T-HUD appropriations bill and was agreed to by a voice vote on the House floor and was included in the fiscal year 2015 omnibus bill. I ask the same for the current amendment, which, like the one passed by the House last year, seeks to prevent profiling by law enforcement officials and to ensure that citizens are not stopped, investigated, or detained based on their color or other inherent physical appearance.

The Supreme Court, in *Whren v. United States*, held that profiling based on physical appearance on highways violates equal protection of the laws. Title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, whose 50th anniversary we celebrated in 2014, enforces the 14th Amendment and applies to funding for all Federal agencies and departments. My amendment carries out this title VI mandate as expressed in transportation funding in particular.

Federal guidance regarding the use of race by a Federal law enforcement official finds that racial profiling is not merely wrong, but is also ineffective. Not only Blacks and Hispanics are affected, but many others in our country as well, given the increasing diversity of American society.

The United States Department of Justice's Bureau of Justice Statistics reports that Whites are stopped at a rate of 3.6 percent, but Blacks at 9.5 percent and Hispanics at 8.8 percent, more than twice that of Whites. The figures are roughly the same regardless of region or State.

In Minnesota, for example, a statewide study of racial profiling found that African American, Hispanic, and Native American drivers were stopped and searched far more often than Whites, yet contraband was found more frequently in cars where White drivers had been stopped.

In Texas, where disproportionate stops and searches of African Americans and Hispanics were found to have taken place, it was also found that Whites more often were carrying contraband.

Earlier this Congress, I reintroduced the Racial Profiling Prevention Act, my bill to reestablish a popular Federal program aimed at reducing racial profiling. This bill permits States to apply for grants to develop racial profiling laws, to collect and maintain data on traffic stops, to fashion programs to reduce racial profiling, and to train law enforcement officers.

Nearly half the States participated in the program when it was in existence, which shows both the need and the interest in our country in tackling this civil rights issue. I got this program in-

cluded in the surface transportation law in 2005, but that program expired in 2009. I will try to get this bill included in the surface transportation reauthorization bill we will be writing this year, but in the meantime, a formal prohibition on racial profiling is in order. Meanwhile, Congress should have no hesitation in carrying out the 14th Amendment and the 1964 Civil Rights Act mandate regarding Federal funding of transportation, and neither the House nor the Senate hesitated last year.

Considering our country's history and increasing diversity, we are late in barring profiling at the national level. At the very least, Federal taxpayers should not be compelled to subsidize the unconstitutional practice of profiling by law enforcement officials in the States.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of this amendment, especially in light of recent issues in cities like Ferguson and Baltimore.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to carry out the rule entitled "Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing", published by the Department of Housing and Urban Development in the Federal Register on July 19, 2013 (78 Fed. Reg. 43710; Docket No. FR-5173-P-01) or to carry out the notice entitled "Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Assessment Tool", published by the Department of Housing and Urban Development in the Federal Register on September 26, 2014 (79 Fed. Reg. 57949; Docket No. FR-5173-N-02).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Arizona and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

□ 0930

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment intended to prevent yet another costly overreach by the Federal Government into the jurisdiction of local towns and communities.

Last Congress, during debate on this bill, the House passed an amendment of mine to prevent funds for HUD's proposed new regulation that will allow bureaucrats in Washington, D.C., to get in the middle of local planning and zoning and prohibit community development block grant funds from going to communities that need them.

The amendment seeks to once again defund and block this new regulation

that was not approved by Congress. HUD's misguided rule would grant the Department authority to dictate local zoning requirements in any community across the country that applies for a community development block grant.

According to reports, in 2012, this rule would have negatively impacted more than 1,200 municipalities throughout the country, causing these communities to forfeit millions that are meant to help the neediest of families.

Once again, this flawed proposal by HUD will increase local taxes, depress property values, and cause further harm to impoverished communities that are actually in need of these funds.

These burdensome zoning rules that would be imposed by HUD bureaucrats on localities would be derived from tracked resident data based on citizens' race, sex, religion, and other federally protected demographics.

Multiple watchdog groups have raised serious and valid concerns about HUD's proposal. A trial run of this rule already took place in New York. It failed miserably, and a local county was initially forced to forego \$12 million in funds that would have benefited the community due to the impractical and unrealistic requirements associated with the misguided agency regulation.

The county had intended to use a large portion of these block grant funds to establish public housing for individuals in need. But recently, the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit ruled in favor of the county and granted a stay against HUD's attempts to reallocate those millions.

This new regulation that is sitting at OMB is very dangerous and, worst of all, unnecessary. The Federal Government already has the authority to withhold grant money from communities that violate the law. And to clarify, I do mean the actual law in the United States Code, as opposed to overreaching executive dictums.

American citizens and communities should be free to choose where they would like to live and not be subject to Federal neighborhood microengineering at the behest of overreaching Federal bureaucrats.

Further, HUD officials shouldn't be holding hostage grant moneys aimed at community improvement based on its unrealistic utopian ideas of what every community should resemble. Local zoning decisions have traditionally been, and should always be, made by local communities, not bureaucrats in Washington, D.C.

I ask my colleagues to support this commonsense amendment because it keeps the Federal Government out of your backyard and prevents the Feds from reorganizing communities to a fantastical standard.

I ask my colleagues to support this amendment because it aims to treat municipalities and individual citizens

as capable and intelligent, rather than disenfranchised, divided, and coddled groups in need of protection from a problem that does not exist.

As always, I thank the chairman and ranking member for their continued work on the committee.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

The rule in question, HUD's rule, is intended to help communities more fully comply with the law and to avoid costly and time-consuming legal challenges.

The charge that this rule injects HUD into local planning and zoning conditions is simply inaccurate. Nor does it set up additional hurdles to Federal funding. That is inaccurate too.

The rule allows for communities to better understand local conditions and to create locally decided and implemented solutions.

I don't understand why we would want to revert back to a standard that relied on draw-out litigation rather than simply presenting communities up front with information on local housing conditions and letting them address their needs. I know my local officials prefer community developed solutions over decrees that are judicially imposed.

With that, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON), a distinguished member of the Financial Services Committee, to express his opposition to this amendment.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman for the time.

Let's talk about what we are really actually talking about. We are trying to fight racial segregation. That is what this is all about. Our Nation, the Nation I love, held slaves for 246 years and did Jim Crow segregation for another 100 years, and that created racial segregation patterns which this Member is trying to stop us from correcting. This is deeply offensive.

I just want to say that when I think about the progress that our Nation has made so that when we say "all men are created equal" and when we say "liberty and justice for all," that it will be true. This amendment is saying no, we are not going to allow it to be true; we are going to keep residential segregation based on race; we are going to make communities balkanize.

When I hear somebody say something like the Federal Government should stay out of local affairs, that sounds like some states' rights talk from 1955. That sounds like something really offensive to me.

Look, we need HUD to help implement affirmatively furthering fair housing rules. We need that. We need

HUD to expand its efforts to fight discrimination and promote equal opportunity in every community.

Too often in this country, too many people's economic opportunities, their life chances, are limited by where they live. And yes, the Federal Government should promote equality and should promote fair housing. Affirmatively furthering a fair housing rule helps to do that. Why we would want to strip it out makes absolutely no sense to me.

I urge Members to understand what is going on right here and to very fervently vote "no" on the Gosar amendment.

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

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, how dare the opposition create and instigate racism. This is about decisions made at the local level and the local level knowing what is best for their communities. There is nothing of the sort that the gentleman from Minnesota brought up in regard to that attitude that I brought forward.

This is an overreach of the Federal Government instilling in our local communities where, how, and when people are going to live. That is the wrong way to be. Instead of building cripples like we are doing right now with the Federal Government, we ought to make sustainable communities that are based on local ideas and principles.

I ask all Members to vote for this amendment because it definitely rejects the overreach of the Federal Government.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR).

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

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. NORTON

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to permit air transportation service between midnight and 6 a.m. at Ronald Reagan National Airport (DCA).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer an amendment that would prohibit Federal funds from being used to permit airline service between midnight and 6 a.m. at Ronald Reagan National Airport.

Last month, I held a widely attended community meeting with standing room only on airport airplane noise with residents of Palisades, Foxhall, Georgetown, Hillandale, and other impacted neighborhoods in the District of Columbia. Representatives of the Metropolitan Washington Airports Authority, the Federal Aviation Administration, and residents sat on a panel while we discussed airplane noise that has completely disrupted the life of this community.

Over the last 18 months, D.C. residents have reported an increase in air traffic activity during nighttime and early morning hours, breaking the sleep of children and adults alike. During this time period, one airline added two flights that arrive at Ronald Reagan Washington National Airport after midnight and three flights that depart before 5 a.m.

As of now, there is no congressional prohibition, none whatsoever, on nighttime flights at Ronald Reagan National Airport. Until recent years, however, flights at this airport could not land after 10 p.m. or take off before 7 a.m.

My amendment gives airlines greater latitude without introducing continuing sleepless nights for residents. Congress can settle this issue in the Nation's Capital to provide relief to those residents who suffer from airline noise night after night and early morning after early morning.

I urge the adoption of my amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, at this time, I will have to oppose this amendment.

I am actually concerned about the potential unintended consequences of this amendment. We don't know all of the potential impacts of this amendment, from safety to capacity to, frankly, the effect on local economics.

We have made in this bill an effort not to legislatively direct specific flight restrictions or flight paths. As you can well imagine, Mr. Chairman, there are a lot of these issues out there, but we have made the decision to not do that.

And again, we just don't know all of the potential unintended consequences, so I would respectfully have to urge a "no" vote.

I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE).

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the chairman yielding.

I would simply add an observation about the situation that this and other

amendments we may be considering today point to with respect to the pending FAA authorization. It is expiring at the end of this fiscal year.

Our colleagues on the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee are exploring options to reform the FAA. One of them includes separating the FAA from the Department of Transportation and allowing the FAA more independence over the use of its resources.

This is an important time to encourage our colleagues to think very carefully about that, about whether a more independent FAA, one that does not have to rely on annual appropriations, would be as attentive to concerns such as our colleague raises today, concerns about noise, concerns about flight paths.

We ought to move very cautiously in this area. I have misgivings about the piecemeal approach, but I believe there is an important message that is being delivered to the leadership of the FAA. I strongly urge the Administrator to ensure the FAA is more attentive to the concerns that are raised by communities when developing their new flight procedures.

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

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, while I understand the concerns of my friend on the other side of the aisle, and I appreciate the remarks of my friend on this side, I do alert the House to the fact that I am at least speaking from precedent.

I understand that all over the United States there are people who may have similar concerns. But remember, we are talking about a jurisdiction which in recent years has had no flights between 10 and 7, and now there are some airlines that have taken advantage of the fact that there are no limit on slots at Reagan National Airport.

This is a community in the Nation's Capital that is metropolitan in scope. The Nation's Capital is different from many other communities. I ask the House—and I certainly appreciate the remarks concerning possible privatization of FAA—to bear in mind that it is Congress that is ultimately the arbiter of such concerns.

I urge adoption of my amendment and yield back the balance of my time.

□ 0945

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement, administer, or enforce the rule entitled "Hazardous Materials: Enhanced Tank Car Standards and Operational Controls for High-Hazard Flammable Trains" published by the Department of Transportation in the Federal Register on May 8, 2015 (80 Fed. Reg. 26643 et seq.).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Arizona and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment which would prohibit funds for the implementation of the Department of Transportation's bungled new regulations for rail tank car standards.

I am strongly in favor of robust standards and best practices which actually improve the safety and efficiency of oil-by-rail transport. However, the new tank car rule completely missed the mark.

Instead of utilizing the expertise and practical experience of the rail, oil, and manufacturing industries, the Obama administration developed a series of special interest regulations at the behest of extremist environmental groups that seem more intent on thwarting the American energy renaissance than on actually creating a safer rail network.

In fact, the only reason these new regulations were even proposed is because of a misguided lawsuit filed against the DOT by the Sierra Club.

Analytics firm ICF International estimated the cost of these new regulations to top \$42 billion, which will be laid on the backs of individual consumers and hard-working Americans. I repeat, \$42 billion will be lost to our economy as a result of this new rule. These costly regulations will be reflected not only in the price we pay at the pump, but also in the price of manufacturing the millions of products that use plastics and chemicals derived from American petroleum.

The most egregious part is that these regulations don't even address the root cause of these accidents, which are related to track conditions and human error.

This new rule is nothing more than regulation in search of a problem. Department of Transportation Secretary Anthony Foxx said as much in 2014 when he admitted: "The truth is that 99.9 percent of these oil shipments reach their destinations safely."

These new and overreaching mandates require railroad companies to unnecessarily increase their steel tank walls and will require significant upgrades and retrofitting for an estimated 154,500 tank cars. In fact, The Wall Street Journal has reported: "The steel jacket alone would lower a car's 30,000-gallon capacity by about 800 gallons, forcing shippers to deploy more cars, according to rail industry analysts."

Clearly, this is an unintended consequence of these new regulations for a .01 percent problem, which actually in-

creases this .01 percent user accident rate percentage by requiring significantly more railcars to actually haul the amount of oil.

In addition, the aggressive timeline proposed by the DOT for completing these retrofits is unrealistic and could harm consumers by disrupting the production and transportation of goods that play major roles in our economy, including chemicals, gasoline, crude oil, and ethanol.

If Democrats and this administration were really concerned about rail safety for transporting oil, they would approve the Keystone pipeline. Pipelines are the safest way to transfer crude.

Our country is in the midst of an energy renaissance which is driving a much-needed economic revival in American manufacturing. We should be pursuing thoughtful, fact-based best practices, instead of adding artificial constraints on the growth of the American energy sector focused on a 1 percent problem that is caused by user error.

I encourage my colleagues to support my amendment which would prohibit the implementation of this extraneous new rule and to insist that the Department of Transportation pursue a more feasible, data-driven approach that has safety standards in mind.

I thank the chair and ranking member for their leadership on this bill.

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise, honestly, in some disbelief that this amendment is actually being offered.

Members of Congress and industry stakeholders have been calling for months for the DOT to complete its rulemaking to update the integrity of tank cars that carry energy products and other hazardous materials. The DOT got the final rule out on May 8, and now, today, the gentleman wants to stop the implementation of that rule in its tracks.

There have been countless examples of derailments involving trains that carry crude oil and other energy products. These incidents have resulted in explosive fires that burn for days. The incident that occurred in Quebec resulted in the preventable deaths of almost 50 people.

U.S. and Canadian transportation officials have worked hard to try to improve the safe transportation of these dangerous products. The railroad industry wants stronger cars. Safety groups want stronger cars. Communities desperately want stronger cars.

We ought not to delay the implementation of this long-awaited rule, so I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment.

I am now happy to yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-

BALART), our distinguished subcommittee chairman.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I also need to first recognize and thank the sponsor of the amendment. I am grateful that he is so vigilant as the Federal Government does have a tendency to overregulate and to, frankly, sometimes do so, I would say, irresponsibly. However, in this case, I have to oppose his amendment.

We have seen some horrific accidents recently associated with crude oil, and I think most Americans would agree that we need to do what we can in a reasonable fashion to try to stop that from happening.

While I am grateful for the sponsor of the amendment for always being vigilant on making sure the government doesn't overregulate, in this case, again, I respectfully have to oppose his amendment and urge a "no" vote.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I want to make sure everybody understands that user error and train track applications are the ones that have actually caused these problems.

When you actually look at a solution to a fact-based application, we ought to be spending more time on engineering errors and track conditions than we are over something that is misguided, like these tank car metals.

I urge all of my colleagues to vote in favor of the Gosar amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time. The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR).

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

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. POLIS

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill, insert the following: SEC. ____ . Section 5309(a) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (3) by inserting "or as merited by ridership demands" after "week-end days";

(2) in paragraph (4)(A) by inserting "or includes performance features that otherwise ensure reliable travel times for public transportation operating in a separated right-of-way in a shared-use facility" after "peak periods"; and

(3) in paragraph (4)(C)(iii) by inserting "or as merited by ridership demands" after "weekend days".

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

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Colorado and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, on behalf of a number of Western Representatives, I am proud to offer this bipartisan amendment, along with Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Ms. MCSALLY, and Ms. DEGETTE.

As we know and as has often been mentioned here on the floor, transportation is the lifeblood of this country. It moves people, goods, ideas, and information. Denver, Boulder, Fort Collins, and Broomfield, in my district, are some of the fastest growing cities in the country.

The majority of our tourists—over 46 million in 2014—make their way through the Denver Metro area; but the very things that make our State a popular home as well as a popular tourist destination—including hiking, biking, hunting, fishing, skiing—challenge growth and infrastructure as well.

Despite that fact that these cities are growing at significant rates and tourism is heavily congesting space, many of the major thoroughfares intersecting the region have not been expanded in decades.

Highway 70 West, our major tourism artery to our world-class ski resorts, stretches from the Denver Metro area out to our 14,000-foot peaks. I-25 North takes our visitors north of Denver and through Longmont, Loveland, Fort Collins, all the way to Wyoming.

These two highways are effectively the only major arteries traveling north and west of Denver and the only option for residents and visitors to my district to even get out of Vail, Breckenridge, or Fort Collins; and in some places, these highways narrow to as little as two lanes, meaning hard-working constituents who commute every day across my district might wait for hours every day just to go back and forth.

Tourists, likewise, spend long times waiting to get out of their destination towns or to their our attractions.

Worse yet, Mr. Chairman, is a lack of a clear solution. You cannot simply expand a road that winds up some of the steepest peaks in the United States, and it is very costly to expand a tunnel under a large mountain.

One of the only good options that we have for quick, reliable, and affordable mass public transportation is bus rapid transit systems. On Highway 36, our main artery from Boulder to Denver, we recently began operating a BRT system with huge success.

This system shares a HOT lane with high-occupancy vehicles that allows for expedited and assured arrive times. It is used by hundreds of people every day for their commutes. That tool, however, was recently taken out of the toolbox for States across the West.

A hugely problematic change to our surface transportation and authoriza-

tion MAP-21 bill 3 years ago was the heavy restrictions placed on project eligibility for capital investment grants that build BRT systems nationwide.

Unfortunately, for the first time in history, Congress required that BRT systems have access to an exclusive lane and operate as regularly during nonpeak weekday hours and weekends as they do during peak hours. That simply doesn't match the reality on the ground in places like Colorado and Arizona.

Mr. Chairman, we need access to these grants. The ability to create and innovate in transportation should be encouraged by Congress; yet we are removing the very critical area of investment for BRTs under the current MAP-21 rule, barring them from BRT eligibility because we don't have the capacity to add additional lanes, nor does it make any sense to reserve a lane solely for bus traffic, nor does it make any sense in our commuter and tourism corridors to have buses every couple of minutes on, let's say, a Tuesday at 2 p.m. or on a Sunday at 9 p.m. Ridership and data should drive these decisions, not Washington bureaucrats and not Congress.

My amendment would allow our States and localities the flexibility we need to create the best possible surface transportation system in our area. There simply isn't a one size fits all when it comes to growth and infrastructure.

I encourage this body to take into account the needs of States like Colorado and Arizona.

I reserve the balance of my time. Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, parliamentary inquiry.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. POLIS. Did the gentleman invoke his point of order or reserve a point of order?

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair understood that the gentleman from Florida reserved a point of order.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, instead of giving top-down directives from Washington, we should be allowing for the equity of Federal resources and take into account local needs. What works for some transportation corridors might not work for others. We simply have different needs with regard to our computing patterns and tourism patterns in other areas of the country.

I am proud to bring up this amendment with a strong bipartisan coalition of Members, which includes Representatives COFFMAN, PERLMUTTER, SCHWEIKERT, DEGETTE, MCSALLY, and KIRKPATRICK, because we can't effectively discuss funding levels like those in the underlying bill without first putting in place equitable policies that encourage innovation for their disbursement.

I ask that my colleagues work with me and the coalition of Members I have named to find and enact a fix as we move forward with the transportation reauthorization later this summer.

I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART) to see if he will be willing to work with us with regard to finding a fix on this policy issue.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

I know the gentleman is very committed and has worked awfully hard. I look forward to working with him on this.

Again, I know how passionate he is about this, and I look forward to working with him.

Mr. POLIS. In reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

□ 1000

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for the Federal Transit Administration's Rapid Growth Area Transit Program.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Arizona and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer a commonsense, fiscally responsible amendment that will ensure scarce transportation dollars are going towards highways, bridges, and other critical infrastructure that are in desperate need of repair.

The Obama administration's budget request for the fiscal year 2016 included \$500 million for a new discretionary grant program for bus transit. The administration made the same new request in fiscal year 2015 for this same misguided program. This request was rejected in its entirety last year, and the proposed rapid growth area transit program received no funding in the CR/Omnibus. With significant infrastructure needs, including road and bridge maintenance, now is not the time to spend \$500 million on a new discretionary bus transit program.

In fact, the Obama administration actually proposed two new programs this year that sought funding from the highway trust fund, both of which asked for \$500 million for each. The committee made clear in the committee report that they chose to fund the new \$500 million Fixing and Accelerating Surface Transportation, or FAST, program in this bill. If I had to fund only one of these two new pro-

grams, that is exactly the one I would have funded.

So I applaud the chairman, ranking member, and committee for the choice they made, and also for apparently choosing not to fund the proposed rapid growth area transit program once again in this legislation.

Having said that, there are no detailed summaries of the particular program accounts because authorizing language has not yet been passed. In addition, nothing is said about the proposed \$500 million new discretionary bus transit program in the bill or the committee report. My amendment is also necessary to prevent funds from being transferred to this account.

A recent economic analysis found: "Over the past few decades lawmakers have diverted more trust fund resources . . . thus starving general purpose roads of funds," and, "Transit—including light rail, trolleys, and buses—marks the largest diversion. In 2010 alone, it received 17 percent, or \$6 billion, of Federal highway user fees, even though it accounted for only 1 percent of the Nation's surface travel. Despite receiving a portion of Federal user fees for decades, transit has failed to reduce traffic congestion or even maintain its share of urban travel. For example, between 1983 and 2010, traffic volumes in the Nation's 51 major metropolitan areas increased by 87 percent, peak travel times in those areas increased by 125 percent, and transit's share of passenger miles fell by one-fourth."

I encourage my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSAR. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to once again repeat what I said a little while ago. I want to thank the gentleman for his hard work. It is evident that he spends the time and he does his homework. I am greatly appreciative of that. I have no objection to the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. GOSAR. I thank the gentleman for his support.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. LEE

Ms. LEE. I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to administer, implement, or enforce section 193 or section 414 of this Act.

Ms. LEE (during the reading). Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent that the reading to be dispensed with.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentlewoman from California and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank Mr. SANFORD for his leadership as it relates to this amendment and helping us try to end these outdated and failed policies toward Cuba. I rise in support of our amendment, and I am very proud to cosponsor this simple, bipartisan amendment. This amendment would strike two provisions included in this bill that would further limit travel to and from Cuba via flights and ferries. Not only are these provisions inappropriate policy riders, they would deny Americans the right to travel to Cuba.

I understand some of my colleagues, including our subcommittee chair, have a personal interest in Cuba, yet personal interest should not stall progress nor interfere with what is good for the American people. I am joined by many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle and a diverse coalition of organizations and businesses in strong opposition to this and other attempts to undermine efforts to normalize relations with Cuba.

Not only are the current provisions in this bill wrong for diplomacy, they are patently antibusiness. That is why this amendment is supported by the United States Chamber of Commerce, Orbitz, the American Society of Travel Agents, and the broad-based coalition Engage Cuba.

These provisions that are currently in the bill set us back 50 years. They would eliminate flights that airlines have already invested in and would kill a new market for maritime carriers. Simply put, these provisions are an affront to Americans' basic freedom. Cuba is the only country in the world, including North Korea, Iran, China, and Vietnam, where Americans cannot freely travel. The President's announcement to expand travel was a step in the right direction.

We should be passing the bipartisan and bicameral Freedom to Travel to Cuba Act, H.R. 664, which I am proud to cosponsor with my colleague Mr. SANFORD, rather than moving backwards with these misguided provisions.

Opponents to normalize the relations are quick to claim that renewed engagement somehow rewards the Cuban Government. That couldn't be more wrong. In order to engage on issues like human rights and democracy, Americans should be able to do just that. This amendment allows that.

Those who are serious about moving our relations forward to the betterment of both Americans and Cubans know that increased exchange and formalized relations are the path we need to be on. A majority of Americans and Cubans agree: we need a 21st century approach to our relations with this nation 90 miles away from our shores.

This is 2015, my colleagues, not 1960. The rest of the world is doing business with Cuba, allows its citizens to travel to Cuba, and also has normal diplomatic relations with Cuba. The United States is isolated. This amendment begins to thaw that freeze and to keep our country moving forward in this next decade and, further, to become part of the world family who understands that Americans should, like other citizens in other countries, have a right to travel wherever they so desire.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD).

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I intend to strike the last word so as to give the speakers more time.

Ms. LEE. I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD).

Mr. SANFORD. I appreciate the gentlewoman yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, my comments will be brief. It is quite simple. The concept is this: if I travel on Delta Airlines to Moscow, it does not mean that I support Putin; if I travel on Royal Caribbean to Shanghai, it does not mean I support the Chinese regime.

This bill is fundamentally, as my colleague from California has pointed out, about Americans' right to travel. It is, secondarily, about something we talk about as Republicans, which is balance of power. If we don't want the President overstepping his bounds, we shouldn't overstep our bounds as Members of Congress. That is precisely what this bill does in trying to proscribe the President, though he has full authority within the licensing, within the Department of Commerce, to do as he has done.

Finally, I think it is about American opportunity. Why should we have Canadian or Mexican jets traveling to a country that we are allowed to travel to rather than American jets?

Ms. LEE. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, just a couple things from the debate that we have heard. The sponsor of the amendment talked about that this may be a personal issue for some. Mr. Chairman, let me be very frank and very clear: this is not a personal issue.

Let me also talk about what the language in the bill does that this amendment is trying to take out. It doesn't deal with the overriding issue of policy versus whether we like the President's policy or not. It deals with one specific issue and one specific issue only, Mr. Chairman: whether we should condone, whether we should approve, whether we should permit the trafficking of confiscated—in other words, stolen—property.

When the gentleman from my side of the aisle said that, you know, this is an issue about traveling to other countries, when we travel to Russia, we should be able to do that, that is fine. But is he also saying, which is what this amendment says, that we should condone the use of stolen, confiscated property, property that was stolen and confiscated illegally from Americans? So if you support this amendment, Mr. Chairman, what you are saying is it is okay to do business on property that was stolen from Americans.

Now, I can understand having differences of opinion on overall policy, but the language in the mark deals specifically with confiscated—in other words, stolen—properties from Americans. For the life of me, I would never understand how anybody can justify doing business on confiscated, stolen property and then try to obfuscate the issue talking about policy, which is not what is in the mark.

I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN), a distinguished gentlewoman from the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. I thank the chairman for yielding.

As the chairman points out, do we really want to trample on the property rights of innocent Americans whose properties were illegally stolen by the Cuban regime?

The gentleman from South Carolina is correct, the concept is simple, but the concept he doesn't seem to understand is this: it is not about travel to Cuba. This is about protecting American properties that were illegally seized by the Castro government. We are selling out these legitimate property claims to thousands of American citizens. Respect for private property rights, Mr. Chairman, has been a consistent American policy since the founding of our Republic.

The Cuban regime illegally confiscated property from American citizens. Our citizens have not been compensated, and we know there is no respect for the rule of law in Cuba. If an American's property has been seized, what does that American do? Well, there is no fair court for recess. Let me tell you what the Inter-American Law Review has noted about the Cuban regime's confiscation of U.S. assets. It says it is the "largest uncompensated taking of American property by a foreign government in history."

So this is what this amendment is about. If this amendment to strike the use of confiscated property were to pass, we would be, in essence, allowing and condoning the trafficking of stolen goods. Currently, there are over 8,800 claims certified by the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, which is under the U.S. Department of Justice. American citizens whose properties were seized illegally—almost 9,000 have filed claims—the Castro regime doesn't care. These certified claims, are they just small? No. They are worth approximately \$8 billion.

This body must protect the interests of those citizens, of all of our citizens, so I implore our colleagues to not support these misguided attempts to normalize relations with the Cuban regime on the backs of American citizens. We are better than that. We must not allow this amendment to pass. We are about protecting American private property rights. This language in the bill protects American citizens, constituents that we represent in our congressional districts.

Is this Chamber really going to side with a Communist tyrant in Cuba over American citizens? The Cuban regime should not be allowed to use American properties stolen from our citizens for its commercial benefit. If the U.S. endorses such a practice, what message will we be sending to other rogue regimes who would love to be confiscating American properties?

So, if we want to help the Cuban people, and I am sure that all of us do, let's not give their oppressors more resources to violate their rights. We are here to protect private property rights of American citizens. We must reject this amendment, and rather than striking the provisions directly, which my colleagues could have done, they are offering limitation amendments that would prohibit funds to enforce those same provisions. Let's not do this.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment. Let's not trample on the rights of American citizens.

□ 1015

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD).

Mr. SANFORD. Three quick points. If you follow this logic, then no American plane should fly into Saigon, no American plane should fly into China, no American plane should fly into Russia, because indeed property was confiscated at the time of the Russian revolution, the Chinese taking, or, for that matter, what happened in Vietnam. There are American properties there.

This is not about American property rights. This is about legalistically trying to undo that which has been changed.

The other thing it is about is, again, legalism. What the bill actually says is if a boat docks in the previous 180 days within 7 miles of a port or property where there may be land somewhere connected.

This is a legalistic attempt to undo what the President has proposed.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman from California has expired.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last

word in order to express my strong support for this amendment and my appreciation to our colleague from California for offering it.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR).

Mr. FARR. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, this is the bill, and the language that we are trying to strike out reads: "None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to facilitate new scheduled air transportation originating from the United States if such flights would land on, or pass through, property confiscated by the Cuban Government, including property in which a minority interest was confiscated, as the terms confiscated, the Cuban Government, and property are defined in" the paragraphs below.

This is just a job killer for Americans. We have a hundred thousand Americans who are visiting Cuba illegally. You know how they get there? They go to Mexico. Who gets the business? Mexican airlines. They go to Canada. Who gets the business? Canadian airlines. Or, any other country in the world that has normal travel relationships with Cuba.

You are just cutting off the ability for American enterprise to get access to Cuba, where everybody wants to go, because there are family feuds going on here, because it is including property which has a minority interest.

How are the airlines, how are the people going to decide what property has been confiscated, who is the ownership title? Those are big legalistic problems in the United States when we confiscate property to build freeways or railways.

This amendment really screws up the ability for America to be involved in a business that Americans want to do. They want to travel. Censorship of American travel—this is just ridiculous in these days.

What is the message to the world? Do we prohibit our citizens from going to countries that are communist countries? You can go to Vietnam, China, and Russia, but you can't go to Cuba because there is a lot of feuding going on in Florida.

In fact, Florida is going to benefit from this because where are the airports that these scheduled airlines are going to leave from? They are Tampa, they are Miami, the businesses in your State.

So if you want to give American jobs to Americans, and you want commerce to occur, and you don't want to continue this censorship of Cuba, then vote for this amendment.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. A couple of points I would just like to make.

First of all, confiscated property 50 years-plus ago should be part of negotiations in terms of bilateral discussions as it relates to normalizing relations with Cuba. What is in this bill

right now is what we have indicated, and which is why we offer this amendment.

This bill prohibits Americans from traveling to Cuba. It eliminates jobs in America, and it eliminates economic growth through our maritime industry and our airline industry.

Once again, all of the issues that occurred 50 years ago are subject to discussion based on any bilateral negotiations taking place.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Could I inquire how much time is remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE) has 45 seconds remaining.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD).

Mr. SANFORD. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I would just make three last points. As was correctly pointed out by my colleague from California, indeed this is about American jobs. It indeed is about, again, this larger notion of private property rights.

I would stand my private property rights record up to anybody. I believe strongly in private property rights and legal code, which is why Ms. LEE is correct: should there be bilateral relations between Cuba and the United States, this would be part of that discussion.

But the idea of creating a legal hurdle for an airline not to be able to fly from Miami or Tampa to Havana—and instead, those jobs go to other places around the globe—makes no sense to me.

Finally, I would simply say this. We have tried 50 years of one policy, and it hasn't worked. It was Ronald Reagan who encouraged travel to the Eastern Bloc countries. I think it would make sense in this instance.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, we have heard a lot of things that, by the way, you will notice, at very few times actually deal with language in the mark, the language in the bill. By the way, for example, that this is going to hurt American jobs.

To argue, Mr. Chairman, that American companies will benefit from trafficking in stolen property that was stolen from American companies I think is probably the definition of an oxymoron, number one.

Number two, there is a lot of obfuscation. The language in the bill doesn't say that Americans can't travel. The language says that they cannot use trafficking in, make a profit from, property that was stolen from Americans. Stolen from Americans.

So I understand that the gentleman says that his property rights record is as good as any, but, Mr. Chairman, the

language in the bill deals with a specific issue, and one specific issue alone: Should we condone, should we allow, should we permit, should we encourage the trafficking, the profiting from stolen property—property that was confiscated from Americans, whether there are certified claims or not.

If you support this amendment, Mr. Chairman, you are saying it is okay for folks to traffic in property that was stolen from Americans, illegally stolen from Americans. I think, frankly, that is a sad day.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CURBELO).

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, it is fascinating to come here to the floor and listen to colleagues who struggle to support free trade agreements with our allies come to the floor and advocate for expanded trade with one of our enemies, taking advantage of properties stolen from American citizens.

I heard that we have a personal interest in this matter—and I do. I am an American citizen. I was born here. And I want to do justice by American property owners.

Shouldn't we resolve these 8,818 claims before proceeding? Shouldn't we do justice by these families, these businesses whose property was stolen with no due process, with no hearing by the Castro government?

Whose side are we on, Mr. Chairman? That is the question here. As Americans, do we want to be on the side of those who were aggrieved by a tyrannical regime—American citizens—or do we want to reward that regime by allowing others now to profit over those stolen properties? That is the question that we need to ask ourselves today.

This is not about travel. No one is here advocating for restricting travel to Cuba. Many people travel to Cuba today legally, and that would not change. But I cannot stand for violating the property rights of my fellow American citizens.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, again, before I yield back, as Mr. CURBELO just mentioned, this is not an issue of travel. This is not an issue of the overriding policy. This is not an issue of even arguing whether President Obama has been a good negotiator or a horrible negotiator on anything. This is about whether we want to condone, permit, accept, in violation of everything that the United States stands for, the trafficking of stolen property, property illegally confiscated from American citizens.

If you support this amendment, Mr. Chairman, you are supporting, you are condoning, you are assisting, you are helping trafficking and the profiting on property that was stolen from Americans.

This cannot stand. This should not stand. I would respectfully ask for a "no" vote on this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. POSEY

Mr. POSEY. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. 416. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Department of Transportation to take any actions with respect to the financing of a new passenger rail project that runs from Orlando to Miami through Indian River County, Florida.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Florida and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. POSEY. Mr. Chairman, All Aboard Florida was presented as a private passenger rail project that would run from Miami to Orlando, and vice versa, along Florida's east coast.

The project was initially sold to the public as the first privately funded and operated passenger train. However, that story soon changed, as All Aboard Florida decided to pursue a \$1.6 billion loan from the Department of Transportation. Apparently, because the loan requires a strict Environmental Impact Statement to be completed, All Aboard Florida decided to also apply for \$1.75 billion in tax-exempt private activity bonds from the Department of Transportation.

□ 1030

The U.S. Department of Transportation has moved to green light this financing option, even though they have absolutely no statutory authority to do that, and the environmental impact study has yet to be completed. We don't even know if the project is safe or feasible yet.

Furthermore, these trains will move through our small beach towns at speeds of up to 110 miles per hour, with virtually no—none, nada—buffer separating it from our communities.

All Aboard Florida envisions 32 trains running per day, on top of 20 freight trains. That is a lot of traffic. Given how close this track is to our adjacent roads and surrounding neighborhoods, obviously, there are serious safety concerns. Why should you ask taxpayers to be on the hook for this train?

I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting my amendment to stop the Department of Transportation from funding this train.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield to my colleague from Florida (Ms. BROWN).

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, here we go again, trying to destroy passenger rail in this country. I don't understand why Republicans refuse to support transportation infrastructure.

Let me tell the gentleman from Florida that our competition is not Georgia, and it is certainly not Alabama. It is Europe. It is Japan. It is China. The people in Florida support All Aboard Florida. This is a system that will go from Orlando to Miami. The studies indicate it is an economic boom to our State.

I just for the life of me don't understand why, without vision, the people perish? Why is it that you can go to Europe and you can get on a train to go from London to Paris—2 hours, 1 hour and 15 minutes—and we don't want that same system here?

Our competition is spending close to 8 percent—8 percent—of their economics for passenger rail, and we fight about 1 percent; yet we can spend close to \$300 billion for tax breaks; yet we don't even want to encourage public-private partnerships.

Shame on you. The people in Florida need to be able to move around our State, and this is not just a Florida issue; it is a national issue. Here we are, \$2 billion that could fix Amtrak; yet we can do a tax break for close to \$300 billion and don't pay for it. I don't understand.

What is wrong with the people's House? Why is it that we don't support transportation infrastructure? This is not just a Florida issue. When we had 9/11, Amtrak was the only entity that was moving people. When we had Katrina, we had over 3,000 people die because they couldn't move around the area.

We need a train that leaves New Orleans to go to Orlando and on down to Miami. That is the future.

Shame on you.

The Acting CHAIR. Members are advised to address their remarks to the Chair and not to other Members in the second person.

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

Mr. POSEY. Mr. Chairman, shame on me for asking the Department of Transportation to follow the law, respect the Constitution of the United States, and make economically sound decisions.

This is not a partisan issue, in response to that allegation. In September, I wrote the GAO, along with my colleague from Florida, Representative PATRICK MURPHY, asking them to study the project to ensure taxpayer funds were not at risk.

A recent independent economic analysis conducted by Dr. John Friedman concludes that, even under all opti-

mistic assumptions, AAF will generate losses of more than \$100 million and will be unable to service its debt burden. Dr. Friedman has a Ph.D in economics, is a distinguished Brown University professor and former Economic Council special assistant in the current Obama administration.

The Department of Transportation has been unable to explain where they get their authority to authorize bonds for this project. That is because they don't have any authority. They say title 23 funding has been given to the project in the past, which could trigger the bond authority, but have been unable to state where title 23 funds were ever spent, on what projects, and when.

This is just common sense. Now, it might not make some congressional sense to some people, but this is common sense and a simple ask that the Department of Transportation follow the law and not violate the law to help a special interest and put the taxpayers on the hook for \$1.75 billion.

I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting this amendment, Mr. Chairman.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. POSEY. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GALLEGO

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill, before the short title, insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of these funds made available by this Act may be used by the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) to redesign the Phoenix Metroplex regional airspace.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Arizona and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer an amendment that would prevent the FAA from moving forward with plans to redesign the Phoenix metroplex airspace. Let me explain why it is important to my city.

Imagine living in a quiet neighborhood, then waking up one morning to discover dozen of planes suddenly have been roaring over your head. Next, imagine the frustration of running a business, raising a family, or even trying to get a good night's sleep when your windows are constantly rattling because of the noise of passing aircraft.

Finally, imagine that all of this discomfort was both needless and avoidable, that it was caused by out-of-

touch bureaucrats who rerouted major flight paths over your community without bothering to consult the people that live there.

Unfortunately, for thousands of Phoenix residents, this is not a hypothetical situation. In September of last year, the FAA instituted new flight paths for the aircraft departing from Phoenix Sky Harbor International Airport, without any notice for anybody, without any notice to our neighbors. For too many members of my community, these changes have meant more noise and a lower quality of life.

Disturbingly, the FAA altered these flight paths without seeking local input, failing to consult with the community members or civic leaders in the Phoenix area. Not only that, but the FAA also failed to provide a report that was mandated by the previous Congress on Sky Harbor on last year's FAA bill about how it planned to do and change with the patterns. It is now more than 2 months overdue, with no response yet from the FAA.

Mr. Chairman, this isn't how our government is supposed to run, and this is not how the FAA is supposed to operate.

I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Chairman, I thank Representative GALLEGRO. I appreciate that.

Let's put some facts around this. Phoenix Sky Harbor International Airport is the tenth busiest airport in the United States, but we have something that is a little unique—and think about this because this is coming to your neighborhood, too.

We actually have a downtown airport. Our city grew up around an airport, so it makes traffic patterns and the mechanics dealing with it quite unique. Also, our big county has about 4.2 million people in it. It is either the third or fourth most populous county in the United States—so a huge population. Remember, Arizona has been attributed as the most urbanized State in the country.

I have a downtown airport, and then the FAA goes and starts to change the flight patterns. When it becomes one of the biggest issues at all of our congressional offices, they are arrogant; they don't return calls. We point out the fact that they are violating last year's law, and they just grin at you and then walk out of the meetings with this sort of arrogant vanity.

This is the process we, as Members— and remember, there are seven congressional districts that touch this Phoenix metroplex area that all care about this. This is our opportunity to at least get our voices heard.

I am going to ask the chairman, please consider what is happening to 4.2 million people in the Phoenix area. The fact of the matter is there is well-established corridors where you don't have to have the effects on the neighborhoods, and we can still be moving to the NextGen if I could find someone at

the FAA who would actually listen to our concerns.

Just to finish, this amendment is very straightforward. It would just simply ensure the FAA does not proceed with the redesign of the regional airspace around Phoenix Sky Harbor International Airport until these issues are resolved in the local neighborhoods.

Experts tell us that if the flight paths in Phoenix are eventually altered, then the entire metroplex airspace will also need to be revisited. By asking them to slow down, consider the overall effect of what is happening now, we are actually going to do them a favor by not having them to revisit it later on.

Instead of rushing forward, the FAA should do the prudent thing and wait until our communities' concerns have been fully addressed.

In closing, let me just offer a word of warning. For those of you who think this is exclusively a Phoenix problem, just wait because your city could be next, and then you will be dealing exactly with the same FAA relationship that we are dealing with right now, someone who is not responsive to the concerns of both the local politicians, the Members of Congress, and the citizens.

Mr. GALLEGRO. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. JOYCE. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

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

Mr. JOYCE. Mr. Chairman, I would be concerned about the unintended consequences of the amendment. We don't know all the potential impacts of this amendment, from safety to capacity to local economics.

While I sympathize with both these gentlemen and I pledged to work with the gentleman and his community and the FAA to find a resolution, we have made an effort in this bill not to legislatively direct specific flight restrictions on flight paths.

I urge a "no" vote.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOYCE. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I simply want to add—or to reiterate, I might say—that our subcommittee's fiscal year '15 report required the FAA to work with the Phoenix community on this issue and to report back to the committee on these efforts. We are still waiting for that report.

Again, let me reiterate what I said earlier. The FAA must be more proactive in responding to concerns that are raised by communities. These are legitimate concerns, and the FAA needs to be accountable.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GALLEGRO).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SESSIONS

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill, before the short title, insert the following new section:

SEC. 416. None of the funds made available by this Act shall be used to support Amtrak's route with the highest loss, measured by contributions/(Loss) per Rider, as based on the National Railroad Passenger Corporation Fiscal Years 2014-2018 Five Year Plan from April 2014.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Texas and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

□ 1045

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is very straightforward. It would eliminate funding for the absolute worst performing line at Amtrak, the Sunset Limited, which runs from New Orleans to Los Angeles.

The Amtrak Reform and Accountability Act of 1997 required that Amtrak operate without any Federal operating assistance after 2002. I have since then offered this amendment each year.

Amtrak was supposed to be free of Federal operating subsidy; yet despite this commonsense requirement that Amtrak cease their fiscal irresponsibility and mismanagement, instead, they turned to continuing this line that costs the taxpayers \$405.67 for every single ticket that is bought, for every single trip. That is \$405.67 to subsidize the travels of passengers from New Orleans to Los Angeles, a trip that takes nearly 48 hours, assuming the train is on time.

I believe this is exceedingly unlikely also because it has a terrible record of being on time. According to Amtrak's most recent monthly performance report, the Sunset Limited was only on time 42 percent of the time; yet 100 percent of the \$405 was paid for the ticket.

This places the Sunset Limited as one of the top 10 worst ontime routes for any of Amtrak's routes in its latest performance report.

Perhaps, Mr. Chairman, taxpayers should be happy when the train is not running, but not running on time, and the cost to the taxpayer is prohibitive. Why does it run this route when Amtrak loses an average of \$41 million a year?

Mr. Chairman, my amendment is simply to help Amtrak make the tough decisions that they appear to be incapable of doing themselves. I think it is the first step to instilling a small measure of fiscal discipline in Amtrak. Failure to do so will only continue Amtrak along this process rather than being a north-south provider on both coasts.

I hope my colleagues will join me. Certainly, I know they are taxpayer

advocates that believe as I do. I urge all my colleagues to support this amendment and the underlying legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. Our colleague from Texas has offered amendments like this in the past, an attempt to micromanage Amtrak from the floor of the House. I don't think it is a good idea.

We had a vigorous debate last night on the importance of investing in inner city passenger rail. Of course, he will get no quarrel from me or other colleagues, I suspect, in arguing for improved service and arguing for making the service more attractive.

What we are dealing with here—and have been through this whole debate—is a number of colleagues who simply want to defund passenger rail in this country, overlooking the fact that every mode of transportation is subsidized to some degree and that the national interest requires diverse modes of transportation.

Colleagues seem intent on singling out passenger rail for elimination, and we have had amendments offered to this bill that would do just that.

This one is more about micromanagement. It is more about a specific route, the Sunset Limited. This would eliminate the Sunset Limited's long-distance route. It serves communities along the southern tier of the United States. Actually, it serves more than 300,000 passengers annually in five States: Louisiana, Arizona, Texas, New Mexico, and California.

It is no way to run a railroad, if I might say so, and I urge rejection of the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Chairman, that is 300,000 times \$405.67 for every single ticket.

I am not trying to micromanage, nor am I trying to kill Amtrak. I vote for Amtrak; I am for Amtrak, but they also want more and more and need more and more resources to help in their north-south line in the East Coast and the West Coast.

What they are doing is bleeding off their hard-earned money, using the subsidy rather than doing what their original mission should be.

Mr. Chair, I think I support all of Amtrak, and I am for it. This is not micromanaging. It is showing them the obvious things which they need to accomplish.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. MAXINE WATERS OF CALIFORNIA

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to carry out section 210 of this Act with respect to the Housing Authority of the county of Los Angeles, California.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentlewoman from California and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer an amendment that removes the exemption that the Housing Authority of the County of Los Angeles currently has from the requirement to have a resident of public housing or Section 8 on its governing board.

I am offering this amendment because I have learned that HACoLA is not in compliance with requirements outlined in this exemption, which has directly resulted in a lack of meaningful engagement by residents of the housing authority on important policy issues affecting the effectiveness of the programs that it administers.

In 1998, Congress passed a law requiring that the governing body of a public housing authority must include at least one member who is directly assisted by the housing authority. This provision was an important recognition of the need for the perspective and participation of tenants in the governance of public housing authorities. It is as simple as that.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for an "aye" vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MAXINE WATERS).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SESSIONS

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill, before the short title, insert the following new section:

SEC. 416. None of the funds made available by this Act shall be used to support any Amtrak route whose costs exceed 2 times its revenues, as based on the National Railroad Passenger Corporation Fiscal Years 2014–2018 Five Year Plan from April 2014.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Texas and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Chairman, once again, I stand in trying to help Amtrak to effectively manage its system by taking away those routes that are cost prohibitive.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment would eliminate funding for Amtrak's long-distance routes, which have total direct costs that are more than twice the revenue that they generate. Every single long-distance route that Amtrak provides—those of over 400 miles in length—operates at a loss every month. Eleven routes cost double the amount of revenue they create.

Oh, by the way, Mr. Chair—and this is true since 1997 when I came to Congress—these routes are ineffective and waste valuable taxpayer money, as well as money that could be used in the system for highly used routes for the safety and security of their passengers on north-south routes.

Some argue that many travelers cannot afford to fly and they need a less expensive travel alternative. However, for most of these routes, bus tickets and plane tickets are less expensive, more efficient, and more frequently on time.

Combined, these 11 routes cost the American taxpayer about \$500 million in fiscal year 2014 alone. Four lines cost over \$50 million each. I think it is clear that government-subsidized rail service on Amtrak does not make economic sense if they have enough money to bleed off \$500 million with routes that cost twice in expense what they generate in revenue, so I am offering this amendment again.

I urge all of my colleagues to support this amendment and the underlying legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment offered by our friend from Texas. This amendment outdoes his last one.

We are now talking about eliminating nine routes, with a total ridership of over 2 million people: the Cardinal and Capitol Limited routes from D.C. to Chicago, through West Virginia, Pennsylvania, Kentucky, Ohio, Indiana; the Southern Crescent, New York City to New Orleans; the Coast Starlight, along the coast of California, Oregon, and Washington.

To elaborate further on our opposition, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy. I appreciate him referencing the Coast Starlight.

This is a self-fulfilling prophecy. Congress has created a difficult situation for Amtrak, consistently short-changing maintenance and capital.

As my good friend from North Carolina points out, all modes of transportation in this country are subsidized by the public. Amtrak is no exception. It provides a variety of services for people.

We are watching on the West Coast ridership increase. It provides an important opportunity for businesspeople. If you talk to businesspeople in Seattle, in Portland, they would say they would like the Federal Government to invest more. It has made a big difference for how they conduct business.

Part of the strength is having a network. Make no mistake, we are, in fact, going to have a passenger rail network in the United States, despite consistent efforts to chop away and minimize it.

China, 6 years ago, had no high-speed rail. Today, they are moving more passengers than the entire air fleet in the United States. We will have higher speed rail, but the question is whether we are going to build on what we have got—American built, American managed—or we will wait until it deteriorates, gets so bad that we end up with a design-build to China, paying more, shipping the profits and the work overseas.

I would suggest it is far better to protect what we have now, build on the progress, not undo the network, and most certainly reject this amendment.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I thank the gentleman.

I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JOYCE).

Mr. JOYCE. I oppose the gentleman's amendment. This amendment has far-reaching implications, and it would shut down 9 of 15 long-distance routes.

I do not believe that an appropriations bill is the place to do this. This would need to be carefully debated and discussed by the committee of jurisdiction.

For these reasons, I urge a "no" vote on the amendment.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Chairman, look, I made a mistake. I came here from business. I came here as somebody that had to operate within the bounds of common sense and doing things that made sense with money and opportunities.

I will just say to you, Mr. Chairman, I am going to stay after this issue. I am all for Amtrak, but not when they continue to have routes that cost twice what the revenue is.

This is what our airlines did for a long time. They provided service, and they went broke, and then we want to turn around and say we are going to subsidize the airlines. Marketplace ideas work, and that is why we are a capitalist country.

I urge my colleagues to think over this commonsense amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1100

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SCHIFF

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill, (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available by this Act shall be used to enforce section 47524 of title 49, United States Code, or part 161 of title 14, Code of Federal Regulations, with regard to noise or access restrictions or to enforce section 47107 of title 49, United States Code, with regard to access restriction on the operation of aircraft by the operate of Bob Hope Airport in Burbank, California.

Mr. SCHIFF (during the reading). Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from California and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to urge my colleagues to support the amendment that I am offering along with my southern California colleague, Mr. SHERMAN.

The amendment would allow the Burbank Bob Hope Airport to implement a nighttime curfew between 10 p.m. and 7 a.m. and restore local control to the community that has been denied to them for decades.

Thousands of residents of southern California's San Fernando Valley who live under the flight paths or near the terminals at the Bob Hope Airport endure the house-shaking noise of air traffic during the day and suffer the jarring interruption of their sleep that is caused by a roaring jet taking off or landing.

I want to also distinguish this measure. I know my colleagues have heard some other curfew measures today, and without detracting from them, I want to point out that the facts of this one are quite different. This is, I think, a unique case in the case of Burbank airport.

When Congress passed the 1990 Airport Noise and Control Act, ANCA, it intended to permit airports to implement noise restrictions if they met certain requirements. At that time, Congress exempted several airports from the law's requirements for FAA approval of new noise rules if they had preexisting noise rules in effect to address local concerns. So airports were

grandfathered in when ANCA was passed; but because of a mistake, Bob Hope Airport, which had a curfew in place, did not get grandfathered in.

The Bob Hope Airport in Burbank was one of the first airports in the country, in fact, to impose a curfew and has a long history of curfews but, unfortunately, was not given the protection of the grandfather provision of ANCA that several other similar airports received. This amendment would correct this inequity and put Bob Hope on the same footing as several other airports across the country that had curfews before ANCA's passage.

It doesn't set a precedent in terms of other airports, and this would be uniquely confined to the situation involving Bob Hope. By correcting the omission of not allowing Bob Hope Airport to implement on a permanent and mandatory basis curfew which it had, in effect, informally in the 1980s, we would return local control to the community that has sought it for years.

It is also important for my colleagues to understand the impact this will have on aviation in southern California. There will be no impact on commercial flights—zero. Almost all commercial airlines already voluntarily abide by the voluntary curfew at Bob Hope, and the impact on general aviation will be limited to two nighttime landings. The impact, however, will be significant for people trying to get sleep that are disrupted by those small number of flights.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from southern California (Mr. SHERMAN), my colleague.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for putting forward this amendment.

Bob Hope is a local neighborhood airport. Only through a technicality was it denied a curfew. All the commercial carriers already adhere to that curfew. We have a handful of nighttime flights that could easily go through one of the larger airports in the Los Angeles area.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is a good balance between the needs for commercial aviation on the one hand and the need to sleep on the other.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, I just want to make one final point. This amendment had bipartisan support last year. It came within just three or four votes of passage. Because of the unique situation facing the Burbank Airport, I would urge unique consideration of correcting the injustice when Bob Hope was not grandfathered as it should have been.

Mr. Chairman, I urge support of the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF).

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

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. POSEY

Mr. POSEY. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. 416. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Department of Transportation to authorize exempt facility bonds to finance passenger rail projects which do not use vehicles that are reasonably expected to be capable of attaining a maximum speed in excess of 150 miles per hour between scheduled stops as defined in section 142 of title 26, United States Code.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Florida and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. POSEY. Mr. Chairman, exempt facility bonds are special tax-exempt financing instruments designed to help raise funds for important infrastructure projects like airports, waste management facilities, highways, and other transportation needs.

In fact our current law, 26 U.S.C. Section 142, clearly lists 15 specific categories of projects that can receive financing through the use of exempt facility bonds.

One area where the law restricts the ability of the Department of Transportation to authorize exempt facility bonds is to finance passenger rail, which it limits to high-speed rail that can reasonably attain the speed of 150 miles per hour between stops. Yet the Department of Transportation has decided to ignore the law and authorize bonds for projects that clearly do not qualify.

Whatever views Members have on passenger rail, my amendment would simply ensure that the Department of Transportation follows the law in authorizing the use of tax-exempt bonds, and I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense amendment.

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

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. All in Florida received a private activity bond allocation to issue these bonds. There is no provision in this particular section of U.S. Code that requires a passenger rail project to achieve 150 miles per hour. This amendment would prevent DOT from taking any potential further steps on this very, very important project. If for some reason, let's say the project needed a small extension, DOT could not process it.

Now, the passenger rail line that would link Miami to Orlando, frankly,

is an important project to the State of Florida and one that I fully support, Mr. Chairman. We have to remember it is being done by the private sector. So I don't think that we should be looking at creating any unnecessary restrictions, any barriers or uncertainty for this project as it moves forward. It is a project—potentially, I think, the first of its kind in the country—where you have the private sector assuming most, if not almost all, of the risk. You have the private sector who is going to be involved in it. The numbers can't be made up, cooked or anything, because it is the private sector who is doing this and who will ultimately be held accountable by their shareholders.

Mr. Chairman, I respectfully ask for a "no" vote on this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. POSEY. Mr. Chairman, with all due respect, there is nothing in this amendment that adds any restrictive impediments whatsoever. It only requires that the Department of Transportation follow the law when they allocate these funds.

Although this is being called a private project, the taxpayers will be on the hook for over \$1.7 billion—that is \$1.7 billion. So I think it is important in the interests of protecting our taxpayers, certainly, that we make sure the Department of Transportation follows the law.

If there weren't a propensity already demonstrated not to follow the law, then I would not have to bother with this amendment. But it is clear there are some intentions to violate the provisions of the law and do things that they are not authorized to do. That is why I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense amendment to bring accountability and protect taxpayers for \$1.7 billion.

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

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

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BLUMENAUER

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill, before the short title, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . The amount otherwise provided by this Act for necessary expenses for the "Department of Transportation, Office of the Secretary, Salaries and Expenses" is hereby reduced by \$1.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Oregon and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, my heart goes out to the chairman and ranking member for the task that they have been given. People have appropriately condemned and opposed many of the provisions. As people dig into the bill, the more they see, the worse it looks: slashing TIGER grant funding, no funding for high-speed rail, cutting Amtrak, and overall reductions. No wonder it has drawn a veto threat. But it is definitely not the fault of the committee. They have been given an impossible task. They have been requested to finance the Federal Government's transportation responsibilities in 2015 with 1993 dollars.

Our country is falling apart while we are falling behind the rest of the world. We are of a generation when some of us can remember the United States having the finest infrastructure in the world. We had rail passenger service, airlines, superb highways and transit. Those days have long since passed. We are watching the deterioration of transit. The squabbling here over Amtrak is really dealing with a failing system because it is a symptom of our inability to invest in the future—just one, but a very glaring symbol.

Sadly, Mr. Chairman, in the 55 months that my Republican friends have taken over Congress, we have not had a single hearing in the Ways and Means Committee, on which I serve, for our responsibility for funding transportation. We have not increased the gas tax in 22 years.

Mr. Chairman, in the last 6 months, six Republican States have raised the gas tax, and we can't even have a hearing on a proposal that is supported by the U.S. Chamber, by the AFL-CIO, by the AAA, the truckers, contractors, transit, bicyclists, and everybody in between. As a result, we continue to limp along.

What did we do late last month? We extended the transportation funding for the 33rd time on a short-term basis. What country ever became great building its infrastructure 6 months at a time? We will be dealing with this in another 2 months.

Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that we deal with this bill as best we do, because it is not adequate. I am going to oppose it. But the bill is a symptom of the failure of my Republican colleagues to face what other entities have done, including red Republican States.

Why don't we come back next week and put the Ways and Means Committee to work for a week, inviting in the people who build, maintain, and use our infrastructure, listen to them, let the committee do its work, and come up with a proposal that will adequately fund our infrastructure?

□ 1115

Then we can have the authorizing committee not mess around with a couple of months' extension but get down

to work to fashion a 6-year, comprehensive transportation bill that will put hundreds of thousands of people to work in communities all across the country, making them more livable, making our families safer, healthier, and more economically secure.

We shouldn't be caught in this trap of our own making. Let's step up, invest in the future, and do our job.

Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. POSEY

Mr. POSEY. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. 416. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Department of Transportation to make a loan in an amount that exceeds \$600,000,000 under title V of the Railroad Revitalization and Regulatory Reform Act of 1976 (45 U.S.C. 821 et seq.).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Florida and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. POSEY. Mr. Chairman, the Railroad Rehabilitation & Improvement Financing program, or RRIF program, provides direct loans and loan guarantees to finance the development of railroad infrastructure. Under the program, the Federal Railroad Administration is authorized to provide direct loans and loan guarantees of up to \$35 billion to finance development of railroad infrastructure.

Since 2002, the Federal Railroad Administration has made 35 loans which demonstrate the importance of this program to our Nation's railroads. No doubt about that. However, only five of these loans have ever met or exceeded \$100 million. Two of those were to Amtrak. In fact, prior to this year, the largest RRIF loan ever made was to Amtrak in 2011 for \$562 million.

My amendment ensures funds are spent responsibly on viable railroad projects and taxpayer risk is minimized by limiting loan amounts to \$600 million.

I urge my colleagues to support my fiscally responsible amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, this amendment prohibits the Department of Transportation from making a Railroad Rehabilitation & Improvement Financing loan that exceeds \$600 million, as the chairman said.

Now, I know that \$600 million, frankly, is a lot of money, and it sounds like

a lot of money because it is; but when we are dealing with financing of railroad projects, it is just really not. This low loan ceiling is way too restrictive, and it would eliminate valuable projects, by the way, including some safety projects from being even considered for a loan. It has really far-reaching effects, and it could impact, frankly, every railroad entity in America. For example, there are railroads that are using this RRIF loan for positive train control—for positive train control.

So, again, it is unduly restrictive. I think it could have some far-reaching, negative effects. So I would respectfully ask for a "no" vote. I cannot support this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE).

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I thank the subcommittee chairman for yielding.

I simply want to underscore his opposition to this amendment. It would block Amtrak's loan request for \$2.5 billion for new Acela high-speed train sets. This loan would make it possible to upgrade Amtrak's best and most profitable service, but one that is severely stressed.

We need to remind ourselves that the cars in which people died in Philadelphia were 40 years old. We desperately need the kind of investment that this loan would make possible. As the chairman has stressed, this may turn out to be the way that we can fund positive train control. It may be the only way, given other limitations in the bill, other limitations in Amtrak funding.

It would prevent loans that exceed \$600 million for other purposes, including safety purposes. This is a very, very ill-advised amendment. I urge colleagues to reject it.

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

Mr. POSEY. Mr. Chairman, it has been said that this could be restrictive. Well, I just want to point out that never, ever before this year in the history of this program have they ever loaned \$600 million under this program, and so I don't think it is unduly restrictive.

I mentioned discussing some other amendments, and I am staring down the barrel of taxpayers being on the hook for \$1.7 billion on one program that clearly is not going to be able to repay the loan, so it is going to fall on the shoulders of the taxpayer.

I think it is just common sense that we take this measure on behalf of our honest, hard-working taxpayers at home. They work hard and play by the home. I think we should respect that.

There are some people that just consider the Federal Government to be a big pinata, and everybody is going to take their whack at it and get all the goodies and the candy and the money that falls out of it, but this money has got to be paid back some day. We are

not going to do it. We are not going to be around here to do it. It is going to be paid back by our children, and I think we need to act responsibly and think about their future.

I urge my colleagues to please support this commonsense amendment for better accountability in our government.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. POSEY. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida will be postponed.

The Committee will rise informally.

The Speaker pro tempore (Ms. ROSLEHTINEN) assumed the chair.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agreed to the following resolution:

S. RES. 191

In the Senate of the United States, June 3, 2015.

Whereas Joseph Robinette "Beau" Biden, III, born in Wilmington, Delaware and a graduate of the University of Pennsylvania and Syracuse University law school, served our country as an attorney in the Department of Justice for seven years, including assisting the nation of Kosovo in rebuilding their criminal justice system;

Whereas Beau Biden served his beloved State of Delaware for eight years as Attorney General;

Whereas Beau Biden joined the Army in 2003 at the age of 34, rose to the rank of major in the Delaware Army National Guard's Judge Advocate General Corps, deployed to Iraq in 2008 and received the Bronze Star for his service;

Whereas Beau Biden leaves behind a beloved wife, Hallie, and two children, Natalie and Hunter;

Whereas Beau Biden was the eldest son of the former Senator from Delaware and current Vice President of the United States and President of the United States Senate, Joseph Robinette Biden, Jr.: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow and deep regret the announcement of the untimely death of Joseph Robinette Biden, III.

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate communicate this resolution to the House of Representatives and transmit an enrolled copy thereof to the family of the Vice President of the United States.

The message also announced that the Senate has agreed to without amendment a concurrent resolution of he House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 48. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for a ceremony to commemorate the 50th anniversary of the Vietnam War.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Committee will resume its sitting.

TRANSPORTATION, HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2016

The Committee resumed its sitting.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. POE of Texas). Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment by Mr. MCCLINTOCK of California.

Amendment by Mr. WALBERG of Michigan.

Amendment by Ms. ESTY of Connecticut.

Amendment by Mr. CARTWRIGHT of Pennsylvania.

Amendment by Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey.

Amendment by Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.

Amendment by Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.

Amendment by Mrs. CAPPS of California.

Amendment by Ms. LEE of California.

Amendment by Mr. STIVERS of Ohio.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MCCLINTOCK

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 166, noes 255, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 298]

AYES—166

Abraham	Cook	Grothman
Allen	Cooper	Guinta
Amash	Crawford	Hardy
Babin	Culberson	Harris
Barr	Denham	Heck (NV)
Bilirakis	DeSantis	Hensarling
Bishop (MI)	DesJarlais	Herrera Beutler
Black	Duncan (SC)	Hice, Jody B.
Blackburn	Duncan (TN)	Hill
Brat	Ellmers (NC)	Himes
Bridenstine	Emmer (MN)	Holding
Brooks (AL)	Farenthold	Hudson
Brooks (IN)	Fincher	Huizenga (MI)
Buchanan	Fleischmann	Hultgren
Buck	Fleming	Hunter
Burgess	Flores	Hurd (TX)
Byrne	Forbes	Hurt (VA)
Carter (GA)	Foxx	Issa
Castor (FL)	Franks (AZ)	Jenkins (KS)
Chabot	Garrett	Johnson, Sam
Chaffetz	Gibbs	Jones
Clawson (FL)	Gohmert	Jordan
Coffman	Goodlatte	Kelly (PA)
Cohen	Gowdy	Kinzinger (IL)
Collins (GA)	Graves (GA)	Kline
Collins (NY)	Graves (LA)	Labrador
Conaway	Grayson	LaMalfa
Connolly	Griffith	Lamborn

Lance	Pittenger
Latta	Poe (TX)
Long	Polis
Loudermilk	Pompeo
Love	Posey
MacArthur	Price, Tom
Marchant	Ratcliffe
Massie	Reed
McCarthy	Renacci
McCaul	Ribble
McClintock	Rice (SC)
McHenry	Roby
McSally	Roe (TN)
Meadows	Rogers (AL)
Meehan	Rohrabacher
Messer	Rokita
Mica	Rooney (FL)
Miller (FL)	Roskam
Miller (MI)	Ross
Mulvaney	Rouzer
Neugebauer	Royce
Newhouse	Russell
Nunes	Ryan (OH)
Olson	Ryan (WI)
Palazzo	Salmon
Palmer	Sanford
Paulsen	Scalise
Perry	Schweikert

NOES—255

Aderholt	Donovan
Aguilar	Duckworth
Amodei	Duffy
Ashford	Edwards
Barletta	Ellison
Barton	Engel
Bass	Eshoo
Beatty	Esty
Becerra	Farr
Benishek	Fattah
Bera	Fitzpatrick
Beyer	Fortenberry
Bishop (GA)	Foster
Bishop (UT)	Frankel (FL)
Blum	Frelinghuysen
Blumenauer	Fudge
Bonamici	Gabbard
Bost	Gallego
Boustany	Garamendi
Boyle, Brendan	Gibson
F.	Gosar
Brady (PA)	Graham
Brown (FL)	Granger
Brownley (CA)	Graves (MO)
Bucshon	Green, Al
Bustos	Green, Gene
Butterfield	Grijalva
Calvert	Guthrie
Capps	Gutiérrez
Capuano	Hahn
Cárdenas	Hanna
Carney	Harper
Carson (IN)	Hartzler
Carter (TX)	Hastings
Cartwright	Heck (WA)
Castro (TX)	Higgins
Chu, Judy	Hinojosa
Cicilline	Honda
Clark (MA)	Hoyer
Clarke (NY)	Huelskamp
Clay	Huffman
Cleaver	Israel
Clyburn	Jeffries
Cole	Jenkins (WV)
Comstock	Johnson (GA)
Costa	Johnson (OH)
Costello (PA)	Johnson, E. B.
Courtney	Jolly
Cramer	Joyce
Crenshaw	Kaptur
Crowley	Katko
Cuellar	Keating
Cummings	Kelly (IL)
Curbelo (FL)	Kennedy
Davis (CA)	Kildee
Davis, Danny	Kilmer
Davis, Rodney	Kind
DeFazio	King (IA)
DeGette	King (NY)
Delaney	Kirkpatrick
DeLauro	Knight
DeBene	Kuster
Dent	Langevin
DeSaulnier	Larsen (WA)
Dowdy	Larson (CT)
Diaz-Balart	Lawrence
Dingell	Lee
Doggett	Levin
Dold	Lewis

Scott, Austin	Sanchez, Loretta
Sensenbrenner	Sarbanes
Sessions	Schakowsky
Smith (MO)	Schiff
Smith (TX)	Schrader
Stutzman	Scott (VA)
Thornberry	Scott, David
Tiberi	Serrano
Trott	Sewell (AL)
Upton	Sherman
Wagner	Shimkus
Walberg	Shuster
Walden	Simpson
Walker	Sinema
Walorski	Sires
Walters, Mimi	Slaughter
Webster (FL)	Smith (NE)
Wenstrup	Smith (WA)
Westmoreland	Speier
Williams	
Wittman	
Woodall	
Yoder	
Yoho	
Young (IA)	
Young (IN)	

Stefanik	Velázquez
Stivers	Visclosky
Swalwell (CA)	Walz
Takai	Wasserman
Takano	Schultz
Thompson (CA)	Waters, Maxine
Thompson (MS)	Watson Coleman
Thompson (PA)	Weber (TX)
Tipton	Welch
Titus	Westerman
Tonko	Whitfield
Torres	Wilson (SC)
Tsongas	Womack
Turner	Yarmuth
Valadao	Young (AK)
Van Hollen	Zeldin
Vargas	Zinke
Veasey	
Vela	

NOT VOTING—11

Adams	Jackson Lee	Stewart
Brady (TX)	Meeks	Wilson (FL)
Conyers	Nugent	
Doyle, Michael	Rice (NY)	
F.	Smith (NJ)	

□ 1151

Messrs. SHIMKUS, RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, CALVERT, WEBER of Texas, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. CLEAVER, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mrs. NOEM, and Mr. STIVERS changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Messrs. PALAZZO, GOHMERT, and FARENTHOLD changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WALBERG

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. POE of Texas). The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 235, noes 189, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 299]

AYES—235

Abraham	Buck	DeSantis
Aderholt	Bucshon	DesJarlais
Allen	Byrne	Diaz-Balart
Amash	Calvert	Dold
Amodei	Carter (GA)	Donovan
Babin	Carter (TX)	Duffy
Barletta	Chabot	Duncan (SC)
Barr	Clawson (FL)	Duncan (TN)
Barton	Coffman	Ellmers (NC)
Benishek	Cole	Emmer (MN)
Bilirakis	Collins (GA)	Farenthold
Bishop (MI)	Collins (NY)	Fincher
Bishop (UT)	Comstock	Fitzpatrick
Black	Conaway	Fleischmann
Blackburn	Cook	Fleming
Blum	Costello (PA)	Flores
Bost	Cramer	Forbes
Boustany	Crawford	Fortenberry
Brat	Crenshaw	Foxx
Bridenstine	Culberson	Franks (AZ)
Brooks (AL)	Curbelo (FL)	Frelinghuysen
Brooks (IN)	Davis, Rodney	Gabbard
Buchanan	Denham	Garrett

Gibbs Luetkemeyer
 Gibson Lummis
 Gohmert Marchant
 Goodlatte Marino
 Gosar McCarthy
 Gowdy McCaul
 Granger McClintock
 Graves (GA) McHenry
 Graves (LA) McMorris
 Graves (MO) Rodgers
 Griffith McSally
 Grothman Meadows
 Guinta Meehan
 Guthrie Messer
 Hardy Miller (FL)
 Harper Miller (MI)
 Harris Moonenar
 Hartzler Mullin
 Hensarling Mulvaney
 Herrera Beutler Murphy (PA)
 Hice, Jody B. Neugebauer
 Hill Newhouse
 Holding Noem
 Hudson Norcross
 Huelskamp Nunes
 Huizenga (MI) Olson
 Hultgren Palazzo
 Hunter Palmer
 Hurd (TX) Paulsen
 Hurt (VA) Pearce
 Issa Perry
 Jenkins (KS) Peterson
 Jenkins (WV) Pittenger
 Johnson (OH) Pitts
 Johnson, Sam Poe (TX)
 Jolly Poliquin
 Jones Polis
 Jordan Pompeo
 Joyce Posey
 Katko Price, Tom
 Kelly (PA) Ratcliffe
 King (IA) Reed
 King (NY) Reichert
 Kinzinger (IL) Renacci
 Kline Ribble
 Knight Rice (SC)
 Labrador Rigell
 LaMalfa Roby
 Lamborn Roe (TN)
 Lance Rogers (AL)
 Latta Rogers (KY)
 LoBiondo Rohrabacher
 Long Rokita
 Loudermilk Rooney (FL)
 Love Ros-Lehtinen
 Lucas Roskam

NOES—189

Aguilar Cummings
 Ashford Davis (CA)
 Bass Davis, Danny
 Beatty DeFazio
 Becerra DeGette
 Bera Delaney
 Beyer DeLauro
 Bishop (GA) DeBise
 Blumenauer Dent
 Bonamici DeSaulnier
 Boyle, Brendan Deutch
 F. Dingell
 Brady (PA) Doggett
 Brown (FL) Duckworth
 Brownley (CA) Edwards
 Burgess Ellison
 Bustos Engel
 Butterfield Eshoo
 Capps Esty
 Capuano Farr
 Cárdenas Fattah
 Carney Foster
 Carson (IN) Frankel (FL)
 Cartwright Fudge
 Castor (FL) Gallego
 Castro (TX) Garamendi
 Chaffetz Graham
 Chu, Judy Grayson
 Cicilline Green, Al
 Clark (MA) Green, Gene
 Clarke (NY) Grijalva
 Clay Gutiérrez
 Cleaver Hahn
 Clyburn Hanna
 Cohen Hastings
 Connolly Heck (NV)
 Cooper Heck (WA)
 Costa Higgins
 Courtney Himes
 Crowley Hinojosa
 Cuellar Honda

Ross
 Rothfus
 Rouzer
 Royce
 Russell
 Ryan (WI)
 Salmon
 Sanford
 Scalise
 Schweikert
 Scott, Austin
 Meadows Sensenbrenner
 Meehan Shimkus
 Messer Shuster
 Miller (FL) Simpson
 Miller (MI) Sinema
 Harris Smith (MO)
 Hartzler Smith (NE)
 Hensarling Smith (TX)
 Herrera Beutler Stefaniak
 Hice, Jody B. Stivers
 Hill Stutzman
 Holding Thompson (PA)
 Hudson Thornberry
 Huelskamp Tiberi
 Huizenga (MI) Tipton
 Hultgren Torres
 Hunter Palmer
 Hurd (TX) Paulsen
 Hurt (VA) Pearce
 Issa Perry
 Jenkins (KS) Peterson
 Jenkins (WV) Pittenger
 Johnson (OH) Pitts
 Johnson, Sam Poe (TX)
 Jolly Poliquin
 Jones Polis
 Jordan Pompeo
 Joyce Posey
 Katko Price, Tom
 Kelly (PA) Ratcliffe
 King (IA) Reed
 King (NY) Reichert
 Kinzinger (IL) Renacci
 Kline Ribble
 Knight Rice (SC)
 Labrador Rigell
 LaMalfa Roby
 Lamborn Roe (TN)
 Lance Rogers (AL)
 Latta Rogers (KY)
 LoBiondo Rohrabacher
 Long Rokita
 Loudermilk Rooney (FL)
 Love Ros-Lehtinen
 Lucas Roskam

McKinley
 McNerney
 Meeks
 Meng
 Mica
 Mooney (WV)
 Moore
 Moulton
 Murphy (FL)
 Nadler
 Napolitano
 Neal
 Nolan
 O'Rourke
 Pallone
 Pascrell
 Payne
 Pelosi
 Perlmutter
 Peters
 Pingree
 Pocan
 Price (NC)
 Quigley

NOT VOTING—8

Adams
 Brady (TX)
 Conyers

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
 There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1157

Messrs. MULLIN, RICE of South Carolina, and BOST changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 299 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yes.”

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. ESTY

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. ESTY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. Members are reminded that the 2-minute voting limit will be strictly enforced. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and a result was announced. The vote was subsequently vacated by order of the Committee, and the amendment was disposed of by rollcall No. 308.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 300, had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CARTWRIGHT

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. CARTWRIGHT) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 176, noes 247, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 301]

AYES—176

Aguilar	Gallego	O'Rourke
Bass	Garamendi	Pallone
Beatty	Graham	Pascrell
Becerra	Grayson	Payne
Bera	Green, Al	Pelosi
Beyer	Green, Gene	Peters
Bishop (GA)	Griffith	Pingree
Blumenauer	Grijalva	Pocan
Bonamici	Hahn	Poe (TX)
Boyle, Brendan	Heck (WA)	Polis
F.	Higgins	Price (NC)
Brady (PA)	Himes	Price, Tom
Brown (FL)	Hinojosa	Quigley
Brownley (CA)	Honda	Rangel
Bustos	Hoyer	Rice (NY)
Butterfield	Huffman	Richmond
Capps	Israel	Roybal-Allard
Capuano	Jeffries	Ruiz
Cárdenas	Johnson (GA)	Ruppersberger
Carney	Johnson, E. B.	Rush
Carson (IN)	Joyce	Ryan (OH)
Carter (GA)	Kaptur	Sánchez, Linda
Cartwright	Keating	T.
Castor (FL)	Kelly (IL)	Sanchez, Loretta
Castro (TX)	Kennedy	Sarbanes
Chu, Judy	Kildee	Schakowsky
Cicilline	Kilmer	Schiff
Clark (MA)	Kind	Scott (VA)
Clay	Kuster	Scott, David
Cleaver	Langevin	Serrano
Clyburn	Larsen (WA)	Sewell (AL)
Cohen	Larson (CT)	Sherman
Connolly	Lee	Sires
Conyers	Levin	Slaughter
Cooper	Lieu, Ted	Smith (NE)
Courtney	LoBiondo	Smith (NJ)
Crowley	Loeb sack	Smith (WA)
Cummings	Lofgren	Speier
Davis (CA)	Lowenthal	Swalwell (CA)
Davis, Danny	Lowey	Takai
DeFazio	Lujan Grisham	Takano
DeGette	(NM)	Thompson (CA)
Delaney	Luján, Ben Ray	Thompson (MS)
DeLauro	(NM)	Titus
DelBene	Lynch	Tonko
DeSaulnier	Maloney,	Torres
Deutch	Carolyn	Tsongas
Dingell	Maloney, Sean	Van Hollen
Doggett	Matsui	Vargas
Duckworth	McCollum	Veasey
Edwards	McDermott	Vela
Ellison	McGovern	Velázquez
Engel	Meeks	Visclosky
Eshoo	Meng	Wasserman
Esty	Moore	Schultz
Farr	Moulton	Waters, Maxine
Fattah	Murphy (FL)	Watson Coleman
Fitzpatrick	Nadler	Welch
Foster	Napolitano	Whitfield
Frankel (FL)	Neal	Yarmuth
Gabbard	Norcross	

NOES—247

Abraham	Boustany	Collins (GA)
Aderholt	Brat	Collins (NY)
Allen	Bridenstine	Comstock
Amash	Brooks (AL)	Conaway
Amodei	Brooks (IN)	Cook
Ashford	Buchanan	Costa
Babin	Buck	Costello (PA)
Barletta	Bucshon	Cramer
Barr	Burgess	Crawford
Barton	Byrne	Crenshaw
Benishek	Calvert	Cuellar
Bilirakis	Carter (TX)	Culberson
Bishop (MI)	Chabot	Curbelo (FL)
Bishop (UT)	Chaffetz	Davis, Rodney
Black	Clarke (NY)	Denham
Blackburn	Clawson (FL)	Dent
Blum	Coffman	DeSantis
Bost	Cole	DesJarlais

Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Katko
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)

NOT VOTING—9

Adams
Brady (TX)
Doyle, Michael
F.

Gutiérrez
Jackson Lee
Noem
Nugent

□ 1203

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mrs. NOEM. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 301, had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Chair, on June 4, 2015 I inadvertently voted “yea” on rollcall No. 301. I would like to state that I intended to vote “no.”

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GARRETT

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 160, noes 266, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 302]

AYES—160

Abraham
Allen
Amash
Ashford
Babin
Barr
Barton
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blum
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Burgess
Byrne
Carter (GA)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cramer
Crawford
DeSantis
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Duncan (SC)
Emmer (MN)
Fincher
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Franks (AZ)
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Olson

NOES—266

Aderholt
Aguilar
Amodei
Barletta
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Black
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bost
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brown (FL)
Bucshon
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Capps
Capuano

Ellmers (NC)
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Foster
Foxy
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gallego
Garamendi
Gibbs
Gibson
Granger
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hardy
Harper
Hastings
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Hultgren
Hunter
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Rothfus
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Smith (MO)
Smith (TX)
Stutzman
Thornberry
Tipton
Torres
Wagner
Walberg
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Woodall
Yoder
Young (IN)
Zinke

NOT VOTING—6

Adams
Brady (TX)

NOT VOTING—6

Doyle, Michael
F.
Jackson Lee

□ 1207

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROOKS OF ALABAMA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BROOKS) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 143, noes 283, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 303]

AYES—143

Aderholt	Hartzler	Pearce
Allen	Heck (NV)	Perry
Amash	Hensarling	Pittenger
Babin	Hice, Jody B.	Polis
Barton	Hill	Pompeo
Benishek	Holding	Posey
Bilirakis	Hudson	Price, Tom
Bishop (UT)	Huelskamp	Ratcliffe
Black	Huizenga (MI)	Ribble
Blackburn	Hultgren	Rice (SC)
Blum	Hunter	Roby
Brat	Hurd (TX)	Roe (TN)
Bridenstine	Hurt (VA)	Rogers (AL)
Brooks (AL)	Issa	Rohrabacher
Brooks (IN)	Jenkins (KS)	Rooney (FL)
Buchanan	Johnson (OH)	Ross
Buck	Johnson, Sam	Rouzer
Burgess	Jones	Royce
Byrne	Jordan	Russell
Carter (GA)	King (IA)	Ryan (WI)
Chabot	Kline	Salmon
Chaffetz	Knight	Sanford
Clawson (FL)	Labrador	Scalise
Coffman	Lamborn	Schweikert
Collins (GA)	Latta	Schweikert
Conaway	Loudermilk	Scott, Austin
Crawford	Love	Sensenbrenner
DeSantis	Luetkemeyer	Sessions
DesJarlais	Lummis	Smith (MO)
Duffy	Marchant	Smith (NE)
Duncan (SC)	Massie	Smith (TX)
Duncan (TN)	McCaul	Stutzman
Emmer (MN)	McClintock	Thornberry
Fincher	McHenry	Tipton
Fleischmann	McSally	Walker
Fleming	Meadows	Walorski
Flores	Messer	Walters, Mimi
Foxx	Mica	Weber (TX)
Franks (AZ)	Miller (FL)	Webster (FL)
Gohmert	Mooney (WV)	Wenstrup
Goodlatte	Mullin	Westerman
Gosar	Mulvaney	Westmoreland
Gowdy	Neugebauer	Williams
Graves (GA)	Noem	Wilson (SC)
Graves (LA)	Olson	Woodall
Grothman	Palazzo	Yoder
Guthrie	Palmer	Yoho
Harris	Paulsen	Young (IA)

NOES—283

Abraham	Clay	Edwards
Aguilar	Cleaver	Ellison
Amodei	Clyburn	Ellmers (NC)
Ashford	Cohen	Engel
Barletta	Cole	Eshoo
Barr	Collins (NY)	Esty
Bass	Comstock	Farenthold
Beatty	Connolly	Farr
Becerra	Conyers	Fattah
Bera	Cook	Fitzpatrick
Beyer	Cooper	Forbes
Bishop (GA)	Costa	Fortenberry
Bishop (MI)	Costello (PA)	Foster
Blumenauer	Courtney	Frankel (FL)
Bonamici	Cramer	Frelinghuysen
Bost	Crenshaw	Fudge
Boustany	Crowley	Gabbard
Boyle, Brendan F.	Cuellar	Gallego
Brady (PA)	Culberson	Garamendi
Brown (FL)	Cummings	Garrett
Brownley (CA)	Curbelo (FL)	Gibbs
Bucshon	Davis (CA)	Gibson
Bustos	Davis, Danny	Graham
Butterfield	Davis, Rodney	Granger
Calvert	DeFazio	Graves (MO)
Capps	DeGette	Grayson
Capuano	Delaney	Green, Al
Cárdenas	DeLauro	Green, Gene
Carney	DelBene	Griffith
Carson (IN)	Denham	Grijalva
Carter (TX)	Dent	Guinta
Cartwright	DeSaulnier	Gutiérrez
Castor (FL)	Deutch	Hahn
Castro (TX)	Diaz-Balart	Hanna
Chu, Judy	Dingell	Hardy
Ciilline	Doggett	Harper
Clark (MA)	Dold	Hastings
Clarke (NY)	Donovan	Heck (WA)
	Duckworth	Herrera Beutler

Higgins	McGovern	Schiff
Himes	McKinley	Schrader
Hinojosa	McMorris	Scott (VA)
Honda	Rodgers	Scott, David
Hoyer	McNerney	Serrano
Huffman	Meehan	Sewell (AL)
Israel	Meeks	Sherman
Jeffries	Meng	Shimkus
Jenkins (WV)	Miller (MI)	Shuster
Johnson (GA)	Moolenaar	Simpson
Johnson, E. B.	Moore	Sinema
Jolly	Moulton	Sires
Joyce	Murphy (FL)	Slaughter
Kaptur	Murphy (PA)	Smith (NJ)
Katko	Nadler	Smith (WA)
Keating	Napolitano	Speier
Kelly (IL)	Neal	Stefanik
Kelly (PA)	Newhouse	Stivers
Kennedy	Nolan	Swalwell (CA)
Kildee	Norcross	Takai
Kilmer	Nunes	Takano
Kind	O'Rourke	Thompson (CA)
King (NY)	Pallone	Thompson (MS)
Kinzinger (IL)	Pascrell	Thompson (PA)
Kirkpatrick	Payne	Tiberi
Kuster	Pelosi	Titus
LaMalfa	Perlmutter	Tonko
Lance	Peters	Torres
Langevin	Peterson	Trott
Larsen (WA)	Pingree	Tsongas
Larson (CT)	Pitts	Turner
Lawrence	Pocan	Upton
Lee	Poe (TX)	Valadao
Levin	Poliquin	Van Hollen
Lewis	Price (NC)	Vargas
Lieu, Ted	Quigley	Veasey
Lipinski	Rangel	Vela
LoBiondo	Reed	Velázquez
LoBosack	Reichert	Visclosky
Lofgren	Renacci	Wagner
Long	Rice (NY)	Walberg
Lowenthal	Richmond	Walden
Lowe	Rigell	Walz
Lucas	Rogers (KY)	Wasserman
Lujan Grisham (NM)	Rokita	Schultz
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)	Ros-Lehtinen	Waters, Maxine
Lynch	Roskam	Watson Coleman
MacArthur	Rothfus	Welch
Maloney, Carolyn	Roybal-Allard	Whitfield
Maloney, Sean	Ruiz	Wilson (FL)
Marino	Ruppersberger	Wittman
Matsui	Rush	Womack
McCarthy	Ryan (OH)	Yarmuth
McCollum	Sánchez, Linda T.	Young (AK)
McDermott	Sanchez, Loretta	Young (IN)
	Sarbanes	Zeldin
	Schakowsky	Zinke

NOT VOTING—6

Adams	Doyle, Michael	Nugent
Brady (TX)	F.	Stewart
	Jackson Lee	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1211

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROOKS OF ALABAMA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. Brooks) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 139, noes 286, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 304]

AYES—139

Abraham	Harris	Paulsen
Aderholt	Hartzler	Pearce
Allen	Heck (NV)	Perry
Amash	Hensarling	Pittenger
Babin	Hice, Jody B.	Pompeo
Barton	Hill	Posey
Benishek	Holding	Price, Tom
Bilirakis	Hudson	Ratcliffe
Bishop (MI)	Huelskamp	Ribble
Bishop (UT)	Huizenga (MI)	Rice (SC)
Black	Hunter	Roby
Blackburn	Hurd (TX)	Roe (TN)
Blum	Hurt (VA)	Rogers (AL)
Boustany	Issa	Rohrabacher
Brat	Jenkins (KS)	Rooney (FL)
Bridenstine	Johnson (OH)	Ross
Brooks (AL)	Johnson, Sam	Rouzer
Buck	Jones	Royce
Burgess	Jordan	Russell
Byrne	King (IA)	Ryan (WI)
Carter (GA)	Kline	Ryan (WI)
Chabot	Knight	Salmon
Chaffetz	Labrador	Sanford
Clawson (FL)	LaMalfa	Scalise
Coffman	Lamborn	Schweikert
Collins (GA)	Latta	Scott, Austin
Conaway	Loudermilk	Loudermilk
Crawford	Love	Sensenbrenner
DeSantis	Lummis	Smith (MO)
DesJarlais	Marchant	Smith (NE)
Duffy	Massie	Smith (TX)
Duncan (SC)	McCaul	Stutzman
Duncan (TN)	McClintock	Thornberry
Emmer (MN)	McHenry	Tipton
Fincher	McSally	Walker
Fleischmann	Meadows	Walorski
Fleming	Messer	Walters, Mimi
Flores	Mica	Weber (TX)
Foxx	Miller (FL)	Wenstrup
Franks (AZ)	Mooney (WV)	Westerman
Gohmert	Mullin	Westmoreland
Goodlatte	Mulvaney	Williams
Gosar	Neugebauer	Wilson (SC)
Gowdy	Noem	Woodall
Graves (GA)	Olson	Yoho
Graves (LA)	Palazzo	Young (IA)
Grothman	Palmer	

NOES—286

Aguilar	Collins (NY)	Fitzpatrick
Amodei	Comstock	Forbes
Ashford	Connolly	Fortenberry
Barletta	Conyers	Foster
Barr	Cook	Frankel (FL)
Bass	Cooper	Frelinghuysen
Beatty	Costa	Fudge
Becerra	Costello (PA)	Gabbard
Bera	Courtney	Gallego
Beyer	Cramer	Garamendi
Bishop (GA)	Crenshaw	Garrett
Blumenauer	Crowley	Gibbs
Bonamici	Cuellar	Gibson
Bost	Culberson	Graham
Boyle, Brendan F.	Cummings	Granger
Brady (PA)	Curbelo (FL)	Graves (MO)
Brooks (IN)	Davis (CA)	Grayson
Brown (FL)	Davis, Danny	Green, Al
Brownley (CA)	Davis, Rodney	Green, Gene
Buchanan	DeFazio	Griffith
Bucshon	DeGette	Grijalva
Bustos	Delaney	Guinta
Butterfield	DeLauro	Gutiérrez
Calvert	DelBene	Hahn
Capps	Denham	Hanna
Capuano	Dent	Hardy
Cárdenas	DeSaulnier	Harper
Carney	Deutch	Hastings
Carson (IN)	Diaz-Balart	Heck (WA)
Carter (TX)	Dingell	Herrera Beutler
Cartwright	Doggett	Higgins
Castor (FL)	Dold	Himes
Castro (TX)	Donovan	Hinojosa
Chu, Judy	Duckworth	Honda
Ciilline	Edwards	Hoyer
Clark (MA)	Ellison	Huffman
Clarke (NY)	Ellmers (NC)	Hultgren
Clay	Engel	Israel
Cleaver	Eshoo	Jeffries
Clyburn	Esty	Jenkins (WV)
Cohen	Farenthold	Johnson (GA)
Cole	Farr	Johnson, E. B.
	Fattah	Jolly

Joyce	Moolenaar	Sewell (AL)	Bera	Gallego	Neal	Hurd (TX)	Mullin	Schweikert
Kaptur	Moore	Sherman	Beyer	Garamendi	Nolan	Issa	Mulvaney	Scott, Austin
Katko	Moulton	Shimkus	Bishop (GA)	Goodlatte	Norcross	Jenkins (KS)	Murphy (FL)	Sensenbrenner
Keating	Murphy (FL)	Shuster	Blumenauer	Grayson	O'Rourke	Jenkins (WV)	Murphy (PA)	Sessions
Kelly (IL)	Murphy (PA)	Simpson	Bonamici	Green, Al	Pallone	Johnson (OH)	Neugebauer	Shimkus
Kelly (PA)	Nadler	Sinema	Boyle, Brendan	Green, Gene	Pascrell	Johnson, Sam	Newhouse	Shuster
Kennedy	Napolitano	Sires	F.	Grijalva	Payne	Jolly	Noem	Simpson
Kildee	Neal	Slaughter	Brady (PA)	Gutiérrez	Pelosi	Jones	Nunes	Sinema
Kilmer	Newhouse	Smith (NJ)	Brooks (AL)	Hahn	Perlmutter	Jordan	Olson	Smith (MO)
Kind	Nolan	Smith (WA)	Hastings	Brown (FL)	Peters	Joyce	Palazzo	Smith (NE)
King (NY)	Norcross	Speier	Heck (WA)	Brownley (CA)	Peterson	Katko	Palmer	Smith (TX)
Kinzinger (IL)	Nunes	Stefanik	Higgins	Butterfield	Pingree	Kelly (PA)	Paulsen	Stefanik
Kirkpatrick	O'Rourke	Stivers	Himes	Capps	Pitts	King (IA)	Pearce	Stivers
Kuster	Pallone	Swalwell (CA)	Hinojosa	Caputo	Pocan	Kinzinger (IL)	Perry	Stutzman
Lance	Pascrell	Takai	Honda	Capuano	Polis	Kline	Pittenger	Thompson (PA)
Langevin	Payne	Takano	Hoyer	Cárdenas	Price (NC)	Knight	Poe (TX)	Thornberry
Larsen (WA)	Pelosi	Thompson (CA)	Huffman	Carney	Quigley	Labrador	Polliquin	Tiberi
Larson (CT)	Perlmutter	Thompson (MS)	Huizenga (MI)	Carson (IN)	Rangel	LaMalfa	Pompeo	Tipton
Lawrence	Peters	Thompson (PA)	Hurt (VA)	Cartwright	Rice (NY)	Lamborn	Posey	Trott
Lee	Peterson	Titus	Israel	Castor (FL)	Richmond	Lance	Price, Tom	Turner
Levin	Pingree	Titus	Jeffries	Castro (TX)	Richmond	Long	Ratcliffe	Valadao
Lewis	Pitts	Tonko	Johnson (GA)	Chu, Judy	Ruiz	Loudermilk	Reed	Wagner
Lieu, Ted	Pocan	Torres	Johnson, E. B.	Cicilline	Ruppertsberger	Love	Reichert	Walberg
Lipinski	Poe (TX)	Trott	Kaptur	Clark (MA)	Rush	Lucas	Renacci	Walden
LoBiondo	Poliquin	Tsongas	Kelly (IL)	Clarke (NY)	Ryan (OH)	Luetkemeyer	Ribble	Walker
Loebsack	Polis	Turner	Kennedy	Clay	Sánchez, Linda	Lujan Grisham	Rice (SC)	Walorski
Lofgren	Price (NC)	Upton	Kildee	Cleaver	T.	(NM)	Rigell	Walters, Mimi
Long	Quigley	Valadao	Kilmer	Clyburn	Sanchez, Loretta	Luján, Ben Ray	Roby	Weber (TX)
Lowenthal	Rangel	Van Hollen	Kind	Coen	Sarbanes	(NM)	Roe (TN)	Webster (FL)
Lowey	Reed	Vargas	King (NY)	Connolly	Schakowsky	Lummis	Rogers (AL)	Wenstrup
Lucas	Reichert	Veasey	Kirkpatrick	Conyers	Schiff	Marchant	Rogers (KY)	Westerman
Luetkemeyer	Renacci	Vela	Kuster	Cooper	Schrader	Marino	Rohrabacher	Westmoreland
Lujan Grisham	Rice (NY)	Velázquez	Langevin	Costa	Scott (VA)	Massie	Rokita	Whitfield
(NM)	Richmond	Visclosky	Larsen (WA)	Costello (PA)	Scott, David	McCarthy	Rooney (FL)	Williams
Luján, Ben Ray	Rigell	Wagner	Larson (CT)	Courtney	Serrano	McCaul	Ros-Lehtinen	Wilson (SC)
(NM)	Rogers (KY)	Walberg	Latta	Crawford	Sewell (AL)	McClintock	Roskam	Wittman
Lynch	Rokita	Walden	Lawrence	Crowley	Sherman	McHenry	Ross	Womack
MacArthur	Ros-Lehtinen	Walz	Lee	Cummings	Sires	McMorris	Rothfus	Woodall
Maloney,	Roskam	Wasserman	Levin	Davis (CA)	Slaughter	Rodgers	Rouzer	Yoder
Carolyn	Rothfus	Schultz	Lewis	Davis, Danny	Smith (NJ)	McSally	Royce	Yoho
Maloney, Sean	Roybal-Allard	Waters, Maxine	Lieu, Ted	DeFazio	Smith (WA)	Meadows	Russell	Young (AK)
Marino	Ruiz	Watson Coleman	Lipinski	DeGette	Speier	Messer	Ryan (WI)	Young (IA)
Matsui	Ruppertsberger	Webster (FL)	LoBiondo	Delaney	Swalwell (CA)	Mica	Salmon	Young (IN)
McCarthy	Rush	Welch	Loebsack	DeLauro	Takai	Miller (FL)	Sanford	Zeldin
McCollum	Ryan (OH)	Whitfield	Lofgren	DelBene	Takano	Moolenaar	Scalise	Zinke
McDermott	Sánchez, Linda	Wilson (FL)	Lowenthal	Dent	Thompson (CA)			
McGovern	T.	Wittman	Lowe	DeSaulnier	Thompson (MS)			
McKinley	Sanchez, Loretta	Womack	Lynch	Deutch	Titus	Adams	Doyle, Michael	Keating
McMorris	Sarbanes	Yarmuth	MacArthur	Dingell	Tonko	Brady (TX)	F.	Nugent
Rodgers	Schakowsky	Yoder	Maloney,	Doggett	Torres	Cramer	Jackson Lee	Stewart
McNerney	Schiff	Young (AK)	Carolyn	Dold	Tsongas			
Meehan	Schrader	Young (IN)	Maloney, Sean	Donovan	Upton			
Meeks	Scott (VA)	Zeldin	Matsui	Duckworth	Van Hollen			
Meng	Scott, David	Zinke	McCollum	Edwards	Vargas			
Miller (MI)	Serrano		McDermott	Ellison	Veasey			

NOT VOTING—7

Adams	Doyle, Michael	Jackson Lee
Brady (TX)	F.	Nugent
	Graves (LA)	Stewart

□ 1214

So the amendment was rejected.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. CAPPS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 202, noes 222, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 305]

AYES—202

Aguilar	Bass	Becerra
Ashford	Beatty	Benishek

NOES—222

Abraham	Clawson (FL)	Garrett
Aderholt	Coffman	Gibbs
Allen	Cole	Gibson
Amash	Collins (GA)	Gohmert
Amodei	Collins (NY)	Gosar
Babin	Comstock	Gowdy
Barletta	Conaway	Graham
Barr	Cook	Granger
Barton	Crenshaw	Graves (GA)
Bilirakis	Cuellar	Graves (LA)
Bishop (MI)	Culberson	Graves (MO)
Bishop (UT)	Curbelo (FL)	Griffith
Black	Davis, Rodney	Grothman
Blackburn	Denham	Guinta
Blum	DeSantis	Guthrie
Bost	DesJarlais	Hanna
Boustany	Diaz-Balart	Hardy
Brat	Duffy	Harper
Bridenstine	Duncan (SC)	Harris
Brooks (IN)	Duncan (TN)	Hartzler
Buchanan	Ellmers (NC)	Heck (NV)
Buck	Emmer (MN)	Hensarling
Bucshon	Farenthold	Herrera Beutler
Burgess	Fleischmann	Hice, Jody B.
Byrne	Fleming	Hill
Calvert	Flores	Holding
Carter (GA)	Forbes	Hudson
Carter (TX)	Fox	Huelskamp
Chabot	Franks (AZ)	Hultgren
Chaffetz	Frelinghuysen	Hunter

NOT VOTING—8

Adams	Doyle, Michael	Keating
Brady (TX)	F.	Nugent
Cramer	Jackson Lee	Stewart

□ 1219

Messrs. HILL and YOUNG of Iowa changed their vote from “aye” to “no.” So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. MURPHY of Florida. Mr. Chair, during rollcall vote No. 305 on H.R. 2577, I mistakenly recorded my vote as “no” when I should have voted “yes.”

VACATING PROCEEDINGS ON AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. ESTY

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that proceedings on rollcall No. 300 be vacated to the end that the Chair resume proceedings on the request for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. ESTY) at the end of the current series of postponed proceedings.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. LEE

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, 2-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 176, noes 247, answered “present” 1, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 306]

AYES—176

Abraham	Fattah	Moore
Aguilar	Fincher	Moulton
Amash	Foster	Mulvaney
Ashford	Fudge	Nadler
Bass	Gabbard	Napolitano
Beatty	Gallego	Neal
Becerra	Green, Al	Nolan
Bera	Green, Gene	O'Rourke
Beyer	Grijalva	Pelosi
Bishop (GA)	Hahn	Perlmutter
Blumenauer	Heck (WA)	Peters
Bonamici	Higgins	Peterson
Boustany	Himes	Pingree
Brady (PA)	Hinojosa	Pocan
Brown (FL)	Honda	Polis
Brownley (CA)	Hoyer	Price (NC)
Bustos	Huelskamp	Rangel
Butterfield	Ribbble	Huffman
Capps	Israel	Rice (NY)
Capuano	Jeffries	Richmond
Carney	Johnson (GA)	Roybal-Allard
Carson (IN)	Johnson, E. B.	Ruiz
Cartwright	Jolly	Ruppersberger
Castor (FL)	Jones	Rush
Castro (TX)	Kaptur	Ryan (OH)
Chaffetz	Keating	Sánchez, Linda
Chu, Judy	Kelly (IL)	T.
Cicilline	Kennedy	Sanchez, Loretta
Clark (MA)	Kildee	Sanford
Clarke (NY)	Kilmer	Sarbanes
Clay	Kind	Schakowsky
Cleaver	Kuster	Schiff
Clyburn	Langevin	Schweikert
Cohen	Larsen (WA)	Scott (VA)
Conyers	Larson (CT)	Scott, David
Cooper	Lawrence	Serrano
Costa	Lee	Sewell (AL)
Courtney	Levin	Sinema
Crawford	Lewis	Slaughter
Crowley	Lieu, Ted	Smith (MO)
Cummings	Loeb sack	Smith (WA)
Davis (CA)	Lofgren	Speier
Davis, Danny	Lowenthal	Swalwell (CA)
Davis, Rodney	Lowe y	Takai
DeFazio	Lujan Grisham	Takano
DeGette	(NM)	Thompson (CA)
Delaney	Luján, Ben Ray	Thompson (MS)
DeLauro	(NM)	Titus
DelBene	Lummis	Tonko
DeSaulnier	Lynch	Torres
Dingell	Maloney,	Tsongas
Doggett	Carolyn	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Massie	Vargas
Edwards	Matsui	Veasey
Ellison	McCollum	Velázquez
Emmer (MN)	McDermott	Vislosky
Engel	McGovern	Walz
Eshoo	McNerney	Waters, Maxine
Esty	Meeks	Welch
Farr	Meng	Yarmuth

NOES—247

Aderholt	Brooks (IN)	Connolly
Allen	Buchanan	Cook
Amodei	Buck	Costello (PA)
Babin	Bucshon	Crenshaw
Barletta	Burgess	Cuellar
Barr	Byrne	Curberson
Barton	Calvert	Curbelo (FL)
Benishkek	Cárdenas	Denham
Billirakis	Carter (GA)	Dent
Bishop (MI)	Carter (TX)	DeSantis
Bishop (UT)	Chabot	DesJarlais
Black	Clawson (FL)	Deutch
Blackburn	Coffman	Diaz-Balart
Blum	Cole	Dold
Bost	Collins (GA)	Donovan
Brat	Collins (NY)	Duffy
Bridenstine	Comstock	Duncan (SC)
Brooks (AL)	Conaway	Duncan (TN)

Ellmers (NC)	LaMalfa	Rogers (KY)
Farenthold	Lamborn	Rohrabacher
Fitzpatrick	Lance	Rokita
Fleischmann	Latta	Rooney (FL)
Fleming	Lipinski	Ros-Lehtinen
Flores	LoBiondo	Roskam
Forbes	Long	Ross
Fortenberry	Loudermilk	Rothfus
Fox	Love	Rouzer
Frankel (FL)	Lucas	Royce
Franks (AZ)	Luetkemeyer	Russell
Frelinghuysen	MacArthur	Ryan (WI)
Garamendi	Maloney, Sean	Salmon
Garrett	Marchant	Scalise
Gibbs	Marino	Schrader
Gibson	McCarthy	Scott, Austin
Gohmert	McCaul	Sensenbrenner
Goodlatte	McClintock	Sessions
Gosar	McHenry	Sherman
Gowdy	McKinley	Shimkus
Graham	McMorris	Shuster
Granger	Rodgers	Simpson
Graves (GA)	McSally	Sires
Graves (LA)	Meadows	Smith (NE)
Graves (MO)	Meehan	Smith (NJ)
Grayson	Messer	Smith (TX)
Griffith	Mica	Stefanik
Grothman	Miller (FL)	Stivers
Guinta	Miller (MI)	Stutzman
Guthrie	Moolenaar	Thompson (PA)
Gutiérrez	Mooney (WV)	Thornberry
Hanna	Mullin	Tipton
Hardy	Murphy (FL)	Trott
Harper	Murphy (PA)	Turner
Harris	Neugebauer	Upton
Hartzler	Newhouse	Valadao
Hastings	Noem	Vela
Heck (NV)	Norcross	Wagner
Hensarling	Nunes	Walberg
Herrera Beutler	Olson	Walden
Hice, Jody B.	Palazzo	Walker
Hill	Pallone	Walorski
Holding	Palmer	Walters, Mimi
Hudson	Pascrell	Wasserman
Huizenga (MI)	Paulsen	Schultz
Hultgren	Payne	Watson Coleman
Hunter	Pearce	Weber (TX)
Hurd (TX)	Perry	Webster (FL)
Hurt (VA)	Pittenger	Wenstrup
Issa	Pitts	Westerman
Jenkins (KS)	Poe (TX)	Westmoreland
Jenkins (WV)	Poliquin	Whitfield
Johnson, Sam	Pompeo	Williams
Jordan	Posey	Wilson (FL)
Joyce	Price, Tom	Wilson (SC)
Katko	Quigley	Wittman
Kelly (PA)	Ratcliffe	Womack
King (IA)	Reed	Woodall
King (NY)	Reichert	Yoder
Kinzinger (IL)	Renacci	Yoho
Kirkpatrick	Rice (SC)	Young (AK)
Kline	Rigell	Young (IA)
Knight	Roby	Young (IN)
Labrador	Roe (TN)	Zeldin
	Rogers (AL)	Zinke

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—1

Boyle, Brendan
F.

NOT VOTING—8

Adams	Doyle, Michael	Nugent
Brady (TX)	F.	Stewart
Cramer	Jackson Lee	Tiberi

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1225

Mr. NORCROSS changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. STIVERS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STIVERS) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 224, noes 198, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 307]

AYES—224

Abraham	Griffith	Palazzo
Aderholt	Grothman	Palmer
Allen	Guinta	Pearce
Amash	Guthrie	Perry
Amodei	Hanna	Pittenger
Babin	Hardy	Pitts
Barletta	Harper	Poe (TX)
Barr	Harris	Poliquin
Barton	Hartzler	Pompeo
Benishkek	Heck (NV)	Posey
Billirakis	Hensarling	Price, Tom
Bishop (MI)	Herrera Beutler	Ratcliffe
Bishop (UT)	Hice, Jody B.	Reed
Black	Hill	Renacci
Blackburn	Holding	Ribbble
Blum	Hudson	Rice (SC)
Boustany	Huelskamp	Rigell
Brat	Huizenga (MI)	Roby
Bridenstine	Hultgren	Roe (TN)
Brooks (AL)	Hunter	Rogers (AL)
Brooks (IN)	Hurd (TX)	Rogers (KY)
Buchanan	Hurt (VA)	Rohrabacher
Buck	Issa	Rokita
Bucshon	Jenkins (KS)	Rooney (FL)
Burgess	Jenkins (WV)	Roskam
Byrne	Johnson (OH)	Ross
Calvert	Johnson, Sam	Rothfus
Carter (GA)	Jolly	Rouzer
Carter (TX)	Jones	Royce
Chabot	Jordan	Russell
Chaffetz	Joyce	Ryan (WI)
Clawson (FL)	Kelly (PA)	Salmon
Cole	King (IA)	Sanford
Collins (GA)	King (NY)	Scalise
Collins (NY)	Kinzinger (IL)	Schweikert
Comstock	Knight	Scott, Austin
Conaway	Labrador	Sessions
Cook	LaMalfa	Shimkus
Costello (PA)	Lamborn	Shuster
Crawford	Lance	Simpson
Crenshaw	Latta	Smith (MO)
Culberson	LoBiondo	Smith (NE)
Davis, Rodney	Long	Smith (NJ)
Denham	Loudermilk	Smith (TX)
Dent	Love	Stivers
DeSantis	Lucas	Stutzman
DesJarlais	Luetkemeyer	Thornberry
Diaz-Balart	Lummis	Tiberi
Donovan	MacArthur	Tipton
Duffy	Marchant	Trott
Duncan (SC)	Marino	Upton
Duncan (TN)	Massie	Valadao
Ellmers (NC)	McCarthy	Wagner
Emmer (MN)	McCaul	Walberg
Farenthold	McClintock	Walden
Fincher	McHenry	Walker
Fitzpatrick	McKinley	Walorski
Fleischmann	McMorris	Walters, Mimi
Fleming	Rodgers	Weber (TX)
Flores	Meadows	Webster (FL)
Forbes	Meehan	Wenstrup
Fortenberry	Messer	Westerman
Fox	Mica	Westmoreland
Franks (AZ)	Miller (FL)	Williams
Frelinghuysen	Miller (MI)	Wilson (SC)
Garrett	Moolenaar	Wittman
Gibbs	Mooney (WV)	Womack
Gohmert	Mullin	Woodall
Goodlatte	Mulvaney	Yoder
Gosar	Murphy (PA)	Yoho
Gowdy	Neugebauer	Young (AK)
Granger	Newhouse	Young (IA)
Graves (GA)	Noem	Young (IN)
Graves (LA)	Nunes	Zeldin
Graves (MO)	Olson	Zinke

NOES—198

Aguilar	Becerra	Blumenauer
Ashford	Bera	Bonamici
Bass	Beyer	Bost
Beatty	Bishop (GA)	

Boyle, Brendan F.
 Brady (PA)
 Brown (FL)
 Brownley (CA)
 Bustos
 Butterfield
 Capps
 Capuano
 Cárdenas
 Carney
 Carson (IN)
 Cartwright
 Castor (FL)
 Castro (TX)
 Chu, Judy
 Cicilline
 Clark (MA)
 Clarke (NY)
 Clay
 Cleaver
 Clyburn
 Coffman
 Cohen
 Connolly
 Conyers
 Cooper
 Costa
 Courtney
 Crowley
 Cuellar
 Cummings
 Curbelo (FL)
 Davis (CA)
 Davis, Danny
 DeFazio
 DeGette
 Delaney
 DeLauro
 DelBene
 DeSaulnier
 Deutch
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Dold
 Duckworth
 Edwards
 Ellison
 Engel
 Eshoo
 Esty
 Farr
 Fattah
 Foster
 Frankel (FL)
 Fudge
 Gabbard
 Gallego
 Garamendi
 Gibson
 Graham
 Grayson
 Green, Al
 Green, Gene
 Grijalva

NOT VOTING—10

Adams
 Brady (TX)
 Cramer

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
 There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1228

Mr. SCHIFF changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the amendment was agreed to.
 The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. ESTY

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. ESTY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE
 The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.
 A recorded vote was ordered.
 The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.
 The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 184, noes 230, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 308]
 AYES—184

Aguilar
 Ashford
 Bass
 Becerra
 Bera
 Beyer
 Bishop (GA)
 Blumenauer
 Bonamici
 Boyle, Brendan F.
 Brady (PA)
 Brown (FL)
 Brownley (CA)
 Bustos
 Butterfield
 Capps
 Capuano
 Cárdenas
 Carney
 Carson (IN)
 Cartwright
 Castro (TX)
 Chu, Judy
 Cicilline
 Clark (MA)
 Clarke (NY)
 Clay
 Cleaver
 Clyburn
 Cohen
 Connolly
 Conyers
 Cooper
 Costa
 Courtney
 Crowley
 Cuellar
 Cummings
 Davis (CA)
 Davis, Danny
 DeFazio
 DeGette
 Delaney
 DeLauro
 DelBene
 Denham
 DeSaulnier
 Deutch
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Dold
 Duckworth
 Ellison
 Emmer (MN)
 Engel
 Eshoo
 Amodei
 Babin
 Barletta
 Barr
 Barton
 Benishek
 Bilirakis
 Bishop (MI)
 Bishop (UT)
 Black
 Blackburn
 Blum
 Bost
 Boustany
 Brat

NOES—230

Abraham
 Aderholt
 Allen
 Amash
 Amodei
 Babin
 Barletta
 Barr
 Barton
 Benishek
 Bilirakis
 Bishop (MI)
 Bishop (UT)
 Black
 Blackburn
 Blum
 Bost
 Boustany
 Brat
 Bridenstine
 Brooks (AL)
 Brooks (IN)
 Buchanan
 Buck
 Bucshon
 Burgess
 Byrne
 Calvert
 Carter (GA)
 Carter (TX)
 Chabot
 Chaffetz
 Clawson (FL)
 Coffman
 Cole
 Collins (GA)
 Collins (NY)
 Comstock
 Conaway
 Cook
 Crenshaw
 Culberson
 Curbelo (FL)
 Davis, Rodney
 Dent
 DeSantis
 DesJarlais
 Diaz-Balart
 Donovan
 Duffy
 Duncan (SC)
 Duncan (TN)
 Edwards
 Ellmers (NC)
 Farenthold
 Fleischmann
 Fleming

Flores
 Forbes
 Foster
 Foxx
 Franks (AZ)
 Frelinghuysen
 Gabbard
 Gibbs
 Gohmert
 Goodlatte
 Gowdy
 Granger
 Graves (GA)
 Graves (LA)
 Griffith
 Grothman
 Guinta
 Guthrie
 Hargett
 Harper
 Harris
 Hartzler
 Hastings
 Heck (NV)
 Hensarling
 Hice, Jody B.
 Hill
 Holding
 Hudson
 Huelskamp
 Huffman
 Huizenga (MI)
 Hultgren
 Hunter
 Hurd (TX)
 Hurt (VA)
 Issa
 Jenkins (KS)
 Jenkins (WV)
 Johnson (GA)
 Johnson (OH)
 Johnson, Sam
 Jolly
 Jones
 Jordan
 Joyce
 Kelly (PA)
 King (IA)
 King (NY)
 Kinzinger (IL)
 Kirkpatrick
 Kline
 Knight
 Labrador
 LaMalfa
 Lamborn
 Lance
 Larsen (WA)
 Latta
 Lipinski
 LoBiondo
 Long
 Loudermilk
 Love
 Lucas
 Luetkemeyer
 Lummis
 Marchant
 Marino
 Massie
 McCarthy
 McCaul
 McClintock
 McHenry
 McKinley
 McMorris
 Rodgers
 Meadows
 Meehan
 Meeks
 Messer
 Mica
 Miller (FL)
 Miller (MI)
 Moolenaar
 Mooney (WV)
 Mulvaney
 Murphy (PA)
 Neugebauer
 Newhouse
 Noem
 Nunes
 Olson
 Palazzo
 Paulsen
 Pearce
 Perry
 Pittenger
 Pitts
 Poe (TX)
 Poliquin
 Polis
 Pompeo
 Posey
 Price, Tom
 Ratcliffe
 Reichert
 Renacci
 Ribble
 Rice (SC)
 Richmond
 Rigell
 Roby
 Roe (TN)
 Rogers (AL)
 Rogers (KY)
 Rohrabacher
 Rokita
 Rooney (FL)
 Ros-Lehtinen
 Roskam
 Ross
 Rothfus
 Rouzer
 Royce
 Russell
 Ryan (WI)
 Salmon
 Sánchez, Linda T.
 Scalise
 Schweikert
 Scott, Austin
 Sensenbrenner
 Sessions
 Shimkus
 Shuster
 Simpson
 Smith (MO)
 Smith (NE)
 Smith (TX)
 Stivers
 Stutzman
 Thompson (MS)
 Thompson (PA)
 Thornberry
 Tipton
 Torres
 Trott
 Turner
 Upton
 Valadao
 Wagner
 Walberg
 Walden
 Walker
 Walorski
 Walters, Mimi
 Weber (TX)
 Webster (FL)
 Wenstrup
 Posey
 Price, Tom
 Ratcliffe
 Reichert
 Renacci
 Ribble
 Rice (SC)
 Richmond
 Rigell
 Roby
 Roe (TN)
 Rogers (AL)
 Rogers (KY)
 Rohrabacher
 Scott, David
 Stewart
 Tiberi
 Visclosky
 Waters, Maxine

NOT VOTING—18

Adams
 Beatty
 Brady (TX)
 Cramer
 Crawford
 Doyle, Michael F.
 Fincher
 Graves (MO)
 Gutiérrez
 Hanna
 Jackson Lee
 Napolitano
 Nugent

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
 There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1237

So the amendment was rejected.
 The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. 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. ZELDIN) having assumed the chair, Mr. POE of Texas, Acting Chair 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. 2577) making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

WELCOMING THE HONORABLE TRENT KELLY TO THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, friends and colleagues, I have the honor of welcoming the new representative from Mississippi's First Congressional District. For me, that means he will be representing the neighboring district in the northeast corner of the State, which most of you are familiar with; but also, for others, this means that he will be representing the birthplace of Elvis Presley.

TRENT KELLY is from the little-known town of Saltillo, Mississippi. The local folk call it Salt-illo, population 3,393. He knows the district well, having served as district attorney for the largest judicial district in that area. Representative KELLY has also served in our Nation's military and has spent 29 years in the Mississippi National Guard.

Representative KELLY will be serving out the term of our dear former colleague Alan Nunnelee, who passed away in February. As he steps into his seat, we hope that he will follow Alan's example of service and dedication to the people of Mississippi.

Our colleague GREGG HARPER will now join me in welcoming our friend from Lee County, Mississippi.

Mr. HARPER. Mr. Speaker, it is my great honor and pleasure to welcome the newest Member of this body, Congressman TRENT KELLY.

I am confident that TRENT KELLY will carry on the legacy of his predecessor, our late colleague, Representative Alan Nunnelee, one of impeccable constituent services and an unyielding commitment to this country and her citizens.

I look forward to working with Representative KELLY as he serves the First Congressional District and the people of the great State of Mississippi.

Congressman, I am so honored to stand here and welcome you to the floor of the House of Representatives.

TRENT KELLY.

Mr. KELLY of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman THOMPSON, Congressman HARPER, and the rest of the Mississippi delegation; and, most importantly, thank you, God.

I would also like to thank Senator WICKER and Senator COCHRAN, who are present.

Thank you to my family, which would include my mother and my wife and my three children and my brother, who cannot be here.

Thank you to my friends who are in the gallery above.

Thank you to the citizens of the First Congressional District of Mississippi and to my fellow Members.

I am humbled and honored to be able to serve this great Nation in this capacity.

Thank you, and God bless you, each and every one.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. Under clause 5(d) of rule XX, the Chair announces to the House that, in light of the administration of the oath to the gentleman from Mississippi, the whole number of the House is 434.

TRANSPORTATION, HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2016

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EMMER of Minnesota). Pursuant to House Resolution 287 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2577.

Will the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HOLDING) kindly take the chair.

□ 1907

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2577) making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes, with Mr. HOLDING (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Thursday, June 4, 2015, an amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. ESTY) had been disposed of, and the bill had been read through page 156, line 15.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 7 by Mrs. BLACKBURN of Tennessee.

Amendment by Mr. GOSAR of Arizona.

Amendment by Mr. GOSAR of Arizona.

Amendment by Mr. POSEY of Florida.

Amendment by Mr. SESSIONS of Texas.

Amendment by Mr. SESSIONS of Texas.

Amendment by Mr. SCHIFF of California.

Amendment by Mr. POSEY of Florida.

Amendment by Mr. POSEY of Florida. The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the time of any electronic vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MRS. BLACKBURN

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 163, noes 259, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 310]

AYES—163

Allen	Guinta	Palazzo
Amash	Guthrie	Palmer
Babin	Hardy	Paulsen
Barr	Harper	Pearce
Barton	Harris	Perry
Bilirakis	Hartzler	Pittenger
Bishop (MI)	Hensarling	Pitts
Bishop (UT)	Hice, Jody B.	Poe (TX)
Black	Hill	Poliquin
Blackburn	Holding	Polis
Blum	Hudson	Pompeo
Brady (TX)	Huelskamp	Price, Tom
Brat	Huizenga (MI)	Ratcliffe
Bridenstine	Hultgren	Ribble
Brooks (AL)	Hunter	Rice (SC)
Brooks (IN)	Hurd (TX)	Roe (TN)
Buchanan	Hurt (VA)	Rogers (AL)
Bucshon	Issa	Rohrabacher
Burgess	Jenkins (KS)	Rokita
Byrne	Johnson (OH)	Rothfus
Carter (GA)	Johnson, Sam	Rouzer
Carter (TX)	Jones	Royce
Chabot	Jordan	Russell
Chaffetz	Kelly (MS)	Ryan (WI)
Clawson (FL)	King (IA)	Salmon
Coffman	Kline	Sanford
Collins (GA)	Knight	Scalise
Collins (NY)	Labrador	Schweikert
Conaway	LaMalfa	Scott, Austin
Cook	Lance	Sensenbrenner
Cooper	Latta	Sessions
Crawford	Long	Shuster
Culberson	Loudermilk	Smith (MO)
DeSantis	Love	Smith (NE)
DesJarlais	Lucas	Smith (TX)
Duffy	Lummis	Stewart
Duncan (SC)	Marchant	Stutzman
Farenthold	Massie	Thornberry
Fleischmann	McCarthy	Upton
Fleming	McCaul	Wagner
Flores	McClintock	Walberg
Forbes	McHenry	Walker
Fox	McMorris	Walorski
Franks (AZ)	Rodgers	Walters, Mimi
Garrett	Meadows	Weber (TX)
Gibbs	Messer	Wenstrup
Gohmert	Mica	Westerman
Goodlatte	Miller (FL)	Williams
Gosar	Miller (MI)	Wilson (SC)
Gowdy	Moolenaar	Wittman
Graves (GA)	Mooney (WV)	Yoho
Graves (LA)	Mulvaney	Young (IA)
Graves (MO)	Murphy (PA)	Young (IN)
Griffith	Neugebauer	Zinke
Grothman	Olson	

NOES—259

Abraham	Bustos	Costello (PA)
Aderholt	Butterfield	Courtney
Aguilar	Calvert	Cramer
Amodei	Capps	Crenshaw
Ashford	Capuano	Crowley
Barletta	Carney	Cuellar
Bass	Carson (IN)	Cummings
Beatty	Cartwright	Curbelo (FL)
Becerra	Castor (FL)	Davis (CA)
Benishek	Castro (TX)	Davis, Danny
Bera	Chu, Judy	Davis, Rodney
Beyer	Ciçilline	DeGette
Bishop (GA)	Clark (MA)	Delaney
Blumenauer	Clarke (NY)	DeLauro
Bonamici	Clay	DeBene
Bost	Clyburn	Denham
Boustany	Cohen	Dent
Boyle, Brendan	Cole	DeSaulnier
F.	Comstock	Deutch
Brady (PA)	Connolly	Diaz-Balart
Brown (FL)	Conyers	Dingell
Brownley (CA)	Costa	Dold

Donovan Lee
 Doyle, Michael Levin
 F. Lewis
 Duckworth Lieu, Ted
 Edwards Lipinski
 Ellison LoBiondo
 Ellmers (NC) Loeb sack
 Emmer (MN) Lofgren
 Engel Lowenthal
 Eshoo Lowey
 Esty Luetkemeyer
 Farr Lujan Grisham
 Fattah (NM)
 Fitzpatrick Luján, Ben Ray
 Fortenberry (NM)
 Foster Lynch
 Frankel (FL) MacArthur
 Frelinghuysen Maloney, Sean
 Fudge Marino
 Gabbard Matsui
 Gallego McCollum
 Garamendi McDermott
 Gibson McGovern
 Graham McKinley
 Graner McNeerney
 Grayson McSally
 Green, Al Meehan
 Green, Gene Meeks
 Grijalva Meng
 Gutiérrez Moore
 Hahn Moulton
 Hanna Mullin
 Hastings Murphy (FL)
 Heck (NV) Nadler
 Heck (WA) Napolitano
 Herrera Beutler Neal
 Higgins Newhouse
 Himes Noem
 Hinojosa Nolan
 Honda Norcross
 Hoyer Nugent
 Huffman Nunes
 Israel O'Rourke
 Jackson Lee Pallone
 Jeffries Pascrell
 Jenkins (WV) Payne
 Johnson (GA) Pelosi
 Johnson, E. B. Perlmutter
 Jolly Peters
 Joyce Peterson
 Kaptur Pingree
 Katko Pocan
 Keating Posey
 Kelly (IL) Price (NC)
 Kelly (PA) Quigley
 Kennedy Rangel
 Kildee Reed
 Kilmer Reichert
 Kind Renacci
 King (NY) Rice (NY)
 Kinzinger (IL) Richmond
 Kirkpatrick Rigell
 Kuster Roby
 Langevin Rogers (KY)
 Larsen (WA) Rooney (FL)
 Larson (CT) Ros-Lehtinen
 Lawrence Roskam

NOT VOTING—11

Adams DeFazio
 Buck Doggett
 Cárdenas Duncan (TN)
 Cleaver Fincher

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
 There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1911

Mr. BARR changed his vote from
 “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.
 The result of the vote was announced
 as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
 business is the demand for a recorded
 vote on the amendment offered by the
 gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR)
 on which further proceedings were
 postponed and on which the noes pre-
 vailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the
 amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-
 ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote
 has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-
 minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-
 vice, and there were—ayes 229, noes 193,
 not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 311]

AYES—229

Abraham Guinta
 Aderholt Guthrie
 Allen Hanna
 Amash Hardy
 Babin Harper
 Barletta Harris
 Barr Hartzler
 Barton Heck (NV)
 Benishek Hensarling
 Bilirakis Herrera Beutler
 Bishop (MI) Hice, Jody B.
 Bishop (UT) Hill
 Black Holding
 Blackburn Hudson
 Blum Huelskamp
 Bost Huizenga (MI)
 Boustany Hultgren
 Brady (TX) Hunter
 Brat Hurd (TX)
 Bridenstine Hurt (VA)
 Brooks (AL) Issa
 Brooks (IN) Jenkins (KS)
 Buchanan Jenkins (WV)
 Bucshon Johnson (OH)
 Burgess Johnson, Sam
 Byrne Jones
 Calvert Carter (GA)
 Carter (TX) Joyce
 Chabot Katko
 Chaffetz Kelly (MS)
 Clawson (FL) Kelly (PA)
 Coffman King (IA)
 Cole King (NY)
 Collins (GA) Kinzinger (IL)
 Collins (NY) Kline
 Comstock Knight
 Conaway Labrador
 Cook LaMalfa
 Costello (PA) Lance
 Cramer Latta
 Crawford Long
 Crenshaw Loudermilk
 Culberson Love
 Denham Lucas
 Dent Luetkemeyer
 DeSantis Lummis
 DesJarlais MacArthur
 Diaz-Balart Marchant
 Donovan Marino
 Duffy Massie
 Duncan (SC) McCarthy
 Ellmers (NC) McCaul
 Emmer (MN) McClintock
 Farenthold McHenry
 Fitzpatrick McKinley
 Fleischmann McMorris
 Fleming Rodgers
 Flores McSally
 Forbes Meehan
 Fortenberry Messer
 Foxx Mica
 Franks (AZ) Miller (FL)
 Frelinghuysen Miller (MI)
 Garrett Moolenaar
 Gibbs Mooney (WV)
 Gibson Mullin
 Gohmert Mulvaney
 Goodlatte Murphy (PA)
 Gosar Neugebauer
 Gowdy Newhouse
 Granger Noem
 Graves (GA) Nugent
 Graves (LA) Nunes
 Graves (MO) Olson
 Griffith Palazzo
 Grothman Palmer

NOES—193

Aguilar Ashford
 Amodei Bass
 Beatty
 Becerra

Bera Green, Gene
 Beyer Grijalva
 Bishop (GA) Gutiérrez
 Blumenauer Hahn
 Bonamici Hastings
 Boyle, Brendan Heck (WA)
 F. Higgins
 Brady (PA) Himes
 Brown (FL) Hinojosa
 Brownley (CA) Honda
 Bustos Hoyer
 Butterfield Huffman
 Capps Israel
 Capuano Jackson Lee
 Carney Jeffries
 Carson (IN) Johnson (GA)
 Cartwright Johnson, E. B.
 Castor (FL) Kaptur
 Castro (TX) Keating
 Chu, Judy Kelly (IL)
 Cicilline Kennedy
 Clark (MA) Kildee
 Clarke (NY) Kilmer
 Clay Kind
 Clyburn Kirkpatrick
 Cohen Kuster
 Connolly Langevin
 Conyers Larsen (WA)
 Cooper Larson (CT)
 Costa Lawrence
 Courtney Lee
 Crowley Levin
 Cuellar Lewis
 Cummings Lieu, Ted
 Curbelo (FL) Lipinski
 Davis (CA) LoBiondo
 Davis, Danny Loeb sack
 Davis, Rodney Lofgren
 DeGette Lowenthal
 Delaney Lowey
 DeLauro Lujan Grisham
 DelBene (NM)
 DeSaulnier Luján, Ben Ray
 Deutch (NM)
 Dingell Lynch
 Dold Maloney, Sean
 Doyle, Michael Matsui
 F. McCollum
 Duckworth McDermott
 Edwards McGovern
 Ellison McNeerney
 Engel Meadows
 Eshoo Meeks
 Esty Meng
 Farr Moore
 Fattah Moulton
 Foster Murphy (FL)
 Frankel (FL) Nadler
 Fudge Napolitano
 Gabbard Neal
 Gallego Nolan
 Garamendi Norcross
 Graham O'Rourke
 Grayson Pallone
 Green, Al Pascrell

NOT VOTING—11

Adams DeFazio
 Buck Doggett
 Cárdenas Duncan (TN)
 Cleaver Fincher

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
 There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1916

Mr. SERRANO changed his vote from
 “aye” to “no.”

Mr. MEEHAN changed his vote from
 “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was agreed to.
 The result of the vote was announced
 as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
 business is the demand for a recorded
 vote on the amendment offered by the
 gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR)
 on which further proceedings were
 postponed and on which the noes pre-
 vailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the
 amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 136, noes 286, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 312]

AYES—136

Abraham	Hardy	Palmer
Aderholt	Harper	Pearce
Allen	Harris	Perry
Amash	Hartzler	Poe (TX)
Babin	Heck (NV)	Pompeo
Barr	Hensarling	Posey
Barton	Hice, Jody B.	Price, Tom
Benishkek	Holding	Ratcliffe
Bilirakis	Hudson	Renacci
Bishop (MI)	Huelskamp	Rice (SC)
Bishop (UT)	Huizenga (MI)	Roe (TN)
Black	Hunter	Rogers (AL)
Blackburn	Hurd (TX)	Rohrabacher
Boustany	Issa	Rooney (FL)
Brady (TX)	Jenkins (KS)	Ross
Brat	Johnson (OH)	Russell
Bridenstine	Johnson, Sam	Ryan (WI)
Brooks (AL)	Jones	Salmon
Byrne	Jordan	Sanford
Carter (GA)	Kelly (MS)	Scalise
Carter (TX)	King (IA)	Schweikert
Chabot	Labrador	Scott, Austin
Chaffetz	LaMalfa	Sessions
Clawson (FL)	Latta	Smith (MO)
Coffman	Long	Smith (TX)
Collins (GA)	Loudermilk	Stewart
Conaway	Love	Stivers
Cook	Luetkemeyer	Stutzman
DeSantis	Lummis	Thompson (PA)
DesJarlais	Marchant	Tipton
Duffy	Massie	Wagner
Duncan (SC)	McCaul	Walberg
Ellmers (NC)	McClintock	Walker
Emmer (MN)	McHenry	Weber (TX)
Fleischmann	Meadows	Webster (FL)
Fleming	Messer	Wenstrup
Flores	Mica	Westerman
Franks (AZ)	Miller (FL)	Westmoreland
Gibbs	Moolenaar	Williams
Gohmert	Mullin	Wilson (SC)
Gosar	Mulvaney	Yoder
Gowdy	Murphy (PA)	Yoho
Graves (GA)	Neugebauer	Young (IN)
Graves (LA)	Nunes	Zinke
Grothman	Olson	
Guinta	Palazzo	

NOES—286

Aguilar	Chu, Judy	DeSaulnier
Amodei	Cicilline	Deutch
Ashford	Clark (MA)	Diaz-Balart
Barletta	Clarke (NY)	Dingell
Bass	Clay	Doggett
Beatty	Clyburn	Dold
Becerra	Cohen	Donovan
Bera	Cole	Doyle, Michael F.
Beyer	Collins (NY)	Duckworth
Bishop (GA)	Comstock	Edwards
Blum	Connolly	Ellison
Blumenauer	Conyers	Engel
Bonamici	Cooper	Eshoo
Bost	Costa	Esty
Boyle, Brendan F.	Costello (PA)	Farenthold
Brady (PA)	Courtney	Farr
Brooks (IN)	Cramer	Fattah
Brown (FL)	Crawford	Fitzpatrick
Brownley (CA)	Crenshaw	Forbes
Buchanan	Crowley	Fortenberry
Bucshon	Cuellar	Foster
Burgess	Culberson	Fox
Bustos	Cummings	Fox
Butterfield	Curbelo (FL)	Frankel (FL)
Calvert	Davis (CA)	Frelinghuysen
Capps	Davis, Danny	Fudge
Capuano	Davis, Rodney	Gabbard
Carney	DeGette	Gallego
Carson (IN)	Delaney	Garamendi
Cartwright	DeLauro	Garrett
Castor (FL)	DelBene	Gibson
Castro (TX)	Denham	Goodlatte
	Dent	Graham

Graves (MO)	Lynch
Grayson	MacArthur
Green, Al	Maloney, Sean
Green, Gene	Marino
Griffith	Matsui
Grijalva	McCarthy
Guthrie	McCollum
Gutiérrez	McDermott
Hahn	McGovern
Hanna	McKinley
Hastings	McMorris
Heck (WA)	Rodgers
Herrera Beutler	McNerney
Higgins	McSally
Hill	Meehan
Himes	Meeks
Hinojosa	Meng
Honda	Miller (MI)
Hoyer	Mooney (WV)
Huffman	Moore
Hultgren	Moulton
Hurt (VA)	Murphy (FL)
Israel	Nadler
Jackson Lee	Napolitano
Jeffries	Neal
Jenkins (WV)	Newhouse
Johnson (GA)	Noem
Johnson, E. B.	Nolan
Jolly	Norcross
Joyce	Nugent
Kaptur	O'Rourke
Katko	Pallone
Keating	Pascrell
Kelly (IL)	Paulsen
Kelly (PA)	Payne
Kennedy	Pelosi
Kildee	Perlmutter
Kilmer	Peters
Kind	Peterson
King (NY)	Pingree
Kinzinger (IL)	Pittenger
Kirkpatrick	Pitts
Kline	Pocan
Knight	Poliquin
Kuster	Polis
Lance	Price (NC)
Langevin	Quigley
Larsen (WA)	Rangel
Larson (CT)	Reed
Lawrence	Reichert
Lee	Ribble
Levin	Rice (NY)
Lewis	Richmond
Lieu, Ted	Rigell
Lipinski	Roby
LoBiondo	Rogers (KY)
Loeb sack	Rokita
Lofgren	Ros-Lehtinen
Lowenthal	Roskam
Lowe	Rothfus
Lucas	Rouzer
Lujan Grisham	Roybal-Allard
(NM)	Royce
Lujan, Ben Ray	Ruiz
(NM)	Ruppersberger

NOT VOTING—11

Adams	DeFazio	Lamborn
Buck	Duncan (TN)	Maloney
Cárdenas	Fincher	Carolyn
Cleaver	Granger	Woodall

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1919

So the amendment was rejected. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. POSEY

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. POSEY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 163, noes 260, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 313]

AYES—163

Abraham	Guinta	Palmer
Aderholt	Guthrie	Paulsen
Allen	Hartzler	Pearce
Amash	Hensarling	Perry
Babin	Herrera Beutler	Pittenger
Barr	Hice, Jody B.	Pitts
Barton	Hill	Poe (TX)
Benishkek	Holding	Poliquin
Bilirakis	Hudson	Pompeo
Bishop (MI)	Huelskamp	Posey
Bishop (UT)	Huizenga (MI)	Price, Tom
Black	Hultgren	Ratcliffe
Blackburn	Hunter	Renacci
Blum	Hurt (VA)	Ribble
Boustany	Issa	Roby
Brady (TX)	Jenkins (KS)	Roe (TN)
Brat	Johnson (OH)	Rooney (FL)
Bridenstine	Johnson, Sam	Roskam
Brooks (AL)	Jones	Rothfus
Brooks (IN)	Jordan	Royce
Burgess	Kelly (MS)	Russell
Carter (GA)	King (IA)	Ryan (WI)
Carter (TX)	Kline	Salmon
Chabot	Knigh	Sanford
Chaffetz	Labrador	Schweikert
Clawson (FL)	LaMalfa	Scott, Austin
Coffman	Latta	Sensenbrenner
Cole	Long	Sessions
Collins (GA)	Loudermilk	Loudermilk
Collins (NY)	Love	Love
Conaway	Luetkemeyer	Lummis
Cook	Costello (PA)	Cramer
Cook	Visclosky	Crawford
Costello (PA)	Walden	Culberson
Cramer	Walorski	Dent
Crawford	Walters, Mimi	DeSantis
Culberson	Walz	DesJarlais
Dent	Wasserman	Duffy
DeSantis	Schultz	Duncan (SC)
DesJarlais	Duffy	Ellmers (NC)
Duffy	Duncan (SC)	Emmer (MN)
Duncan (SC)	Ellmers (NC)	Fleming
Ellmers (NC)	Emmer (MN)	Flores
Emmer (MN)	Fleming	Forbes
Fleming	Flores	Franks (AZ)
Flores	Forbes	Garrett
Franks (AZ)	Franks (AZ)	Gibbs
Garrett	Gibbs	Gohmert
Gibbs	Gohmert	Goodlatte
Gohmert	Goodlatte	Gosar
Goodlatte	Gosar	Gowdy
Gosar	Gowdy	Graves (GA)
Gowdy	Graves (GA)	Griffith
Graves (GA)	Griffith	Grothman
Graves (LA)	Grothman	Olson

NOES—260

Aguilar	Carson (IN)	Delaney
Amodei	Carter (TX)	DeLauro
Ashford	Cartwright	DelBene
Barletta	Castor (FL)	Denham
Bass	Castro (TX)	DeSaulnier
Beatty	Chu, Judy	Deutch
Becerra	Cicilline	Diaz-Balart
Bera	Clark (MA)	Dingell
Beyer	Clarke (NY)	Doggett
Bishop (GA)	Clay	Dold
Blumenauer	Clyburn	Donovan
Bonamici	Cohen	Doyle, Michael F.
Bost	Comstock	Duckworth
Boyle, Brendan F.	Connolly	Edwards
Brady (PA)	Conyers	Ellison
Brown (FL)	Cooper	Engel
Brownley (CA)	Costa	Eshoo
Buchanan	Courtney	Esty
Bucshon	Crenshaw	Farenthold
Bustos	Crowley	Farr
Butterfield	Cuellar	Fattah
Byrne	Cummings	Fitzpatrick
Calvert	Curbelo (FL)	Fleischmann
Capps	Davis (CA)	Fortenberry
Capuano	Davis, Danny	Foster
Carney	Davis, Rodney	Fox
	DeGette	

Frankel (FL) LoBiondo Ruiz
 Frelinghuysen Loebsock Ruppertsberger
 Fudge Lofgren Rush
 Gabbard Lowenthal Ryan (OH)
 Gallego Lowey Sánchez, Linda
 Garamendi Lucas T.
 Gibson Lujan Grisham Sanchez, Loretta
 Graham (NM) Sarbanes
 Granger Luján, Ben Ray Scalise
 Graves (LA) (NM) Schakowsky
 Graves (MO) Lynch Schiff
 Grayson MacArthur Schrader
 Green, Al Maloney, Sean Scott (VA)
 Green, Gene Marino Scott, David
 Grijalva Matsui Serrano
 Gutiérrez McCollum Sewell (AL)
 Hahn McDermott Sherman
 Hanna McGovern Shimkus
 Hardy McNeerney Shuster
 Harper Meehan Simpson
 Harris Meeks Sinema
 Hastings Moolenaar Sires
 Heck (NV) Mica Slaughter
 Heck (WA) Moolenaar Smith (NJ)
 Higgins Moore Smith (WA)
 Himes Moulton Speier
 Hinojosa Murphy (PA) Stefanik
 Honda Nadler Stivers
 Hoyer Napolitano Swalwell (CA)
 Huffman Neal
 Hurd (TX) Newhouse
 Israel Nolan
 Jackson Lee Norcross
 Jeffries O'Rourke
 Jenkins (WV) Palazzo
 Johnson (GA) Pallone
 Johnson, E. B. Pascrell
 Jolly Payne
 Joyce Pelosi
 Kaptur Perlmutter
 Katko Peters
 Keating Peterson
 Kelly (IL) Pingree
 Kelly (PA) Pocan
 Kennedy Polis
 Kildee Price (NC)
 Kilmer Quigley
 Kind Rangel
 King (NY) Reed
 Kinzinger (IL) Reichert
 Kirkpatrick Rice (NY)
 Kuster Rice (SC)
 Lance Richmond
 Langevin Rigell
 Larsen (WA) Rogers (AL)
 Larson (CT) Rogers (KY)
 Lawrence Rohrabacher
 Lee Rokita
 Levin Ros-Lehtinen
 Lewis Ross
 Lieu, Ted Rouzer
 Lipinski Roybal-Allard Zeldin

NOT VOTING—10

Adams DeFazio Maloney,
 Buck Duncan (TN) Carolyn
 Cárdenas Fincher Woodall
 Cleaver Lamborn

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
 There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1923

Mr. COLE changed his vote from
 “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.
 The result of the vote was announced
 as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SESSIONS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
 business is the demand for a recorded
 vote on the amendment offered by the
 gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS)
 on which further proceedings were
 postponed and on which the ayes pre-
 vailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the
 amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-
 ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote
 has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.
 The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-
 minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-
 vice, and there were—ayes 205, noes 218,
 not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 314]

AYES—205

Abraham Hardy Perry
 Aderholt Harris Pittenger
 Allen Hartzler Pitts
 Amash Heck (NV) Poe (TX)
 Amodei Hensarling Poliquin
 Babin Herrera Beutler Pompeo
 Barletta Hice, Jody B. Posey
 Barr Hill Price, Tom
 Barton Holding Ratcliffe
 Benishek Hudson Reichert
 Bilirakis Huelskamp Renacci
 Bishop (MI) Huizenga (MI) Ribble
 Bishop (UT) Hultgren Rice (SC)
 Black Hunter Rigell
 Blackburn Hurd (TX) Roby
 Blum Hurt (VA) Roe (TN)
 Brady (TX) Issa Rogers (AL)
 Brat Jenkins (KS) Rogers (KY)
 Bridenstine Johnson (OH) Rohrabacher
 Brooks (AL) Johnson, Sam Rokita
 Brooks (IN) Jolly Rooney (FL)
 Buchanan Jones Roskam
 Buchanon Jordan Ross
 Burgess Kelly (MS) Rothfus
 Byrne Kelly (PA) Rouzer
 Calvert King (IA) Royce
 Carter (GA) Kinzinger (IL) Russell
 Carter (TX) Kline Ryan (WI)
 Chabot Knight Salmon
 Chaffetz Labrador Sanford
 Clawson (FL) LaMalfa Scalise
 Coffman Latta Schweikert
 Collins (GA) Long Scott, Austin
 Collins (NY) Loudermilk Sensenbrenner
 Conaway Love Sessions
 Cook Lucas Shimkus
 Costello (PA) Luetkemeyer Simpson
 Crawford Lummis Smith (MO)
 Crenshaw MacArthur Smith (NE)
 Culberson Marchant Smith (TX)
 Dent Marino Stewart
 DeSantis Massie Stivers
 DesJarlais McCarthy Stutzman
 Diaz-Balart McCaul Thornberry
 Duffy McClintock Tiberi
 Duncan (SC) McHenry Tipton
 EIlmers (NC) McMorris Trott
 Emmer (MN) Rodgers Upton
 Farenthold McSally Valadao
 Fleischmann Meadows Wagner
 Fleming Meehan Walberg
 Flores Messer Walden
 Forbes Mica Walker
 Foxx Miller (FL) Walorski
 Franks (AZ) Miller (MI) Walters, Mimi
 Garrett Moolenaar Weber (TX)
 Gibbs Mooney (WV) Webster (FL)
 Gohmert Mullin Wenstrup
 Goodlatte Mulvaney Westmoreland
 Gosar Neugebauer Whitfield
 Gowdy Newhouse Williams
 Granger Noem
 Graves (GA) Nugent Wilson (SC)
 Graves (LA) Nunes Wittman
 Graves (MO) Olson Yoder
 Griffith Palazzo Yoho
 Grothman Palmer Young (AK)
 Guinta Paulsen Young (IA)
 Guthrie Pearce Young (IN)

NOES—218

Aguilar Bustos Comstock
 Ashford Butterfield Connolly
 Bass Capps Conyers
 Beatty Capuano Cooper
 Becerra Carney Costa
 Bera Carson (IN) Courtney
 Beyer Cartwright Cramer
 Bishop (GA) Castor (FL) Crowley
 Blumenauer Castro (TX) Cuellar
 Bonamici Chu, Judy Cummings
 Bost Cicilline Curbelo (FL)
 Boustany Clark (MA) Davis (CA)
 Boyle, Brendan Clarke (NY) Davis, Danny
 F. Clay Davis, Rodney
 Brady (PA) Clyburn DeGette
 Brown (FL) Cohen Delaney
 Brownley (CA) Cole DeLauro

DelBene Kilmer Rice (NY)
 Denham Kind Richmond
 DeSaulnier King (NY) Ros-Lehtinen
 Deutch Kirkpatrick Roybal-Allard
 Dingell Kuster Ruiz
 Doggett Lance Ruppertsberger
 Dold Langevin Rush
 Donovan Larsen (WA) Ryan (OH)
 Doyle, Michael Larson (CT) Sánchez, Linda
 F. Lawrence T.
 Duckworth Lee Sanchez, Loretta
 Edwards Levin Sarbanes
 Ellison Lewis Schakowsky
 Engel Lieu, Ted Schiff
 Eshoo Lipinski Schrader
 Esty LoBiondo Scott (VA)
 Farr Loebsock Scott, David
 Fattah Lofgren Serrano
 Fitzpatrick Lowenthal Sewell (AL)
 Fortenberry Sherman Shuster
 Foster Lujan Grisham Sinema
 Frankel (FL) (NM) Luján, Ben Ray
 Frelinghuysen (NM) Sires
 Fudge Lynch Slaughter
 Gabbard Maloney, Sean Smith (NJ)
 Gallego Matsui Smith (WA)
 Garamendi Garamendi Stefanik
 Gibson McCollum Swalwell (CA)
 Graham McDermott Takai
 Grayson McGovern Takano
 Green, Al McKinley Thompson (CA)
 Green, Gene McNeerney Thompson (MS)
 Grijalva Meeks Thompson (PA)
 Gutiérrez Meng
 Hahn Moore
 Hanna Moulton Titus
 Harper Murphy (FL) Tonko
 Hastings Torres
 Heck (WA) Murphy (PA) Tsongas
 Higgins Nadler Turner
 Hinojosa Napolitano Van Hollen
 Honda Neal Vargas
 Hoyer Nolan Veasey
 Huffman Norcross Vela
 Israel Pallone Velázquez
 Jackson Lee Pascrell Visclosky
 Jeffries Payne Walz
 Jenkins (WV) Pelosi Wasserman
 Johnson (GA) Perlmutter Schultz
 Johnson, E. B. Peters Waters, Maxine
 Joyce Peterson Watson Coleman
 Kaptur Pingree Welch
 Katko Pocan Westernman
 Keating Polis Wilson (FL)
 Kelly (IL) Price (NC) Womack
 Kelly (PA) Quigley Yarmuth
 Kennedy Rangel Zeldin
 Kildee Reed Zinke

NOT VOTING—10

Adams DeFazio Maloney,
 Buck Duncan (TN) Carolyn
 Cárdenas Fincher Woodall
 Cleaver Lamborn

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
 There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1926

So the amendment was rejected.
 The result of the vote was announced
 as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SESSIONS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
 business is the demand for a recorded
 vote on the amendment offered by the
 gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS)
 on which further proceedings were
 postponed and on which the ayes pre-
 vailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the
 amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-
 ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote
 has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.
 The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-
 minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 186, noes 237, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 315]

AYES—186

Abraham Guthrie Perry
 Aderholt Hardy Pittenger
 Allen Harris Poe (TX)
 Amash Heck (NV) Poliquin
 Babin Hensarling Pompeo
 Barr Herrera Beutler Posey
 Barton Hice, Jody B. Price, Tom
 Benishek Hill Ratcliffe
 Bilirakis Holding Renacci
 Bishop (MI) Hudson Ribble
 Bishop (UT) Huelskamp Rice (SC)
 Black Huiזנגa (MI) Rigell
 Blackburn Hultgren Roby
 Blum Hunter Roe (TN)
 Brady (TX) Hurd (TX) Rogers (AL)
 Brat Hurt (VA) Rogers (KY)
 Bridenstine Issa Rohrabacher
 Brooks (AL) Johnson (OH) Rokita
 Brooks (IN) Johnson, Sam Rooney (FL)
 Buchanan Jolly Roskam
 Bucshon Jones Joyce
 Burgess Jordan Royce
 Byrne Kelly (MS) Russell
 Carter (GA) King (IA) Ryan (WI)
 Carter (TX) Kline Salmon
 Chabot Knight Sanford
 Chaffetz Labrador LaMalfa
 Clawson (FL) LaMalfa Scalise
 Coffman Latta Schweikert
 Collins (GA) Long Scott, Austin
 Collins (NY) Loudermilk Sensenbrenner
 Conaway Love Sessions
 Cook Luetkemeyer Simpson
 Costello (PA) Lummis Smith (MO)
 Crawford Marchant Smith (NE)
 Crenshaw Marino Smith (TX)
 Culberson Massie Stewart
 Dent McCarthy Stivers
 DeSantis McCaul Stutzman
 DesJarlais McClintock Thornberry
 Diaz-Balart McHenry Tiberi
 Duffy McMorris Tipton
 Duncan (SC) Rodgers Trott
 Ellmers (NC) McSally
 Emmer (MN) Meadows Valadao
 Farenthold Meehan Wagner
 Fleischmann Messer Walberg
 Fleming Mica Walker
 Flores Miller (FL) Walorski
 Forbes Miller (MI) Walters, Mimi
 Foxx Mooney (WV) Webster (FL)
 Franks (AZ) Mullin Wenstrup
 Garrett Mulvaney Westmoreland
 Gibbs Neugebauer Williams
 Gohmert Newhouse Wilson (SC)
 Goodlatte Noem Wittman
 Gosar Nugent Womack
 Gowdy Nunes Yoder
 Granger Olson Yoho
 Graves (GA) Palazzo Young (AK)
 Graves (LA) Palmer Young (IA)
 Graves (MO) Paulsen Young (IN)
 Guinta Pearce

NOES—237

Aguilar Castor (FL) DeIBene
 Amodei Castro (TX) Denham
 Ashford Chu, Judy DeSaulnier
 Barletta Cicilline Deutch
 Bass Clark (MA) Dingell
 Beatty Clarke (NY) Doggett
 Becerra Clay Dold
 Bera Clyburn Donovan
 Beyer Cohen Doyle, Michael
 Bishop (GA) Cole F.
 Blumenauer Comstock Duckworth
 Bonamici Connolly Edwards
 Bost Conyers Ellison
 Boustany Cooper Engel
 Boyle, Brendan Costa Eshoo
 F. Courtney Esty
 Brady (PA) Cramer Farr
 Brown (FL) Crowley Fattah
 Brownley (CA) Cuellar Fitzpatrick
 Butterfield Cummings Fortenberry
 Calvert Curbelo (FL) Foster
 Carson (IN) Davis (GA) Frankel (FL)
 Cartwright Davis, Danny Frelinghuysen
 Calvert Davis, Rodney Fudge
 Carson (IN) Delaney Gabbard
 Cartwright DeLauro Gallego
 DeLauro Garamendi

Gibson Lofgren Rush
 Graham Lowenthal Ryan (OH)
 Grayson Lowey Sanchez, Linda
 Green, Al Lucas T.
 Green, Gene Lujan Grisham Sanchez, Loretta
 Griffith (NM) Sarbanes
 Grijalva Luján, Ben Ray Schakowsky
 Grothman (NM) Schiff
 Gutiérrez Lynch Schrader
 Hahn MacArthur Scott (VA)
 Hanna Maloney, Sean Scott, David
 Harper Matsui Serrano
 Hartzler McCollum Sewell (AL)
 Hastings McDermott Sherman
 Heck (WA) McGovern Shimkus
 Higgins Renacci Shuster
 Himes McKinley Sinema
 Hinojosa Meeks Sires
 Honda Meng Slaughter
 Hoyer Moolenaar Smith (NJ)
 Huffman Moore Smith (WA)
 Israel Moulton Speier
 Jackson Lee Murphy (FL) Stefanik
 Jeffries Murphy (PA) Swalwell (CA)
 Jenkins (KS) Nadler Takai
 Jenkins (WV) Napolitano Takano
 Johnson (GA) Neal Thompson (CA)
 Johnson, E. B. Nolan Thompson (MS)
 Joyce Norcross Thompson (PA)
 Kaptur O'Rourke Titus
 Katko Pallone Tonko
 Keating Pascrell Torres
 Kelly (IL) Payne Tsongas
 Kelly (PA) Pelosi Turner
 Kennedy Perlmutter Upton
 Kildee Peters Van Hollen
 Kilmer Peterson Vargas
 Kind Pingree Veasey
 King (NY) Pitts Vela
 Kinzinger (IL) Pocan Velázquez
 Kirkpatrick Polis Kirpatrick
 Kuster Price (NC) Walden
 Lance Quigley Walz
 Langevin Rangel Wasserman
 Larsen (WA) Reed Schultz
 Larson (CT) Reichert Waters, Maxine
 Lawrence Rice (NY) Watson Coleman
 Lee Richmond Welch
 Levin Ros-Lehtinen Westerman
 Lewis Ross Whitfield
 Lieu, Ted Rothfus Wilson (FL)
 Lipinski Roybal-Allard Yarmuth
 Ruiz Ruiz Zeldin
 Loeb sack Ruppertsberger Zinke

NOT VOTING—10

Adams DeFazio Maloney
 Buck Duncan (TN) Carolyn
 Cárdenas Fincher Woodall
 Cleaver Lamborn

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR
 The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
 There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1930

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana changed her vote from “no” to “aye.”
 So the amendment was rejected.
 The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SCHIFF
 The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 157, noes 266, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 316]

AYES—157

Aguilar Gallego Napolitano
 Ashford Garamendi Newhouse
 Bass Grayson Nolan
 Beatty Green, Gene Norcross
 Becerra Gutiérrez O'Rourke
 Beyer Hahn Pallone
 Bishop (GA) Hastings Pascrell
 Blum Heck (WA) Payne
 Blumenauer Higgins Pelosi
 Bonamici Himes Peters
 Boyle, Brendan Hinojosa Peterson
 F. Honda
 Brooks (AL) Hoyer Price (NC)
 Brownley (CA) Huffman Quigley
 Bustos Israel Jackson Lee
 Butterfield Jefferson Rangel
 Capps Jeffries Richmond
 Capuano Jones Roybal-Allard
 Carney Jordan Ruiz
 Castor (FL) Kaptur Rush
 Castro (TX) Keating Ryan (OH)
 Chu, Judy Kelly (IL) Sánchez, Linda
 Cicilline Kennedy T.
 Clark (MA) Kildee Sanchez, Loretta
 Clay Kilmer Sarbanes
 Clyburn Kind Schakowsky
 Connolly Kirkpatrick Schiff
 Conyers Kuster Scott (VA)
 Cooper Langevin Scott, David
 Courtney Larson (CT) Sensenbrenner
 Crowley Lee Serrano
 Culberson Levin Sewell (AL)
 Davis (CA) Lieu, Ted Sherman
 Davis, Danny Loeb sack Sinema
 DeGette Lofgren Slaughter
 Delaney Lowenthal Smith (WA)
 DeLauro Lowey Speier
 DelBene Lujan Grisham Swalwell (CA)
 (NM) Takano
 Deutch Luján, Ben Ray Thompson (CA)
 Dingell (NM) Thompson (MS)
 Doggett Lummis Tonko
 Duncan (SC) Lynch Tsongas
 Edwards Massie Van Hollen
 Ellison Matsui Vargas
 Engel McCollum Velázquez
 Eshoo McDermott Visclosky
 Esty McGovern Walz
 Farr McNeerney Wasserman
 Foster Meeks Schultz
 Frankel (FL) Meng Welch
 Franks (AZ) Moulton Whitfield
 Fudge Murphy (FL) Yoho
 Gabbard Nadler Zeldin

NOES—266

Abraham Collins (GA) Gohmert
 Aderholt Collins (NY) Goodlatte
 Allen Comstock Gosar
 Amash Conaway Gowdy
 Amodei Cook Graham
 Babin Costa Granger
 Barletta Costello (PA) Graves (GA)
 Barr Cramer Graves (LA)
 Barton Crawford Graves (MO)
 Benishek Crenshaw Green, Al
 Bera Cuellar Griffith
 Bilirakis Cummings Grijalva
 Bishop (MI) Curbelo (FL) Grothman
 Bishop (UT) Davis, Rodney Guinta
 Black Denham Guthrie
 Blackburn Dent Hanna
 Bost DeSantis Hardy
 Boustany DesJarlais Harper
 Brady (PA) Diaz-Balart Harris
 Brady (TX) Dold Hartzler
 Brat Donovan Heck (NV)
 Bridenstine Doyle, Michael Hensarling
 Brooks (IN) F. Herrera Beutler
 Brown (FL) Duckworth Hice, Jody B.
 Buchanan Duffy Hill
 Bucshon Ellmers (NC) Holding
 Burgess Emmer (MN) Hudson
 Byrne Farenthold Huelskamp
 Calvert Fattah Huiזנגa (MI)
 Carson (IN) Fitzpatrick Hultgren
 Carter (GA) Fleischmann Hunter
 Carter (TX) Fleming Hurd (TX)
 Cartwright Cartwright Hurl (VA)
 Chabot Forbes Issa
 Chaffetz Fortenberry Jenkins (KS)
 Clarke (NY) Foxx Jenkins (WV)
 Clawson (FL) Frelinghuysen Johnson (GA)
 Coffman Garrett Johnson (OH)
 Cohen Gibbs Johnson, E. B.
 Cole Gibson Johnson, Sam

Jolly
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lance
Larsen (WA)
Latta
Lawrence
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
MacArthur
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neal
Neugebauer

NOT VOTING—10

Adams
Buck
Cárdenas
Cleaver

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1934

Messrs. CONYERS, JORDAN, and GUTIÉRREZ changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. POSEY

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. POSEY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 148, noes 275, not voting 10, as follows:

Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Takai
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Titus
Torres
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Veasey
Vela
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Yarmuth
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zinke

NOT VOTING—10

Adams
Buck
Cárdenas
Cleaver

NOES—275

Aderholt
Aguilar
Amodei
Ashford
Barletta
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bost
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Capps
Capuano
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clarke (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Comstock
Connolly
Conyers

[Roll No. 317]

AYES—148

Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
HuiZenga (MI)
Hunt
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly (MS)
King (IA)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
Tipton
Trott
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Womack
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—10

Adams
Buck
Cárdenas
Cleaver

Joyce
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Sean
Marino
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
McSally
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Mica

NOT VOTING—10

Adams
Buck
Cárdenas
Cleaver

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1939

Mr. FORBES changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. POSEY

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. POSEY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 134, noes 287, not voting 12, as follows:

Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Roe (TN)
Rohrabacher
Rooney (FL)
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Stewart
Stutzman
Tipton
Trott
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Womack
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)

Moore
Moulton
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Newhouse
Nolan
Norcross
Nunes
O'Rourke
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Ribble
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rokita
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schradler

Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stefanik
Stivers
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wittman
Yarmuth
Zeldin
Zinke

[Roll No. 318]

AYES—134

Abraham Hartzler Pearce
 Allen Hensarling Pittenger
 Amash Hice, Jody B. Poe (TX)
 Babin Hill Poliquin
 Barr Holding Pompeo
 Barton Hudson Posey
 Benishek Huelskamp Price, Tom
 Bilirakis Huizenga (MI) Ratcliffe
 Bishop (MI) Hunter Renacci
 Bishop (UT) Hurt (VA) Roe (TN)
 Black Issa Rohrabacher
 Blackburn Jenkins (KS) Rooney (FL)
 Blum Johnson (OH) Rothfus
 Boustany Johnson, Sam Rouzer
 Brady (TX) Jones Royce
 Brat Jordan Russell
 Bridenstine Kelly (MS) Salmon
 Brooks (AL) King (IA) Sanford
 Burgess Kline Schalise
 Carter (GA) Knight Schweikert
 Chabot LaMalfa Scott, Austin
 Chaffetz Latta Sensenbrenner
 Clawson (FL) Long Sessions
 Coffman Loudermilk
 Collins (GA) Love Smith (MO)
 Conaway Luetkemeyer Smith (NE)
 Cook Lummis Smith (TX)
 Crawford Marchant Stewart
 DeSantis Massie Stutzman
 DesJarlais McCarthy Tipton
 Duffy McClintock Trott
 Duncan (SC) McHenry Wagner
 Ellmers (NC) Meadows Walberg
 Emmer (MN) Messer Walden
 Fleming Miller (FL) Walker
 Flores Miller (MI) Weber (TX)
 Franks (AZ) Moolenaar Webster (FL)
 Garrett Mooney (WV) Westrup
 Gohmert Mullin Westerman
 Gosar Mulvaney Westmoreland
 Gowdy Neugebauer Williams
 Graves (GA) Nugent Wilson (SC)
 Guinta Olson Yoder
 Guthrie Palmer Yoho
 Harris Paulsen Young (IA)

NOES—287

Aderholt Courtney Goodlatte
 Aguilar Cramer Graham
 Amodei Crenshaw Granger
 Ashford Crowley Graves (LA)
 Barletta Cuellar Graves (MO)
 Bass Culberson Grayson
 Beatty Cummings Green, Al
 Becerra Curbelo (FL) Green, Gene
 Bera Davis (CA) Griffith
 Beyer Davis, Danny Grijalva
 Bishop (GA) Davis, Rodney Grothman
 Blumenauer DeGette Gutiérrez
 Bonamici Delaney Hahn
 Bost DeLauro Hanna
 Boyle, Brendan DelBene Hardy
 F. Denham Harper
 Brady (PA) Dent Hastings
 Brooks (IN) DeSaulnier Heck (NV)
 Brown (FL) Deutch Heck (WA)
 Brownley (CA) Diaz-Balart Herrera Beutler
 Buchanan Dingell Higgins
 Bucshon Doggett Himes
 Bustos Dold Hinojosa
 Butterfield Donovan Honda
 Byrne Doyle, Michael Hoyer
 Calvert F. Huffman
 Capps Duckworth Hultgren
 Capuano Edwards Hurd (TX)
 Carney Ellison Israel
 Carson (IN) Engel Jackson Lee
 Carter (TX) Eshoo Jeffries
 Cartwright Esty Jenkins (WV)
 Castor (FL) Farenthold Johnson (GA)
 Castro (TX) Farr Johnson, E. B.
 Chu, Judy Fattah Jolly
 Cicilline Fitzpatrick Joyce
 Clark (MA) Fleischmann Kaptur
 Clarke (NY) Forbes Katko
 Clay Fortenberry Keating
 Clyburn Foster Kelly (IL)
 Cohen Foxx Kelly (PA)
 Cole Frankel (FL) Kennedy
 Collins (NY) Frelinghuysen Kildee
 Comstock Fudge Kilmer
 Connolly Gabbard Kind
 Conyers Gallego King (NY)
 Cooper Garamendi Kinzinger (IL)
 Costa Gibbs Kirkpatrick
 Costello (PA) Gibson Kuster

Labrador Palazzo
 Lance Pallone
 Langevin Pascrell
 Larsen (WA) Payne
 Larson (CT) Pelosi
 Lawrence Perlmutter
 Lee Perry
 Levin Peters
 Lewis Peterson
 Lieu, Ted Pingree
 Lipinski Pitts
 LoBiondo Pocan
 Loeb sack Polis
 Lofgren Price (NC)
 Lowenthal Quigley
 Lowey Rangel
 Lucas Reed
 Lujan Grisham Reichert
 (NM) Ribble
 Luján, Ben Ray Rice (NY)
 (NM) Rice (SC)
 Lynch Richmond
 MacArthur Rigell
 Maloney, Sean Roby
 Marino Rogers (AL)
 Matsui Rogers (KY)
 McCaul Rokita
 McCollum Ros-Lehtinen
 McDermott Roskam
 McGovern Ross
 McKinley Roybal-Allard
 McNeerney Ruiz
 McSally Ruppertsberger
 Meehan Rush
 Meeks Ryan (OH)
 Meng Ryan (WI)
 Mica Sánchez, Linda
 Moore T.
 Moulton Sanchez, Loretta
 Murphy (FL) Sarbanes
 Murphy (PA) Schakowsky
 Nadler Schiff
 Napolitano Schrader
 Neal Scott (VA)
 Newhouse Scott, David
 Noem Serrano
 Nolan Sewell (AL)
 Norcross Sherman
 Nunes Shimkus

Shuster
 Simpson
 Sinema
 Sires
 Slaughter
 Smith (NJ)
 Smith (WA)
 Speier
 Stefanik
 Stivers
 Swalwell (CA)
 Takai
 Takano
 Thompson (CA)
 Thompson (MS)
 Thompson (PA)
 Thornberry
 Tiberi
 Titus
 Tonko
 Torres
 Tsongas
 Turner
 Upton
 Valadao
 Van Hollen
 Vargas
 Veasey
 Vela
 Velázquez
 Visclosky
 Walorski
 Walters, Mimi
 Walz
 Wasserman
 Schultz
 Waters, Maxine
 Watson Coleman
 Welch
 Whitfield
 Wilson (FL)
 Wittman
 Womack
 Yarmuth
 Young (AK)
 Young (IN)
 Zeldin
 Zinke

□ 1945

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2685, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2016, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2393, COUNTRY OF ORIGIN LABELING AMENDMENTS ACT OF 2015

Mr. NEWHOUSE, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 114-145) on the resolution (H. Res. 303) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2685) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes, and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2393) to amend the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 to repeal country of origin labeling requirements with respect to beef, pork, and chicken, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H. RES. 198

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Congressman AMASH be removed as a cosponsor of H. Res. 198.

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

There was no objection.

NOT VOTING—12

Adams
 Buck
 Cárdenas
 Cleaver
 DeFazio

Duncan (TN)
 Fincher
 Lamborn
 Maloney,
 Carolyn

McMorris
 Rodgers
 O'Rourke
 Woodall

□ 1944

So the amendment was rejected.
 The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. LAMBORN. Madam Chair, I was unavoidably detained on account of a flight delay. Had I been present I would have voted "aye" on rollcall vote 309, "aye" on rollcall vote 310, "aye" on rollcall vote 311, "aye" on rollcall vote 312, "aye" on rollcall vote 313, "aye" on rollcall vote 314, "aye" on rollcall vote 315, "nay" on rollcall vote 316, "aye" on rollcall vote 317, and "aye" on rollcall vote 318.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Madam Chair, I move that the Committee do now rise. The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN) having assumed the chair, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Acting Chair 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. 2577) making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

TRANSPORTATION, HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2016

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 2577, and that I may include tabular material on the same.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 287 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2577.

Will the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) kindly resume the chair.

□ 1949

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2577) making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes, with Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, an amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. POSEY) had been disposed of, and the bill had been read through page 156, line 15.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Madam Chair, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN) for the purpose of a colloquy.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I thank the chairman for yielding, and I thank him for his great work on this appropriations bill.

Madam Chairman, for over 20 years I have been a staunch advocate for reducing aircraft noise over northern New Jersey. I have attended dozens of public hearings and meetings with officials from the FAA and responded to thousands of calls from constituents whose lives have been affected by increased aircraft noise.

While the safety of airplane passengers is paramount and the vitality of our air transport system is important, people on the ground have a right to a quality of life with a minimum exposure to air noise overhead.

Despite spending over \$70 million in taxpayer dollars on the New York, New Jersey, and Philadelphia airspace redesign project, time and time again the Federal Aviation Administration has turned a deaf ear to the tremendous impact air noise has had over northern New Jersey. I recently wrote two letters to the FAA to bring my constituent concerns directly to Administrator Michael Huerta's attention. To date, these letters and my constituents' pleas for help have gone unanswered.

As the FAA proceeds with the New York, New Jersey, and Philadelphia airspace redesign, they must factor air noise into their calculations. I look forward to working with the chairman to ensure that this is done.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. I want to again thank the gentleman for raising this important issue. I appreciate his dedication to ensuring that his constituents' air noise concerns are adequately addressed by the FAA.

Again, I thank the gentleman, and I yield back the balance of my time.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. MAXINE WATERS OF CALIFORNIA

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. 4. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to establish any asset management position (including any account executive, senior account execu-

tive, and troubled asset specialist position, as such positions are described in the Field Resource Manual (Wave 1) entitled "Transformation: Multifamily for Tomorrow" of the Department of Housing and Urban Development) of the Office of Multifamily Housing of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, or newly hire an employee for any asset management position, that is located at a Core office (as such term is used in such Field Resource Manual) before filling each such asset management position that is located at a Non-Core office (as such term is used in such Field Resource Manual) and has been vacated since October 1, 2015.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentlewoman from California and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Madam Chair, I rise to offer an amendment regarding HUD's multifamily transformation plan. I will ultimately withdraw this amendment because I know that there will be Republican opposition, but I think it is important for me to speak out against the ill-advised plan.

The Department of Housing and Urban Development is currently in the process of a major consolidation of its multifamily offices, which it has dubbed the multifamily transformation plan. I have been vocal in my skepticism of HUD's assurances that this plan will bring about significant savings without impacting program delivery.

In fact, last year this House approved an amendment to the fiscal year 2015 appropriations bill that required HUD to follow a transformation plan that maintains asset management staff in its field offices. I fought for this amendment because I believe strongly that HUD's plan to consolidate the important function of asset management from 17 hubs overseeing 50 field offices into just 5 hub locations and 7 satellite offices would significantly impair program delivery without resulting in significant cost savings.

Asset management is a hands-on job which calls for an intimate knowledge of the local housing market and frequently requires staff to make on-site visits to troubled properties. That is why it is so important to have asset management staff in local field offices to respond to local needs.

Unfortunately, I have been hearing from advocates that HUD has been failing to replace vacancies in asset management positions in field offices and is only hiring new asset management staff in hub locations. This is unacceptable. There are already two field offices that have completely shuttered because they have no working staff. In Los Angeles, we have already lost 15 asset management staff who have not been replaced.

My amendment would ensure that HUD prioritizes the hiring of asset management staff in local field offices for vacancies that occur in the next fiscal year instead of continuing to con-

solidate this important function to a select few hub and satellite locations. It would help ensure that our multifamily field offices remain open and operating at current staffing levels. Without this amendment, local multifamily offices will continue to have more vacancies that go unfilled.

I regretfully ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. YOHO

Mr. YOHO. I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used in contravention of subpart E of part 5 of the regulations of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development (24 C.F.R. Part 5, Subpart E; relating to restrictions on assistance to noncitizens).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Florida and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. YOHO. Madam Chair, my amendment simply ensures that no funds can be used to circumvent current law which prevents illegal immigrants from obtaining housing assistance. Spending should be prioritized based on the needs of American taxpaying citizens, not those who are residing in our country illegally.

Constituents back in my district and throughout the country work hard every day, and their needs should not play second fiddle to those of immigrants who broke our laws and came into this country illegally.

With the continued efforts by some in this country to disregard the rule of law, much to the detriment of taxpaying Americans, I truly believe this amendment is necessary to clarify and reinforce the intent of Congress as it pertains to housing assistance providing via HUD.

This is a simple, commonsense amendment that shows the hard-working American citizens that we are serious when it comes to spending their tax dollars and that we will not use their hard-earned money to prioritize and reward those who break our laws. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and support the rule of law.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Madam Chair, I do oppose this amendment. On the face of it, it simply restates existing regulations, but I fear there is another motive at play, that is, an anti-immigrant agenda.

Let me explain what I mean. This amendment feeds into the widely held misperception that many undocumented individuals are, in fact, obtaining Federal benefits despite restrictions—verification procedures—specifically designed to prohibit such activity.

We must not allow this appropriations bill to become a platform to denigrate immigrants in this country or to score political points at their expense. We need real solutions. We need to actually fix our broken immigration system. We shouldn't be wasting valuable floor time on amendments such as these. We would be better served by moving comprehensive immigration reform, fully debating it in this Chamber.

□ 2000

We are ready to do that. We can pass comprehensive immigration reform, if the Speaker would bring it to the floor, this very week. Until then, I would ask restraint on amendments that in no way alter existing law and regulation and only serve to stir controversy, reinforce prejudices, and distract us from the business at hand.

I urge defeat of this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YOHO. Madam Chair, this amendment is strictly about the rule of law and following the rule of law. I agree we shouldn't have to debate immigration here. This is not about this. This is about following the rule of law.

At this point, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT).

Mr. GOHMERT. Madam Chair, this amendment has nothing to do with being anti-immigrant. In fact, the gentleman's comments play into that accusation. This is entirely incorrect and inappropriate. In fact, it reminds me of a comment a President made from right up there at that podium that no illegal aliens would get ObamaCare. Somebody thought that was not true and said so. It turns out it was not true. They have gotten it.

I went home and talked to a number of people that were in and around Walmart this weekend—immigrants, people that are here legally, and they can't find work and they need help. They did everything to come here legally and properly—Hispanic Americans, Asian Americans, African Americans, Anglo Americans—and they just need help.

I would submit, if we are going to be true to the oath we took to our Constitution and the laws which uphold our Constitution, we need to be about helping those that are under our care, those who have come legally.

I support the gentleman's amendment, and I appreciate him doing it. It is a pro-immigrant amendment for immigrants that will come legally, and there are plenty of those here.

Mr. YOHO. Madam Chair, to the ranking member, I would love to have that discussion down the road about responsible immigration reform, and I think we need to have that. The Amer-

ican people expect it. They deserve it, and I look forward to having that.

In the meantime, this is just a commonsense amendment that strictly puts the emphasis on following the rule of law, and I think all Americans, regardless of what side of the aisle, would stand supporting the Constitution, the very document that we all took an oath to.

I yield back the balance of my time. The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOHO).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 16 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used in contravention of section 5309 of title 49, United States Code.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentlewoman from Texas and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Let me thank the ranking member, Mr. PRICE, and his staff, as well as the chairman, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, for their work on something that is very close and near and dear to many Members' hearts. It certainly is close to mine.

The Jackson Lee amendment was passed last year. I am grateful to have the opportunity this year to restate the fact that this amendment indicates that none of the funds made available by this act under the heading "Federal Transit Administration: Transit Formula Grants" may be used in contravention of section 5309.

This is, as I said, an amendment identical to the Jackson Lee amendment. Might I just briefly speak to this amendment. It affirms the importance to the Nation of projects that create economic development, particularly in the transportation area.

It particularly says that the Secretary of Transportation may make grants under this section to State and local governments; it has the authority to assist in financing capital projects, small start-up projects, including the acquisition of real property.

The key is that these grants under State and local authority can undertake capital projects, which means that, when local governments propose their projects, the Secretary has the

authority to go forward. Nothing can contravene that authority.

It is well documented that nothing enhances the competitiveness of a Nation in this increasingly globalized economy than investments in transportation and infrastructure capital projects.

I will include an article about transportation dated March 31, 2015, into the RECORD.

[From the Houston Chronicle, Mar. 31, 2015]
STUDY FINDS HOUSTON TRAFFIC CONGESTION WORSENING

(By Dug Begley)

As workday commutes go, Raj Dada's isn't terrible. He lives east of Jersey Village, an easy drive from the freeway. His off-ramp from Interstate 10 puts him practically in front of his job near Bunker Hill.

In each of the past three years, though, the daily drive has gotten worse, Dada said.

"I leave earlier than I used to," he said Monday morning as he stopped for gas near his office. "Even on weekends, it's taking longer to get around all the construction and traffic."

It's a common dilemma for Houston motorists. Congestion in Houston increased sharply from 2013 to 2014, according to a report released Tuesday by TomTom, developer of the mapping and traffic data fed to phones and other GPS devices.

Analysts said trips in the region on average last year took 25 percent longer than they would have in free-flowing conditions, compared with 21 percent longer in 2013.

This means that a hypothetical 30-minute, congestion-free trip, on average, takes about 52 minutes at peak commuting times. For an entire year, it means drivers waste 85 hours—more than 3.5 days—plodding along the highways and streets of Houston.

It's the first increase in TomTom's traffic index for Houston in four years after three consecutive years of slight declines.

Growing cities with robust economies tend to experience the biggest increases in traffic. Oil price dips notwithstanding, Houston certainly fits the bill, said Tony Voigt, the program manager for the Texas A&M Transportation Institute's Houston office.

Voigt said local analysis supports the conclusion in the TomTom report: More local streets and highways are more congested for more hours of the day. Even weekend trips to some spots—notably retail corridors—can be increasingly time-consuming.

"This is a result of more people living here as compared to two or three years ago and our economy being very active and healthy," Voigt said.

Nick Cohn, senior traffic expert for TomTom, said the opposite is true in places where job prospects are not as strong, based on the company's worldwide traffic research.

"In Moscow, where there has really been an economic slowdown and gas prices are up, there has been a slowdown," Cohn said.

Moscow and other international cities continue to experience traffic far worse than cities in the U.S. In the United States, Houston ranked 12th-worst among major cities for traffic, compared to 85th worldwide.

News that 11 other American cities have worse congestion isn't comforting to Houston drivers.

"It's terrible," said Debbie Curry, 60, a lifelong Houstonian. "Traffic in this city has gotten worse. When I moved (to western Houston) I thought it would get better. It did for a little while; now it's as bad as it's ever been."

Reasons why Houston drivers spend so much of their time in traffic vary, but most theories circle back to explosive growth.

"Some of the congestion on U.S. 290 and on (Loop 610 North) is, of course, construction-related," Voigt said. "But what we are really seeing is travel demand is greater overall, and this is causing the peak congestion periods to spread out."

Peak commutes, once contained to two hours each in the morning and evening, are spreading to three and sometimes four hours. Though it means more days when traffic is heavy for longer periods, the gradual growth of peak commuting periods isn't all bad, Cohn said.

"It means at least when possible they are being flexible with those work-to-home and home-to-work trips," Cohn said, noting that an alternative could be a more compressed—but more severe—peak commuting period.

Houston-area officials have a long list of road-widening projects planned over the next decade, along with some transit growth. Suburban areas, notably Conroe and The Woodlands, are exploring their own transit options. It's a pattern across the U.S., Cohn said.

Each city faces different obstacles, Cohn said. Houston's lack of density could make transit less effective, but public transportation remains a critical part of any congestion relief as roads dominate.

Many municipalities, state transportation officials and counties in the area have made "significant requests for roadway dollars," said Houston Councilman Stephen Costello, chairman of the Transportation Policy Council of the Houston-Galveston Area Council.

Those projects are not just about relieving traffic now, but about building before it gets worse, Costello said.

Any improvements are constrained by funding, which federal and state lawmakers have been slow to deliver. Federal officials remain at an impasse about a long-term transportation bill, and many have shown reluctance to increase federal highway spending. Texas voters last year approved \$1.7 billion for state highways, leaving about \$3.3 billion in additional money needed, according to the Texas A&M Transportation Institute.

That funding shortfall has many, especially officials in suburban Houston, worried as their traffic worsens and projects crawl toward completion, said West University Place Mayor Bob Fry.

"I think outside (Loop 610) is going to be worse for traffic than inside the Loop," Fry said. "Inside is built out, and it's not going to get worse like it is outside."

In the urban core, Fry said, transit is the important investment. He said Metro's upcoming redesign of bus service will "help quite a bit."

PERSONAL CHOICE

With projects slow to take shape, Cohn said drivers might see the best results by using an increasing and improving array of traffic information available to them. Houston's TranStar system—a partnership of Houston, Harris County, the Texas Department of Transportation and the Metropolitan Transit Authority—is one of the largest and most comprehensive real-time traffic systems in the country.

"There used to be a big difference between what the highway authority has and what real-time traffic systems have," Cohn said. "It is more of a unified service now."

When a motorist finds alternate routes to avoid congestion, it helps not just that driver but also others because one less vehicle is clogging up the problem spot.

Reliance on the information, and better personal planning, might be the best relief for traffic now.

"I don't think drivers can sit back and wait for some big infrastructure project," he said.

[From the Houston Chronicle, Feb. 5, 2013]

CONGESTION A CONSTANT FOR HOUSTON COMMUTERS

(By Dug Begley)

Houston region has been rated as having the sixth worst commute in the nation based on hours of delay.

The good news is that traffic congestion isn't getting much worse in the Houston area. The bad news is it was pretty bad to begin with.

Houston commuters continue to endure some of the worst traffic delays in the country, according to the 2012 Urban Mobility Report released Tuesday by the Texas A&M Transportation Commission. Area drivers wasted more than two days a year, on average, in traffic congestion, costing them each \$1,090 in lost time and fuel.

And it's unlikely to get any better, researchers and public officials say.

"I think as rapidly as this area is growing, (the challenge) is just trying to stay where we are," Harris County Judge Ed Emmett said of the traffic congestion.

Planned toll projects on U.S. 290 and eventually Interstate 45 will help ease traffic, just as the Katy Freeway managed lanes did in 2008, Emmett said.

Drivers take the congestion in stride and devise their own strategies to deal with the hassle. Roger Wilson, 54, takes a park and ride bus from Katy, but his co-worker Brad Steele, 39, drives in from Spring. Over lunch Monday, both claimed their method was best.

"Yeah, you get to read or sleep," Steele told Wilson, "but I would rather have my car."

But as long as Houston attracts jobs, and those jobs attract workers, commuting hassles will persist, said Tim Lomax, a co-author of the mobility report.

"We're hitting the limits of improving traffic by widening the roads," said Stephen Klineberg, co-director of the Kinder Center for Urban Research at Rice University.

With 4 million people in Harris County, and another 1 million coming in the next 20 years, the region will embrace new development patterns that reduce the need for driving—but on its own terms and without abandoning the car, Klineberg said.

"Suburban areas are developing town centers and walkable urbanist developments," Klineberg said, pointing to developments in The Woodlands, Sugar Land and Pearland.

DRIVERS ADAPTING

The new patterns follow years of steady outward growth, leading to greater distances between homes and workplaces.

Based on the mobility report, in 1982 drivers spent about 22 hours each year stuck in congestion, a figure that has increased almost every year since. Traffic congestion peaked in 2008 at 55 hours, the same year two carpool/toll lanes along I-10 opened between downtown and Katy. The lanes took five years to complete and cost \$2.8 billion.

But some of the best ways to reduce congestion are less costly. As Houston drivers have acclimated to rush-hour traffic jams, they've become more adept at saving themselves time.

"People are adjusting when they leave," Lomax said, noting resources that provide real-time traffic information. As smartphones and computers become more common, and workdays come with greater flexibility for some people to work from home, commuters can adjust to less-stressful drive times.

Thus, even though they have the sixth-worst commute in the country based on hours of delay, the region's drivers rank 21st on a new calculation that determines how

much extra time drivers have to build into their trips. The new measure, called the freeway planning time index, shows drivers don't have to build in as much extra time as others, because planning and good freeway clearance rates by tow trucks keep roads moving, Lomax said.

Public transit can provide some relief, but with jobs in Houston divided among a dozen or so job areas, it's hard for public transit to carry everyone where they need to go efficiently, Lomax said.

Still, drivers and elected officials said traffic congestion is spreading farther from the urban core and growing.

TRUCKING HURT

"I think within the next two years it is going to get worse," said Liberty County Commissioner Norman Brown, who said traffic is already worsening for some Dayton-area drivers.

Some congestion on the region's fringes is the result of trucking and manufacturing, Brown said. The mobility report found congestion accounted for \$646 million in cost to businesses reliant on trucking in 2011, up from \$490 million in 2007.

Emmett said the shipping growth demonstrates the need for investment in rail and other methods to move goods.

Lomax said congestion caused by flourishing truck business can be a good problem to have.

"Economic recession seems to be the one foolproof way of controlling congestion," Lomax said. "But nobody's saying that is a solution."

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Just to emphasize, finally, whether it is seaways, dams, highways, or tollways, whether it involves other modes of transportation, transportation projects are major engines driving the economy. That is why we are here on the floor. It is important for the local communities to be drivers of that. The metropolitan regions will not be able to maintain economic vitality without this investment.

Finally, the Jackson Lee amendment clearly speaks to the global aspects of the Secretary of Transportation having the ability to work with our local and State governments.

I ask my colleagues to join me in restating that the Secretary of Transportation has authority to work with local and State entities on the proposed projects that they have and for these projects to continue to grow and develop to ease traffic congestion.

Madam Chair, Let me thank Subcommittee Chairman DIAZ-BALART and Ranking Member PRICE for their leadership on this important legislation and for the opportunity to explain my amendment.

The Jackson Lee Amendment adds at the end of the bill the following new section providing that:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act under the heading "Federal Transit Administration—Transit Formula Grants" may be used in contravention of section 5309 of title 49, United States Code.

This amendment is identical to the Jackson Lee Amendment to H.R. 4775, the Transportation, Housing and Urban Development Appropriations Act for FY2015 adopted by the House last year by voice vote.

In particular, the Jackson Lee affirms the importance to the nation of projects that create economic development, particularly in the transportation area.

Pursuant to section 5309 of title 49, the Secretary of Transportation may make grants under this section to State and local government the authority to assist in financing capital projects, small startup projects, including the acquisition of real property.

This section further supports capacity improvements, including double tracking, and it specifically relates to work that deals with projects on approved transportation plans.

That is key; section 5309 of title 49 grants to State and local governments the authority to undertake capital projects, which means that when local governments propose their projects, the Secretary has the authority to go forward on them.

It's instructive to consider what some of the nation's leading transportation and economic development organizations have to say about the importance and economic impact of investments in local light rail capital projects.

It is well documented that nothing enhances the competitiveness of a nation in this increasingly globalized economy, than investments in transportation infrastructure capital projects.

Whether it is the seaways, dams, highways, or tollways, and whether it involves other modes of transportation, transportation projects are major engines driving the economy.

And it is important for the local community to be the drivers of that.

Metropolitan regions will not be able to maintain its economic vitality without the ability to create and preserve infrastructure that supports the movement of people and goods throughout our country.

The Jackson Lee Amendment clearly speaks to the global aspect of the Secretary of Transportation having the ability to work with our local and State governments.

Houston is the fourth most populous city in the country; but unlike other large cities, we have struggled to have an effective mass transit system.

Over many decades Houston's mass transit policy was to build more highways with more lanes to carry more drivers to and from work.

The city of Houston has changed course and is now pursuing Mass transit options that include light rail.

This decision to invest in light rail was and is strongly supported by Houstonians by their votes in a 2003 referendum and by their increased usage of light rail service made possible in part by transportation appropriations bills.

Specifically, Harris County voters passed a massive referendum proposal that was to set the stage for transit for the next 20 years.

It included a first stage of four light rail lines, to be complete by 2012, and a master plan for a 65-mile system, to be complete by 2025.

An April 2014 report by the Houston METRO on weekly ridership states that 44,267 used Houston's light rail service, which represented a 6,096 or 16% increase in ridership from April of the previous year.

This increase in light rail usage outpaced ridership of other forms of mass transit in the city of Houston: metro bus had a 2.3% increase over April 2013; metro bus-local had a 1.3% increase over April 2013; and Metro bus-Park and ride had a 8.0% increase over April 2013.

In a story published February 5, 2013, the Houston Chronicle reported on the congestion Houston drivers face under daily commute to and from work.

According to the Chronicle article, in 2011 Houston commuters continue to enjoy some of the worst traffic delays in the country, and Houston area drivers wasted more than two days a year, on average, in traffic congestion, costing them each \$1,090 in lost time and fuel.

Today, those figures have increased to 3.5 days a year wasted in traffic congestion, costing them each \$1,850 in lost time and fuel.

To put it in simpler and starker terms: A driver in Houston could see 154 movies this year or purchase 21 tickets to a home Texans game with the money wasted because of poorly maintained or traffic-clogged roads.

Expanded light rail is critical to Houston's plan to meet its transportation and environmental challenges, ease its traffic congestion, and improve its air quality.

Places most likely to see immediate benefit from light rail in Houston are the 50,000 students that attend the University of Houston and Texas Southern University.

Funds made available under this deal should be available to support local government decisions of the Houston Metropolitan Transit Authority and the city of Houston to expand rail service.

When we put our minds to it, we can get things done.

In Houston, we built a port 50 miles from the ocean, created the world's greatest medical center in the middle of open prairie, and convinced the federal government to base its astronauts in a hurricane zone 870 miles from the launch pad.

Each of those achievements shares a common element: elected officials have advocated, built public support, and brought the agencies together.

Members of Congress should respect the decisions of state and local governments when it comes to deciding how they will spend funding made available for public transportation under this appropriations bill.

I ask my colleagues to again support the Jackson Lee Amendment and affirm the authority of the Secretary of Transportation to work with local governments to develop local transit projects that will relieve traffic congestion, efficiently move people and goods, create jobs and maintain America's status as the leading economy in the world.

I ask my colleagues to support the Jackson Lee amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROOKS OF ALABAMA

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to provide financial assistance in contravention of section 214(d) of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 1436a(d)).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman

from Alabama and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Madam Chair, America recently blew through the \$18 trillion debt mark. America's Comptroller General warns that America's debt path is unsustainable.

In short, Washington's financial irresponsibility threatens America with a debilitating insolvency and bankruptcy that risks destroying the America our ancestors sacrificed so much to build.

With this impending financial crisis as a backdrop, I ask the House of Representatives to have the courage, to have the backbone, to be financially responsible. The House can do that in part by adopting my amendment that eliminates Federal Government housing subsidies for illegal aliens.

How big is this problem? Census Bureau data analyzed by the Center for Immigration Studies in 2012 reflects that at least 130,000 households headed by self-identifying illegal aliens live in public or subsidized housing. That is potentially hundreds of millions of taxpayer dollars being illegally taken by illegal aliens with the tacit or open consent or even the encouragement of the United States Government.

Think about that for a moment. While American families struggle to make ends meet, while America faces a debilitating and destructive insolvency and bankruptcy, while American families and lawful immigrants are being forced to wait in line for public housing, this administration ignores the law to spend potentially hundreds of millions of taxpayer dollars subsidizing illegal aliens, thereby encouraging their illegal conduct.

Madam Chair, my amendment is simple. It prohibits funding to subsidized housing in violation of section 214(d) of the Housing and Community Development Act that, for clarity, bars HUD from providing taxpayer assistance for the benefit of an applicant "before immigration documentation is presented and verified" by DHS' automated Systematic Alien Verification for Entitlements system or a subsequent successful appeal.

Unfortunately, this administration ignores the law and permits illegal aliens to move into public housing before the legality of their status is finally determined.

Also, unfortunately, the administrative and legal process being what it is, it takes as much as 2 years to evict illegal alien tenants after their illegal alien status is discovered.

Madam Chair, it is unacceptable that, in a time of out-of-control United States debt and deficit, HUD violates the law to give limited public housing benefits to illegal aliens, rather than needy American citizens and lawful immigrants.

Madam Chair, I urge the adoption of my amendment that, first, denies public housing subsidies to illegal aliens; and, second, underscores the sense of

Congress that the law must be obeyed and that it is wrong to use public housing subsidies to reward illegal aliens for their illegal conduct.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment. Once again, we have an amendment that, on its face, simply restates existing law. In fact, the gentleman offering the amendment has acknowledged that existing law categorically prohibits HUD benefits from going to undocumented persons.

What is going on here? What is lurking beneath the surface? I fear something is. An anti-immigrant agenda based on fear and prejudice would appear to be the answer.

We are feeding into widely held misconceptions that so many undocumented immigrants are seeking and receiving Federal benefits, that Federal programs, Federal dollars, are being abused and misused.

Well, we do need to have a remedy for our broken immigration system. As I said earlier, a comprehensive immigration reform bill, bipartisan, passed the Senate last Congress. It could be placed on this floor tomorrow and pass overwhelmingly. That doesn't appear to be happening. Instead, what we have is this drumbeat of measures that are denigrating the immigrant community.

We need to have some restraint in this body on such amendments. They don't alter existing law. They do, I am afraid, though, stir controversy. They reinforce prejudice and stereotypes. They distract us from the business at hand.

I think it is an unworthy amendment. I urge my colleagues to reject it, and I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART), the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I think it is important to just kind of always try to lower the decibels as much as we can.

This amendment, as both gentlemen have said, does not change current law. It doesn't change current HUD policies. It merely restates current law. I don't, frankly, see a reason to have the amendment. Likewise, I don't see a big reason to oppose the amendment that just, again, restates current law. I ask all sides to try to lower the rhetoric on this issue. This amendment does not change anything.

As the ranking member knows, I have been involved in trying to get immigration reform for a long, long time and have worked with a number of Republicans and Democrats. I will tell you that both sides have had opportunities to get it done, and neither side got it done when they had the opportunity to get it done. I am hoping that we will be able to get it done.

□ 2015

But this is not the time and place to have that debate. So, again, while I don't see the need for this amendment, I don't see what the issue is of objecting to an amendment that, in essence, does absolutely nothing.

I thank the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE) for allowing me some of his time.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I thank the chairman, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Madam Chair, I find it interesting and somewhat perplexing how my good friend across the aisle talks about an anti-immigrant agenda appealing to fear and prejudice.

It seems that whenever we start talking about border security and lawful immigration, the race card is played. And I would submit that that is because, in part, there is an absence of rational sound public policy for the position taken.

Let's emphasize something. America has, far and away, the most generous lawful immigration policy in the world. No nation is as compassionate with respect to lawful immigrants as the United States of America is, and I challenge anyone to say different.

I wish that this kind of amendment was not necessary, but when you have got an executive branch that has shown itself to be willingly lawless, to the point that two Federal judges, one in Pennsylvania and one in Texas, have had to render a decision trying to force this administration to obey the law, then I would submit, Madam Chair, that it is important to have these kinds of amendments to also deny the funding that otherwise would be used for that lawless conduct.

I ask for support of the amendment. I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BROOKS).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. ENGEL

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Department of Transportation, the Department of Housing and Urban Development, or any other Federal agency to lease or purchase new light duty vehicles for any executive fleet, or for an agency's fleet inventory, except in accordance with Presidential Memorandum—

Federal Fleet Performance, dated May 24, 2011.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from New York and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Chair, on May 24, 2011, President Obama issued a memorandum on Federal fleet performance that required all new light-duty vehicles in the Federal fleet to be alternative fuel vehicles, such as hybrid, electric, natural gas, or biofuel, by December 31, 2015.

My amendment echoes the President's memorandum by prohibiting funds in this act from being used to lease or purchase new light-duty vehicles unless that purchase is made in accord with the President's memorandum.

I have submitted identical amendments to 17 different appropriations bills over the past few years, and every time they have been accepted by both the majority and the minority. I hope my amendment will receive similar support today.

Global oil prices are down. We no longer pay \$147 per barrel. But despite increased production here in the United States, the global price of oil is still largely determined by OPEC.

Spikes in oil prices have profound repercussions for our economy. The primary reason is that our cars and trucks run only on petroleum. We can change that with alternative technologies that exist today.

The Federal Government operates the largest fleet of light-duty vehicles in America, over 635,000 vehicles. More than 6,000 of these vehicles are within the jurisdiction of this bill, being used by the Department of Transportation and the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

When I was in Brazil a few years ago, I saw how they diversified their fuel by greatly expanding their use of ethanol. People there can drive to a gas station and choose whether to fill their vehicle with gasoline or with ethanol and also possible blends as well. They make their choice based on cost or whatever criteria they deem important.

So I want the same choice for America's consumers. That is why I am proposing a bill in Congress, as I have done many times in the past, which will provide for cars built in America to be able to run on a fuel instead of, or in addition to, gasoline. If they can do it in Brazil, we can do it here, and it would cost less than \$100 per car to do.

So, in conclusion, expanding the role these alternative technologies play in our transportation economy will help break the leverage that foreign-government-controlled oil companies hold over Americans. It will increase our Nation's domestic security and protect consumers.

I urge that my colleagues support the Engel amendment.

In conclusion, I would just say that energy policy is something that is really important, and we can take a very

small step tonight to move closer to energy independence and protecting the American consumer. I would urge all my colleagues on both sides, as they have in the past, to support this bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HULTGREN

Mr. HULTGREN. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

Sec. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Federal Aviation Administration for the bio-data assessment in the hiring of Air Traffic Control Specialists.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Illinois and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. HULTGREN. Madam Chair, I rise today to offer my amendment, which defends a troubling hiring test put forth by the FAA which has led to cheating and questionable hiring practices for air traffic controllers.

The intent of my amendment is not to slow hiring, but to stop the FAA's use of a discredited gatekeeper hiring test.

I represent more than 270 air traffic controllers in Illinois' 14th Congressional District. More than a year ago, the FAA made an inexplicable and obscure change to its longstanding hiring practices, with few details given about how the changes would be implemented and with little advance warning.

Setting aside its decades-long process by which qualified Collegiate Training Initiative students and military veterans were given preference in hiring, the FAA implemented a new biographical questionnaire, or Bio Q, which contains such questions as, "How many sports did you play in high school?"

With no way to know what a right answer is, how to improve on the test, or what their final score was, many otherwise highly qualified applicants failed, after spending countless resources and time training to become air traffic controllers.

The new procedures caused the agency to divert the hiring process around highly qualified, CTI-certified trainees and experienced veterans, jeopardizing air travel safety in favor of off-the-street hires, some of whom have little experience or ambition.

Since then, the FAA has been under fire following a six-month investigation which uncovered that FAA or aviation-related employees may have assisted in giving potential air traffic controller recruits special access to answers on the Bio Q to help them gain jobs with the FAA.

This cheating is greatly disturbing and jeopardizes any shred of credibility

of the Bio Q that it had any accurate or fair test to determine who should be an air traffic controller.

Yet, we are now finding out that the cheating may run deeper than first reported, possibly with knowledge at the highest levels of the FAA.

If additional FAA or aviation-related employees helped applicants cheat on the Bio Q, it is imperative that we expose those responsible and determine how widespread and systemic the misconduct is.

I have urged Congress to compel the FAA to appear before the American people to get to the bottom of this troubling discovery. These investigations uncover just how discredited the Bio Q is in any hiring process.

But until we get answers to these questions, like who knew about the cheating, when did they know about it, and how did they cover it up, we cannot let the FAA employ people unfairly using the highly flawed Bio Q as a gatekeeper.

In addition, we still don't know what will happen to those who have either failed the Bio Q, aged out of the hiring process, or both.

Disqualifying highly trained, certified graduates and military veterans because they did or did not play sports in high school is ridiculous. This amendment would restrict funding for the Bio Q, stopping its use by the FAA.

When you climb into an airliner, you trust the pilot, the crew, and the air traffic controllers will keep you safe. I have introduced H.R. 1964, the Air Traffic Controllers Hiring Act of 2015, to reverse the effects of the FAA's policy, restore safety and confidence to air travel, and to make sure we have the best and brightest in our control towers.

I have hopes that this legislation can move quickly through the House and have urged the Transportation Committee to hold a hearing on the bill. Now that Aviation Subcommittee Chairman LOBIONDO has cosponsored the legislation, I am looking forward to the committee's consideration.

Until then, this amendment will help restore some sanity back to the FAA.

I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI), my good friend and colleague.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his work on this amendment and on the bill.

As the gentleman said, early last year, the FAA switched course on its hiring process by moving from the AT-SAT, which was a tried-and-true, knowledge-based test, to a bio-data assessment. The change had a tremendous impact on the 36 Air Traffic Collegiate Training Initiative schools.

I have one of the best of these schools in my district, Lewis University. Lewis 2 years ago won the Loening Trophy as the best aviation program in the Nation.

Maybe students chose to attend Lewis and these other schools because

of the advantages that CTI schools provided under the old hiring system. They decided at a young age to enroll in a program fostered by the FAA and were given the opportunity to excel on the AT-SAT, which was unfairly pulled out from under them.

Madam Chair, this amendment is a step in the right direction towards fixing the misguided policy change that had a negative impact on students and the universities that invested significant resources in training our future generations of air traffic controllers.

But I need to emphasize that this amendment should not come at the cost of slowing down the hiring of air traffic controllers. We have already suffered from a hiring and training slowdown and cannot afford further delays to staffing an essential safety function of the FAA.

Our hard-working air traffic controllers are already understaffed, and Congress must ensure that we are increasing their ranks quickly and with well-trained air traffic controllers.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes."

Mr. HULTGREN. I thank my colleague from Illinois, and I would also urge my colleagues to support this passage and to make sure that we continue to have the safest air traffic control towers in the world.

Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Madam Chair, I very reluctantly, actually, claim time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Madam Chair, I actually understand and, frankly, listened very intently to the gentleman's concerns, and I actually want to work with him to make sure that nothing is used that is absolutely arbitrarily, or frankly, totally unfair. And so I think the gentleman's concerns are very, very valid.

At this time, however, and that is why I say "very reluctantly" have to oppose, because, again, at this moment, I am concerned, hearing the other gentleman from Illinois mention the fact that we want to make sure that we don't slow down the hiring of the air traffic controllers. We need to hire another 1,500 new controllers in 2016.

So I not only appreciate the gentleman's concerns, but I, in fact, potentially could share a lot of his concerns.

But again, reluctantly at this time, because I am concerned about potentially slowing down the hiring of new controllers, I reluctantly have to oppose his amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HULTGREN).

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

Mr. HULTGREN. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MEEHAN

Mr. MEEHAN. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. 416. None of the funds made available by this Act for Amtrak capital grants may be used for projects off the Northeast Corridor until the level of capital spending by Amtrak for capital projects on the Northeast Corridor during fiscal year 2016 equals the amount of Amtrak's profits from Northeast Corridor operations during fiscal year 2015.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Pennsylvania and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

□ 2030

Mr. MEEHAN. Madam Chair, before I begin my comments, I would like to thank Chairman DIAZ-BALART and Ranking Member PRICE for all of their diligent work on this bill.

My amendment seeks to prioritize investment in Amtrak's Northeast Corridor, which is its most heavily traveled route, by ensuring that operating profits that are earned there stay there.

Last year, Amtrak's Northeast Corridor line earned nearly \$500 million in operating profit. More than 100,000 Americans get on a train that travels along the Northeast Corridor every day, but instead of reinvesting those dollars into improvements in the line's infrastructure, much of that money was sent across the country, used to subsidize money-losing, long-distance Amtrak routes. This has left Amtrak's most heavily traveled route less funded, and it has delayed needed improvements to Amtrak's only line that actually turns a profit.

This amendment will fix that. It will ensure that the dollars Amtrak earns along the Northeast Corridor are invested into improvements in the line's infrastructure. It will make travel along Amtrak's most heavily used route safer, and it will also do so without adding to the taxpayers' burden.

This amendment will codify the principle that was passed in the Passenger Rail Reform and Investment Act, and I might add that that was approved with more than 300 votes in this House earlier this year. This tracks that same principle. And that legislation passed with the leadership of my friend and fellow Pennsylvanian, Chairman BILL SHUSTER, which requires that Amtrak direct capital investments into the Northeast Corridor, where it is needed most.

Madam Chair, more than 11 million Americans rode an Amtrak train between Boston and Washington last

year. Many more used rail lines like SEPTA or Metro-North, operating on tracks owned by Amtrak, to get to work every day. The tragic derailment in my own area of Philadelphia last month has shown that there is a desperate need to improve the line and strengthen capital investments in the region.

This amendment will ensure Amtrak makes smart investment decisions and directs capital spending where it is needed most. It will help Amtrak tackle the backlog of capital projects that plague the Northeast Corridor. It will reduce delays. It will mean safer, more efficient travel for millions of Americans who rely on Amtrak's Northeast Corridor every year. I urge my colleagues to support it.

I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART).

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Chair, there is a lot of work that goes into this bill and there is a lot of work that goes into the amendments, but I will tell you that the gentleman from Pennsylvania has worked nonstop to find real solutions to deal with making sure that Amtrak is safe and, in particular, that the Northeast Corridor is as viable and as safe as possible. So I just must commend the gentleman for his hard work, for the way that he has just worked this issue day in, day out to get to the point where we are today.

Mr. MEEHAN. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Madam Chair, I wish to claim the time in opposition.

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Madam Chair, I too want to commend my colleague for offering this amendment. I understand his intent. There are significant capital needs on the busy Northeast Corridor. It is Amtrak's busiest and most successful corridor. It is a fundamental flaw of this bill that we are unable to provide for the kind of investments that the service in that corridor warrants and, indeed, that the service of Amtrak nationwide warrants.

But the effect of this amendment, I fear, in the environment of inadequate investment, this would provide a much-needed boost in investment in the Northeast Corridor. It may be still not enough, but it would do so at the expense of the rest of the Amtrak network, and that should give us pause when we consider this amendment.

The amendment would require Amtrak to spend at least \$1.2 billion—the annual amount of Northeast Corridor revenues—on Northeast Corridor capital projects before they could spend any of their Federal capital funding elsewhere. This would have the effect of halting all capital projects that are not on the Northeast Corridor, including all information technology, upgraded safety technology, until very

late in the fiscal year at the earliest, and possibly longer, should projects on the Northeast Corridor not be ready to advance. This would also hinder Amtrak's ability to manage State and long-distance service.

I know that all of these consequences are probably not my colleague's intent, but it does demonstrate the types of consequences that we need to consider when making such a policy change. I ask colleagues to vote against this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. MEEHAN. Madam Chair, before I close my comments, I think it is important to recognize that the same principle has already been adopted by 318 Members of this body, including a near unanimous vote by my colleague from the other side of the aisle, his colleagues on that side of the aisle.

I will also say that I am not sure that the gentleman understands the actual effect of the bill. It simply is to reinvest the profits that are made on the Northeast Corridor. These are being made by the investments that are being made by the taxpaying people who are purchasing those tickets. We can still look for ways to fund other parts of the system around the country where they can earn their investments on merit.

We are asking, in light of the fact that this is a line which is so heavily used, the priorities be placed where they are most needed.

Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MEEHAN).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. NEWHOUSE

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to issue, implement, or enforce the proposed regulation by the Federal Aviation Administration entitled "Operation and Certification of Small Unmanned Aircraft Systems" (FAA-2015-0150) without consideration of the use of small unmanned aircraft systems for agricultural operations, as defined in 14 CFR 21.25(b)(1).

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Madam Chairwoman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NEWHOUSE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Madam Chair, I rise today to introduce an amendment on an important topic that will undoubtedly have a growing impact not just on our Nation's agricultural sector, but on our economy as a whole.

The use of unmanned aerial vehicles, or UAVs, has enormous possibilities for our economy, whether it is providing cost-effective means to deliver packages, photographing housing for Realtors, broadcasting sports games, assisting law enforcement with tracking criminals, or providing mobile WiFi hubs for Internet access. However, one vastly underconsidered outcome for UAV technology is that it could potentially transform our Nation's agricultural sector.

Ideas have been considered using UAVs to survey cropland, to determine property lines, or to help plan for planting, spraying, watering, or harvesting of crops; however, the potential applications are even greater. Depending on how this technology evolves, UAVs may be equipped with special cameras to determine if crops are dry and need extra water and where and how much should be applied. They may also be used to apply pesticides or fertilizers with precision to ensure that too little or too much isn't being used. And depending on their sophistication, someday, UAVs may even be used to harvest the food we grow.

The potential applications don't just stop there, though. In my district last year, we experienced the worst forest fire in Washington State history, consuming hundreds of thousands of acres. In the future, first responders, the Forest Service, and other stakeholders may be able to use UAVs to monitor the spread of fire to get people out of harm's way or to better predict where to best apply water and fire retardants. They could even help with identifying dry or overgrown areas in advance to help stakeholders know where treatment is needed, which could prevent fires in the first place.

Madam Chair, I appreciate the steps the FAA has taken in releasing draft rules regarding UAVs and that the FAA has been more agreeable in allowing testing of UAVs for commercial purposes.

While I understand that safety and privacy are enormous concerns being considered by the FAA, it is also important that we do not fall behind other nations in utilizing this technology, which are currently developing and innovating in this industry more rapidly than we are here in the United States.

Madam Chair, my amendment today is simple. It merely limits FAA's rule-making on UAVs if the rules do not take into consideration agricultural applications of UAVs in the rule-making process.

I appreciate the work the FAA is doing on this matter, and I hope the final rules that are expected later this

year generously allow for the safe testing and commercial use of UAVs, ensuring the amazing agricultural prospects for these technologies are well considered in the process.

Madam Chair, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. NEWHOUSE

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to issue, implement, or enforce regulations by the Federal Aviation Administration entitled "operations and certification of small unmanned aircraft systems" (FAA-2015-0150) in contravention to 14 CFR 21.25(b)(1).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Washington and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Madam Chair, in my previous comments, I addressed this amendment, which is in order, and I would just submit those comments to be used for this particular amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NEWHOUSE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GARRETT

Mr. GARRETT. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement, administer, or enforce the final rule entitled "Implementation of the Fair Housing Act's Discriminatory Effects Standard", published by the Department of Housing and Urban Development in the Federal Register on February 15, 2013 (78 Fed. Reg. 11460; Docket No. FR-5508-F-02).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from New Jersey and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

□ 2045

Mr. GARRETT. Madam Chair, I rise today, as I have done in the past, to offer an amendment that attempts to restore some sanity, fairness, and certainty to our housing market. My amendment would undo harmful economic actions taken by the administration that weaken credit availability and job creation. You see, the Department's final rule implementing the Fair Housing Act's discriminatory ef-

fects standard establishes regulations promoting the use of a legal theory known as disparate impact.

What is disparate impact? Disparate impact liability allows the government to allege discrimination on the basis of race or other factors based solely on statistical analyses that find disproportionate results among different groups of people and—get this—regardless of any evidence of any actual discriminatory actions or intent. Let me point that out again—regardless of any evidence of actual discrimination.

If, for example, a mortgage lender uses a completely nondiscriminatory standard to assess credit risk, such as maybe a debt-to-income ratio, they can still be found to have discriminated if the data shows different loan approval rates for different groups of consumers.

So real and actual discrimination must be prosecuted to the fullest extent of the law. I think that is something everyone here can agree on. But under the example that I just laid out, that lender could even have specific antidiscriminatory practices in play, in other words, he would have rules in his business in place, but still be found liable under this theory.

Predictably, by creating a presumption of discrimination, this rule will result in a perverse regulatory scheme where lenders, insurers, and landlords would effectively be required to intentionally discriminate among different classes of borrowers. Why? Just to protect themselves from becoming entangled in the regulatory pretzel-like logic of this administration.

So if we specifically consider the examples of homeowner insurance commonly considered factors, including an applicant's claim history, construction material, the presence or absence of a security system, the distance to the firehouse, well, they could be barred if they were found to result in creating a statistical disparity for a class defined by race or ethnicity or gender.

You see, sound risk-based lending insurance underwriting and pricing that unintentionally results in a statistical disparate outcome, that is not discrimination; rather, accurate risk identification and classification is absolutely essential to the lending of insurance businesses.

In addition to being unfair and unwise, the HUD rule is also unnecessary. Why? Because protected class characteristics are already prohibited from consideration in the risk assessment process.

You see, State law already prohibits insurers from recording race, for example. The HUD rule requiring race considerations there turns on its head and violates these laws. You see, all 50 States in this country have antidiscriminatory provisions in their housing insurance regulations, and there is no claim that these have been insufficient. The Federal Government, therefore, should be encouraging sound business practices, not punishing them to utilize them.

We have seen what risky lending practices can do to our economy already. Although I believe the Supreme Court will strike down disparate impact theory, we should do all we can in our power to rein in an administration policy that will increase the cost and undermine the availability of credit throughout the economy.

Now, to this Chamber's credit, let me point out, this House recently passed my amendment to the Commerce-Justice-Science Appropriations bill that would prevent the DOJ from using this very same theory.

I hope that we will continue to take a stand against this flawed logic and theory and promote sound business practices.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Madam Chair, I wish to claim the time in opposition.

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I rise in opposition to this amendment. It would nullify a critical enforcement tool that has been used, for example, to rule against discrimination and racially discriminatory zoning requirements, practices that exclude families with children from housing, discrimination by lenders, zoning requirements that discriminate against group homes housing individuals with disabilities. It is a critical enforcement tool, and it would be a very, very bad mistake to pass this amendment.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MAXINE WATERS), the ranking member of the Financial Services Committee.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Madam Chair, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment. I am very surprised that this amendment is being brought by my friend, Mr. GARRETT.

Mr. GARRETT's amendment seeks to empower HUD's efforts in enforcing the Fair Housing Act in such a way that relies on the disparate impact doctrine. It weakens our ability to protect Americans from discriminatory policies that deny them access to quality housing, quality neighborhood schools, and other resources.

The disparate impact doctrine is a very effective legal tool that has been used for decades to address seemingly neutral policies that have the effect of discriminating against protected classes.

The disparate impact doctrine provides legal redress for victims of hidden discrimination. It ensures that women cannot be evicted from their apartments solely because they were victims of domestic violence, and it ensures that veterans with disabilities are not barred from living in certain places solely because of the lack of accommodations for their disability. This amendment ignores the realities of harmful discrimination in our Nation

today, and it would eliminate well-established, decades-old protections for American families.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN), another outstanding Financial Services member.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Madam Chair, this amendment would absolutely, totally, and completely allow discrimination against our veterans. If you are a veteran and you need a service animal and if there is an area that is set aside with no pets allowed, that service animal can become a pet. We cannot allow veterans to be discriminated against.

With reference to this amendment being a theory, all 11 circuit courts have upheld it. It is not a theory. It is a standard. It is a standard that the courts adhere to, and it is a standard we ought not abrogate. We must continue.

I am absolutely, totally, and completely opposed to this amendment, and I beg that my colleagues would go on record as being opposed to it as well.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART).

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Madam Chair, I am wary of considering an amendment on a rule and regulation that is currently pending before the Supreme Court. The sponsor of the amendment is a good man, but I would hope that we would wait for the Court to issue its ruling and then the committee of jurisdiction can properly debate and consider what, if any, legislative action should be taken. For those reasons, I urge a "no" vote on this amendment.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON).

Mr. ELLISON. I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time, and I strenuously urge all Members to vote "no" on this particular amendment.

The fact is that residential segregation in this country has limited opportunities for people for so many years. And I don't mean segregation just in terms of race—people who are excluded because of race, because of gender, because of all types of reasons.

If we say that disparate impact has no place, then we will be precluded from looking into how disparity just causes people to have different chances to live the American Dream. We will be consigned to having to find a smoking gun or intent before we can take action to try to make this country fairer and more open.

This is a very bad amendment, and I urge all Members to vote "no."

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GARRETT. Madam Chair, how much time remains?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. GARRETT. The gentleman said, "The fact is." Well, everything we have heard for the last 5 minutes as the facts has absolutely nothing to do with this bill. This bill has nothing to do with vets and service animals. This bill has nothing to do with domestic violence and women not being able to be in the house. This has nothing to do with any of the weakening of State standards whatsoever.

This bill basically simply says that, if a lender to you says that you live in a wooden house versus a stone house, there might be different rates for your insurance. It says that, if your house is miles from a fire department and your house is right next to the firehouse, there might be different rates for the insurance and the mortgages and the loans you get on that house. Those are not discriminatory practices. Those are reasonable practices that businesses enter into. It has nothing to do with all of the examples just given.

This bill says we should continue to go after and prosecute when there is evidence of discrimination and intentional discrimination. This bill will not end that. This bill will not end your ability to look into the examples the last gentleman just raised. It would simply say that businesses should be allowed to use standard rationales in their risk analysis, whether it is debt-to-income ratio or construction materials and the like.

For those reasons, along with the other reasons I have already said and the host of organizations that support this legislation, and that this House just passed last week on the CJS bill, we should do so again tonight.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT).

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

Mr. GARRETT. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ELLISON

Mr. ELLISON. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to enter into a contract with any person whose disclosures of a proceeding with a disposition listed in section 2313(c)(1) of title 41, United States Code, in the Federal Awardee Performance and Integrity Information System include the term "Fair Labor Standards Act" and such disposition is listed as "willful" or "repeated".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Minnesota and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. ELLISON. Madam Chair, this amendment simply says that the United States Government should not give appropriations and pay contracts for people or companies who have been found to have willful or repeated violations of the Fair Labor Standards Act. In other words, if you have repeatedly and willfully stolen the wages of workers and you have a Federal contract, then you are not the kind of contractor who the American people, through the U.S. Congress, want to do business with.

No hard-working American should ever have to worry that her employer will refuse to pay her when she works overtime or take money out of her paycheck, especially if she works for a Federal contractor. The practice is known as wage theft. Right now, Federal contractors who violate the Fair Labor Standards Act are still allowed to apply for Federal contracts.

This amendment, which my colleagues from the Progressive Caucus join me in, will ensure that funds may not be used to enter into a contract with a government contractor that willfully or repeatedly violates the Fair Labor Standards Act. The amendment ensures that those in violation of the law do not get taxpayer support and should not get the rewards that other good contractors receive.

It is important to point out to Members contemplating this amendment that, if you are a contractor who pays your workers on time, who does what you are supposed to do, who has avoided willful violations and repeated violations of the Fair Labor Standards Act, you should not, as a good contractor, have to compete with somebody who gets a competitive advantage by stealing the pay of their workers. We should have good contractors competing for contracts, not contractors who make willful, repeated violations of the Fair Labor Standards Act.

This amendment relies upon violations reported to the Federal Awardee Performance and Integrity Information System.

□ 2100

That system looks back 5 years to review criminal, civil, or administrative agency actions which have a final disposition.

This amendment differs from previous amendments that I have offered similar to it because it targets actors who willfully or repeatedly engage in wage theft. The amendment would ensure that a single inadvertent violation would not disqualify a contractor, but it would show clearly that someone who had made repeated and willful violations would not be able to benefit from the contract.

I urge Members to vote in favor of this particular amendment because a penny worked for and a penny earned must be a penny paid; particularly when that penny is derived from a com-

pany with a Federal contract, we have a right to believe that we are going to be treated in an honest way.

I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Madam Chair, I want to commend my friend from Minnesota for offering this amendment. Every worker is entitled to receive pay, fair pay, for the hours they work. We know, unfortunately, there are employers, as the gentleman has stated, who refuse to pay for overtime, who make their employees work off the clock, who refuse to pay the minimum wage. These things go on.

The least we can do is take steps to ensure that those employers don't receive new Federal contracts. That is what the gentleman's amendment does. I commend him for offering it and urge colleagues to support him.

Mr. ELLISON. Madam Chair, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Minnesota has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. ELLISON. Madam Chair, I want to thank the gentleman for the support for this amendment.

Let me just point out a few things for Members contemplating this amendment.

An important think tank looked at this question and found that in total, the average low-wage worker loses a stunning \$2,600 a year in unpaid wages, representing about 15 percent of their earned income.

One thing that I believe Democrats and Republicans can agree on is that, if you break your back on the job all day long trying to earn a living and you don't get paid what you are supposed to get paid and your check is light, we all have to agree that that is wrong.

I expect to have an all green board up there because to do otherwise would say that you want to stand on the side of the wage thieves, the ones who are willfully and repeatedly making violations of the Fair Labor Standards Act.

I think that, as the United States Congress, we should stand together and say a penny worked is a penny that is going to be paid, and we are going to insist upon it.

Finally, I just want to say that breaking the law is a bipartisan problem. Nobody can stand with the contractors who do this. It is one thing to underpay your workers in a way that is consistent with the law by paying them the Federal minimum wage rate—I want to raise it; we may not agree on that—but for sure, we have got to agree that, for people who work for Federal contractors, we have got to insist that the contractors who pay these workers even less than they have earned should not benefit from a Federal contract.

To help the workers, we have to do this, and to help the honest Federal contractors, we have to do this.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Madam Chair, the gentleman's amendment is obviously very well intentioned.

However, the amendment, as drafted, is so broad that, for example, a contractor could be excluded for something as minor as failing to display a poster in a break room. Again, it is well intentioned.

We have to remember something. We fund a lot of contracts in this bill, everything from phone service to the computer systems that ensure an orderly and efficient air space. Potentially, this amendment could eliminate a number of those transportation-industry-dependent contracts.

Nobody wants to allow for lawbreaking; but, because it is so broadly drafted, the unintended consequences, I think, that folks could be caught in this are a lot more than I think many folks understand.

Again, though it is a well-intentioned amendment, I would urge a "no" vote on this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON).

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

Mr. ELLISON. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 28 OFFERED BY MR. EMMER OF MINNESOTA

Mr. EMMER of Minnesota. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to carry out any enrichment as defined in Appendix A to part 611 of title 49, Code of Federal Regulations, for any New Start grant request.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Minnesota and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. EMMER of Minnesota. Madam Chair, I rise to address an issue that is playing a role in crippling America's transportation system by driving our deficits and exacerbating the need for bailouts of the highway trust fund. As we debate how to fund transportation, one of the most vital functions of government, this body is being forced to make hard choices.

I want to thank Chairman DIAZ-BALART, the ranking member, and the members of the subcommittee for their

work on bringing this appropriations bill to the floor. Their work is definitely appreciated by me and my constituents. That said, it is inconceivable to me that, as we kick the can on a long-term transportation authorization bill, we continue to allow frivolous spending on transit projects.

As important as New Starts transit projects are to my State and my district, one would think that every last available dollar would go towards ensuring transit New Starts have the funding needed to make a line operational and as cost effective as possible.

Madam Chair, that is not what is happening. Within Federal grant applications, extras are being included that can dramatically raise the cost of transit New Starts.

Excessive enrichments such as artwork, landscaping, and bicycle and pedestrian improvements such as sidewalks, paths, plazas, site and station furniture, site lighting, signage, public artwork, bike facilities, and permanent fencing are included in the overall grant application.

Even more shocking is that the Federal Transit Administration doesn't include these extra costs into the cost-effective measurements for the overall cost of the project which serves to deceive taxpayers and Congress as to the project's real price tag.

Madam Chair, in my district alone, I have cities that have placed a moratorium on new business development due to severe transportation issues. It is insane to me and my constituents that we blindly spend money on the niceties rather than prioritize funds for the necessities.

There are numerous reasons that our Federal highway trust fund continues to run deficits and we will continue to have that debate; but one place that we can agree, certainly, is that Federal taxpayers should absolutely not be paying for things like artwork, furniture, lighting, and bike racks while transportation projects remain unfinished across America.

I understand the need and desire for transit projects—I have them in my district—which is why I have offered this amendment. We should make funds available to ensure more Federal dollars go to what the hard-working taxpayers who fund these accounts expect, transit projects, rather than expensive add-ons that are driving deficits in our transit accounts.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Madam Chair, in considering this amendment, it is important to be very clear about what the amendment means when it refers to enrichments.

This refers to improvements to a transit project like a sidewalk, paths,

plazas, lighting, and signage, things that can help individuals in utilizing transportation infrastructure and ensure that they do so in safety.

Unfortunately, Madam Chair, there are approximately 4,000 pedestrian deaths, comprising 14 percent of overall traffic fatalities each year. These enrichments are just the kinds of projects that could help reduce the risk for pedestrians, for bicyclers, and other users of our systems.

Now, the gentleman offering this amendment is just bordering on ridicule when he talks about site lighting. Really, site lighting? What is more important to promoting safety, promoting visibility, and discouraging those who would prey on individuals than site lighting?

Site lighting is extremely important in improving general safety in public places. It is incredibly important for protecting individuals against crime, including harassment and assault. That is what we are talking about here.

Now, the amount of funding that goes towards such enrichments is small relative to other expenditures, but it is a commonsense way that we can enhance our transportation projects, we can broaden their use, and, above all, we can ensure that they are safe for all users.

It is an unwise amendment, Madam Chair, and I urge its rejection.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. EMMER of Minnesota. Madam Chair, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. EMMER of Minnesota. Thank you, Madam Chair.

I have the utmost respect for my colleague from North Carolina, but he actually makes the argument for the amendment as opposed to opposed to it.

Yes, it reduces risk for bicyclists and pedestrians when you talk about signage, when you talk about certain lighting, when you talk about certain enhancements that are add-ons to the project that the Federal Government and the Federal taxpayer dollars are intended to fund.

The Federal taxpayer dollars should be going to the transit project that it is intended for, instead of all the extras. The local authorities should be responsible for those.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to support the amendment. It is a clear-cut amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. EMMER).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by

the gentleman from Minnesota will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. BASS

Ms. BASS. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the spending reduction account), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Federal Transit Administration to implement, administer, or enforce section 18.36(c)(2) of title 49, Code of Federal Regulations, for construction hiring purposes.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentlewoman from California and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. BASS. Madam Chair, as the economy continues to recover, 8.5 million Americans are still unemployed. Meanwhile, the effectiveness of local transportation agencies to spur job creation in their local communities is unnecessarily obstructed by restrictive Department of Transportation policies.

Limiting the ability of local officials to contribute to targeted job growth is detrimental to local economies across the United States, especially in communities where many remain jobless.

Local hiring and procurement policies have helped to provide quality job opportunities to residents in communities hardest hit by the economic downturn.

My local hire amendment is designed to help spur local job creation through federally funded transportation projects nationally.

My amendment would prevent the Department of Transportation from issuing regulations that prevent local hiring. Specifically, it would limit the regulations and burdens placed on local governmental agencies, preserve the competition and cost-effectiveness mandates in our current rules that govern Federal transit grants, and give local transportation agencies the necessary flexibility to apply geographically targeted preferences when making hiring decisions for federally funded transit and highway projects.

It is important to note that this local hire amendment does not require transportation agencies to implement local hiring policies. It simply gives local leaders the opportunity to do so if they determine it is in the best interest of their communities.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this important amendment. It will reduce burdensome regulations and spur local job creation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 2115

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BASS).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ZELDIN

Mr. ZELDIN. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill, (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration to institute an administrative or civil action (as defined in section 47107 of title 49, United States Code) against the sponsor of the East Hampton Airport in East Hampton, NY.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from New York and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ZELDIN. Madam Chair, I am proud to represent a district that is home to some of the most scenic destinations in the country, and all forms of transportation are part of our tourism economy. Yet, with the high season upon us, many of my constituents are finding themselves bewildered by actions of the FAA. Federal agencies ought to stand by their word and keep their commitments to Members of Congress and to the citizens we represent.

In 2012, the FAA made assurances to my predecessor that, in light of a 2005 court settlement between the FAA and a community group, the town of East Hampton, New York, would not be subject to certain regulations after December 31, 2014, when certain grant assurances expired and, thus, could adopt restrictions on the use of their airport without FAA approval.

The FAA has written that the town can proceed on certain course and not fear FAA reprisal for their actions. Earlier this spring, the democratically elected town board passed a set of airport regulations—all predicated on the FAA's written assurance to not take negative action against the town. Recently, however, the FAA has started wavering.

I am offering this amendment, which is 100 percent consistent with the prior written assurance made by the FAA. This amendment will hold the FAA to its word on this critical local issue, a local issue that should have a local solution—bring all sides to the table to improve the quality of life on the East End this high season.

Madam Chair, I urge all of my colleagues to support this effort. The people of the East End communities across Long Island and around America deserve straight answers and follow-through from government agencies.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition.

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Madam Chair, I do this, though, simply to express some concerns about this amendment and others like it that we have heard over the course of this debate.

I do have some concerns about limiting flight path options for the FAA in a piecemeal fashion from the floor of

the House. The FAA needs to have appropriate flexibility to use flight paths in the wisest ways, particularly if there are safety risks for incoming or outgoing aircraft. I do think, however, that the FAA needs to take note and be more responsive to the concerns that have been raised in these limitation amendments, and there have been several this evening and in the prior days of this debate.

I also want to observe that the FAA's authorization expires at the end of the fiscal year. Now, as I mentioned in the debate last week, our colleagues on the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee are exploring options to reform the FAA, including separating the FAA from the Department of Transportation, allowing it more independence over the use of its resources.

I would say this is an important time to encourage caution, to encourage our colleagues to think very carefully about a more independent FAA, one that does not have to rely on annual appropriations. Would it be as attentive to concerns such as those raised by communities and by our colleagues here tonight? We ought to move very cautiously in this area.

I strongly urge the FAA Administrator, in observing this parade of limitation amendments, to take note to ensure that the FAA is more attentive to the concerns that are raised by communities when developing their new flight procedures.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. ZELDIN. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman from North Carolina for his comments. Certainly, concerns within the First Congressional District of New York are the reason this amendment is being offered. I strongly urge my colleagues to support this important amendment so as to ensure that these local issues have local control.

I yield back the balance of my time. The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. ZELDIN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LEWIS

Mr. LEWIS. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 156, after line 15, insert the following new section:

SEC. 416. Notwithstanding Mortgagee Letter 2015-12 of the Department of Housing and Urban Development (dated April 30, 2015) or any other provision of law, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall—

(1) implement the Mortgagee Optional Election (MOE) Assignment for home equity conversion mortgages (as set forth in Mortgagee Letter 2015-03, dated January 29, 2015), allowing additional flexibility for non-borrowing spouses to meet its requirements; and

(2) provide for a 5-year delay in foreclosure in the case of any other home equity conversion mortgage that—

(A) has an FHA Case Number assigned before August, 4, 2014; and

(B) has a last surviving borrower who has died and who has a non-borrowing surviving

spouse who does not qualify for the Mortgagee Optional Election and who, but for the death of such borrowing spouse, would be able to remain in the dwelling subject to the mortgage.

Mr. LEWIS (during the reading). Madam Chair, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Madam Chair, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Florida reserves a point of order.

Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Georgia and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. LEWIS. Madam Chair, I rise today to offer an amendment to H.R. 2577.

When I was first elected in 1987, Congress created the first nationwide Home Equity Conversion Mortgage program. Also known as reverse mortgages, these loans differ from traditional mortgages and have very good intentions. They are designed to help seniors stay in their homes by using the values of their properties as a means for living more stable and independent lives. Since the borrowers must be 62 years of age or older, lenders often advise some borrowers to remove younger spouses from the titles. This allows them to be eligible for the program or to qualify for greater loans. Unfortunately, Madam Chair, many seniors are experiencing challenges in the program's actual operation.

For example, a citizen in my district, Mrs. Helen Griffin, reached out to my office last year. She and her husband took out a reverse mortgage on their home. In order to qualify, she agreed to be taken off the title. The lender promised that she could be added back on the title at a later date if they refinanced. Unfortunately, she and her husband had no idea how expensive refinancing would be. Like so many others, Mrs. Griffin was now in a dangerous financial situation. Upon the reverse mortgage borrower's death, a surviving spouse is required to pay the full balance due on the loan—or 95 percent of the value of the property—simply to remain in their home.

My amendment would protect people like Mrs. Griffin and allow them more time to protect themselves from foreclosure. I think we must do everything in our power to inform and protect unknowing senior couples from the danger of not only losing their loved ones but also their nest eggs.

Madam Chair, I want to thank the gentleman from Florida and his staff for working so hard on this legislation and for making a commitment to this issue. I look forward to continuing to work with the gentleman to make sure that we do all that we can to realize

the full goal of this important program.

Madam Chair, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DENHAM

Mr. DENHAM. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for high-speed rail in the State of California or for the California High-Speed Rail Authority, nor may any be used by the Federal Railroad Administration to administer a grant agreement with the California High-Speed Rail Authority that contains a tapered matching requirement.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from California and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. DENHAM. Madam Chair, once again, I am here one more year, offering another amendment to end this incredible waste of taxpayer dollars.

I have been clear about my position on high-speed rail. High-speed rail has a future in the United States. It just can't be done as it is being done in California—\$70 billion over budget and completely changed from the proposition that the voters originally voted on. If the Governor and the Obama administration are committed to bringing this high-speed rail to fruition, then it should go back before the voters and actually uphold the will of the voters.

This is a case study. If you want to get it wrong, if you want to end high-speed rail across the Nation, then go ahead and continue to waste dollars in California on a project that continues to have many different flaws. This authority in California is not only demolishing homes, but it is demolishing businesses. The only way they can continue to get right-of-way is through eminent domain—slashing farms, tearing down businesses, and now kicking people out of their homes.

Today, it was announced that, instead of ending the initial construction segment in the outskirts of Bakersfield, the rail work will now stop just north of Shafter—a full 8 miles of what the original segment was—with still no operating segment that will allow people to travel from one end of the State to the other or even from one end of the valley to the other. Currently, if you ride Amtrak from north to south, you have to get off in Bakersfield, get on a bus, go over the mountains, and take that bus until it hits rail in the LA area. Now we are going to have a bus in Shafter. This just doesn't make any sense. They continue to change over and over again.

In the wake of Amtrak accident 188 and with the incredible focus on safety that is necessary to pass PTC across the country, why wouldn't we take high-speed rail dollars and actually fix the safety improvements that need to be done in California? Where is the commitment to safety? Let's fix the positive train control and make sure that our trains in California are safe, and let's end this project that continues to waste taxpayer dollars.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Madam Chair, this amendment is a new twist on an amendment that the gentleman from California has been offering over the last few years. The net result, however, is the same. It would stop the development of California high-speed rail in its tracks, so to speak.

The amendment would prevent the Federal Railroad Administration from administering the funding that California received under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act. This would have the effect of preventing the FRA staff from providing routine project delivery oversight or invoicing on all of the environmental work funded under the grant agreement.

Do we want the Federal Government to conduct oversight on the projects that receive Federal funding?

Furthermore, with the Recovery Act funds set to expire at the end of fiscal year 2017, the amendment would make it virtually impossible for the California High-Speed Rail Authority to spend all of its funding by the deadline. It would put the completion of the project in grave jeopardy. In January, Governor Brown and other California leaders came together to mark the commencement of construction for California's high-speed rail project. The project is expected to create 20,000 jobs per year.

I include for the RECORD two letters—one from industry and one from labor groups. Both support the California high-speed rail project.

MAY 12, 2015.

HON. MARIO DIAZ-BALART,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Transportation, HUD, and Related Agencies, Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, Washington DC.

HON. DAVID E. PRICE,
Ranking Member, Subcommittee on Transportation, HUD, and Related Agencies, Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, Washington DC.

We are writing to voice our strong support for public works investment, including recent efforts to develop, construct and deliver high-speed intercity passenger rail service for the first time in American history. Specifically, we oppose the inclusion of harmful riders in the fiscal year (FY) 2016 Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act that would target or impede efforts to construct any specific high-speed rail projects, including the California High-Speed Rail program.

American public works infrastructure is at an inflection point, and this will be a pivotal

year as the U.S. Congress deliberates Federal highway, transit, rail and aviation policy bills, and debates how to fund Federal transportation programs that will meet our Nation's future mobility needs. Meanwhile, the State of California, in partnership with the Federal government, has made significant investments in intercity high-speed passenger rail. In January, the California High-Speed Rail Authority (the Authority) hosted a "Groundbreaking Ceremony" for the California High-Speed Rail program to mark the commencement of sustained construction, which will accelerate this year and create 20,000 jobs annually for the next five years. Additionally, the bids on the Authority's first two construction contracts, valued at almost \$2.2 billion, came in significantly under budget.

To date, the State of California has committed the majority of the funding that has been committed to build the program's initial operating section. And last year, the Authority secured the ongoing appropriation of 25 percent of all future California State Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund auction proceeds for the high-speed rail program—a dedicated revenue stream capable of producing hundreds of millions of dollars annually for direct funding or financing. The private sector is now also exhibiting a great deal of interest in investing in the program.

We believe that America is a country with bold vision that does big things, and we believe that robust investment in infrastructure benefits our industry and the American public. Congressional efforts to impede new public works projects in any one state send the wrong message to local, state and private sector investors in every state who are willing to invest in sorely needed new infrastructure projects in any mode of transportation.

Moreover, the California High-Speed Rail program represents the first ever effort to build an intercity high-speed passenger rail system in this country. California is at the forefront of developing an entirely new American industry where investments in and the development of new technologies, manufacturing capabilities, and innovative business practices will create high-skilled, good paying jobs and benefit American public works for decades. The Authority is also operating under a Community Benefits Agreement with skilled building trades and contractors to promote training and apprenticeship programs and provide opportunities for disadvantaged workers. Halting or impeding this seminal program at its outset will set our industry back and jeopardize thousands of new middle-class jobs.

We believe that the California High-Speed Rail program may serve as model of a Federal, state, industry and labor partnership that creates jobs, links economies and communities, preserves our environment and builds a sustainable future. Therefore, we respectfully oppose the inclusion of harmful riders in the fiscal year (FY) 2016 Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act that would target or impede efforts to construct any specific high-speed rail project, including the California High-Speed Rail program.

American Train Dispatchers Association;
Brotherhood of Electrical Workers;
Brotherhood of Railway Signalmen;
International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers;
International Brotherhood of Boilermakers;
International Union of Operating Engineers;
North America's Building Trades Unions;
SMART Transportation Division;
State Building and Construction Trades Council of California;
Transportation Communications International

Union; Transportation Trades Department, AFL-CIO; Transport Workers Union International; UNITE HERE!

JUNE 1, 2015.

Hon. SUSAN COLLINS, Chair,
Hon. JACK REED, Ranking Member,
Subcommittee on Transportation, HUD, and Related Agencies, Committee on Appropriations, U.S. Senate, Washington DC.

DEAR SENATORS COLLINS AND REED: As you prepare to consider the Senate's version of the fiscal year (FY) 2016 "THUD" appropriations bill, we are writing to ask you to avoid using the measure to set up roadblocks to transportation investment. Specifically, we wanted to make you aware of policy language contained in the House version of the FY 2016 THUD bill that seeks to block federal approvals for the California high speed rail program.

In January, Governor Jerry Brown and other California leaders commemorated the beginning of construction on the nation's largest infrastructure project: a high-speed railroad connecting Southern and Northern California through the Central Valley. This program, in which the state will be the primary funder, will bring together public and private funds to create a transformative investment for California and the nation. During construction, the program will create 20,000 jobs per year. After it is open, it will help ensure a sustainable and growing economic future for California.

By including language in its appropriations bill intended to withhold federal support and approvals for the project, the House is sending a message to all the states that major infrastructure projects—even after receiving federal grants and multiple federal approvals—are at risk of being halted in their tracks based on political considerations in Washington, DC.

In a May 11 letter to House appropriators, OMB Director Shaun Donovan also expressed the Administration's opposition to the language in the House bill dealing with the California High-Speed Rail program.

We believe that the California high speed rail program will serve as model of a Federal, state, industry and labor partnership that creates jobs, links economies and communities, preserves our environment and builds a sustainable future. Therefore, we respectfully request that your subcommittee produce a bill free of any harmful riders in the FY 2016 Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act that would impede efforts to construct any specific high-speed rail project, including the California High-Speed Rail program.

Thank you for your attention to our views.
Sincerely,

AMERICAN COUNCIL OF
ENGINEERING COMPANIES.
AMERICAN PUBLIC
TRANSPORTATION
ASSOCIATION.
AMERICAN ROAD AND
TRANSPORTATION
BUILDERS ASSOCIATION.
ASSOCIATION OF
INDEPENDENT PASSENGER
RAIL OPERATORS.
RAILWAY SUPPLY
INSTITUTE.
U.S. HIGH SPEED RAIL
ASSOCIATION.

□ 2130

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. The administration has been very clear that it strongly opposes provisions in this bill that would restrict the development of high-speed rail. Moreover,

the California congressional delegation has overwhelmingly opposed these restrictive riders in the past, and I am happy to stand with them again tonight, urging my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DENHAM. I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA).

Mr. LAMALFA. Madam Chair, I thank my colleague, Mr. DENHAM, for his hard work on curtailing this waste of taxpayer money.

Here are just a few of the headlines currently on the Internet about California's high-speed rail project: "Why California's High-Speed Rail is Off Track"; "High-Speed Rail Brings Fears of Guttered Communities and Noise"; "High-Speed Rail Foes Cite Noise, Property Value Concerns"; "Protesters Rail Against High-Speed Rail Route Proposal"; "High-Speed Rail Opponents Expected to Converge at LA Meeting"; finally, "What an Unholy Mess This California Bullet Train Meeting is Going to Be."

This is all reflected in southern California planning for a route that isn't even planned yet; yet billions of dollars of the California taxpayers—but even more importantly, in this body, Federal taxpayer dollars—are being planned and spent and will be spent if we don't stop this here tonight for a route, for a plan, for a project that isn't even a plan.

You couldn't send astronauts into outer space without a plan to bring them back, yet they are hell-bent on this project to spend the money as fast as they can without having any idea where the route is going to go; and we are seeing people all over California protest it, for a project that has tripled in price from what the voters saw as Prop 1A just 7 years ago. Yet here we are 7 years later with a groundbreaking that consists of knocking down some of the houses and buildings without any track being laid, without a real project they can actually count on being a true route under Prop 1A from San Francisco to Los Angeles. We need to put a stop to this now.

Mr. DENHAM. Madam Chair, as you have heard, this project is \$70 billion over budget. It has a shortfall of \$87 billion. If my colleagues in California, if the minority party of this body would like to continue on with this project, then where is the \$87 billion? I don't see a proposal from them, nor do I see a proposal from the Governor for \$87 billion.

We have priorities in the State. As you may know, we are going through a big drought in California. We would love to create the jobs. Let's utilize the billions of dollars that would be spent on high-speed rail over the next several decades on water projects that would actually help our infrastructure, our agriculture, as well as people throughout California.

There is a good way to spend taxpayer dollars. This is not it. We cannot

afford to leave the next generation with an \$87 billion hole that will continue to not only put California in further debt, but will continue to show that our priorities are misguided.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. DENHAM).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PETERS

Mr. PETERS. I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available by this Act may be used in contravention of Executive Order 11246 (relating to Equal Employment Opportunity).

Mr. PETERS (during the reading). Madam Chair, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Objection.

The Acting CHAIR. Objection is heard.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk continued to read.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from California (Mr. PETERS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. PETERS. Madam Chair, no American should be fired, denied a job or a place to live for being who they are or because of whom they love. Every American deserves to be treated equally and with dignity.

My amendment would make a simple change to the text of the bill but make an important difference in the lives of LGBT Americans across the country. President Obama signed an executive order in July 2014 to prohibit Federal contractors from discriminating on the basis of sexual orientation or gender identity against their employees or those seeking employment. This amendment would affirm that order by ensuring that no funds in the bill are used to conflict with the President's rule. It would demonstrate to the American people that Congress supports fairness and equality for all.

Today, only 18 States and the District of Columbia have nondiscrimination protections for LGBT communities in sexual orientation and gender identity in both employment and housing. That means that in a number of States an LGBT individual can get married in the morning and fired from his or her job or denied an application in the afternoon for no other reason than the change in marital status. That is unacceptable. As a country that believes in equality for all people, we must do better.

June is Pride Month, and in cities and towns across the country, millions

of Americans will celebrate the vibrant diversity of the LGBT communities who are enriching our society. As we look forward toward full non-discrimination, we can help provide at least a small window of equality for all members of the LGBT community by passing this amendment. I urge my colleagues to stand on the side of equality and against discrimination and support this amendment.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE).

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Chair, I simply want to commend him for offering this amendment and offer my enthusiastic support.

In various ways, we ensure that the Federal Government doesn't pay substandard wages, doesn't do other things that are detrimental in the workplace or that set a low bar, set a low standard. This amendment adds to that, I think, in a very constructive way. It adds to worker protections by preventing any company that does business with the Government from firing employees based on who they are and whom they love.

I commend the gentleman. It is a fine amendment. I hope colleagues will support it.

Mr. PETERS. I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. PETERS).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. MULLIN. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MULLIN

Mr. MULLIN. I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill, before the short title, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enforce subpart B of part 750 of title 23, Code of Federal Regulations, regarding signs for service clubs and religious notices as defined in section 153(p) of such part.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Oklahoma and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. MULLIN. Madam Chair, churches and civic groups are in danger of being forced to tear down their informational highway signs. Some of these signs have stood for decades. The current law states that religious and civic groups can no longer have signs larger than 8 square feet. That is 2 feet by 4 feet. However, "Free Coffee" signs in the same law are unlimited in size.

My amendment would allow churches and civic organizations to keep their signs that are larger than 8 square feet. This is a reasonable amendment. It would be beneficial to the safety of the traveling public and allow our Federal Government to focus its resources on more critical infrastructure uses. We need to be focusing on repairing our roads and bridges, not tearing down church signs.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Madam Chair, this amendment would suspend enforcement of rules governing the size of billboards for religious organizations and service clubs. These rules have been in place for a long time—since 1975.

As I understand it, the gentleman is seeking to increase the allowable size of billboards for religious organizations and service clubs from 8 square feet to 32 square feet. This isn't the appropriate place to deal with this issue. We have barely heard of it before it was offered. We certainly haven't had extensive deliberations, haven't heard from State authorities, local authorities, people who have a stake in this. It needs to be reviewed and debated within the context of the surface transportation authorization.

The authorizing committees are in the midst of working on the new authorization bill right now. That is where I would suggest the gentleman might want to take his concerns. This is not the place here tonight. I urge colleagues to reject this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MULLIN. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. BRIDENSTINE), my colleague.

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. Madam Chair, I rise today to give my very strong support to this amendment offered by my colleague from Oklahoma.

The Federal Government creates a regulation. That regulation says that, if you are a church or if you are a civic group or if you are some kind of community organization, you are limited in the size of your sign to 8 square feet, 2 feet by 4 feet; however, if you are a billboard company, you can have 25 feet by 60 feet. This is discrimination against churches and civic groups that I think is inappropriate.

I would also say that the State of Oklahoma has weighed in. The State of Oklahoma would like to regulate the signs in the State of Oklahoma. I think that is absolutely not only appropriate, but I think it is constitutional that the State have the right to regulate the signs in its own State.

Here is the sad part that I would like to let people know and understand. If the State of Oklahoma chooses not to enforce this Federal regulation that is discriminatory, then the State of Oklahoma risks losing 10 percent of its Federal funding for roads. This is the Fed-

eral Government using Oklahoma taxpayer dollars against the State of Oklahoma. It is Federal bullying.

This amendment offered by my colleague from Oklahoma is a good amendment. I fully support it, and I highly recommend my colleagues support it.

Mr. MULLIN. Our churches and our civic organizations have better ways to spend their limited resources than tearing down signs. Our States would have more time on their hands to be looking at our roads and bridges if they didn't have to go out and enforce a law that our State doesn't even want. If we could simply be focusing on the important issues, like our roads and our bridges, not wasting Federal dollars and State dollars on enforcing an out-of-date law, this wouldn't even simply be an issue.

I would urge my colleagues to support this commonsense amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. MULLIN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GROTHMAN

Mr. GROTHMAN. I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available by this Act under the heading "Department of Housing and Urban Development—Housing Programs—Project-Based Rental Assistance" may be used for any family who is not an elderly family or a disabled family (as such terms are defined in section 3(b) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437a(b)) and who was not receiving project-based rental assistance under section 8 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1437f) as of October 1, 2015, and the amount otherwise provided under such heading is reduced by \$300,000,000.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Wisconsin and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

□ 2145

Mr. GROTHMAN. The first thing we should look at when we look at this budget is cost, and this is one program that is going up in cost. We are still in a position in this budget in which we anticipate borrowing about 14 percent. We have the \$18 trillion debt.

This amendment will reduce the cost in this budget by \$300 million, which by itself is nothing to sneeze at, but the real reason for this amendment is the perverse incentives in Section 8 and other tenant-based rental assistance programs.

All of these programs are conditioned upon, first, having little or no income. It is wrong to encourage people not to work. As I get around my district, I find so many employers who cannot find employees today, in part, because they feel it pays better not to work.

Secondly, and more importantly, this program, like so many other programs designed to help poor people, has a huge marriage penalty associated with it. In order to get this low-income housing, it almost encourages one—it does encourage one—to have children without a mother and father at home. To continue this program or even expand this program to more people is to just destroy the moral fiber of America.

This amendment is tailored to not include or not reduce low-income housing for the elderly or disabled. I am aware of the fact that we have people in this country on Social Security maybe making \$500 a month, and they may find it very difficult to find anywhere else to live, so I am not chipping away at that part of the program.

I will give you an example. In my district, I talked to someone who ran one of these low-income projects—not Section 8, but more of a project-based one—and they were very proud of what nice, low-income housing it was. It was very nice, very generous. They pointed out the only thing you needed to do to get these apartments for \$25 a month was to not have a job. Now, can you imagine anything so foolish as to encourage people to not have a job?

In any event, I hope this amendment passes. I hope there is nobody else in this room who would have any objection to this commonsense amendment designed to restore the moral fiber that made America great.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Madam Chair, if there is an air of familiarity about this amendment and what the gentleman has just said about his amendment, listeners may want to tune in and remind themselves of virtually this same amendment being offered last week.

I should begin by saying that tenant-based Section 8 housing—a program, by the way, that conservatives should love because it is market based and the tenants pay a substantial portion of their income in rent—tenant-based Section 8 housing in this bill is just barely held even, with more or less level funding. Of course, other things in the bill are treated much worse.

The gentleman apparently thinks there is too much money in this bill, too much investment, with thousands on waiting lists across this country. This amendment would certainly increase those waiting lists.

Now, last week, it was \$614 million cut; this week, it is a \$300 million cut—so not quite as many people would be evicted. This week, the gentleman is saying that the elderly and the disabled would not be evicted. Who does that leave? It leaves everybody else; it leaves working families.

I ask anyone in this body to go to their local community house authority

and ask about those waiting lists. Ask how many people are waiting for a roof over their head who are willing to work, willing to participate in financing, but need a leg up, the kind of support that tenant-based and project-based Section 8 represents.

It escapes me why the gentleman would offer this amendment in a bill that is already at rock bottom.

I urge my colleagues to reject this amendment, just as we did last week, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GROTHMAN. I do not give up hope that, by the time this budget rolls around next year, you see the wisdom of the amendment.

I think a lot of people get confused when they find waiting lists for this sort of program. If you are handing out apartments for \$25 a month, of course, there are going to be waiting lists; so that is not surprising. Even then, there are certain areas in my State, in my district, where they are trying to find people who are not in the local area to fill these units because there is an excess of units.

Nevertheless, I think you want to think about the perverse incentives you have in a program in which, the more you work, the more your rent goes up. In order to get in, in the first place, you almost can't work at all; and, secondly, what the long-term effect on our society is if you would tell somebody that, if they raise a child out of wedlock, you get a free, air-conditioned, maybe two-bedroom, two-bath apartment, but if you get married to somebody with a job, you lose that apartment—is that the type of incentive we want for the next generation?

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GROTHMAN

Mr. GROTHMAN. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available by this Act under the heading "Department of Housing and Urban Development—Public and Indian Housing Programs—Tenant-Based Rental Assistance" may be used for any family who is not an elderly family or a disabled family (as such terms are defined in section 3(b) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437a(b)) and who was not receiving tenant-based rental assistance under section 8 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1437f) as of October 1, 2015, and the amount otherwise provided under such heading is reduced, the amount specified under such heading for renewals of expiring section 8 tenant-based annual contributions contracts is reduced, and the amount specified under such heading for administrative and other expenses of public housing agencies in administering the section 8 tenant-based rental assistance program) is reduced, by \$300,000,000, \$210,000,000, and \$90,000,000, respectively.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Wisconsin and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. GROTHMAN. I think all we talked about in that last amendment applies to this amendment, with one additional thing that people should find offensive, because here we are dealing with project-based rental assistance.

Not only are we encouraging some people not to work very hard, not only are we encouraging people not to raise children in an old-fashioned nuclear family, we are also kind of having a strong element of corporate welfare here, too, which is something I don't care for.

Over time, we have this kind of industry growing up in which you operate low-income housing. In some ways, I assume people are entering into it because it is more profitable than a pure, free market sort of thing; and I would think that people who are opposed to corporate welfare ought to be opposed to it for that reason as well.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Madam Chair, here we go again with, once again, a reprisal of the amendment offered last week and rejected.

The amendment offered tonight separates that amendment in two: tenant-based Section 8, project-based Section 8.

The argument does apply, I think, to any of this assisted housing. It behooves us to reflect on some numbers, I think. On any given night, 575,000 of our constituents are homeless, absolutely homeless. That is 50,000 veterans, by the way.

They get on these waiting lists for these Section 8 projects, and the waiting lists often have thousands of names. They finally get into Section 8. They are paying a large proportion of their income in rent. They are struggling to get a leg up and struggle to find jobs.

By the way, how likely is one to find a job if one is homeless? If you are talking about self-reliance, isn't it better to have a roof over your head and have some of the basics of life so you can go out and seek work?

Evictions, we are talking about evictions here. How does kicking out children and how does kicking out families promote marriage, for goodness' sake? How does it promote wedlock? How does it promote self-reliance? It is likely to promote destitution and desperation.

We are a better country than this. I plead with colleagues, look at this amendment closely. Think about what we stand for. Think about the fact that this bill is already inadequate. Let's not make it worse.

Reject this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GROTHMAN. First of all, I would like to clarify something in the amendment. The amendment does not apply to people who were receiving rental assistance—and neither did the other amendment—prior to October 1 of this year. It is not a matter of kicking people out; it is a matter of not putting any further people on.

Furthermore, I think we have to discuss how generous this benefit is. There are so many people in our society who are living with parents, living with other family members, living with roommates, and working to afford that rent. To give somebody a freestanding apartment—some of these are very nice apartments, two-bedroom, two-bath, air-conditioned apartments—without having to work at all to receive that apartment is just a horrible incentive.

I would ask the gentleman to go back in his district and talk to people who live in the neighborhoods where they have these subsidized projects. One of the things I find is that sometimes people who live in maybe high-end areas and are not familiar with these get confused.

I think, if you talk to people who know people who live in this subsidized housing, you will have no problem finding many anecdotes of people who are clearly not hurting materially; and, in order to keep their subsidies going, they cannot work, work harder, or get raises. Above all, they can't get married.

I think you have to ask yourself whether we ought to continue these programs that are around year after year after year or whether it is high time to look at these programs; change the underlying qualifications; change the time limits; change the amount that has to be paid; and, quite frankly, also sometimes look at the very generous accommodations that the government is providing, quite frankly, more generous accommodations than a lot of people who are working quite hard have.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ISSA

Mr. ISSA. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill, before the short title, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to acquire a camera for the purpose of collecting or storing vehicle license plate numbers.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from California and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. ISSA. Madam Chair, this amendment reflects a simple principle. The government does not and should not have unchecked power to track American citizens.

There are many very legitimate reasons to observe license plates using camera technology. Every day in America, law enforcement drives through neighborhoods looking for stolen cars. Cameras and computers identify the number of that plate and run it against a database to see if it is stolen.

□ 2200

But again, there is no reason to store that data. The bulk collection of the location of every American's automobile is well beyond a reasonable standard. It is a difficult one, but it is simple in this case.

The Federal Government should not provide money for cameras that indiscriminately bulk collect information on where you are at all times. I hope that this amendment will spark a healthy dialogue similar to the one we had on the PATRIOT Act, one in which we agreed that with a court order you can collect this kind of data, with a court order you can seek it, with a known database of stolen cars or wanted criminals, you can compare a camera image.

But the simple collection, in bulk, of your location of your car, 24 hours a day, using thousands, tens of thousands or perhaps millions of cameras, is far too "1984" for Members of this body or the American people.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition.

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Madam Chair, this amendment is well-intentioned, I realize, but I think it is an overreach and certainly not appropriate for this appropriations bill.

Records of license plate information can serve as a helpful clue to investigators. They can produce leads in criminal cases. This information is also used routinely by law enforcement and by the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children to help find missing children.

I understand there are legitimate privacy concerns. I share those concerns. But there is already a Federal law that governs the use of such data. The data is not used to track citizens in real time, despite what some assert.

Putting restrictions on law enforcement's ability to obtain and use this license plate information without really fully exploring the facts or giving due consideration to the consequences, this needs to be done by the appropriate committees. But doing it here tonight seems risky and unreasonable, actually, to expect us to legislate on this matter in the context of this appropriations bill.

Madam Chair, I will insert into the RECORD a letter from the Fraternal

Order of Police and other law enforcement entities asking Congress not to limit the use of this information.

NATIONAL FRATERNAL
ORDER OF POLICE,
February 23, 2015.

Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,
Majority Leader, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.
Hon. HARRY M. REID,
Minority Leader, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.
Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House, House of Representatives
Washington, DC.

Hon. NANCY P. PELOSI,
Minority Leader, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR MCCONNELL, MR. SPEAKER, SENATOR REID AND REPRESENTATIVE PELOSI: I am writing on behalf of the members of the Fraternal Order of Police to express our concern about continued efforts to portray automated license plate recognition (ALPR) as an ongoing, national real-time tracking system operated by law enforcement. This is emphatically not the case.

We believe that there is a fundamental misunderstanding as to how ALPR technology is deployed and used by law enforcement and other public safety agencies. Many people, including members of Congress, are under the impression that this technology is being used by our national security apparatus to geotrack our citizens and monitor their movements. Indeed, a Dear Colleague letter circulated last year in support of an amendment defunding this technology was entitled, "Stop NSA-like geotracking of innocent Americans."

This is not the case. To begin with, ALPR data is simply a photograph of a vehicle's license plate in a public place at a particular point in time. Geotracking is the use of Global Positioning System (GPS) data to track over time the movement of a specific electronic device capable of emitting GPS location information. Conversely, ALPR data is collected anonymously without personally identifying information. A government agency with access to ALPR data may connect that data to personal information from a State's vehicle registration system, but if they do so without a legitimate law enforcement or public safety purpose, then they are in violation of the Drivers' Privacy Protection Act. Any other use of the data would be an unjustifiable violation of privacy and Federal law.

Thousands of local, State and Federal law enforcement agencies use ALPR data every day to generate leads in criminal investigations, apprehend murderers, respond to Amber and Silver alerts, find missing children, recover stolen vehicles, and protect our borders. Even something as simple as the use of cameras at traffic lights and toll booths has a beneficial impact on the safety of our roadways.

The FOP would also submit that the only difference between the use of ALPR technology and an officer taking down license plate information along with the time, date and location is the efficiency by which the data is collected. Every State in the Republic mandates that every vehicle have a mounted and clearly visible license plate for the specific purpose of contributing to public safety, whether the data is collected by a fellow citizen, law enforcement officer or camera.

With these facts in mind, it is our hope that Congress will recognize the substantial benefits this technology makes to public safety and oppose any legislation or amendment that would restrict the use of ALPR by law enforcement.

On behalf of the more than 335,000 members of the Fraternal Order of Police, I thank you

for your consideration of our views. If I can provide any further information about law enforcement's use of ALPR technology, please do not hesitate to contact me or Executive Director Jim Pasco in my Washington office.

Sincerely,

CHUCK CANTERBURY,
National President.

MARCH 9, 2015.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
Speaker.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Minority Leader,
House of Representatives.

Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,
Majority Leader.

Hon. HARRY REID,
Minority Leader, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.
DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER, LEADER PELOSI, LEADER MCCONNELL, AND LEADER REID: We are deeply concerned about efforts to portray automated license plate recognition (ALPR) technology as a national real-time tracking capability for law enforcement. The fact is that this technology and the data it generates is not used to track people in real time. ALPR is used every day to generate investigative leads that help law enforcement solve murders, rapes, and serial property crimes, recover abducted children, detect drug and human trafficking rings, find stolen vehicles, apprehend violent criminal alien fugitives, and support terrorism investigations.

There is a misconception of continuous government tracking of individuals using ALPR information. This has led to attempts to curtail law enforcement's use of the technology without a proper and fair effort to truly understand the anonymous nature of the data, how it is used, and how it is protected.

We are seeing harmful proposals—appropriations amendments and legislation—to restrict or completely ban law enforcement's use of ALPR technology and data without any effort to truly understand the issue. Yet, any review would make clear that the value of this technology is beyond question, and that protections against mis-use of the data by law enforcement are already in place. That is one of the reasons why critics are hard-pressed to identify any actual instances of mis-use.

If legislative efforts to curtail ALPR use are successful, federal, state, and local law enforcement's ability to investigate crimes will be significantly impacted given the extensive use of the technology today.

We call on Congress to foster a reasonable and transparent discussion about ALPR. We believe strong measures can be taken to ensure citizens' privacy while enabling law enforcement investigators to take advantage of the technology. Strict data access controls, mandatory auditing of all use of ALPR systems, and regular reporting on the use of the technology and data prevent misuse of the capability while enabling law enforcement to make productive use of it. Adoption and enforcement of strong policies on the use of ALPR and other technologies by individual law enforcement agencies would also help.

We strongly urge members of the House and Senate to understand and recognize the substantial daily benefits of this technology to protect the public and investigate dangerous criminals. We urge opposition to any bill or amendment that would restrict the use of ALPR without full consideration of the issue.

Sincerely,

J. Thomas Manger, Chief of Police, Montgomery County Police Department, President, Major Cities Chiefs Police Association; Chief Richard Beary, President, Inter-

national Association of Chiefs of Police; Mike Sena, Director, Northern California Regional Intelligence Center, President, National Fusion Center Association; Ronald C. Sloan, Director, Colorado Bureau of Investigation, President, Association of State Criminal Investigative Agencies; Sheriff Donny Youngblood, President, Major County Sheriffs' Association; Bob Bushman, President, National Narcotic Officers' Associations' Coalition; Jonathan Thompson, Executive Director, National Sheriffs' Association; William Johnson, Executive Director, National Association of Police Organizations; Mike Moore, President, National District Attorneys Association; Andrews Matthews, Chairman, National Troopers Coalition.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I urge opposition to the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ISSA. Madam Chair, in closing, I respect the gentleman's opinion, but we are not legislating on this appropriations bill. What we are doing is determining that the relevant committees of jurisdiction have not authorized broad collection of data of the American people.

The committees of jurisdiction have not authorized this sort of proactive tracking of people because, at some point, someday there may be a reason to use that database. So, in fact, it is perfectly appropriate not to spend the money, not to authorize the money until or unless the authorizing committees have made a thorough decision of what should be authorized and what safeguards need to be in order.

So my amendment will simply limit, until such time as a legislating amendment or authorization from a committee can, in fact, ensure that we both authorize law enforcement to collect and protect the privacy of American citizens because, ultimately, these are the taxpayer dollars of the American citizens and the privacy embodied in the Constitution and guaranteed to every citizen.

Therefore, I insist that Members consider voting for an amendment that recognizes, just as the minority clearly said, we have not yet had a debate on the basis under which we should pay for the bulk collection against the American people without their permission or safeguards of their rights.

I urge support for the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA).

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

Mr. ISSA. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California will be postponed.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Madam Chair, we are coming to the end of sev-

eral days of floor debate on the 2016 Transportation, Housing and Urban Development Appropriations bill.

I want to, again, express my appreciation to Chairman DIAZ-BALART, subcommittee members from both sides of the aisle, and our remarkable, dedicated staff for all the hard work that has gone into this bill and for the orderly and civil character of our floor deliberations.

I very much wish that all of this work and all of our efforts at cooperation were being more adequately rewarded, but they are not. And that is not the chairman's fault. It is the fault of the majority's profoundly misguided and flawed budget policy, a policy that has left this bill a mere shadow of what it should be and has decimated the investments a great country should be making.

Make no mistake, Madam Chair, our roads, our highways are crumbling. One out of every nine bridges in this country is structurally deficient and in need of repair or replacement.

Americans spend the equivalent of one work week a year sitting in congestion caused by overcrowded highways. The capital backlog for our transit systems is nearly \$78 billion.

And make no mistake, our public housing resources don't meet the basic needs of millions of vulnerable and low-income Americans. On any given night, 575,000 of our constituents, including more than 50,000 veterans, are homeless. The maintenance backlog for public housing approaches \$25 billion.

Madam Chair, this is a defining crisis for our generation. This bill, which is intended to help improve housing and transportation options and create jobs for hard-working American families, will, instead, dig the hole deeper by cutting everything from safety programs to transportation construction grants to maintenance budgets for public housing.

It would be bad enough if the cuts were limited to our transportation and housing systems, but Republicans have taken the same shortsighted approach with each of this year's domestic appropriations bills.

Unfortunately, the majority has targeted domestic appropriations to bear the entire brunt of deficit reduction. That means deep cuts, not just to our transportation and housing infrastructure but also to research support, programs that make college more affordable, the very things that make this country the envy of the world.

Meanwhile, the majority lacks the courage to address the real drivers of the deficit, which I think most Members of this Chamber realize are tax expenditures and entitlement spending.

In the 1990s, we achieved budget surpluses as the result of concerted bipartisan efforts to balance the budget through a comprehensive approach. We actually paid off \$400 billion of the national debt.

Until we have a similar budget agreement this year, one that sets responsible funding and revenue levels across

the board, we cannot write a bill that addresses our country's crumbling roads and bridges, that brings our rail system up to first-world standards, or that provides shelter for America's elderly, disabled, and other vulnerable populations.

In fact, we cannot make any of the investments that we simply have to make to continue as the greatest country in the world. So I implore my colleagues to vote "no" on this shortsighted, irresponsible bill, but beyond that, to consider the long-term consequences of the fiscal course we are on. We simply have to make a correction for our country's sake.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Madam Chair, I want to thank the ranking member, first, for his kind words towards me right now but, more importantly, for his willingness to work with me, to spend the time, the effort. Both he and his staff, the committee staff, have, frankly, worked awfully hard on making sure we do the best job that we can, and I am grateful for that.

I just very briefly want to just mention that this bill, this is a bill that prioritizes funding and funds our country's priorities. It is a balanced bill.

And very important, Madam Chair, this is a bill, that, yes, it does not raise taxes.

Now, I know that a lot of folks have talked about the President's requests and the President's requests. And the President's requests for this area are much higher in many areas than what this bill is funding.

But let's remember a couple of things. The President has massive taxes, tax increases in his proposals, number one. And also, that this bill adheres to not only the budget that was passed by Congress, House and Senate, but this bill adheres to the law, the law that was passed by Congress and signed by the President of the United States, the so-called "sequester" law.

So if we go above and beyond that level, which some people, I guess, don't remember, it is fake. It gets sequestered.

So, Madam Chair, again, I thank the ranking member for his hard work.

This is a balanced bill. It is a good bill. It is a responsible bill. It pays and funds the priorities of this great country. And I am going to ask for our colleagues to give us a favorable vote on this fine bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed in the following order:

Amendment by Mr. YOHO of Florida.
Amendment by Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.

Amendment by Mr. HULTGREN of Illinois.

Amendment by Mr. MEEHAN of Pennsylvania.

Amendment by Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey.

Amendment by Mr. ELLISON of Minnesota.

Amendment No. 28 by Mr. EMMER of Minnesota.

Amendment by Mr. PETERS of California.

Amendment by Mr. ISSA of California.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. YOHO

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOHO) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 244, noes 181, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 319]

AYES—244

Abraham	Cuellar	Hensarling
Aderholt	Culberson	Herrera Beutler
Allen	Curbelo (FL)	Hice, Jody B.
Amash	Davis, Rodney	Hill
Amodei	Dent	Holding
Babin	DeSantis	Hudson
Barletta	DesJarlais	Huelskamp
Barr	Diaz-Balart	Huizenga (MI)
Barton	Donovan	Hultgren
Benishek	Duffy	Hunter
Bilirakis	Duncan (SC)	Hurd (TX)
Bishop (MI)	Duncan (TN)	Issa
Bishop (UT)	Ellmers (NC)	Jenkins (KS)
Black	Emmer (MN)	Jenkins (WV)
Blackburn	Farenthold	Johnson (OH)
Blum	Fitzpatrick	Johnson, Sam
Bost	Fleischmann	Jolly
Boustany	Fleming	Jones
Brady (TX)	Flores	Jordan
Brat	Forbes	Joyce
Bridenstine	Fortenberry	Katko
Brooks (AL)	Foxx	Kelly (MS)
Brooks (IN)	Franks (AZ)	Kelly (PA)
Buchanan	Frelinghuysen	King (IA)
Buck	Garrett	King (IA)
Bucshon	Gibbs	King (NY)
Burgess	Gibson	Kinzinger (IL)
Byrne	Gohmert	Kline
Calvert	Goodlatte	Knight
Carter (GA)	Gosar	Labrador
Carter (TX)	Gowdy	LaMalfa
Chabot	Granger	Lamborn
Chaffetz	Graves (GA)	Lance
Clawson (FL)	Graves (LA)	Latta
Coffman	Graves (MO)	Lipinski
Cole	Griffith	LoBiondo
Collins (GA)	Grothman	Long
Collins (NY)	Guinta	Loudermilk
Comstock	Guthrie	Love
Conaway	Hanna	Lucas
Cook	Hardy	Luetkemeyer
Costello (PA)	Harper	Lummis
Cramer	Harris	MacArthur
Crawford	Hartzler	Maloney, Sean
Crenshaw	Heck (NV)	Marino

McCarthy	Price, Tom	Stefanik
McCaul	Ratchliffe	Stewart
McClintock	Reed	Stivers
McHenry	Renacci	Stutzman
McKinley	Ribble	Thompson (PA)
McMorris	Rice (SC)	Thornberry
Rodgers	Rigell	Tiberi
McSally	Roby	Tipton
Meadows	Roe (TN)	Trott
Meehan	Rogers (AL)	Turner
Messer	Rogers (KY)	Upton
Mica	Rohrabacher	Valadao
Miller (FL)	Rokita	Wagner
Miller (MI)	Rooney (FL)	Walberg
Moolenaar	Ros-Lehtinen	Walden
Mooney (WV)	Roskam	Walker
Mullin	Ross	Walorski
Mulvaney	Rothfus	Walters, Mimi
Murphy (PA)	Rouzer	Weber (TX)
Neugebauer	Royce	Webster (FL)
Newhouse	Russell	Wenstrup
Noem	Ryan (WI)	Westerman
Nugent	Salmon	Westmoreland
Nunes	Sanford	Whitfield
Olson	Scalise	Williams
Palazzo	Schweikert	Wilson (SC)
Palmer	Scott, Austin	Wittman
Paulsen	Sensenbrenner	Womack
Pearce	Sessions	Woodall
Perry	Shimkus	Yoder
Pittenger	Shuster	Yoho
Pitts	Simpson	Young (AK)
Poe (TX)	Sinema	Young (IA)
Poliquin	Smith (MO)	Young (IN)
Pompeo	Smith (NE)	Zeldin
Posey	Smith (NJ)	Zinke
	Smith (TX)	

NOES—181

Aguilar	Frankel (FL)	Murphy (FL)
Ashford	Fudge	Nadler
Bass	Gabbard	Napolitano
Beatty	Gallego	Neal
Bera	Garamendi	Nolan
Beyer	Graham	Norcross
Bishop (GA)	Grayson	O'Rourke
Blumenauer	Green, Al	Pallone
Bonamici	Green, Gene	Pascarell
Boyle, Brendan	Grijalva	Payne
F.	Gutiérrez	Pelosi
Brady (PA)	Hahn	Perlmutter
Brown (FL)	Hastings	Peters
Brownley (CA)	Heck (WA)	Peterson
Bustos	Higgins	Pingree
Butterfield	Himes	Pocan
Capps	Hinojosa	Polis
Capuano	Honda	Price (NC)
Carney	Hoyer	Quigley
Carson (IN)	Huffman	Rangel
Cartwright	Israel	Reichert
Castor (FL)	Jackson Lee	Rice (NY)
Castro (TX)	Jeffries	Richmond
Chu, Judy	Johnson (GA)	Roybal-Allard
Ciциlline	Johnson, E. B.	Ruiz
Clark (MA)	Kaptur	Ruppersberger
Clarke (NY)	Keating	Rush
Clay	Kelly (IL)	Ryan (OH)
Clyburn	Kennedy	Sánchez, Linda
Cohen	Kildee	T.
Connolly	Kilmer	Sanchez, Loretta
Conyers	Kind	Sarbanes
Cooper	Kirkpatrick	Schakowsky
Costa	Kuster	Schiff
Courtney	Langevin	Schrader
Crowley	Larsen (WA)	Scott (VA)
Cummings	Larson (CT)	Scott, David
Davis (CA)	Lawrence	Serrano
Davis, Danny	Lee	Sewell (AL)
DeGette	Levin	Sherman
Delaney	Lewis	Sires
DeLauro	Lieu, Ted	Slaughter
DelBene	Loeback	Smith (WA)
Denham	Lofgren	Speier
DeSaulnier	Lowenthal	Swalwell (CA)
Deutch	Lowe	Takai
Dingell	Lujan Grisham	Takano
Doggett	(NM)	Thompson (CA)
Dold	Luján, Ben Ray	Thompson (MS)
Doyle, Michael	(NM)	Titus
F.	Lynch	Tonko
Duckworth	Matsui	Torres
Edwards	McCollum	Tsongas
Ellison	McDermott	Van Hollen
Engel	McGovern	Vargas
Eshoo	McNerney	Veasey
Esty	Meeks	Vela
Farr	Meng	Velázquez
Fattah	Moore	Visclosky
Foster	Moulton	Walz

Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine

Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)

McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom

Ratcliffe
Reed
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik

Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine

Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)

Adams
Becerra
Cárdenas

NOT VOTING—8

Cleaver
DeFazio
Fincher

Hurt (VA)
Maloney,
Carolyn

Adams
Becerra
Cárdenas

NOT VOTING—7

Cleaver
DeFazio
Fincher

Maloney,
Carolyn

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 2242

So the amendment was agreed to.
The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HULTGREN

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair will re-
mind Members these are 2-minute
votes.

The unfinished business is the de-
mand for a recorded vote on the
amendment offered by the gentleman
from Illinois (Mr. HULTGREN) on which
further proceedings were postponed and
on which the noes prevailed by voice
vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the
amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-
ment.

□ 2237

Messrs. NORCROSS and CONNOLLY
changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”
Ms. STEFANIK, Messrs. CALVERT
and NUNES changed their vote from
“no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was agreed to.
The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROOKS OF
ALABAMA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
business is the demand for a recorded
vote on the amendment offered by the
gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BROOKS)
on which further proceedings were
postponed and on which the ayes pre-
vailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the
amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-
ment.

NOES—180

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote
has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-
minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-
vice, and there were—ayes 246, noes 180,
not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 320]

AYES—246

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Billirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar

Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeGette
DeLaney
DeLauro
DeBene
DelBene
Lofgren
DeSaulnier
Lowey
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Doyle, Michael
F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster

Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Schiff
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)

Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascarell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Reichert
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote
has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-
minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-
vice, and there were—ayes 240, noes 186,
not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 321]

AYES—240

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Ashford
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bonamici
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crowley
Davis, Rodney
DelBene
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais

Dingell
Donovan
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler

Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul

McClintock	Poliquin	Smith (NJ)	Waters, Maxine	Welch	Wilson (FL)	Moolenaar	Rogers (AL)	Thornberry
McCollum	Pompeo	Smith (TX)	Watson Coleman	Westmoreland	Yarmuth	Mullin	Rogers (KY)	Tiberi
McHenry	Posey	Stefanik				Mulvaney	Rohrabacher	Tipton
McMorris	Price, Tom	Stewart				Murphy (PA)	Rooney (FL)	Trott
Rodgers	Ratcliffe	Stivers	Adams	Cleaver	Maloney,	Neal	Ros-Lehtinen	Upton
McNerney	Reed	Stutzman	Becerra	DeFazio	Carolyn	Neugebauer	Roskam	Valadao
Meadows	Renacci	Thompson (PA)	Cardenas	Fincher		Newhouse	Rothfus	Walden
Meng	Ribble	Thornberry				Nugent	Rouzer	Walorski
Mica	Rice (SC)	Tipton				Nunes	Royce	Walters, Mimi
Miller (FL)	Rigell	Wagner				Olson	Russell	Weber (TX)
Moolenaar	Roby	Walberg				Palazzo	Ryan (WI)	Webster (FL)
Mooney (WV)	Roe (TN)	Walden				Palmer	Salmon	Wenstrup
Moulton	Rokita	Walker				Pearce	Scalise	Westerman
Mullin	Rooney (FL)	Walorski				Perry	Schweikert	Westmoreland
Mulvaney	Roskam	Walz				Pittenger	Scott, Austin	Whitfield
Murphy (FL)	Ross	Wasserman				Pitts	Sessions	Williams
Murphy (PA)	Rothfus	Schultz				Poliquin	Shuster	Wilson (SC)
Neugebauer	Rouzer	Weber (TX)				Price, Tom	Simpson	Wittman
Noem	Royce	Webster (FL)				Ratcliffe	Smith (NE)	Womack
Nolan	Ruiz	Wenstrup				Reed	Smith (NJ)	Yoder
Nugent	Russell	Westerman				Renacci	Smith (TX)	Yoho
Nunes	Ryan (OH)	Whitfield				Rigell	Stefanik	Young (AK)
Olson	Ryan (WI)	Williams				Roby	Stewart	Young (IA)
Palazzo	Salmon	Wilson (SC)				Roe (TN)	Thompson (PA)	Zeldin
Palmer	Sanford	Wittman						
Paulsen	Scalise	Womack						
Pearce	Schweikert	Woodall						
Perlmutter	Scott, Austin	Yoder						
Perry	Sensenbrenner	Yoho						
Peters	Sessions	Young (AK)						
Peterson	Shimkus	Young (IA)						
Pingree	Simpson	Young (IN)						
Pittenger	Sinema	Zeldin						
Pitts	Smith (MO)	Zinke						
Poe (TX)	Smith (NE)							

NOT VOTING—7

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 2247

Ms. WILSON of Florida changed her vote from “aye” to “no.”

Mses. EDWARDS, SINEMA, Messrs. MOULTON and JENKINS of West Virginia changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MEEHAN

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MEEHAN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 199, noes 227, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 322]

AYES—199

Aguilar	Gallego	Neal	Abraham	DesJarlais	Jeffries
Barton	Garamendi	Newhouse	Aderholt	Diaz-Balart	Johnson (OH)
Bass	Graham	Norcross	Allen	Donovan	Johnson, Sam
Beatty	Granger	O'Rourke	Amash	Duncan (TN)	Jolly
Benishek	Grayson	Pallone	Amodei	Ellmers (NC)	Jones
Bera	Green, Al	Pascarell	Babin	Emmer (MN)	Jordan
Beyer	Green, Gene	Payne	Barietta	Engel	Katko
Bilirakis	Grijalva	Pelosi	Barr	Esty	Keating
Bishop (GA)	Hahn	Pocan	Benishek	Farenthold	Kelly (MS)
Bishop (MI)	Hanna	Polis	Bilirakis	Fitzpatrick	Kelly (PA)
Blumenauer	Heck (NV)	Price (NC)	Bishop (UT)	Fleischmann	King (IA)
Boyle, Brendan F.	Heck (WA)	Quigley	Black	Fleming	King (NY)
Brady (PA)	Higgins	Rangel	Blackburn	Flores	Kinzinger (IL)
Brooks (IN)	Himes	Reichert	Blum	Forbes	Kline
Brown (FL)	Hinojosa	Rice (NY)	Boustany	Fox	Knight
Brownley (CA)	Honda	Richmond	Boyle, Brendan F.	Franks (AZ)	Labrador
Butterfield	Hoyer	Rogers (AL)		Frelinghuysen	Lamborn
Capps	Huffman	Rogers (KY)	Brady (TX)	Garrett	Lance
Capuano	Israel	Rohrabacher	Brat	Gibbs	Larson (CT)
Carney	Jackson Lee	Ros-Lehtinen	Bridenstine	Gibson	Latta
Carson (IN)	Jeffries	Royal-Ballard	Brooks (IN)	Gohmert	LoBiondo
Carter (TX)	Johnson (GA)	Ruppersberger	Bucshon	Goodlatte	Loudermilk
Cartwright	Johnson, E. B.	Rush	Burgess	Gosar	Love
Castor (FL)	Johnson, Sam	Sánchez, Linda T.	Byrne	Gowdy	Lowey
Castro (TX)	Kaptur	Sánchez, Loretta	Calvert	Granger	Lummis
Chu, Judy	Keating	Sarbanes	Carney	Graves (GA)	Lynch
Ciçilline	Kelly (IL)	Schakowsky	Carter (GA)	Graves (LA)	MacArthur
Clark (MA)	Kennedy	Schiff	Carter (TX)	Griffith	Marchant
Clarke (NY)	Kildee	Schrader	Chaffetz	Guinta	Marino
Clay	Kilmer	Scott (VA)	Clarke (NY)	Guthrie	Massie
Clyburn	Kind	Scott, David	Clawson (FL)	Hanna	McCarthy
Cohen	Kinzinger (IL)	Serrano	Coffman	Hardy	McCauley
Collins (NY)	Kirkpatrick	Sewell (AL)	Collins (NY)	Harper	McClintock
Connolly	Kuster	Sherman	Comstock	Harris	McHenry
Conyers	Langevin	Shuster	Cook	Hensarling	McMorris
Cooper	Larsen (WA)	Sires	Costello (PA)	Hill	Rodgers
Costa	Larson (CT)	Slaughter	Courtney	Himes	McSally
Costello (PA)	Lawrence	Smith (WA)	Crawford	Huizenga (MI)	Meehan
Crenshaw	Lee	Speier	Cresshaw	Hultgren	Meehan
Cuellar	Levin	Swalwell (CA)	Curbelo (FL)	Hunter	Meng
Culberson	Lewis	Takai	Denham	Hurd (TX)	Messer
Cummings	Lieu, Ted	Takano	Dent	Hurt (VA)	Mica
Curbelo (FL)	Loeb	Thompson (CA)	DeSantis	Issa	Miller (FL)
Davis (CA)	Loeb	Thompson (MS)			
Davis, Danny	Lowey	Tiberi			
DeGette	Lujan Grisham	Titus			
Delaney	(NM)	Tonko			
DeLauro	Luján, Ben Ray	Torres			
Denham	(NM)	Trott			
DeSaulnier	Matsui	Tsongas			
Deutch	McDermott	Turner			
Diaz-Balart	McGovern	Upton			
Doggett	McKinley	Valadao			
Dold	McSally	Van Hollen			
Doyle, Michael F.	Meehan	Vargas			
Ellison	Meeks	Veasey			
Engel	Messer	Miller (MI)			
Fattah	Moore	Mooney (WV)			
Fudge	Nadler	Moore			
Gabbard	Napolitano	Nadler			
		Napolitano			

Walberg Waters, Maxine Yarmuth
Walker Watson Coleman Young (IN)
Walz Welch Zinke
Wasserman Wilson (FL)
Schultz Woodall

NOT VOTING—7

Adams Cleaver Maloney,
Becerra DeFazio Carolyn
Cárdenas Fincher

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 2251

So the amendment was rejected.
The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GARRETT

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
business is the demand for a recorded
vote on the amendment offered by the
gentleman from New Jersey (MR. GAR-
RETT) on which further proceedings
were postponed and on which the noes
prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the
amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-
ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote
has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-
minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-
vice, and there were—ayes 231, noes 195,
not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 323]

AYES—231

Abraham Dent Hurt (VA)
Aderholt DeSantis Issa
Allen DesJarlais Jenkins (KS)
Amosh Donovan Jenkins (WV)
Amodei Duffy Johnson (OH)
Babin Duncan (SC) Johnson, Sam
Barletta Duncan (TN) Jolly
Barr Ellmers (NC) Jones
Barton Emmer (MN) Jordan
Benishkek Farenthold Joyce
Bilirakis Fitzpatrick Kelly (MS)
Bishop (MI) Fleischmann Kelly (PA)
Bishop (UT) Fleming King (IA)
Black Flores King (NY)
Blackburn Forbes Kinzinger (IL)
Blum Fortenberry Kline
Bost Foxx Knight
Brady (TX) Franks (AZ) Labrador
Brat Garrett LaMalfa
Bridenstine Gibbs Lamborn
Brooks (AL) Gohmert Lance
Brooks (IN) Goodlatte Latta
Buchanan Gosar LoBiondo
Buck Gowdy Long
Bucshon Graves (GA) Loudermilk
Burgess Graves (LA) Love
Byrne Graves (MO) Lucas
Calvert Griffith Luetkemeyer
Carter (GA) Grothman Lummis
Carter (TX) Guinta MacArthur
Chabot Guthrie Marchant
Chaffetz Hanna Marino
Clawson (FL) Hardy Massie
Coffman Harper McCarthy
Cole Harris McCaul
Collins (GA) Hartzler McClintock
Collins (NY) Heck (NV) McHenry
Comstock Hensarling McMorris
Conaway Herrera Beutler Rodgers
Cook Hice, Jody B. McSally
Costello (PA) Hill Meadows
Cramer Holding Meehan
Crawford Hudson Messer
Crenshaw Huelskamp Mica
Culberson Huizenga (MI) Miller (FL)
Curbelo (FL) Hultgren Miller (MI)
Davis, Rodney Hunter Moolenaar
Denham Hurd (TX) Mooney (WV)

Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)

Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boustany
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DeBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Doyle, Michael
F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego

NOES—195

Garamendi
Gibson
Graham
Granger
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McKinley
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nader
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan

Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rigell
Ros-Lehtinen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stefanik
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Viscosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—7

Adams Cleaver Maloney,
Becerra DeFazio Carolyn
Cárdenas Fincher

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 2254

So the amendment was agreed to.
The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ELLISON

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
business is the demand for a recorded
vote on the amendment offered by the
gentleman from Minnesota (MR. ELLI-
SON) on which further proceedings were
postponed and on which the noes pre-
vailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the
amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-
ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote
has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-
minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-
vice, and there were—ayes 182, noes 243,
not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 324]

AYES—182

Aguilar Engel Lujan Grisham
Ashford Eshoo (NM)
Bass Esty Luján, Ben Ray
Beatty Farr (NM)
Bera Fattah Lynch
Beyer Fitzpatrick Maloney, Sean
Bishop (GA) Foster Matsui
Blumenauer Frankel (FL)
Bonamici Fudge McDermott
Boyle, Brendan Gabbard McGovern
F. Gallego McNeerney
Brady (PA) Garamendi Meeks
Brown (FL) Graham Meng
Brownley (CA) Grayson Moore
Bustos Green, Al Moulton
Butterfield Green, Gene Murphy (FL)
Capps Grijalva Nadler
Capuano Gutiérrez Napolitano
Carney Hahn Neal
Carson (IN) Hastings Nolan
Cartwright Heck (WA) Norcross
Castor (FL) Higgins O'Rourke
Castro (TX) Himes Pallone
Chu, Judy Hinojosa Pascrell
Cicilline Honda Payne
Clark (MA) Hoyer Pelosi
Clarke (NY) Huffman Perlmutter
Clay Israel Peters
Clyburn Jackson Lee Peterson
Cohen Jeffries Pingree
Connolly Johnson (GA) Pocan
Conyers Johnson, E. B. Polis
Cooper Kaptur Price (NC)
Costa Keating Quigley
Courtney Kelly (IL) Rangel
Crowley Kennedy Rice (NY)
Cuellar Kildee Richmond
Cummings Kilmer Roybal-Allard
Davis (CA) Kind Ruiz
Davis, Danny Kirkpatrick Ruppersberger
DeGette Kuster Rush
Delaney Langevin Ryan (OH)
DeLauro Larson (CT) Sánchez, Linda
DeBene Lawrence T.
DeSaulnier Lee Sanchez, Loretta
Deutch Levin Sarbanes
Dingell Lewis Schakowsky
Doggett Lieu, Ted Schiff
Doyle, Michael Lipinski Schrader
F. Loeb sack Scott (VA)
Duckworth Lofgren Scott, David
Edwards Lowenthal Serrano
Ellison Lowey Sewell (AL)

Sherman	Thompson (MS)	Visclosky
Sinema	Titus	Walz
Sires	Tonko	Wasserman
Slaughter	Torres	Schultz
Smith (WA)	Tsongas	Waters, Maxine
Speier	Van Hollen	Watson Coleman
Swalwell (CA)	Vargas	Welch
Takai	Veasey	Wilson (FL)
Takano	Vela	Yarmuth
Thompson (CA)	Velázquez	

NOES—243

Abraham	Guinta	Pearce
Aderholt	Guthrie	Perry
Allen	Hanna	Pittenger
Amash	Hardy	Pitts
Amodei	Harper	Poe (TX)
Babin	Harris	Poliquin
Barletta	Hartzler	Pompeo
Barr	Heck (NV)	Posey
Barton	Hensarling	Price, Tom
Benishek	Herrera Beutler	Ratcliffe
Bilirakis	Hice, Jody B.	Reed
Bishop (MI)	Hill	Reichert
Bishop (UT)	Holding	Renacci
Black	Hudson	Ribble
Blackburn	Huelskamp	Rice (SC)
Blum	Huizenga (MI)	Rigell
Bost	Hultgren	Roby
Boustany	Hunter	Roe (TN)
Brady (TX)	Hurd (TX)	Rogers (AL)
Brat	Hurt (VA)	Rogers (KY)
Bridenstine	Issa	Rohrabacher
Brooks (AL)	Jenkins (KS)	Rokita
Brooks (IN)	Jenkins (WV)	Rooney (FL)
Buchanan	Johnson (OH)	Ros-Lehtinen
Buck	Johnson, Sam	Roskam
Bucshon	Jolly	Ross
Burgess	Jones	Rothfus
Byrne	Jordan	Rouzer
Calvert	Joyce	Royce
Carter (GA)	Katko	Russell
Carter (TX)	Kelly (MS)	Ryan (WI)
Chabot	Kelly (PA)	Salmon
Chaffetz	King (IA)	Sanford
Clawson (FL)	King (NY)	Scalise
Coffman	Kinzinger (IL)	Schweikert
Cole	Kline	Scott, Austin
Collins (GA)	Knight	Sensenbrenner
Collins (NY)	Labrador	Sessions
Comstock	LaMalfa	Shimkus
Conaway	Lamborn	Shuster
Cook	Lance	Simpson
Costello (PA)	Larsen (WA)	Smith (MO)
Cramer	Latta	Smith (NE)
Crawford	LoBiondo	Smith (NJ)
Crenshaw	Long	Smith (TX)
Culberson	Loudermilk	Smith (TX)
Curbelo (FL)	Love	Stefanik
Davis, Rodney	Lucas	Stewart
Denham	Luetkemeyer	Hanna
Dent	Lummis	Brat
DeSantis	MacArthur	Bridenstine
DesJarlais	Marchant	Brooks (AL)
Diaz-Balart	Marino	Brooks (IN)
Dold	Massie	Buck
Donovan	McCarthy	Bucshon
Duffy	McCaul	Burgess
Duncan (SC)	McClintock	Byrne
Duncan (TN)	McHenry	Calvert
Ellmers (NC)	McKinley	Carter (GA)
Emmer (MN)	McMorris	Carter (TX)
Farenthold	Rodgers	Chabot
Fleischmann	McSally	Chaffetz
Fleming	Meadows	Hunter
Flores	Meehan	Hurd (TX)
Forbes	Messer	Hurt (VA)
Fortenberry	Mica	Hurt (VA)
Fox	Miller (FL)	Issa
Franks (AZ)	Miller (MI)	Jenkins (WV)
Frelinghuysen	Moolenaar	Weber (TX)
Garrett	Mooney (WV)	Collins (NY)
Gibbs	Mullin	Conaway
Gibson	Mulvaney	Cook
Gohmert	Murphy (PA)	Cramer
Goodlatte	Neugebauer	Crawford
Gosar	Newhouse	Crenshaw
Gowdy	Noem	King (IA)
Granger	Nugent	Roby
Graves (GA)	Nunes	Roe (TN)
Graves (LA)	Olson	Rogers (AL)
Graves (MO)	Palazzo	Rogers (KY)
Griffith	Palmer	Rohrabacher
Grothman	Paulsen	Rokita

NOT VOTING—8

Adams	Cleaver	Maloney
Becerra	DeFazio	Carolyn
Cárdenas	Fincher	Stutzman

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR
The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 2257

So the amendment was rejected.
The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 28 OFFERED BY MR. EMMER OF
MINNESOTA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
business is the demand for a recorded
vote on the amendment offered by the
gentleman from Minnesota (Mr.
EMMER) on which further proceedings
were postponed and on which the ayes
prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the
amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-
ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote
has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-
minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-
vice, and there were—ayes 212, noes 214,
not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 325]

AYES—212

Abraham	Forbes	McCaul
Aderholt	Fox	McClintock
Allen	Franks (AZ)	McHenry
Amash	Garrett	McMorris
Babin	Gibbs	Rodgers
Barletta	Gohmert	McSally
Barr	Goodlatte	Meadows
Barton	Gosar	Messer
Bilirakis	Gowdy	Mica
Bishop (MI)	Graves (GA)	Miller (FL)
Bishop (UT)	Graves (LA)	Miller (MI)
Black	Graves (MO)	Moolenaar
Blackburn	Griffith	Mooney (WV)
Blum	Grothman	Mullin
Bost	Guinta	Mulvaney
Boustany	Guthrie	Neugebauer
Brady (TX)	Hanna	Newhouse
Brat	Hardy	Noem
Bridenstine	Harris	Nugent
Brooks (AL)	Hartzler	Nunes
Brooks (IN)	Heck (NV)	Olson
Buck	Hensarling	Palazzo
Bucshon	Herrera Beutler	Palmer
Burgess	Hice, Jody B.	Paulsen
Byrne	Holding	Pearce
Calvert	Hudson	Perry
Carter (GA)	Huelskamp	Pittenger
Carter (TX)	Huizenga (MI)	Pitts
Chabot	Hultgren	Poe (TX)
Chaffetz	Hunter	Poliquin
Clawson (FL)	Hurd (TX)	Pompeo
Coffman	Hurt (VA)	Posey
Cole	Issa	Price, Tom
Collins (GA)	Jenkins (WV)	Ratcliffe
Collins (NY)	Johnson (OH)	Reed
Conaway	Johnson, Sam	Reichert
Cook	Jones	Renacci
Cramer	Jordan	Ribble
Crawford	Katko	Rice (SC)
Crenshaw	Kelly (MS)	Rigell
Culberson	King (IA)	Roby
Gibbs	Kline	Roe (TN)
Gibson	Knight	Rogers (AL)
Gohmert	Knigh	Rogers (KY)
Goodlatte	Labrador	Rohrabacher
Gosar	LaMalfa	Rokita
Gowdy	Lamborn	Rooney (FL)
Granger	Lance	Ros-Lehtinen
Graves (GA)	Latta	Roskam
Graves (LA)	Latta	Ross
Graves (MO)	Long	Rothfus
Griffith	Loudermilk	Rouzer
Grothman	Love	Royce
	Lucas	Russell
	Luetkemeyer	Ryan (WI)
	Lummis	Salmon
	Marchant	Sanford
	Massie	
	McCarthy	

Scalise	Stivers	Weber (TX)
Schweikert	Stutzman	Wenstrup
Scott, Austin	Thornberry	Westerman
Sensenbrenner	Tiberi	Westmoreland
Sessions	Tipton	Williams
Shimkus	Trott	Wilson (SC)
Shuster	Upton	Wittman
Simpson	Valadao	Womack
Smith (MO)	Wagner	Woodall
Smith (NE)	Walberg	Yoder
Smith (NJ)	Walden	Yoho
Smith (TX)	Walker	Young (IA)
Stefanik	Walorski	Young (IN)
Stewart	Walters, Mimi	Zinke

NOES—214

Aguilar	Gibson	Nadler
Amodei	Graham	Napolitano
Ashford	Granger	Neal
Bass	Grayson	Nolan
Beatty	Green, Al	Norcross
Benishek	Green, Gene	O'Rourke
Bera	Grijalva	Pallone
Beyer	Gutiérrez	Pascarell
Bishop (GA)	Hahn	Payne
Blumenauer	Harper	Pelosi
Bonamici	Hastings	Perlmutter
Boyle, Brendan	Heck (WA)	Peters
F.	Higgins	Peterson
Brady (PA)	Hill	Pingree
Brown (FL)	Himes	Pocan
Brownley (CA)	Hinojosa	Polis
Buchanan	Honda	Price (NC)
Bustos	Hoyer	Quigley
Butterfield	Huffman	Rangel
Capps	Israel	Rice (NY)
Capuano	Jackson Lee	Richmond
Carney	Jeffries	Roybal-Allard
Carson (IN)	Jenkins (KS)	Ruiz
Cartwright	Johnson (GA)	Ruppersberger
Castor (FL)	Johnson, E. B.	Rush
Castro (TX)	Jolly	Ryan (OH)
Chu, Judy	Joyce	Sánchez, Linda
Ciçilline	Kaptur	T.
Clark (MA)	Keating	Sanchez, Loretta
Clarke (NY)	Kelly (IL)	Sarbanes
Clay	Kelly (PA)	Schakowsky
Clyburn	Kennedy	Schiff
Cohen	Kildee	Schrader
Comstock	Kilmer	Scott (VA)
Connolly	Kind	Scott, David
Conyers	King (NY)	Serrano
Cooper	Kinzinger (IL)	Sewell (AL)
Costa	Kirkpatrick	Sherman
Costello (PA)	Kuster	Langevin
Courtney	Langevin	Larsen (WA)
Crowley	Larsen (WA)	Sires
Cuellar	Larson (CT)	Slaughter
Cummings	Lawrence	Smith (WA)
Davis (CA)	Lee	Speier
Davis, Danny	Levin	Swalwell (CA)
DeGette	Lewis	Takai
Delaney	Lieu, Ted	Takano
DeLauro	Lipinski	Thompson (CA)
DeBene	LoBiondo	Thompson (MS)
DeSaulnier	Loeback	Thompson (PA)
Deutch	Lofgren	Titus
Dingell	Lowenthal	Tonko
Doggett	Lowe	Torres
Dold	Lujan Grisham	Tsongas
Donovan	(NM)	Turner
Doyle, Michael	Luján, Ben Ray	Van Hollen
F.	(NM)	Vargas
Duckworth	Lynch	Veasey
Edwards	MacArthur	Vela
Ellison	Maloney, Sean	Velázquez
Engel	Marino	Visclosky
Eshoo	Matsui	Walz
Esty	McCollum	Wasserman
Farr	McDermott	Schultz
Fattah	McGovern	Waters, Maxine
Fitzpatrick	McKinley	Watson Coleman
Fortenberry	McNerney	Webster (FL)
Foster	Meehan	Welch
Frankel (FL)	Meeks	Whitfield
Frelinghuysen	Meng	Wilson (FL)
Fudge	Moore	Yarmuth
Gabbard	Moulton	Young (AK)
Galleo	Murphy (FL)	Zeldin
Garamendi	Murphy (PA)	

NOT VOTING—7

Adams	Cleaver	Maloney
Becerra	DeFazio	Carolyn
Cárdenas	Fincher	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR
The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 2301

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PETERS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. PETERS) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 241, noes 184, answered “present” 1, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 326]

AYES—241

Aguilar Donovan Lance
Amash Doyle, Michael Langevin
Ashford F. Larsen (WA)
Bass Duckworth Larson (CT)
Beatty Duffy Lawrence
Benishek Edwards Lee
Bera Ellison Levin Lewis
Beyer Emmer (MN)
Bishop (GA) Engel Lieu, Ted
Blumenauer Eshoo LoBiondo
Bonamici Esty Loebsack
Boyle, Brendan Farr Lofgren
F. Fattah Lowenthal
Brady (PA) Fitzpatrick Lowey
Brooks (IN) Foster Lujan Grisham
Brown (FL) Frankel (FL) (NM)
Brownley (CA) Frelinghuysen Luján, Ben Ray
Bucshon Fudge (NM)
Bustos Gabbard Lynch
Butterfield Gallego MacArthur
Calvert Garamendi Maloney, Sean
Capps Matsui
Capuano Graham McCollum
Carney Grayson McDermott
Carson (IN) Green, Al McGovern
Cartwright Green, Gene McKinley
Castor (FL) Grijalva McNeerney
Castro (TX) Guinta McSally
Chu, Judy Gutiérrez Meehan
Cicilline Hahn Meeks
Clark (MA) Hanna Meng
Clarke (NY) Hastings Messer
Clay Heck (NV) Moore
Clyburn Heck (WA) Moulton
Coffman Higgins Murphy (FL)
Cohen Himes Nadler
Connolly Hinojosa Napolitano
Conyers Honda Neal
Cook Hoyer Newhouse
Cooper Huffman Nolan
Costa Hurd (TX) Norcross
Costello (PA) Israel O'Rourke
Courtney Issa Pallone
Crowley Jackson Lee Pasorell
Cuellar Jeffries Paulsen
Cummings Jenkins (WV) Payne
Curbelo (FL) Johnson (GA) Pelosi
Davis (CA) Johnson, E. B. Perlmutter
Davis, Danny Jolly Peters
Davis, Rodney Joyce Peterson
DeGette Kaptur Pingree
Delaney Katko Pocan
DeLauro Keating Poliquin
DelBene Kelly (IL) Polis
Denham Kennedy Price (NC)
Dent Kildee Quigley
DeSaulnier Kilmer Rangel
Deutch Kind Reed
Diaz-Balart Kinzinger (IL) Reichert
Dingell Kirkpatrick Renacci
Doggett Knight Rice (NY)
Dold Kuster Richmond

Rigell
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sanchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David

Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (IN)
Zeldin

□ 2305

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ISSA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 297, noes 129, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 327]

AYES—297

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Buchanan
Buck
Burgess
Byrne
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Eilmers (NC)
Farenthold
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Garrett
Gibbs
Gohmert
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith

Grothman
Guthrie
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt (VA)
Jenkins (KS)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCauley
McClintock
McHenry
McMorris
Rodgers
Meadows
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer

Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Russell
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Wagner
Walberg
Walker
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Witman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (IA)
Zinke

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—1

Lipinski

NOT VOTING—7

Adams
Becerra
Cárdenas
Cleave
DeFazio
Fincher
Maloney,
Carolyn

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

Noem	Rooney (FL)	Thornberry
Nolan	Roskam	Tiberi
Norcross	Ross	Tipton
Nugent	Rothfus	Titus
Nunes	Rouzer	Trott
O'Rourke	Royce	Turner
Olson	Ruppersberger	Upton
Palazzo	Russell	Valadao
Palmer	Ryan (WI)	Vargas
Pascarell	Salmon	Veasey
Paulsen	Sánchez, Linda	Vela
Pearce	T.	Wagner
Perlmutter	Sanchez, Loretta	Walberg
Perry	Sanford	Walden
Peterson	Scalise	Walker
Pingree	Schweikert	Walorski
Pittenger	Scott (VA)	Walz
Pitts	Scott, Austin	Walters, Mimi
Poe (TX)	Sensenbrenner	Walz
Poliquin	Sessions	Waters, Maxine
Polis	Shimkus	Weber (TX)
Pompeo	Shuster	Welch
Posey	Simpson	Wenstrup
Price, Tom	Sinema	Westerman
Ratcliffe	Sires	Westmoreland
Reed	Smith (MO)	Whitfield
Reichert	Smith (NE)	Williams
Renacci	Smith (NJ)	Wilson (SC)
Ribble	Smith (TX)	Wittman
Rice (SC)	Smith (WA)	Womack
Richmond	Speier	Woodall
Rigell	Stefanik	Yoder
Roby	Stewart	Yoho
Roe (TN)	Stivers	Young (AK)
Rogers (AL)	Stutzman	Young (IA)
Rogers (KY)	Thompson (CA)	Young (IN)
Rohrabacher	Thompson (MS)	Zeldin
Rokita	Thompson (PA)	Zinke

NOES—129

Aguilar	Frelinghuysen	Meeks
Ashford	Fudge	Meng
Barletta	Gallego	Murphy (FL)
Bass	Garamendi	Nadler
Beatty	Goodlatte	Napolitano
Beyer	Graham	Pallone
Bishop (GA)	Granger	Payne
Blumenauer	Hahn	Pelosi
Bonamici	Hastings	Peters
Boyle, Brendan	Heck (WA)	Pocan
F.	Higgins	Price (NC)
Brady (PA)	Himes	Quigley
Brooks (IN)	Honda	Rangel
Brown (FL)	Hoyer	Rice (NY)
Capps	Huffman	Ros-Lehtinen
Carney	Hurd (TX)	Roybal-Allard
Carson (IN)	Israel	Ruiz
Cartwright	Johnson (GA)	Rush
Castor (FL)	Johnson, E. B.	Ryan (OH)
Chaffetz	Jolly	Sarbanes
Chu, Judy	Katko	Schakowsky
Ciilline	Kelly (IL)	Schiff
Clyburn	Kennedy	Schrader
Comstock	Kildee	Scott, David
Cooper	Kilmer	Serrano
Crowley	Kind	Sewell (AL)
Cuellar	King (NY)	Sherman
Cummings	Kirkpatrick	Slaughter
Davis (CA)	Langevin	Swalwell (CA)
Davis, Danny	Larsen (WA)	Takai
Delaney	Lawrence	Takano
DeLauro	Lee	Tonko
Dent	Levin	Torres
DeSaulnier	Lewis	Tsongas
Deutch	Lipinski	Van Hollen
Dold	Loebsack	Velázquez
Donovan	Lowenthal	Visclosky
Duckworth	Lowe	Wasserman
Engel	Lynch	Schultz
Esty	MacArthur	Watson Coleman
Farr	Maloney, Sean	Webster (FL)
Fitzpatrick	McDermott	Wilson (FL)
Foster	McNerney	Yarmuth
Frankel (FL)	Meehan	

NOT VOTING—7

Adams	Cleaver	Maloney,
Becerra	DeFazio	Carolyn
Cárdenas	Fincher	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 2309

Mr. LOWENTHAL changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

Mrs. DINGELL changed her vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

This Act may be cited as the "Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2016".

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Madam Chair, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. FOXX) having assumed the chair, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Acting Chair 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. 2577) making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes, directed her to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. DELANEY. Madam Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. DELANEY. I am opposed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Delaney moves to recommit the bill H.R. 2577 to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

In the "Capital and Debt Service Grants to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation" account, on page 47, line 11, after the dollar amount relating to capital investments, insert "(increased by \$6,000,000)".

Page 116, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$6,000,000)".

Mr. DELANEY (during the reading). Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. DELANEY. Madam Speaker, this is a final amendment to the bill, which will not kill the bill or send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage, as amended.

Madam Speaker, imagine if this Congress were focused on how the forces of innovation and globalization were changing our economy and making it harder for our businesses to compete, large and small.

Madam Speaker, imagine if this Congress were focused on the fact that, while we are creating jobs, we are increasingly creating two types of jobs—high-skilled jobs, which are reserved for those people with the best educations, and low-skilled, low-paid jobs. Increasingly, we are not creating middle-skilled jobs—the kind of jobs that have supported middle class families for decades.

Madam Speaker, imagine if this Congress were focused on the fact that, while the standard of living of average Americans is going down, the friction in their lives is going up, including the fact that so many of them have longer commutes—overbearing commutes—because of inadequate transportation, commutes that are taking time away from their families and from their communities.

Madam Speaker, if this Congress were focused on those three things, then it would quickly conclude that our top domestic economic priority should be increasing our investment in our infrastructure because this Congress would understand that rebuilding America makes us more competitive. This Congress would understand that a national infrastructure program is the best jobs program we could have because it creates good jobs, and it is sound economics.

□ 2315

This Congress would understand that better infrastructure improves the quality of life of our constituents; and because it has been so bipartisan for so many years, it could be something that unifies us, and it would understand that rebuilding America is not an expense but an investment, and we would probably score it that way dynamically.

But unfortunately, Madam Speaker, that is not the Congress we have here this evening because we are doing precisely the opposite this evening, and we are cutting our investment in infrastructure. When you look at the facts, that is a strange conclusion indeed.

But, Madam Speaker, I am optimistic. I am optimistic that one day, hopefully soon, this Congress can do something transformative around infrastructure and rebuild our country. I believe we can pay for it by fixing our broken international tax system, where we have trillions of dollars

trapped overseas, and creating pathways for that money to come back to rebuild our country.

While we wait for that day to happen, Madam Speaker, we still should be doing smart and sensible things to improve our infrastructure. My amendment does that.

My amendment increases funding for Amtrak so they can better implement the positive train control system, which is technology that is proven to make commuter rail trains safer. The National Transportation Safety Board has said that, if this system were in place since 2004, we would have had 30 fewer accidents, including preventing that terrible tragedy that we all stood here and mourned about 30 days ago in Pennsylvania.

So I ask my colleagues to support the amendment to increase funding for Amtrak so that they can better implement smart technology, the positive train control system. Like most investments in infrastructure, it is good for our constituents—in this case, public safety—and it is also a good investment for our country. I urge support of the Democratic motion to recommit.

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

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Madam Speaker, this bill that is in front of us funds programs that are the backbone of our economy and the safety net of those who need it. These are issues that we must fund responsibly, adequately, and on time. This bill does precisely just that. It does so after a lengthy, open process. It does so while looking at the individual issues one by one.

I know some people like to criticize this Congress. This is not the Congress—this is not the Congress, however—that made “shovel-ready” a joke phrase. This is a Congress who wants to act responsibly, and this bill does just that. It makes the most of what we have. It makes the most of what we have in our coffers. It acknowledges that we can’t just simply have everything that everybody wants at a time when we do have to pick priorities, when we have to spend responsibly and wisely. This bill in front of us has no tax increases, Madam Speaker.

Now, let’s be very clear: fostering economic growth has always been a top priority in our appropriations bills, and this one is no different. You see, our businesses and communities rely on safe and efficient roads and rails and waterways and airways to facilitate the billions and billions of dollars of commerce that our economy depends on. So we choose to prioritize transportation infrastructure projects that will help improve our Nation as a whole; that will make traveling across the country easier; and, make no mistake, that will also make traveling across country safer, a safer place to travel.

Madam Speaker, from increasing funding for critical agencies like the FAA, the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, and the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration to providing the Federal Railroad Administration with the resources it needs for its safety and research programs, this bill does not sacrifice safety in any way at all, in any shape or form.

Madam Speaker, the other primary responsibility of this bill is to provide for important housing programs. It ensures that our veterans continue to have access to the VASH program. It takes care of our most vulnerable citizens, such as the elderly and people with disabilities. It does that.

Let me just briefly address the specifics of this motion.

We have already taken action on the floor to add \$9 million to Amtrak for inward-facing cameras to improve the safety of Amtrak’s operation, but let me say something else. We have spent literally hundreds of hours on this bill. We have done so in a bipartisan way, in an open way. We held six public hearings with agency and department heads—six public hearings. We considered amendments in committee, and we have spent, as all of you know, 3 days on the floor now and considered about 80 amendments on this bill after 3 days in an open, transparent process. It has been an open and transparent process. We have taken amendments on this floor from both sides of the aisle.

So despite, obviously, budgetary constraints, this bill accomplishes all of what it should. We have worked hard at what we had to fund, and we got it done in a smart, purposeful, responsible way, yes.

Let me say something else that this Congress is doing. We are making serious progress on our appropriations bills this year. We are moving ahead faster and through an open process faster than we have in many years, getting the necessary work done in a timely and open and responsible fashion.

So now we have this motion to recommit. What is the purpose of this motion to recommit? Why wasn’t it done as an amendment during the 3 days when we were here?

I urge a “no” vote, and let’s get this good bill passed out of the House.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. DELANEY. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 5-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by 5-minute

votes on passage of the bill and agreeing to the Speaker’s approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 181, noes 244, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 328]

AYES—181

Aguilar	Graham	O’Rourke
Ashford	Grayson	Pallone
Bass	Green, Al	Pascarell
Beatty	Green, Gene	Payne
Bera	Grijalva	Pelosi
Beyer	Gutiérrez	Perlmutter
Bishop (GA)	Hahn	Peters
Blumenauer	Hastings	Peterson
Bonamici	Heck (WA)	Pingree
Boyle, Brendan F.	Higgins	Pocan
Brady (PA)	Himes	Polis
Brown (FL)	Hinojosa	Price (NC)
Brownley (CA)	Honda	Quigley
Bustos	Hoyer	Rangel
Butterfield	Huffman	Rice (NY)
Capps	Israel	Richmond
Capuano	Jackson Lee	Royal-Allard
Carney	Jeffries	Ruiz
Carson (IN)	Johnson (GA)	Ruppersberger
Cartwright	Johnson, E. B.	Rush
Castor (FL)	Kaptur	Ryan (OH)
Castro (TX)	Keating	Sánchez, Linda T.
Chu, Judy	Kelly (IL)	Sanchez, Loretta
Ciulline	Kennedy	Sarbanes
Clark (MA)	Kildee	Schakowsky
Clarke (NY)	Kilmer	Schiff
Clay	Kind	Schrader
Clyburn	Kirkpatrick	Scott (VA)
Cohen	Kuster	Scott, David
Connolly	Langevin	Serrano
Conyers	Larsen (WA)	Sewell (AL)
Cooper	Larson (CT)	Sherman
Costa	Lawrence	Sinema
Courtney	Lee	Sires
Crowley	Levin	Slaughter
Cuellar	Lewis	Smith (WA)
Cummings	Lieu, Ted	Speier
Davis (CA)	Lipinski	Swaik (CA)
Davis, Danny	Lipinski	Takai
DeGette	Loeb	Takano
Delaney	Loeb	Thompson (CA)
DeLauro	Lujan Grisham (NM)	Thompson (MS)
DelBene	Lujan, Ben Ray (NM)	Titus
DeSaulnier	Lynch	Tonko
Deutch	Maloney, Sean	Torres
Dingell	Matsui	Tsongas
Doggett	McCollum	Van Hollen
Doyle, Michael F.	McDermott	Vargas
Duckworth	McGovern	Veasey
Edwards	McNerney	Vela
Ellison	Meeks	Velázquez
Engel	Meng	Visclosky
Eshoo	Moore	Walz
Esty	Moulton	Wasserman
Fattah	Murphy (FL)	Schultz
Foster	Nadler	Waters, Maxine
Frankel (FL)	Napolitano	Watson Coleman
Fudge	Neal	Welch
Gabbard	Nolan	Wilson (FL)
Gallego	Norcross	Yarmuth
Garamendi		

NOES—244

Abraham	Buchanan	Curbelo (FL)
Aderholt	Buck	Davis, Rodney
Allen	Bucshon	Denham
Amash	Burgess	Dent
Amodei	Byrne	DeSantis
Babin	Calvert	DesJarlais
Barletta	Carter (GA)	Diaz-Balart
Barr	Carter (TX)	Dold
Barton	Chabot	Donovan
Benishek	Chaffetz	Duffy
Bilirakis	Clawson (FL)	Duncan (SC)
Bishop (MI)	Coffman	Duncan (TN)
Bishop (UT)	Cole	Ellmers (NC)
Black	Collins (GA)	Emmer (MN)
Blackburn	Collins (NY)	Farenthold
Blum	Comstock	Fitzpatrick
Bost	Conaway	Fleischmann
Boustany	Cook	Fleming
Brady (TX)	Costello (PA)	Flores
Brat	Cramer	Forbes
Bridenstine	Crawford	Fortenberry
Brooks (AL)	Crenshaw	Fox
Brooks (IN)	Culberson	Franks (AZ)

Frelinghuysen	Love	Ros-Lehtinen	Brooks (IN)	Hultgren	Ribble	Jeffries	McGovern	Sanchez, Loretta
Garrett	Lucas	Roskam	Buchanan	Hunter	Rice (SC)	Johnson (GA)	McNerney	Sanford
Gibbs	Luetkemeyer	Ross	Chen	Hurd (TX)	Rigell	Johnson, E. B.	McSally	Sarbanes
Gibson	Lummis	Rothfus	Burgess	Hurt (VA)	Roby	Jones	Meehan	Schakowsky
Gohmert	MacArthur	Rouzer	Byrne	Issa	Roe (TN)	Kaptur	Meeks	Schiff
Goodlatte	Marchant	Royce	Calvert	Jenkins (KS)	Rogers (AL)	Katko	Meng	Schrader
Gosar	Marino	Russell	Carter (TX)	Jenkins (WV)	Rogers (KY)	Keating	Moore	Scott (VA)
Gowdy	Massie	Ryan (WI)	Chabot	Johnson (OH)	Rokita	Kelly (IL)	Moulton	Scott, David
Granger	McCarthy	Salmon	Chaffetz	Johnson, Sam	Rooney (FL)	Kennedy	Murphy (FL)	Sensenbrenner
Graves (GA)	McCaul	Sanford	Clawson (FL)	Jolly	Ros-Lehtinen	Kildee	Nadler	Serrano
Graves (LA)	McClintock	Scalise	Coffman	Jordan	Roskam	Kilmer	Napolitano	Sewell (AL)
Graves (MO)	McHenry	Cole	Cole	Joyce	Ross	Kind	Neal	Sherman
Griffith	McKinley	Schweikert	Collins (GA)	Kelly (MS)	Rothfus	King (NY)	Nolan	Sinema
Grothman	McMorris	Scott, Austin	Collins (NY)	Kelly (PA)	Rouzer	Kirkpatrick	Norcross	Sires
Guinta	Rodgers	Sensenbrenner	Conaway	King (IA)	Royce	Kuster	O'Rourke	Slaughter
Guthrie	McSally	Sessions	Cook	Kinzinger (IL)	Russell	Lamborn	Pallone	Smith (NJ)
Hanna	Meadows	Shimkus	Cramer	Kline	Ryan (WI)	Langevin	Pascrell	Smith (WA)
Hardy	Meehan	Shuster	Crawford	Knight	Salmon	Larsen (WA)	Payne	Speier
Harper	Messer	Simpson	Crenshaw	Labrador	Scalise	Larson (CT)	Pelosi	Swalwell (CA)
Harris	Mica	Smith (MO)	Cuellar	LaMalfa	Schweikert	Lawrence	Perlmutter	Takai
Hartzler	Miller (FL)	Smith (NE)	Culberson	Lance	Scott, Austin	Lee	Peters	Takano
Heck (NV)	Miller (MI)	Smith (NJ)	Latta	LoBiondo	Sessions	Levin	Peterson	Thompson (CA)
Hensarling	Moolenaar	Smith (TX)	Latta	LoBiondo	Shimkus	Lewis	Pingree	Thompson (MS)
Herrera Beutler	Mooney (WV)	Stefanik	Davis, Rodney	Denham	Shuster	Lieu, Ted	Pitts	Titus
Hice, Jody B.	Mullin	Stewart	Denham	Dent	Simpson	Lipinski	Pocan	Tonko
Hill	Mulvaney	Stivers	DeSantis	Loudermilk	Smith (MO)	Loeb sack	Polis	Torres
Holding	Murphy (PA)	Stutzman	DesJarlais	Love	Smith (NE)	Logren	Posey	Tsongas
Hudson	Neugebauer	Thompson (PA)	Diaz-Balart	Lucas	Smith (TX)	Lowenthal	Price (NC)	Van Hollen
Huelskamp	Newhouse	Thornberry	Duncan (SC)	Luetkemeyer	Duffy	Duffy	Quigley	Vargas
Huizenga (MI)	Noem	Tiberi	Duncan (TN)	MacArthur	Stefanik	Lujan Grisham	Rangel	Veasey
Hultgren	Nugent	Tipton	Ellmers (NC)	Marchant	Stewart	(NM)	Ratcliffe	Vela
Hunter	Nunes	Trott	Emmer (MN)	Marino	Stivers	Luján, Ben Ray	Rice (NY)	Velázquez
Hurd (TX)	Olson	Turner	Fleming	McCarthy	Stutzman	(NM)	Richmond	Visclosky
Hurt (VA)	Palazzo	Upton	Flores	McCaul	Thompson (PA)	Lummis	Rohrabacher	Walz
Issa	Palmer	Valadao	Forbes	McHenry	Thornberry	Lynch	Roybal-Allard	Wasserman
Jenkins (KS)	Paulsen	Wagner	Fortenberry	McKinley	Tiberi	Maloney, Sean	Ruiz	Schultz
Jenkins (WV)	Pearce	Walberg	Meadows	McMorris	Tipton	Massie	Ruppersberger	Waters, Maxine
Johnson (OH)	Perry	Walden	Messer	Rodgers	Trott	Matsui	Rush	Watson Coleman
Johnson, Sam	Pittenger	Walker	Mica	Meadows	Turner	McClintock	Ryan (OH)	Welch
Jolly	Pitts	Walorski	Miller (FL)	Miller (MI)	Upton	McCollum	Sánchez, Linda	Wilson (FL)
Jones	Poe (TX)	Walters, Mimi	Frelinghuysen	Moolenaar	Waldado	McDermott	T.	Yarmuth
Jordan	Poliquin	Weber (TX)	Garrett	Mooney (WV)	Wagner	Adams	Cleaver	Maloney,
Joyce	Pompeo	Webster (FL)	Gibbs	Mullin	Walberg	Becerra	DeFazio	Carolyn
Katko	Posey	Wenstrup	Goodlatte	Mulvaney	Walden	Cárdenas	Fincher	
Kelly (MS)	Price, Tom	Westerman	Gowdy	Murphy (PA)	Walker			
Kelly (PA)	Ratcliffe	Westmoreland	Graham	Neugebauer	Walorski			
King (IA)	Reed	Whitfield	Granger	Newhouse	Walters, Mimi			
King (NY)	Reichert	Williams	Graves (GA)	Noem	Weber (TX)			
Kinzinger (IL)	Renacci	Wittman	Graves (LA)	Nugent	Webster (FL)			
Kline	Ribble	Womack	Graves (MO)	Nunes	Wenstrup			
Knight	Rice (SC)	Woodall	Griffith	Olson	Westerman			
Labrador	Rigell	Yoder	Grothman	Palazzo	Whitfield			
LaMalfa	Roby	Yoho	Guinta	Palmer	Williams			
Lamborn	Roe (TN)	Young (AK)	Guthrie	Paulsen	Wilson (SC)			
Lance	Rogers (AL)	Young (IA)	Hanna	Pearce	Wittman			
Latta	Rogers (KY)	Young (IN)	Hardy	Perry	Womack			
LoBiondo	Rohrabacher	Zeldin	Harper	Pittenger	Woodall			
Long	Rokita	Zinke	Harris	Heck (NV)	Yoder			
Loudermilk	Rooney (FL)		Hartzler	Hensarling	Yoho			
			Heck (NV)	Herrera Beutler	Young (AK)			
			Hensarling	Hill	Young (IA)			
			Hill	Holding	Young (IN)			
			Holding	Hudson	Zeldin			
			Hudson	Huizenga (MI)	Zinke			
			Huizenga (MI)					

NOT VOTING—8

Adams	Cleaver	Fincher
Becerra	DeFazio	Maloney,
Cárdenas	Farr	Carolyn

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 2329

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Under clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 216, nays 210, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 329]

YEAS—216

Abraham	Barr	Blackburn
Aderholt	Barton	Blum
Allen	Benishek	Bost
Amodi	Bilirakis	Boustany
Ashford	Bishop (MI)	Brady (TX)
Babin	Bishop (UT)	Brat
Barletta	Black	Bridenstine

NAYS—210

Aguilar	Clyburn	Farr
Amash	Cohen	Fattah
Bass	Comstock	Fitzpatrick
Beatty	Connolly	Foster
Bera	Conyers	Frankel (FL)
Beyer	Cooper	Franks (AZ)
Bishop (GA)	Costa	Fudge
Blumenauer	Costello (PA)	Gabbard
Bonamici	Courtney	Galleo
Boyle, Brendan	Crowley	Garamendi
F.	Cummings	Gibson
Brady (PA)	Davis (CA)	Gohmert
Brooks (AL)	Davis, Danny	Gosar
Brown (FL)	DeGette	Grayson
Brownley (CA)	Delaney	Green, Al
Buck	DeLauro	Green, Gene
Bustos	DelBene	Grijalva
Butterfield	DeSaunier	Gutiérrez
Capps	Deutch	Hahn
Capuano	Dingell	Hastings
Carney	Doggett	Heck (WA)
Carson (IN)	Dold	Hice, Jody B.
Carter (GA)	Donovan	Higgins
Cartwright	Doyle, Michael	Himes
Castor (FL)	F.	Hinojosa
Castro (TX)	Duckworth	Honda
Chu, Judy	Edwards	Hoyer
Ciциlline	Ellison	Huelskamp
Clark (MA)	Engel	Huffman
Clarke (NY)	Eshoo	Israel
Clay	Esty	Jackson Lee

NOT VOTING—7

Adams	Cleaver	Maloney,
Becerra	DeFazio	Carolyn
Cárdenas	Fincher	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 2335

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.

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

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN EN-GROSSMENT OF H.R. 2577, TRANSPORTATION, HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2016

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, in the engrossment of H.R. 2577, the Clerk be authorized to correct section numbers, punctuation, and cross-references, and to make such other technical and conforming changes as may be necessary to reflect the actions of the House in amending the bill, including the changes now at the desk.